

CAL POLY

Academic Senate

805.756.1258

<http://academicsenate.calpoly.edu/>

Meeting of the Academic Senate

Tuesday, May 19, 2015

UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. **Minutes:** Approval of May 5, 2015 minutes (pp. 3-4).

II. **Communication(s) and Announcement(s):** none.

III. **Reports:**

- A. Academic Senate Chair:
- B. President's Office:
- C. Provost:
- D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
- E. Statewide Senate:
- F. CFA:
- G. ASI:

IV. **Consent Agenda:**

A. Proposal for the reorganization of the Animal Science Department and Dairy Science Department (p. 5).

B.

ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED BY ACADEMIC SENATE				
Program Name or Course Number, Title	ASCC recommendation/ Other	Academic Senate	Provost	Term Effective
BUS 206 Business Professionalism and Career Readiness I (2), 2 lectures	Reviewed 4/16/15; additional information requested from the department. Recommended for approval 4/23/15.	On consent agenda for 5/19/15 meeting.		
BUS 306 Business Professionalism and Career Readiness II (2), 2 lectures	Reviewed 4/16/15; additional information requested from the department. Recommended for approval 4/23/15.	On consent agenda for 5/19/15 meeting.		
GSB 510 Data Visualization and Communication in Business (4), 3 lectures, 1 laboratory	Reviewed 4/23/15; additional information requested from the department. Recommended for approval 5/4/15.	On consent agenda for 5/19/15 meeting.		
GSB 550 Bayesian Econometrics (4), 4 lectures	Reviewed 4/23/15; additional information requested from the department. Recommended for approval 5/4/15.	On consent agenda for 5/19/15 meeting.		

C.

COURSES TO LIST ON SUSCAT		
Course Number	Title	GE Area
AEPS 315	Organic Agriculture	F
AG 315	Organic Agriculture	F
AG 330	Cal Poly Land: Nature, Technology, and Society	F
AG 350	The Global Environment	F
AG 360	Holistic Management	F
ASCI 360	Holistic Management	F
BIO 112	Environmental Biology and Conservation	B5
BIO 227	Wildlife Conservation Biology	B2
BOT 311	Plants, People and Civilization	B5
BRAE 348	Energy for a Sustainable Society	F
CM 317	Sustainability and the Built Environment	F
EDES 350	The Global Environment	F
ENGR 350	The Global Environment	F

Course Number	Title	GE Area
GEOG 301	Geography of Resource Utilization	D5
HNRS 391	Appropriate Technology for the World's People: Development	D5
HNRS 392	Appropriate Technology for the World's People: Design	F
HUM 350	The Global Environment	F
ISLA 330	Cal Poly Land: Nature, Technology, and Society	F
ISLA 350	The Global Environment	F
IT 330	Packaging Fundamentals	F
LA 220	Landscape Ecology: Concepts, Issues and Interrelationships	B5
ME 320	Consumer Energy Guide	F
MSCI 307	World Aquaculture: Applications, Methodologies and Trends	F
NR 321	Water Systems Technology, Issues and Impacts	F
NR 323	Human Dimensions in Natural Resources Management	D5
NR 324	Social Dimensions of Sustainable Food and Fiber Systems	D5
PHIL 340	Environmental Ethics	C4
POLS 333	World Food Systems	F
PSC 201	Physical Oceanography	B5
PSC 320	Energy, Society and the Environment	F
PSC 391	Appropriate Technology for the World's People: Development	D5
PSC 392	Appropriate Technology for the World's People: Design	F
PSY 311	Environmental Psychology	D5
SCM 350	The Global Environment	F
SCM 360	Selected Environmental Issues of the California's Central Coast	F
SS 121	Introductory Soil Science	B5
UNIV 330	Cal Poly Land: Nature, Technology, and Society	F
UNIV 333	World Food Systems	F
UNIV 350	The Global Environment	F
UNIV 391	Appropriate Technology for the World's People: Development	D5
UNIV 392	Appropriate Technology for the World's People: Design	F

V. **Special Reports:**

- A. **Sexual Assault and Prevention Across Campus** by Jean DeCosta, Dean of Students and Christina Kaviani, Coordinator Safer.
- B. **Master Plan and Enrollment Planning** by Linda Dalton, Interim University Planning Officer.

VI. **Business Item(s):**

- A. **Resolution in Support of AS-3197-14 The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom:** Manzar Foroohar, Statewide Senator, second reading (pp. 6-10).
- B. **Resolution to Amend the Definition of Membership of the General Faculty on the *Constitution of the Faculty*:** Manzar Foroohar, Statewide Senator, first reading (pp. 11-12).
- C. **Resolution on Faculty Involvement in the Development and Articulation of Faculty Salary Adjustment Plans:** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee chair, first reading (p. 13-16).
- D. **Resolution Requesting that Chancellor Tim White Undertake a Prompt Review of Cal Poly, SLO Governance:** Wyatt Brown, CAFES Senator, first reading (p. 17).
- E. **Resolution on Department Name Change for the Animal Science Department:** Richard Cavaletto, Associate Dean-Undergraduate CAFES, first reading (p. 18).
- F. **Resolution on Modification of Retention of Exam Policy:** Jonathan Shapiro, Fairness Board chair, first reading (p. 19).
- G. **Resolution to Review the Periodic Review Guidelines for Campus Centers and Institutes with Academic Affiliation:** Rafael Jimenez-Flores, Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Committee chair, first reading (pp. 20-25).

VII. **Discussion Item(s):**

VIII. **Adjournment:**

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of the
Academic Senate Meeting
Tuesday, May 5, 2015
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the Academic Senate minutes from April 21, 2015.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

- A. **Letter to Chancellor White & Chancellor Harris regarding community college baccalaureate degrees:** The Council of Academic Senate Chairs sent a letter to Chancellor White and Chancellor Harris regarding the implementation of Senate Bill 850. The letter asks for friendlier response times to comment on the potential overlap in proposed community college programs.
- B. **Introduction of Senators for 2015-2016:** The Academic Senate caucus chairs introduced new and returning senators from their respective colleges.

III. Reports:

- A. **Academic Senate Chair (Laver):** There will be a Senate meeting on May 26, 2015 in building 7, the Advance Technology Lab.
- B. **President's Office:** none.
- C. **Provost (Pedersen):** The Chancellor's Office's Task Force on Sustainable Budget is finalizing their report and will be coming forward very soon. The Associate Vice President for Facilities search is continuing and two candidates will be on site for interviews.
- D. **Vice President for Student Affairs:** none.
- E. **Statewide Senate:** none.
- F. **CFA Campus President (Archer):** Please sign the petition regarding equity and administrative bloat.
- G. **ASI Representative (Billington):** Billington reported that Resolution #15-03 ASI Board of Director Stance Against Mandatory Second Year Housing passed. If there are any questions about Resolution #15-04 ASI Board of Director Support of Open Course Evaluations, please e-mail them to Nicole Billington at chairofboard@asi.calpoly.edu.

IV. Consent Agenda:

- A. **Report on the Status of the University Honors Program:** Gregg Fiegel, Interim Director of University Honors Program, gave a report on the growth and development of the University Honors Program.
The presentation can be found here: http://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academic_senate/1/presentations/2014-2015/050515_honors_program.pdf
- B. **Update:** Jeffrey Armstrong, President, spoke about his thoughts on the compensation issues the faculty has been facing. The President then opened up a question and answer session to the floor of the Senate.
- C. **Salary Adjustment Update:** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee chair, spoke on a report that is currently being drafted by the Faculty Affairs Committee regarding salary equity for Cal Poly faculty. The report articulates standards to guide the implementation of the salary adjustment program through the next few years.

V. Business Item(s):

- A. **Resolution on Faculty, Staff, and Management Compensation:** Manzar Foroohar, Statewide Senate, presented a resolution that lowers the student to faculty ratio, increases tenure density, increases transparency in management salaries. M/S/F to approve the amendments presented by Steve Rein to the resolution. M/S/P to approve the Resolution on Faculty, Staff, and Management Compensation.
- B. **Resolution on Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Nutrition:** Aydin Nazmi, Food Science and Nutrition, spoke on a resolution that proposes a Master of Science in Nutrition program. M/S/P to approve the Resolution on Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Nutrition.
- C. **Resolution on the New Registration System:** Tom Gutierrez, CSM Caucus Chair, and Harvey Greenwald, Math Department, spoke on a proposed resolution that asks the Registrar's Office to develop and share an assessment for the effectiveness of the New Registration System. M/S/P to approve the Resolution on the New Registration System.
- D. **Resolution in Support of AS-3197-14 The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom:** Manzar Foroohar presented a resolution for Cal Poly to endorse AS-3197-14 The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom. This resolution was discussed and will return as a second reading.

VI. Discussion Item(s): none.

VII. Adjournment: 5:00 pm

Submitted by,



Alex Ye
Academic Senate Student Assistant

**ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
ON THE PROPOSAL FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF THE ANIMAL SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT AND DAIRY SCIENCE DEPARTMENT**

Per Academic Senate resolution AS-715-10, Resolution on the Academic Senate Policy and Procedures for Reorganization of Academic Programs and Academic Units and Suspension of Programs, the Academic Senate Executive Committee reviewed at its May 12, 2015 meeting the request from the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences for the reorganization of the Animal Science Department and Dairy Science Department.

This would result in the Animal Science Degree Program and Dairy Science Degree Program remaining independent programs but housed under the new Animal Sciences Department, with Dr. Jaymie Noland serving as Department Head.

The Executive Committee's conclusion is that the request is non-contentious, and recommends approval of this proposal.

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

AS-___-15

**RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF AS-3197-14
THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
POLICY ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

- 1 WHEREAS, The last formal statement on academic freedom for the California State University was
2 approved by the Board of Trustees in 1971, therefore be it
3
4 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse AS-3197-14 The Need for a
5 Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom, which was
6 approved by the Academic Senate California State University on January 23, 2015; and
7 be it further
8
9 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate urge President Armstrong to support the statewide senate
10 resolution, "THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE CALIFORNIA STATE
11 UNIVERSITY POLICY ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM," and forward his support to
12 Chancellor White, the CSU Board of Trustees, and other presidents; and be it further
13
14 RESOLVED: That this resolution be forwarded to the CSU Board of Trustees, Chancellor White, the
15 CSU Academic Senate Chair, Cal Poly President Armstrong, and each CSU Campus
16 Academic Senate.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: March 5, 2015
Revised: April 30, 2015

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-3197-14/FA (Rev)
November 5-6, 2014

**THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY POLICY ON
ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm its constitutional responsibility “to advance the principles of academic freedom and freedom of inquiry....”¹; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Trustees to draft a comprehensive California State University (CSU) policy on academic freedom in collaboration with ASCSU faculty representatives; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge that this new policy explicitly and directly address all three main principles of the 1940 AAUP statement on Academic Freedom and its 1970 interpretation²; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge that this comprehensive policy consider both past omissions and contemporary issues related to academic freedom³, including but not limited to the right of faculty to:
- a) teach; conduct research; explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression; reach conclusions according to one’s scholarly discernment; and publish free of institutional restraint and external constraints other than those normally implied by the scholarly standards of a discipline.
 - b) freely conduct extramural activities beyond the classroom in service to their scholarly discipline, students, university community, and society at large.
 - c) freely exchange ideas and research findings in different formats, including electronic communications, without fear of violation of their privacy⁴.
 - d) freely express their views on public matters (for example, via social media) as public intellectuals without fear of retaliation from the university administration.

¹ ASCSU Constitution

[http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/About the Senate/documents/ASCSU Constitution 2013 Revision.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/About%20the%20Senate/documents/ASCSU_Constitution_2013_Revision.pdf)

² <http://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure>

³ We recognize that academic freedom is directly related to membership in the academic profession, which carries with it special responsibilities. See: AAUP “Statement on Professional Ethics.” <http://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics> and AAUP statement on “Civility” <http://www.aaup.org/issues/civility>

⁴ See AAUP statement on “Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications.” <http://www.aaup.org/report/academic-freedom-and-electronic-communications>

And University of California, Los Angeles, Faculty Resource Guide for California Public Records Requests
<https://www.apo.ucla.edu/resources/recordrequest>

- e) address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance⁵.
- f) ensure the full protections of the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the State of California, and the CSU mission; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, California Faculty Association, CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association, California State Student Association, American Association of University Professors.

RATIONALE: *The last formal statement on academic freedom for the California State University, formulated in 1971, reads:*

"a. The teacher is entitled to full freedom in teaching and in the publication of the results, subject to adequate performance of other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.

b. The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing any subject, but he should be careful not to introduce into his teaching controversial matter which has no relation to his subject."

Apart from the datedness of the masculine pronoun, the 1971 policy demands rethinking in light of the many developments over the last 40 years that have both broadened the scope of academic work and responsibilities and redefined the public expectations of what a university is and does. It also warrants rethinking in terms of the challenges to academic freedom faced by the CSU and its faculty.

Some of the developments that have broadened the scope of academic work and responsibilities include:

- *the global expansion of higher education;*
- *developments in communication technology that enable, and in fact encourage, scholars and students to function within global professional, research, and civic networks;*
- *the broader expectations attendant on academic scholars in their role as "public intellectuals" (with accompanying pressures that bear on their behavior and pronouncements inside as well as, and especially, outside of the classroom); and*

⁵AAUP statement: "Protecting an Independent Faculty Voice: Academic Freedom after Garcetti v. Ceballos" <http://www.aaup.org/report/protecting-independent-faculty-voice-academic-freedom-after-garcetti-v-ceballos>
 University of Oregon <http://policies.uoregon.edu/node/218>
 University of Wisconsin <http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/senate/2010/0301/2186.pdf>
 University of Minnesota http://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/policies/Academic_Freedom.pdf
 University of California <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/aar/jule.pdf>

- *the expansion of international programs and scholarly and student exchanges, with the concomitant potential for geopolitical pressures on universities and faculty.*

In addition, public expectations regarding the nature and role of the university itself have evolved significantly over the last 40 years. The expansion of expectations of a large public university such as the CSU--from a community of teachers and students to a complex institution functioning at the intersection of diverse worlds, interests, and investments (intellectual, economic, social, political, as well as local, regional, national, and global in scope)--opens the university as well as its faculty to intensified scrutiny and potential interference from a wide variety of quarters and in pursuit of a variety of agendas.

The 1940 AAUP policy, reaffirmed in 1970, includes three components, the first two are reflected directly in the CSU policy, but the following component is not explicitly addressed:

College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.⁶

The 1971 CSU policy is too limited in scope to deal with potential challenges presented by activities such as faculty's participation in extramural pursuits beyond the classroom, faculty's use of electronic communications, faculty's public expressions via social media, faculty's role in shared governance, or external requests for access to faculty electronic communications. The lack of a clear policy has the dangerous potential of faculty self-censorship. The lack of a comprehensive policy on academic freedom has left CSU faculty at the mercy of different interpretations and implementations of the principles of academic freedom.

The CSU cannot afford to have a policy on Academic Freedom that is insufficient for the 21st century. The mission of the institutions of higher education is serving society by discovering, investigating, communicating, and preserving knowledge by educating students and the larger society. This mission cannot be fulfilled without freedom of teaching, research, and communication inside and outside of the classroom.

In summary, the wording and content of the policy is outdated and insufficient, as the nature of academic activity has changed. Our policy should be regularly reviewed and,

⁶<http://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure>

if needed, revised to reflect such changes, as is done by other major universities⁷. We want to be proactive, updating the policy to reflect best practices and address components of academia in the 21st century. As the largest public university system in the United States, the CSU is often a leader in higher education, but our current policy is behind the times, as it does not fully reflect the content of the 1940 AAUP statement nor advancements in area of academic freedom since then.

Approved – January 23, 2015

⁷Some examples of best practices could be found

at: University of Oregon

<http://policies.uoregon.edu/node/218>

University of Wisconsin <http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/senate/2010/0301/2186.pdf>

University of Minnesota

http://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/policies/Academic_Freedom.pdf University of

California <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/aar/jule.pdf>

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

AS-__-15

Background Statement: On January 23, 2015, the Academic Senate CSU unanimously approved resolution AS-3199-15/FA Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Shared Governance in the California State University: A Call to Campus Senates. Such resolution encourages campus senates to review or revise their constitutions and policies in order to include lecturers, non-tenure track librarians, coaches, and counselors, in the term “faculty” in a manner consistent with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 2.13).

**RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE DEFINITION OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE GENERAL
FACULTY ON THE *CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY***

1 RESOLVED: That the definition of General Faculty in Article I and Article III.1 of the current
2 *Constitution of the Faculty* be amended; and be it further
3

4 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate conduct a General Faculty referendum to amend Article I and
5 Article III.1 of the current *Constitution of the Faculty* as follows:
6

7 **ARTICLE I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE GENERAL FACULTY**

8 Voting members of the General Faculty of Cal Poly shall consist of those persons who are employed at
9 Cal Poly and belong to at least one of the following entities: (1) full-time tenured/tenure-track
10 instructional faculty; academic employees holding faculty rank whose principal duty is within an
11 academic department, unit, or program; (2) faculty members permanent instructional faculty in the Pre-
12 Retirement Reduction in Time Base Program (PRTB) and Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP); (3)
13 full-time probationary and/or permanent employees in Professional Consultative Services (PCS) as
14 defined in Article III.1.b of this constitution which includes (a) librarians; (b) counselors; (c) student
15 services professionals [SSP]: SSPI-Academically Related, SSPII-Academically Related, and SSPIII-
16 Academically Related; (d) SSPs III and IV; (e) physicians; and (f) coaches holding a current faculty
17 appointment of at least one year; (4) Librarian and counselor faculty in the Pre-Retirement Reduction in
18 Time Base Program (PRTB) and Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP); full-time coaches holding a
19 current faculty appointment of at least one year; (5) part-time lecturers holding full-time appointments of
20 for at least one six consecutive years in one or more academic departments, units, or programs; or (6)
21 lecturers with a current holding full-time appointments of at least one year, or who have had three
22 consecutive quarters with an assignment of 15 WTUs; for at least three consecutive quarters; or (7) part-
23 time probationary and/or permanent employees in Professional Consultative Services (PCS) holding
24 current employment of at least six consecutive years which include (a) librarians; (b) counselors; (c)
25 student services professionals [SSP]: SSPI-Academically Related, SSPII-Academically Related, and
26 SSPIII-Academically Related; (d) SSPs III and IV; (e) physicians; and (f) coaches.
27

28 Members of the General Faculty, including department chairs/heads, shall not cease to be members
29 because of any assigned time allotted to them for the carrying out of duties consistent with their

employment at Cal Poly. "Visiting Personnel" and volunteer instructors shall not be members of the General Faculty. Members of the General Faculty who are on leave for at least one year shall not be voting members during their leave.

Nonvoting membership in the General Faculty shall consist of all academic personnel not included in the voting membership.

ARTICLE III. THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Section I. Membership

- (a) Colleges with fewer than 30 faculty members shall elect two senators. All other colleges shall elect three senators, plus one additional senator for each additional 30 ~~faculty members~~ FTEP (Full Time Equivalent Faculty) or major fraction thereof.¹
- (b) Designated personnel in Professional Consultative Services (excepting directors) shall be represented in the Academic Senate by the formula of one senator per each fifteen FTE (Full Time Equivalent) members or major fraction thereof:²
- (1) ~~Full time probationary or permanent Librarians; and~~
 - (2) ~~Full time probationary or permanent (a) counselors; (b) student services professionals [SSP]; SSP I academically related, SSP II academically related, and SSP III academically related; (c) SSPs III and IV; (d) Cooperative Education lecturers; and (e) physicians.~~
 - (3) ~~Full time coaches holding a current faculty appointment of at least one year.~~
- (c) ~~Part-time lecturers in an academic department/teaching area and part-time employees in Professional Consultative Services, other than those who are members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I, will be represented by one voting member in the Senate.~~
- (d) Senators acting in an at-large capacity are the current Academic Senate Chair, the immediate Past Academic Senate Chair, and the CSU academic senators. All at-large positions shall be voting positions except for the Academic Senate Chair which is a nonvoting position except when the Chair's vote is needed to break a tie.

Proposed By: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: April 24, 2015

¹ All calculations are based on employment data from October of the academic year of the election

² All calculations are based on employment data from October of the academic year of the election

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

AS-__-15

**RESOLUTION ON FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN THE
DEVELOPMENT AND ARTICULATION OF
FACULTY SALARY ADJUSTMENT PLANS**

- 1 WHEREAS, The CSU faculty contract allows the CSU to fund campus-specific ways to address salary
2 inequities according to campus and region specific needs; and
3
- 4 WHEREAS, Salary inequities include salary compression, salary inversion, and substandard salaries for the
5 lowest paid junior faculty; and
6
- 7 WHEREAS, The President and Provost announced that Cal Poly has implemented the first stage of a four
8 year salary adjustment program to address these salary inequities for faculty; and
9
- 10 WHEREAS, The Cal Poly President and Provost have stated that there is no greater problem at Cal Poly than
11 salary inequities; and
12
- 13 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate was not involved in the initial formation of this salary adjustment
14 program; and
15
- 16 WHEREAS, In the interest of shared governance, Senate Chair has asked the Faculty Affairs Committee to
17 work with the administration to provide faculty input in the further articulation and
18 development of Cal Poly's salary adjustment program; and
19
- 20 WHEREAS, The Provost has also requested that the Faculty Affairs Committee assist in further articulation
21 and development of Cal Poly's salary adjustment program beyond the first stage already in
22 place; therefore be it
23
- 24 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the attached *Achieving Salary Equity for Cal Poly Faculty*
25 report proposing goals for assessing and articulating salary adjustment plans: and be it further
26
- 27 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate request that the administration deliver to the Faculty Affairs
28 Committee a budgetary feasibility report on the implementation of the salary adjustments
29 programs in light of the goals articulated in the attached Faculty Affairs Committee report: and
30 be it further
31
- 32 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate urge the administration and local CFA leadership to consult with the
33 Academic Senate about in any further development of salary adjustment programs, and to do so
34 at the initial stages of the development of such programs.

Proposed by: Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: May 14, 2015

ACHIEVING SALARY EQUITY FOR CAL POLY FACULTY

Report by Faculty Affairs Committee
Presented to Academic Senate 5/19/2015

This report from the Faculty Affairs Committee to the Academic Senate advises the administration concerning goals for the next three stages of the salary adjustment program, especially the second stage to be implemented July, 2015. Ideally, the administration will provide to the Senate budgetary feasibility reports on our recommendations for further discussion.

Specifically, we provide advice on implementing two types of equity adjustments for the next rounds of salary adjustments: 1) **Baseline Salary Equity** (i.e. setting minimum salaries for assistant, associate, and full professors), and 2) **General Salary Equity** (i.e. targeting inversion and compression, faculty below CSU averages for rank and department, and full professors with stagnant salaries). We also advise that the next phases of salary adjustment provide meaningful salary increases for lecturers, with emphasis on the 3-year entitled lecturers. However, it is not for us to dictate an appropriate salary structure for lecturers. The wide range of duties and degrees held by lecturers (from bachelor's to M.D. and Ph.D.) suggests that their salary concerns must be addressed through consultation between Academic Personnel, Deans, and lecturer representatives.

These aspirational goals for the administration to use in formulating the next three phases of the salary adjustment program take into consideration all Unit 3 faculty. However, the budgetary realities of adjusting faculty and staff base salaries (and benefits), and achieving a satisfactory level of equity across all ranks, must be quantified so that we can tailor our goals and phase them in over the next three stages of the Salary Adjustment Program.

Two categories of salary equity adjustments for Tenure/Tenure-Track Faculty:

We recommend that the administration employ two forms of adjustments to salaries. Baseline salary equity adjustments define an absolute minimum salary for faculty: salaries below the baseline need to be adjusted (at least) to that baseline. General salary equity adjustments apply to compression and inversion adjustments, full professors with flat salaries since promotion, and to faculty whose salaries merit adjustment by being below standards for comparison with other comparable faculty. We describe each of these salary adjustment instruments below and offer recommendations for the use of each. Our recommendations concerning these instruments serve two functions:

1. Framing overall goals for salary equity at Cal Poly
2. Formulating clear means to aim towards achieving these goals

Since the salary adjustment program consists of four stages, one of which is already completed, clear overall goals and clear means for achieving those goals would aid in partitioning the effort to achieve those goals into manageable steps whose purpose can be more easily understood and communicated.

Baseline Salary Equity

Baseline salary equity defines an absolute minimum salary for faculty for each year in rank as a function of three things: the absolute baseline minimum salary of an Assistant Professor, minimum salaries for each year in rank as a compounded percentage of the Assistant Professor minimum, and a minimum step for promotion to a higher rank.

- a) Minimum for Assistant Professors (now set at \$65k/yr),
- b) 1.25% compounded per year at rank (5 yrs. for Assistant, 4 yrs. for Associate),
- c) 7.5% promotion (contract minimum) sets minimum for next rank,
- d) Halt annual steps at SSI max.

The value for (a) has already been determined in the first stage of the salary adjustment program ("SAP1"); we simply preserve this number for the purpose of explaining the further aspects of baseline salary equity. The value of (a) could change due to future GSI as a result of contract negotiations, or from decisions at Cal Poly that a higher minimum salary is appropriate for newly hired Assistant Professors.

The values of percentage annual and rank promotion steps used in (b) and (c) together approximate the percentage step from the Assistant Professor minimum to the Associate Professor minimum on the current Unit 3 salary schedule (approximately 14.5%). The annual step percentage is nothing more than a rate that when compounded for the nominal number of years in rank would use the contract minimum for promotions (7.5%) to define the minimum for the next rank. Repeat that process and a minimum step to Full Professor would likewise be calculated.

Using Baseline Salary Equity as a guide, we have a recommendation for structuring SAP2: use compounded annual steps and the contract minimum promotion rate from the new minimum Assistant Professor salary of \$65,000 to calculate new minimum salaries for Associate and Full Professors, and the annual steps from the three rank baselines. Then, adjust salaries that fall below their annual step up to their annual step. Doing so would achieve Baseline Salary Equity for those faculty whose salaries are below the baselines. We ask for a budgetary feasibility report on the implementation of this recommendation.

Baseline Salary Equity requires that faculty salaries may not fall below their annual step at rank. Implementing adjustments from this instrument would arrest compression and inversion at the bottom end of the salary scale, and do so according to a clear rubric. Salary inequities above the baseline require alternate means of relief, and that is what is covered in the next section.

General Salary Equity

- Adjust salaries for compression/inversion inequities at the department level, based on rank
- Adjust salaries for long-serving Full Professors who typically have had a flat salary since promotion.
 - Account for time in rank in adjustments
 - May use 5 year periods used for PT review for future step increases
- Adjust salaries that are below averages for peer CSU departments, or peer departments at other institutions

Compression/inversion salary equity adjustments should continue. The adjustments should be on a department basis, based on rank. Academic Personnel and the deans should identify cases with all faculty considered as potential candidates.

Long serving Full Professors who have not had raises since promotion should be considered for equity salary adjustments. Priority should be based on time served at that rank. This should be coordinated with a long term recommendation to use 5 year Post Tenure reviews as occasions for salary adjustments with consideration of the results of the performance review.

Salaries that are below averages for peer CSU departments should also be adjusted. Salaries should also be competitive with peer departments at other institutions. Such comparisons should take into consideration the stature of Cal Poly's programs and the pools of students with which they compete. Deans, department heads and Academic Personnel should work to identify peer departments competitive salaries.

Second phase of the salary adjustment program should implement both baseline and general equity adjustments

- Neither the baseline nor general salary equity provisions get a substantially smaller allotment than the other.

- Emphasis should be given to groups whose salary inequities were not addressed with the first round.

Our desideratum for the completion of the salary adjustment program is to treat baseline and general equity adjustments as comparably compelling concerns. At the same time, since the salary adjustment programs shall be implemented in four phases, one of which is already complete, we think that a shift in emphasis for the second phase is appropriate towards those groups/individuals that were not targeted on the first phase.

Once the groups to be targeted, the individuals in them deserving adjustment, and the target level of adjustment for each individual are identified the task remains as to how to apportion the available funds among the above identified individuals.

We did not reach a consensus in this regard. Rather, we identified two alternative ways to proceed. One alternative is to first divide the available funds into three separate sub-funds, one for each type of claim (baseline, general equity adjustments, lecturer adjustments—see below), and then apportion the amount in each sub-fund among all the identified individuals from that group in proportion to their target level of adjustment. Were there to be a ‘surplus amount’ in any of those sub-funds after meeting the targets for the individuals in those groups, the surplus amount would be added to the funds available to the other groups. This method has the advantage that it recognizes that all three groups of claims deserve, in principle, substantial consideration in the apportionment process.

A second alternative is simply to divide the available funds among all the identified individuals from all groups in proportion to their target level of adjustment, up to the meeting of all individual targets. This method has the advantage that it is conceptually simpler, and that it treats all claims to the available funds on equal footing, regardless of the source of the claim.

Equity for Lecturers

Lecturers need meaningful inclusion in the subsequent implementations of SAP, both with respect to baseline and general equity adjustments to lecturer salaries. We recommend that the focus initially be on inequities for the 3 year entitled lecturers, and it seems to make good sense to phase equity adjustments in at the time of contract renewal. This spreads the budgetary burden of addressing these inequities across the remaining three implementations of SAP. Deans and Academic Personnel need to work together to find solutions specific to the diverse body of lecturers in each college. We strongly recommend that Deans and the office of Academic Personnel determine how to exhaust other alternatives for addressing salary inequities before tapping into SAP funds. We request that, based on this consultative work, the office of Academic Personnel formulate a budgetary report for the cost of implementing appropriate equity adjustments that identifies which inequities could be addressed by means outside of SAP, and which would be better addressed within the scope of SAP.

FAC Members:

D. Kenneth Brown, CLA (chair) (dbrown07@calpoly.edu)
 Pat M. Fidopiastis, CSM
 Jim Guthrie, CAED
 Gary Laver, Senate Chair (ex officio, non-voting)
 Albert Liddicoat, Admin (ex officio)
 Vittorio Monteverdi, ASI (ex officio)
 Aydin Nazmi, CAFES
 Hugh Smith, CENG
 Eduardo Zambrano, OCOB
 PCS vacant

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

AS-__-15

**RESOLUTION REQUESTING THAT CHANCELLOR TIM WHITE UNDERTAKE A
PROMPT REVIEW OF CAL POLY, SLO GOVERNANCE**

- 1 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo has received widespread
2 expressions of concern from faculty and staff about the present efficacy of
3 governance on campus; and
4
- 5 WHEREAS, A series of conflicts over the last few years has highlighted issues related to
6 communication and transparency and shared governance, has opened serious
7 rifts in our shared sense of community, and has contributed to extremely low
8 morale; and
9
- 10 WHEREAS, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo needs to refocus its attention on its core mission to
11 serve our students and community through teaching, research and service; and
12
- 13 WHEREAS, A fresh look at the Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo situation from outside the
14 campus could help diagnose problems and identify solutions, therefore, be it
15
- 16 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo requests that
17 Chancellor Tim White undertake a prompt review of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo
18 governance. We recommend that the review should broadly and confidentially
19 consult with all relevant campus leaders and groups – including faculty, staff,
20 students and all levels of administration. We urge that the Chancellor use the
21 findings of the review to implement any measures needed to improve the
22 efficacy of management and to help restore a strong sense of shared purpose to
23 our campus governance; be it further
24
- 25 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo make this request
26 respectfully, with a desire for a constructive outcome, and with no
27 preconceived vision.

Proposed by: Wyatt Brown, CAFES Senator
Date: May 13, 2015

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

AS-__-15

**RESOLUTION ON
DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE FOR THE ANIMAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT**

- 1 WHEREAS, Due to a reorganization of the Animal Science Department and the
2 Dairy Science Department to form a single new department; and
3
4 WHEREAS, The Animal Science Degree Program and Dairy Science Degree
5 Program will remain independent but housed under the same
6 department; therefore be it
7
8 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support the request for department name
9 change from Animal Science Department to Animal Sciences
10 Department.

Proposed by: Animal Science & Dairy Science Departments
Date: May 1, 2015

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

AS-____-15

RESOLUTION ON MODIFICATION OF RETENTION OF EXAMS POLICY

- 1
2 WHEREAS, Students have the right to view their final exams, papers, projects, or other tangible
3 items used as evaluation instruments; and
4
5 WHEREAS, Such access is necessary for a student to understand the grade which was assigned
6 and, if he or she finds it necessary, dispute it by filing a complaint with the Fairness
7 Board; and
8
9 WHEREAS, There are often times following the completion of a quarter, especially over the
10 summer, when either the student or the faculty member is away from campus, or
11 unforeseen circumstances, such as illness by either a student or instructor, which
12 delay access by the student to these evaluation instruments beyond the current one
13 quarter minimum retention period required of instructors; and
14
15 WHEREAS, Faculty are often unaware of even the current requirement that they maintain
16 evaluation instruments and records for at least one quarter; therefore be it
17
18 RESOLVED: That the following changes be made to the appropriate section of the CAM
19 (wording following AS-247-87/SA&FBC):
20 "Faculty Responsibilities Regarding Retention of Exams and Other Evaluation
21 Instruments
22 Exams, papers, projects, or other tangible items used in the evaluation of students
23 need not be retained by the instructor beyond the end of the term of evaluation, if
24 there was an announced opportunity for students to retrieve same during the term.
25 For final exams or other evaluation instruments where no announced opportunity
26 for student review existed before the end of the term, instructors should retain the
27 materials for ~~one~~ two full quarters. While special situations may arise requiring
28 deviation from this goal, instructors will be responsible to defend any deviation in
29 the event of a subsequent review of a student's evaluations"; and be it further
30
31 RESOLVED: That the Deans of the colleges be encouraged to make their faculty aware of this
32 policy on retention of exams and student access to same.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Fairness Board
Date: March 30, 2015

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

AS-__-15

**RESOLUTION TO REVISE THE PERIODIC REVIEW GUIDELINES FOR
CAMPUS CENTERS AND INSTITUTES WITH ACADEMIC AFFILIATION**

- 1 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Executive Committee charged the Research,
2 Scholarship & Creative Activities (RSCA) Committee with the review
3 of CAP 260, including subsection 262 related to Campus Centers and
4 Institutes; and
5
- 6 WHEREAS, On October 24, 2014, Executive Order 751 – Centers, Institutes, and
7 Similar Organizations on Campuses of the California State University
8 was replaced with coded memorandum AA-2014-18; and
9
- 10 WHEREAS, The RSCA Committee has evaluated and suggests certain revisions to
11 the Program Review (aka Periodic Review) process for Campus
12 Centers and Institutes; therefore be it
13
- 14 RESOLVED: That the attached *Periodic Review Guidelines for Campus Centers and*
15 *Institutes with Academic Affiliation* be approved as a replacement for
16 *Program Review Guidelines for Campus Centers and Institutes with*
17 *Academic Affiliation*, approved by the Academic Senate on March 11,
18 2014.

Proposed by: Research, Scholarship and Creative
Activities Committee

Date: April 21, 2015

BRIEF SUMMARY OF REVISIONS TO POLICY RELATED TO PERIODIC REVIEW
FOR CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

(SUMMARY DOCUMENT, REV. MARCH 18, 2015)

1. Periodic Review Guidelines for Campus Centers and Institutes with Academic Affiliation.

A. TITLE/DESCRIPTION.

i. The former policy (and its predecessor) used the term "program review." This was awkward and confusing, because program review is affiliated with academic, degree granting activities.

ii. In order to avoid confusion with program review, the term "periodic review" has been implemented in the revised policy.

B. TIMING.

i. FORMER POLICY. The former policy had a recurring five year cycle. During the CSU audit of centers and institutes (13-14) on our campus, the auditor noted that many of our centers and institutes had not performed a periodic review for over five years. To address that audit finding, our campus agreed to implement a five year rotation for all centers and institutes.

ii. NEW POLICY. Last year, the CSU has issued an administrative memorandum which allows up to seven years between periodic reviews for centers and institutes. In order to comply with our audit finding, we will continue to use a single five year cycle for all centers and institutes to bring them up to currency, and thereafter will implement a seven year cycle (e.g. every center/institute in existence at time of the audit will complete a periodic review within the originally scheduled five year period, and thereafter a seven year schedule will be implemented).

C. EXTERNAL REVIEWERS.

i. FORMER POLICY. The former policy required external reviewers and had references which appeared to imply that centers and institutes were associated with granting academic degrees.

ii. ISSUE. The former policy appeared to be merely copied from a program review template for degree granting academic programs. Centers and institutes do not issue degrees, and may provide co-curricular support for many different degrees (with a variety of different learning goals, learning objectives, and subject matter areas). The requirement of external reviewers is associated with degree granting programs, and not the mission of centers and institutes.

iii. NEW POLICY. The new policy allows greater flexibility in program review by not requiring (but still permitting) external reviewers, and instead focuses upon the mission centric nature of centers and institutes in providing co-curricular support. Rather than inappropriate alignment with an academic program, the new policy looks to reporting of outcomes (e.g. support of faculty and student research) and outputs (e.g. theses, peer reviewed journals, industry engagement).

C. BEST PRACTICES.

i. FORMER POLICY. The former policy did not elicit continuous improvement or identification and implementation of best practices.

ii. ISSUE. Program review should have a continuous improvement focus.

iii. NEW POLICY. The new policy provides guidelines for program review, including identification and implementation of best practices.

Periodic Review Guidelines for Campus Centers and Institutes with Academic Affiliation

(DRAFT: 3/18/15 (includes RSCA comments on draft;

Approved by Academic Senate on _____

NOTE: This document replaces and supersedes the "Program Review Guidelines for Campus Centers and Institutes with Academic Affiliation" Approved by the Academic Senate on March 11, 2014)

1. Overview

These guidelines govern periodic review for Campus Centers and Institutes with academic affiliation at the College or University level. Such Campus Centers and Institutes are engaged in the enhancement of selected areas of research, teaching, and service.

This policy does not apply to central administrative or service units such as the Gender Equity Center, the Multi-Cultural Center, the Advising Center, or the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology, which serve campus-wide functions and which may also use the term "Center" or "Institute." These guidelines do not apply to State or Federal centers or institutes which are governed by separate policies associated with the enabling entity (e.g. Small Business Development Center which is formed through the Federal Small Business Administration, or the CSU Agricultural Research Institute which is a system wide Institute governed by the CSU).

In accordance with the University's policy for the Establishment, Evaluation, and Discontinuation of Campus Centers and Institutes with Academic Affiliation, and the California State University Chancellor's Office Coded Memorandum (CODE: AA-2014-18, dated October 24, 2014), periodic review is required for all Campus Centers and Institutes with academic affiliation (hereafter "Centers/Institutes").

2. Distinguishing Factors of Periodic Review for Centers/Institutes

The periodic review of Centers/Institutes differs from program review for degree granting academic programs offered by an academic college. Unlike an academic college, Campus Centers/Institutes do not award degrees and do not have a degree granting program curriculum committee.

Centers/Institutes operate in the context of supporting the campus mission in the areas of research, scholarship, public service, training, experiential learning, instructional support, and/or other types of co-curricular activities. Centers/Institutes are not expected to create academic assessment plans, because academic assessment plans are designed to evaluate a specific degree granting program.

For clarity, periodic review is different from the annual report requirement for all Centers/Institutes, more fully described in the Policy for the Establishment, Evaluation, and Discontinuation of Campus Centers and Institutes with Academic Affiliation (Approved by the Academic Senate, March 11, 2014).

3. Periodic Review Process

The Director of the Center or Institute, in collaboration with faculty actively involved in the subject Center/Institute, is responsible for proposing the Review Team composition, preparing the Self Study Report, and addressing any requests for additional information or clarifications, each as more fully described below in this policy.

If the Center/Institute lacks a Director at the time of scheduled periodic review, the Vice President for Research and Economic Development shall identify an appropriate substitute to perform the necessary tasks.

4. Composition of Review Team

The Review Team for the Self Study Report shall consist of:

- (A) One director from another Cal Poly Center or Institute;
- (B) One faculty member from Cal Poly (not affiliated with the Center or Institute undergoing periodic review);
- (C) One external reviewer (not affiliated with the Center or Institute undergoing periodic review) with expertise in the field associated with the Center or Institute; and

It is the duty of the Director of the Center or Institute to identify potential Review Team members, as well as consult with and obtain approval of the Dean of the Academic College affiliated with the Center or Institute undergoing periodic review (or the Vice President of Research and Economic Development if the Center or Institute is not affiliated with an Academic College) on the composition of the Review Team. Following such consultation and approval, the Review Team shall be appointed. Review Team members are tasked with reviewing and commenting upon the Self Study Report, and conducting a visit to the facilities of the Center or Institute.

5. Contents of Self Study Report for Centers/Institutes

The Self Study Report shall be structured to address the activities of the Center or Institute from a perspective of both quantitative and qualitative contributions to the campus. For example, the number of students and faculty participating in a particular event, or the number of peer reviewed journal articles which contain research related to center/institute activities, can be measured as quantitative output. Research and experiential activities that link to any University Learning Objectives, Sustainability Learning Objectives, Diversity Learning Objectives, and/or program based learning objectives may serve as forms of qualitative support.

The Self Study Report shall address each of the following items:

- (A) Executive Summary.
- (B) Situational Analysis on outcomes related to the activities of the Center/Institute:
 - (1) Statement of Center/Institute Mission and description of how activities have aligned with that mission, including any suggested revisions to the mission.
 - (2) Overview of how Center/Institute has supported College/University goals, in accordance with organizational documents for Center/Institute.
 - (3) Detailed information regarding academic outcomes related to Center/Institute activities, including references to support of any Academic Program learning goals/learning objectives, as well as University Learning Objectives, Sustainability Learning Objectives, and Diversity Learning Objectives. To the extent the Center/Institute collaborates with academic units on collecting assessment data, provide the data and an analysis of the data.
 - (4) Detailed information regarding teaching, research, and service associated with the Center/Institute, including grants, seminars, competitions, training sessions, community events, and other activities, along with details of faculty/student/industry/community participation and attendance.
- (C) Intellectual Contributions.
 - Detailed list of intellectual output resulting from Center/Institute activities. Include faculty and student research, faculty/student peer reviewed journal publications, theses,

conference presentations, and other intellectual contributions directly related to Center/Institute activities.

(D) Financial and Resource Condition.

Financial disclosure shall provide for transparency on the financial status and source/use of funds. Describe the financial and resource situation for the Center/Institute, including projected sustainability of Center/Institute activities and sources of funding.

(E) Accomplishment of Corrective Actions and Achievement of Aspirational Goals Identified in Prior Periodic Review.

Discuss and describe improvements and aspirational goals which were identified in the prior program review and how those improvements/aspirational goals were achieved. If certain goals were not achieved, discuss and describe why, including a corrective action plan (if applicable).

(F) Aspirational Goals.

Describe the aspirational goals of the Center/Institute for the upcoming seven year time period, including details of how these goals will benefit stakeholders and how fiscal and other resources will be obtained to support these goals.

(G) Safety and Ethical Conduct of Research.

Discuss and describe the methodology, training, and protocols implemented to assure safety of persons, protection of property, and ethical conduct of research associated with activities of the Center/Institute.

An appendix containing copies of supporting documentation may provide beneficial artifacts and evidence to support the analysis contained within the Self Study Report.

6. Timing of Periodic Review

The Vice President of Research and Economic Development shall post a periodic review schedule which complies with the Chancellor's Office policy. The Self Study Report and periodic review shall address the time period from the previous scheduled periodic review up to and including the most recent completed academic year, but need not include the current academic year during which the Self Study Report and periodic review is prepared and due.

The deadlines are as follows (references are to dates within the academic year in which the periodic review is scheduled to occur):

(A) Director identifies potential Review Team members and obtains approval for composition of Review Team - October 1;

(B) Review Team members are formally appointed - October 15;

(C) Director submits completed Self Study Report to Review Team members - February 1;

(D) Review Team members transmit request (if any) for clarification on contents of Self Study Report to Director - March 1;

(E) Director submits clarification to Review Team - March 21;

(F) Review Team submits final written comments on Self Study Report to Director - April 15;

(G) Director submits Self Study Report, clarifications, Review Team comments, and any rebuttal to Review Team comments to the Dean of the Academic College affiliated with the Center or Institute undergoing periodic review - May 1.

(H) Following review of the materials in Section 6(G), the Dean of the Academic College affiliated with the Center or Institute undergoing periodic review and the Vice President for Research and Economic Development shall consult and provide copies of these materials and any comments to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Copies of the documents described in Section 6(C) through 6(G) shall be simultaneously transmitted to the Dean of the Academic College affiliated with the Center or Institute undergoing periodic review and the Vice President for Research and Economic Development.

In the event of exigent circumstances which merit an extension, the Vice President for Research and Economic Development may grant an appropriate extension.

7. Action Items

Based upon the information from the periodic review, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Dean of the Academic College affiliated with the Center or Institute, and/or the Vice President for Research and Economic Development may request clarifications and/or a corrective action plan from the Director of the Center or Institute. The Director shall address such items in a timely manner. The periodic review documents shall be stored by the Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development.

