MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, October 26 2010
UU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: none.

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

III. Regular Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost:
D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
E. Statewide Senate:
F. CFA Campus President:
G. ASI Representative:
H. Committee and Caucus Chair(s):

IV. Special Report(s):

V. Consent Agenda:
Approval of curriculum proposals: Schaffner, chair of Curriculum Committee (p. 2):
- CRP 509 Professional Development (1) 1 activity CR/NC
- CSC/CPE 105 Fundamentals of Computer Science I Supplemental Instruction (1) 1 lab
- MU 328 Women in Music (4) 3 lec, 1 activity

VI. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Academic Assessment at the Program and University Levels:
   Fernflores/Giberti/Keesey, second reading (pp. 3-4).
B. Resolution on Academic Senate Operating Procedures for Its Committees:
   Executive Committee, second reading (pp. 5-9).
C. Resolution on Modification to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate to Allow for
   Electronic Voting: Executive Committee, second reading (p. 10).
D. Resolution on Modification to Academic Program Review Procedures:
   Executive Committee, second reading (p. 11).
E. Resolution on Initiatives in Conflict with Cal Poly Mission Statement:
   Executive Committee, first reading (p. 12).
F. Resolution on Academic Senate Fairness Board Description and Procedures:
   Executive Committee, first reading (pp. 13-19).
G. Resolution on Academic Dishonesty: Cheating and Plagiarism Procedures:
   Executive Committee, first reading (pp. 20-24).

VII. Discussion Item(s):

VIII. Adjournment:
Continuous Course/Curriculum Summary
For Academic Senate Consent Agenda

Note: The following courses/programs have been summarized by staff in the Registrar’s Office for review by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC) and Academic Senate (AS)

Date: October 1, 2010

Fall 2010 Review

ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED BY ACADEMIC SENATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/ Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate (AS)</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRP 509 Professional Development (1) 1 activity CR/NC</td>
<td>Reviewed again 9/30/10; approval recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2011 - pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC/CPE 105 Fundamentals of Computer Science I Supplemental Instruction (1) 1 lab</td>
<td>Reviewed again 9/30/10; approval recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2011 - pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 328 Women in Music (4) 3 lec, 1 activity</td>
<td>Reviewed 9/23/10; approval recommended for USCP credit. (Existing course)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective term pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adopted:

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

AS-___-10

RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT AT THE
PROGRAM AND UNIVERSITY LEVELS

WHEREAS, As a university accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), Cal Poly is expected to assess educational effectiveness “at each level of institutional functioning” (Criteria For Review 4.4); and

WHEREAS, The General Faculty acknowledges its responsibility for teaching and concern for student learning; and

WHEREAS, Academic assessment is here defined as the consideration given to the evidence of student learning based on stated program and university outcomes; and

WHEREAS, The purpose of assessment is to support academic planning and program improvement; and

WHEREAS, To be effective, the process of assessment must focus not on the individual student or faculty member but on the program or institution; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That findings or data resulting from assessment at the program or university levels should be of a general nature and not linked to individual faculty members; and be it further

RESOLVED: That findings or data resulting from such assessment must not be used in making retention, tenure, and promotion decisions nor placed in an individual faculty member’s personnel action file; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate oversees university-level assessment; and be it further

RESOLVED: That RPT reviewers regard faculty members may report participation in assessment activities as an appropriate contribution to as a form of teaching, scholarship, or service.

Proposed by: R. Fernflores, B. Giberti, and D. Keesey
Date: September 21 2010
Revised: September 28 2010
Revised: October 19 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFR #</th>
<th>Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR1</th>
<th>Self-Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes include assessing effectiveness, tracking results over time, using comparative data from external sources, and improving structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy.</td>
<td>Cal Poly has clear policies and practices that provide quality assurance at each level of institutional functioning. For example, all proposals for new or substantially modified programs, curricula and courses are reviewed by peer committees and administrators at the department, college, and institutional levels. Reviewers' findings are communicated to those making the proposals, often resulting in improvements to the proposals. All academic programs undergo periodic program review, with standard program data provided by IP&amp;A and external reviewers in effect benchmarking against other institutions. Programs are required to maintain assessment plans and prepare action plans intended to turn recommendations into realized improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, The current set of operating procedures for Academic Senate standing and ad hoc committees was adopted in 1989 as Resolution AS-306-89 (attached); and

WHEREAS, The procedures outlined in AS-306-89 contain outdated information; and

WHEREAS, New operating procedures are needed that conform to changes made to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, Section VIII.D “Operating Procedures” and to acknowledge the widespread use of electronic communications for committee deliberations; and

WHEREAS, Confusion over the definition of “meeting” has occurred due to the widespread use of electronic communications for committee deliberations, and providing a definition of “meeting” will improve the reading of bylaws section VIII.D, “Operating Procedures”; and

WHEREAS, Robert’s Rules of Order 10th edition requires that efforts to conduct the deliberative process by asynchronous means (not all at the same time) must be expressly authorized by the organization’s bylaws and supported by standing rules since many procedures common to parliamentary law are not applicable; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That Academic Resolution AS-306-89, “Resolution to Provide a Generic Set of Operating Procedures for Academic Senate Standing and Ad Hoc Committees” be repealed; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the operating procedures appearing in section VIII.D of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate supersede AS-306-89; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached modifications to sections VIII.D and VIII.E of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be adopted by the Academic Senate of Cal Poly.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: September 21 2010
Revised: October 19 2010
Operating procedures for Academic Senate standing and ad hoc committees are as follows:

A committee meeting is defined as a deliberative gathering of individuals—either physically or electronically, as appropriate—for the purpose of reviewing, discussing, or deciding on matters assigned by the Academic Senate Executive Committee. Electronic meetings are appropriate where simple, straight-forward decisions can be considered. They do not lend themselves to items that need detailed discussion and the exploration of options.

Meetings shall be called at the discretion of the committee chair or upon the request of three members of the committee. Committees are required to meet at least once per quarter during the school year.

Special rules and procedures must be approved by the Executive Committee, included in the committee’s description, and on file with the Academic Senate office.

VIII.D.1 Physical Meetings
1. A simple majority (51%) of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for a meeting. A quorum is required to conduct business.
2. Chairpersons serve until the end of the academic year. In the event that a chair must miss a meeting, s/he shall appoint a substitute chair for that meeting.
3. Meetings shall be called at the discretion of the chair or upon the request of three members of the committee. Committees are required to meet at least once per quarter during the school year. Regular meetings shall be scheduled during normal work hours.
4. Notification of meetings shall be sent by the committee chair at least three working days before the meeting date. Committees may establish regular meeting times. Upon committee agreement, a regular meeting time shall constitute notice.
5. Members may not vote by proxy.
6. A vote by the majority of the voting members attending a meeting shall be the decision of the committee.
7. Minutes shall be kept for each meeting and a copy transmitted to the Academic Senate office.
8. Special rules and procedures must be approved by the Executive Committee, included in the committee’s description, and on file with the Academic Senate office.

VIII.D.2 Electronic Meetings (e-meetings)
1. A simple majority (51%) of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for an e-meeting. A quorum is required to conduct business.
2. The decision to use an e-meeting should be made with due regard to the nature of the work to be undertaken. If a member of the committee objects to the use of an e-meeting for a particular business item, then the committee shall discuss that matter at a physical meeting.
3. A variety of technologies may be adopted as available, subject to the needs of the meeting and compliance with these procedures. No special requirements should be imposed on members other than having suitable access to meeting communications and documents.
4. Committee e-meetings are open to the public and when a member of the public wishes to attend, the committee shall make reasonable efforts to accommodate the attendance of that person.

5. A vote by the majority of the voting members of the committee shall be the decision of the committee.

6. The chair of the committee shall:
   a. Control the committee’s flow of business
   b. Maintain a current list of members
   c. Provide a notice of meeting with agenda and instructions for members about what is required (e.g., “members are asked to read and consider each item in the agenda, then [vote, comment, recommend, etc.]”). Notice shall include a time line for discussion and action
   d. Members shall respond to the notice of meeting indicating their presence
   e. The committee chair shall prepare a final record of each meeting (minutes) and transmit a copy to the Academic Senate office.

VIII.E. MEETINGS OPEN TO PUBLIC

Physical and electronic meetings of all committees, except those dealing with confidential and/or personnel matters of individuals, shall be open. The time, place, and manner and place of each meeting shall be announced in advance.
BACKGROUND MATERIAL
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Adopted: January 31, 1989

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

Background statement: The Academic Senate bylaws specify that each committee shall have written operating procedures on file in the office of the Academic Senate. These are to be reviewed by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is proposing this set of generic operating procedures to assist committees in meeting this requirement. It could be accepted as a blanket procedure unless a committee prefers to draft its own. This draft was accepted unanimously by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee in January 1988 and affirmed by a vote of 6-0 on October 11, 1988. Vacant membership on the committee included SAED, SSM, and ASL.

AS-306-89/C&BC

RESOLUTION TO
PROVIDE A GENERIC SET OF OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING AND AD HOC COMMITTEES

WHEREAS, Article VII Section D of the Academic Senate bylaws specify each committee shall have a written set of operating procedures on file in the Senate office; and

WHEREAS, A generic set of procedures will be acceptable to many committees; and

WHEREAS, Any committee requiring greater detail and specificity in operation can propose and have them accepted; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the generic operating procedures for Academic Senate committees (attached) be accepted.

Proposed By:
Constitution and Bylaws Committee
November 1, 1988
Revised January 10, 1989
OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES

The committees of the Academic Senate, both standing and ad hoc, in compliance with Article VII, Section D, of the bylaws must have an approved set of operating procedures on file in the office of the Academic Senate. Excepting elected committees which must have specific operating procedures approved by the Senate, committees may elect to be governed by these procedures or must develop and submit for approval the procedures they will employ in the conduct of their charges.

1. A simple majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for a meeting. A quorum is required to conduct business.

2. Chairpersons shall be elected by the majority vote at the first meeting of the academic year called by the Chair of the Senate. Chairpersons serve until the end of the academic year. In the event that a chairperson must miss a meeting, the chairperson shall appoint a substitute chairperson for that meeting.

3. Meetings shall be called at the discretion of the chairperson or upon the request of three members of the committee. Committees are required to meet at least once per quarter during the school year. Regular meetings shall be scheduled during normal work hours.

4. Notification of meetings shall be sent by the chairperson at least three (3) working days before the meeting date. Committees may establish regular meeting times. Upon committee agreement, a regular meeting time shall constitute notice. Decisions made at meetings may not be challenged for lack of proper notice either if all members attend or if all sign statements waiving the notice requirement.

5. Decisions of the committee must be made at meetings in which the attending members are in simultaneous communication with each other. This excludes telephone polling of members unless accomplished with conference phone with all members included.

6. Members may not vote by proxy.

7. A vote by the majority of the voting members attending a meeting shall be the decision of the committee.

8. Voting shall take place by a show of hands unless one attending member requests a secret ballot. The record shall show the resulting vote.

9. A committee report explaining the decision and noting the vote leading to the decision of the committee shall be filed at the Academic Senate office. Minority reports also may be filed with that office.
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-10

RESOLUTION ON MODIFICATION TO THE
BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
TO ALLOW FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING

WHEREAS, Currently, the Bylaws of the Academic Senate outline procedures for electing members to the Academic Senate, Academic Senate offices, the Academic Senate CSU, and elected committees; and

WHEREAS, Procedures for these elections call for a “double envelope system” (outside envelope signed, inside envelope sealed and containing the voted ballot); and

WHEREAS, Incorporating an option for using electronic voting technology would provide a means for both casting a ballot and counting ballots electronically; and

WHEREAS, The advantages of casting electronic ballots and counting ballots electronically include: (1) the move to a paperless voting system; (2) the savings of time and materials used in preparing, mailing, and counting paper ballots; (3) a greater level of voter anonymity provided by cryptographic verification; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That Section IILA of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be modified as follows: Balloting procedures shall use either an electronic voting system or a ‘double envelope system’ (outside envelope signed, inside envelope sealed and containing the voted ballot), whichever is more appropriate to the nature of the election and which ensures that only eligible persons will vote and ballots will remain secret;

and be it further

RESOLVED: That Section III.A.5 of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be modified as follows: Ballots will be counted electronically if electronic voting is used; or if the ‘double envelope system’ is used, ballots will be counted only if they are properly signed and received by the announced closing date. Individual voting information will be retained for ten working days;

and be it further

RESOLVED: That based on the petition of any candidate or eligible voter, received within ten days from the conclusion of electronic election, the Academic Senate shall judge the validity of any electronic election, and, if found invalid, the election shall be reconducted using the paper ballot system.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: September 21 2010
Revised: October 19 2010
ACADEMIC SENATE of CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-10

RESOLUTION ON MODIFICATION TO ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

WHEREAS, Academic program review procedures for baccalaureate and graduate programs were first implemented in 1992 along with the formation of an Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee; and

WHEREAS, Procedures for adding and selecting internal reviewers (Cal Poly faculty members outside the program who are “knowledgeable in the discipline/field of the program under review”) and external reviewers (individuals from other educational institutions) to academic program review were drafted and approved in 1996; and

WHEREAS, In 2000, after extensive study of academic program review practices nationwide, a new process for academic program review was proposed for Cal Poly by the Task Force on Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment; and

WHEREAS, The 2000 academic program review process—which eliminated the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee—was approved by the Academic Senate on November 21 2000 as “Resolution on Academic Program Review,” resolution number AS-552-00; and

WHEREAS, The 2000 academic program review process calls for the Academic Senate Executive Committee to be the final approving body for the program’s internal reviewers; and

WHEREAS, A Kaizen (“continuous improvement”) pilot project reviewed the current academic program review process in early 2010 and recommended “removing Senate [Executive Committee] approval” from the process in order to remove steps that resulted in redundant approval since the internal reviewer nominations are already “selected and vetted by the program faculty and endorsed by the college deans and the vice provost”; and

WHEREAS, Waiting for Academic Senate Executive Committee approval often delays the appointment of the internal reviewer(s) and causes the academic program review process to run behind schedule; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Executive Committee be removed as the final approving body in the appointment of internal reviewers for academic program review; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Programs Office provide annual summaries to the Academic Senate on the findings of academic programs that underwent academic program review in that year, including a list of internal reviewers as part of the report.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: September 21 2010
Revised: October 19 2010
WHEREAS, The 2007-2008 Academic Senate Chair gave an interim charge to the Research & Professional Development Committee to “hear complaints from faculty about initiatives that are perceived to be in conflict with Cal Poly’s Mission Statement”; and

WHEREAS, In spring, 2010, the Research & Professional Development Committee reported in its committee procedures that the Academic Senate needs “to find a more permanent way to resolve such concerns” due to the increased workload this would place on the committee; and

WHEREAS, Perceived conflicts with the Cal Poly Mission Statement could cover a range of issues, including, but not limited to, curriculum, faculty affairs, instruction, research; and

WHEREAS, A broad-based committee would provide a more inclusive perspective to deliberations of perceived conflicts; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the following procedure be adopted by the Academic Senate for Cal Poly:

When a proposed initiative is perceived to be in conflict with the Cal Poly Mission Statement, the matter will be documented by a senator who will bring the documentation forward to the Academic Senate Chair. The Academic Senate Chair will engage in consultative practices with the appropriate parties to determine if the proposed initiative needs to come to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for its consideration. If the Academic Senate Executive Committee determines that the matter is deserving of serious consideration, then the Academic Senate Executive Committee will form an ad hoc committee, comprised of chairs of all Academic Senate standing committees to deliberate the matter. The ad hoc committee will report its findings to the Executive Committee, and the Executive Committee will determine if such findings should be forwarded to the Academic Senate, in the form of a resolution, for further deliberation. If the resolution is adopted by the Academic Senate, it shall be forwarded to the University President for her/his approval in keeping with the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 12 2010
Revised: October 19 2010
RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC SENATE
FAIRNESS BOARD DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES

1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the attached *Fairness Board Description and Procedures.*

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 5 2010
FAIRNESS BOARD DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES

Description
The Fairness Board (hereafter called the "Board") is one of the primary campus groups concerned with providing "due process" of academically related matters for students and instructors at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, particularly in terms of student/faculty grading relationships. The Board hears grade appeals based on the grievant's belief that the instructor has made a mistake, shown bad faith or incompetence, or been unfair. Issues of cheating, dishonesty, and plagiarism are addressed by the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR). Grades received due to cheating, dishonesty, and/or plagiarism cannot be appealed to the Board.

In grade appeals, the Board operates under the presumption that the grade assigned was correct. The grievant must prove otherwise by a preponderance of the evidence; in other words, the grievant must show that her/his version of the events is more likely than not (equal to or greater than 51 percent probability) to have occurred. Should the Board's members find in favor of the grievant, the chair will recommend to the Provost that the grade be changed. In all cases, the Board's authority is limited to actions consistent with campus and system policy.

A student who submits a grievance cannot receive a grade lower than the one originally assigned.

In addition to grade grievances, the Board may hear grievances that do not involve grade appeals and are not covered by existing policies administered by other University offices.

Procedures
A. The first and most often successful opportunity for resolving a grade dispute occurs at the department level. Before initiating a grievance with the Board, the student should first make an informal request for redress to the course instructor. If a resolution cannot be reached, such request can then be made to the instructor's department chair/head. If resolution cannot be made at these levels, then later involvement by the Dean of Students may occur.

Any student who still feels aggrieved after requesting relief from both the instructor and instructor's department chair/head may initiate an appeal for redress by writing to the chair of the Board. The Board chair may counsel a student as to the relative merit of the case but must accept all written complaints which are ultimately submitted. The written request shall be in letter form. A copy of Fairness Board Description and Procedures can be
obtained from the Board website at http://academicsenate.calpoly.edu or the student may request a copy from the Board chair.

The student's letter should contain all pertinent details of the situation, including the name of the course, section, instructor, term in question, any witnesses to be called, and the redress sought. All relevant documents should be included as attachments, including items such as a course grade determination handout, exams, papers, letters of support, etc. The student has the responsibility of identifying evidence to overcome the Board's presumption that the instructor's action was correct. As a resource, the Board may request any pertinent documentation (historic or current) from the OSRR. It is noted that decisions of the OSRR are informational and nonbinding.

Within two weeks of receiving a written request, the Board chair will convene a meeting of the Board to determine if the case may have merit. If the Board decides that the case lacks merit, then the Board chair will forward to the student, within two working days, notice that no further action will be taken unless the student rebuts with new evidence. If the Board decides that the case may have merit, then the following actions will take place:

1. Within two working days, the Board chair will forward a copy of the student grievance letter to the challenged party and request her/his written reply to the Board chair within one week. The Board chair will share a copy of any reply with the student grievant. The Board chair will also send a copy of *Fairness Board Description and Procedures* to the challenged party.

2. The Board chair will coordinate with the Academic Senate office to make scheduling arrangements for the hearing which will take place within two weeks of the Board's deciding that the case may have merit, and will be conducted informally. At least six Board members must be present before a hearing may begin, and the same six members must be present for the full hearing.

3. When a hearing is scheduled, the Board chair will immediately notify (through the Academic Senate office) the Board members and the two principal parties.

4. Board members will recuse themselves from participation in any case if they are a principal party in the grievance or if they feel they cannot be impartial.

5. The Board will allow each principal party to be accompanied to the hearing by a supportive advocate (a supportive advocate is not to be an attorney or legal advisor, per Academic Senate resolution AS-655-07), call and question witnesses, and present exhibits. The Board may ask for copies of any material it believes relevant to the hearing. The student grievant will usually appear first. Each Board member may ask questions of either party or any witness. The Board itself may call or recall witnesses. The Board will handle all
proceedings without undue delay, will keep a summary file of each case, and will record the hearing. The Board will close the hearing when satisfied that both sides have been fully heard.

6. In the event the student fails to appear at the scheduled hearing, the Board may dismiss the case.

7. Within two weeks after the hearing has been closed, the Board will deliberate in private and will make a written summarization of the facts of the case and of the Board's reasoning in its recommendation to the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Senate.

8. The Board chair will send a copy of its recommendation to each principal party, to the instructor's department, and to each Board member.

9. Should any Board member(s) desire to file a minority recommendation, it will be attached to the Board's majority recommendation.

10. Within two weeks after receiving the Board's recommendation, the Provost will inform the Board and each principal party what action, if any, has been taken. The Provost shall have final authority regarding any change of grade with the provision, however, that no grade change will be made unless it is recommended by the Board. If the recommendation of the Board is not accepted, the Provost shall indicate the reason(s) why in writing to the Board.

B. The hearings are closed to all persons except the Board and the two principal parties and advisors. Witnesses, if any, shall be present only when testifying. No testimony shall be taken outside the hearing room, but written statements from persons unable to attend are admissible.

C. Students should ideally initiate any grade complaint within one quarter as instructors are obligated to retain evaluation instruments (other than those for which there was an announced opportunity for students to retrieve) for only one quarter (Academic Senate resolution AS-247-87). However, the Board will accept grievances for two quarters after an evaluation. If special circumstances exist, such as when an instructor is on leave and not available to the student, the Board may choose to entertain grievances involving grades issued more than two quarters earlier.

D. In the event a situation arises wherein the Board unanimously deems the above rules inappropriate, the Board will modify its procedures to ensure that fairness prevails. Furthermore, exceptions to these rules are possible if the Board and both principal parties have no objections.

E. In accordance with Executive Order 1037, at the end of every academic year, the Board chair shall report, in writing, to the Academic Senate Chair and the President the number of cases heard during that academic year and the disposition of each such case. A copy of this report shall also be
filed annually with the University Registrar so that it is available for review during the student records and registration audit.

Membership
One tenured or probationary faculty member from each college shall be appointed to the Board by the Academic Senate Chair for two-year terms. Ex officio members are the Vice President for Student Affairs or designee, and two student members selected by ASI, with no less than junior standing and three consecutive quarters of attendance at Cal Poly preceding appointment. The Board chair shall be a member of the General Faculty and shall be appointed in accordance with Article VIII.C of the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate*. 
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ACADEMIC SENATE FAIRNESS BOARD PROCESS

Unresolved problem exists between student and University

\[ \downarrow \]

Student makes informal request for redress of problem with instructor of record; if unresolved:

\[ \downarrow \]

Student makes informal request for redress of problem with instructor's department chair/head and possible involvement of Dean of Students; if unresolved:

\[ \downarrow \]

Student may consult with chair of the Fairness Board on relative merit of case; if unresolved:

\[ \downarrow \]

Student initiates appeal for redress by submission of written letter to Board chair. The letter should:

(a) Identify the course name, section, term, and instructor
(b) State complaint and redress sought
(c) Indicate witnesses that may be called
(d) Summarize the efforts to resolve the problem with instructor and department
(e) Include copies of relevant documents such as course grade determination handout, exams, papers, statements of support made by others, etc.

\[ \downarrow \]

Within two weeks of Board chair's receipt of student's letter, Fairness Board reviews complaint and determines if case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAY HAVE MERIT</th>
<th>LACKS MERIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board requests written response from instructor (within a week) and schedules a hearing (within two weeks). If a resolution to the problem presents itself, the hearing may be terminated. If no resolution seems satisfactory to the Board and the principal parties, the hearing will lead to the Board making a recommendation to the Provost (within two weeks).</td>
<td>Within two working days of determination, Board chair notifies student no further action will be taken unless:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student rebuts with new evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \leftarrow \quad \rightarrow \]

MERIT NO MERIT
FAIRNESS BOARD DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES

ACADEMIC SENATE FAIRNESS BOARD PROCESS

Unresolved problem exists between student and University

↓

Student makes informal request for redress of problem with instructor of record; if unresolved:

↓

Student makes informal request for redress of problem with instructor's department chair/head and possible involvement of Dean of Students; if unresolved:

↓

Student may consult with chair of the Fairness Board on relative merit of case; if unresolved:

↓

Student initiates appeal for redress by submission of written letter to Board chair. The letter should:

(a) Identify the course name, section, term, and instructor
(b) State complaint and redress sought
(c) Indicate witnesses that may be called
(d) Summarize the efforts to resolve the problem with instructor and department
(e) Include copies of relevant documents such as course grade determination handout, exams, papers, statements of support made by others, etc.

Within two weeks of Board chair's receipt of student's letter, Fairness Board reviews complaint and determines if case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAY HAVE MERIT</th>
<th>LACKS MERIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board requests written response from instructor (within a week) and schedules a hearing (within two weeks). If a resolution to the problem presents itself, the hearing may be terminated. If no resolution seems satisfactory to the Board and the principal parties, the hearing will lead to the Board making a recommendation to the Provost (within two weeks).</td>
<td>Within two working days of determination, Board chair notifies student no further action taken unless: Student rebuts with new evidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within two weeks of Board chair's receipt of student's letter, Fairness Board determines if case:

- MAY HAVE MERIT
- NO MERIT

Comment [MB1]: Deleted "the"

Comment [MB2]: This step was changed to reflect the first step indicated in the procedures sect A. Nowhere in the procedures does it indicate the student is to meet with the counseling center and therefore, this step was deleted and replaced.

Comment [MB3]: Second step changed to indicate exact order of actions taken by student so it now matches the written document Procedures, section a. first paragraph.

Comment [MB4]: Step remains same; reworded to reflect language used in procedures document.

Comment [MB5]: Step remains the same; however, changed in wording to again reflect the language used in the Procedures document.

Comment [MB6]: Text remains exactly the same, however, the first letter in the first word of each line was capitalized.

Comment [MB7]: Fundamentally the same, however, reworded to reflect actual language used in the Procedures document.

Comment [MB9]: Inserted statement to clarify process as indicated in the Procedures document.

Comment [MB8]: No Changes
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RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY:
CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM PROCEDURES

1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the attached Academic Dishonesty:
Cheating and Plagiarism procedures.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 5 2010
ACADEMIC DISHONESTY: CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM

684 Academic Dishonesty: Cheating and Plagiarism
The University will not condone academic cheating or plagiarism in any form. The faculty is expected to uphold and support the highest academic standards in this matter. Instructors should be diligent in reducing potential opportunities for academic cheating and plagiarism to occur. Students' rights shall be ensured through attention to due process, as detailed below.

684.1 Definition of Cheating
Cheating is defined as obtaining or attempting to obtain, or aiding another to obtain credit for work, or any improvement in evaluation of performance, by any dishonest or deceptive means. Cheating includes, but is not limited to: lying; copying from another's test or examination; discussion at any time of questions or answers on an examination or test, unless such discussion is specifically authorized by the instructor; taking or receiving copies of an exam without the permission of the instructor; using or displaying notes, "cheat sheets," or other information devices inappropriate to the prescribed test conditions; allowing someone other than the officially enrolled student to represent same.

684.2 Policy on Procedure for Addressing Cheating
Cheating requires, at a minimum, an "F" assigned to the assignment, exam, or task; the course grade shall, at a minimum, reflect the assigned "F"; and further attendance in the course is prohibited at the instructor's discretion. The instructor may assign an "F" course grade for an incidence of cheating. However, if a student appeals the charge of cheating, s/he shall be permitted to remain in the class through the appeals process. The instructor is obligated to place evidence of the cheating in writing before the vice President of Student Affairs with the copies to the department head of the student's major. Physical evidence, circumstantial evidence, and testimony of observation may be included. Said memorandum should notify the student that if s/he denies cheating, an appeal is possible through the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR) once the department head of the course of record has been consulted regarding the appeal.

a) Instructors should be confident that cheating has occurred; if there is any doubt, the student should be consulted and/or additional information sought prior to taking action for cheating.

b) The student should be notified by memorandum of the instructor's determination that cheating has occurred and the intended punishment. Said memorandum should notify the student that if s/he denies cheating: (1) the department head of the course of record will be given an opportunity to resolve the situation to the satisfaction of both parties; and (2) if the situation remains unresolved, an appeal of the finding of cheating (though not of the punishment, if the finding of cheating is upheld) is available through the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR).

c) Cheating requires, at a minimum, an "F" assigned to the assignment, exam, or task, and this "F" must be reflected in the course grade. The instructor may assign an "F" course grade for an incidence of cheating.
d) Irrespective of whether an appeal is made, the instructor is obligated to submit to the OSRR director a Confidential Faculty Report of Academic Dishonesty. Physical evidence, circumstantial evidence, and testimony of observation may be attached.

e) If an appeal is made, the grade assigned for cheating and the associated course grade cannot be appealed to the Fairness Board should the OSRR confirm the incidence of cheating.

f) The Vice President of Student Affairs OSRR director shall determine if any disciplinary action is required in addition to the assignment of a failing grade. Disciplinary actions which are possible include, but are not limited to: required special counseling, special paper or research assignments, loss of student teaching or research appointments, removal from a course, loss of membership in organizations, suspension or dismissal from individual programs or from the University. The most severe of the possible actions shall be reserved for grievous cheating offenses or more than one offense by an individual.

684.3 Definition of Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined as the act of using the ideas or work of another person or persons as if they were one's own without giving proper credit to the source. Such an act is not plagiarism if it is ascertained that the ideas were arrived at through independent reasoning or logic or where the thought or idea is common knowledge. Acknowledgement of an original author or source must be made through appropriate references; e.g., quotation marks, footnotes, or commentary. Examples of plagiarism include but are not limited to the following: the submission of a work, either in part or in whole completed by another; failure to give credit for ideas, statements, facts or conclusions which rightfully belong to another; failure to use quotation marks (or other means of setting apart, such as the use of indentation or a different font size) when quoting directly from another, whether it be a paragraph, a sentence, or even a part thereof; close and lengthy paraphrasing of another's writing without credit or originality; use of another's project or programs or part thereof without giving credit.

684.4 Policy on Procedure for Addressing Plagiarism

a) Instructors should be confident that plagiarism has occurred; if there is any doubt, the student should be consulted and/or additional information sought prior to taking action for plagiarism. Student's rights shall be ensured through attention to due process.

b) Plagiarism may be considered a form of cheating and therefore subject to the same policy procedure which requires notification to the Vice President of Student Affairs and includes possible disciplinary action (see Section 684.2). OSRR director and, at a minimum, an "F" assigned to the assignment, exam, or task (See Section 684.2).

However, as there may be a technical plagiarism which is may be the result of poor learning or poor attention to format, and may occur without any intent to deceive; consequently, some instructor discretion is appropriate. Under such circumstances, notification to the Vice President of Student Affairs is not required. Provided that there was no obvious intent to deceive, an instructor may choose to counsel the student and offer a remedy (within her/his authority) which is less severe than that required for cheating. If in doubt about her/his authority to offer a particular remedy, the instructor should consult OSRR. Even under these circumstances, the instructor must submit to the OSRR director a Confidential Faculty Report of Academic Dishonesty.
c) An instructor may not penalize a student for plagiarism in any way without advising the student by memorandum that a penalty is being imposed. The instructor should further advise that an appeal is possible through the OSRR once the department head has been consulted regarding the appeal. The student in said memorandum that if s/he denies committing plagiarism: (1) the department head of the course of record will be given an opportunity to resolve the situation to the satisfaction of both parties; and (2) if the situation remains unresolved, an appeal of the finding of plagiarism (though not of the punishment, if the finding of plagiarism is upheld) is possible through OSRR.
CONFIDENTIAL FACULTY REPORT OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

1. Name and ID number of Student

2. Course in which the incident occurred Date of the incident

3. Witnesses and role (e.g. student, faculty, staff) if applicable:
   Name:
   Name:
   Name:

4. Nature of the alleged offence intended to gain unfair academic advantage

5. Briefly describe the incident and, if any, subsequent investigation. How did you discover the incident? What events did you observe? What statements were made by the persons present? You may attach an additional report.

6. What actions did you take to sanction the student?
   - None
   - Counseled student
   - Reduction in assignment grade
   - Reduction in course grade
   - Other (please describe)

7. In your assessment, did the student understand that he or she was committing an act of academic dishonesty?

8. Do you include a statement regarding academic dishonesty in your course documents? If so, please provide it.
   - Yes, in the syllabus or on Blackboard
   - Yes, on individual exams or assignments
   - No

   Comments, if any:

9. Resolution Options
   Based on this incident alone, do you recommend that the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities issue a warning letter or file formal charges?

Name of reporting faculty member: ___________________________ Date ______________
Department: ___________________________ Contact Information: ___________________________

Submission Options: [Print Form] [Submit by Email]
Click "Print Form" button above, return completed form with attached copies of all supporting documentation to: Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities, Building 124, Room 127; or click "Submit by Email" button above and attach copies of all supporting documentation to the email.

THIS INFORMATION IS COMMUNICATED ON A NEED-TO-KNOW BASIS AND IS PROTECTED BY THE FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT
Cal Poly: Division of Student Affairs