MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
Tuesday, April 11, 2006  
VU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: Approval of minutes for the February 28, 2006 Academic Senate meeting (pp. 2-3).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Report from Joe Grimes on CSU Workshop on RPT held February 24, 2006 (pp. 4-11).

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President's Office:
C. Provost's Office:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. ASI Representatives:
G. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
A. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2006-07.
B. Resolution on Course Syllabi: Executive Committee, first reading (pp. 12-14).
C. Resolution on Grade Forgiveness: Schaffner, chair of Instruction Committee, first reading (pp. 15-16).
D. Resolution on Textbook Pricing: Foroohar, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, second reading (pp. 17-20).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
I. Minutes: The minutes for the Academic Senate meetings of February 7, 2005 were approved.

II. Communications and Announcements: Election results for 2006-2007 Senators are available on page 4 and 5, Academic Senate and University wide vacancies are also listed. March 17, 2006 is the deadline for submitting nominations for 2006-2007 Academic Senate officers.

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair: (Hannings)

B. President's Office: (Howard-Greene) The CSU is sponsoring a Summit on math and science teacher education this week and President Baker will be serving as the MC. The CSU efforts to increase the recruiting and training of math and science teacher will be the central issue at the Summit.

C. Provost's Office: (Detweiler) It's expected that the CSU system will ask us to slightly increase our enrollment planning for the coming year. The application pool for new and transfer students is strong and total applications are up by 12% over previous years. Much of the enrollment growth will be accommodated by expanding the summer quarter. Budget is very secure and should not change much except for the monies to cover the additional enrollment of approximately 2.5%. ASI approved the increase of the fee to support Instructionally Related Activities. The fee is indexed for inflation and will be effective in fall 2006. The search committee for the Dean of College of Liberal Arts has identified 4 finalists and interviews will begin March 2 and 3 and continue until March 14. The search committee for the Dean of Library Services has identified 3 finalists and expects them to be on campus starting March 27 and completing interview on April 7. The search committee for the Vice-President for Advancement has identified 3 finalists with interviews scheduled to begin in early April. The search committee for the Provost is being reconstituted and is currently searching for a recruitment firm to assist in the search process.

D. Statewide Senators: (Hood) Former Academic Senate Chair Anny Morrobel-Sosa has been selected a finalist for the presidency at Cal State Monterey Bay.

E. CFA Campus President: (Foroohar) Bargaining continues. Summer session is the current problem. The reason for the lack of agreement on summer session is that the Chancellor's policy calls for full-time faculty workload to be 15-units, while Cal Poly has a local contract recognizing full-time status at 12-units. According to the former contract, which expired last July 1, those FERPs have 5-year contracts. The Chancellor's offer for new FERPs is to cut it back gradually to 2-years. Deadline to apply for FERP for next fall is March 18, 2006 so if you are interested and want to FERP under the 5-year agreement, please submit your application. If we have a different contract, you may pull your application. CFA is in the process of holding local elections. Send the names of your nominees by Friday, March 3 for consideration. Last year the Academic Senate passed a resolution to support the new intellectual property policy. The intellectual property is in the scope of bargaining, therefore, in regards to faculty compensation, the statewide contract has controlling power. A committee has been created to look into these conflicting policies and arrive at a solution.

F. ASI Representatives: (Middlestadt) ASI Board of Directors passed a resolution at its last meeting entitled "ASI Recognizes University Efforts to Enhance Campus Diversity," in
support of numerous attempts to try and improve campus diversity, awareness, and outreach. A delegation of 16 students will be in Sacramento for the California Higher Education Student Summit which is considered the premier leadership development opportunity for Cal State University students. This event concludes on Monday with a student day in the Capitol where students will be lobbying their legislators. A couple of the issues that will be advocated for include the California State University budget and the acknowledgement of the CSU’s $1.5 billion structural deficit of which $200 million are considered immediate needs. The Legislators' Analyst Office has requested that the Cal Poly Science Center be removed from the next state bond. ASI has been working very closely with the universitywide Sustainability Advisory Committee, the Academic Senate Sustainability Committee, Materials Engineering Department Chair Linda Vanasupa, and Orfalea College of Business Associate Dean Doug Cerf on a campus implementation project proposal which looks at ways to identify challenges that the campus is facing. We are attempting to break them down into comprehensible problem statements and design requirements. These challenges will be available for students as potential senior project ideas and accessible to faculty for course projects. The main goals of this proposal are to successfully implement projects and to be a resource to strengthen the relationships between Cal Poly and local municipalities and between Cal Poly and potential donors. ASI urges the Academic Senate to appoint a faculty representative to the ASI Board of Directors.

G. Other: Tim Keams, Vice Provost IT/CIO: Status of Email Service. There have been two main issues with the new Oracle email system. The worst problem took place when email was down for two days in a row. This problem was caused by a longer than usual time to accomplish the update of the email-list job that is performed daily. The second problem has been ongoing since Oracle was installed, and that is the intermittent performance of the system due to heavier than usual loads. ITS is currently in the process of working with Oracle engineers to identified the problem in order to provide the campus with a clear prognosis. Oracle is committed to look at our system and make recommendations about the overall architecture of the system.

IV. Consent Agenda: None.

V. Business Item(s):
A. **Resolution on Textbook Pricing:** Foroohar, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading. This resolution encourages faculty to consider price and the need for new editions when selecting textbooks as well as submitting their textbook requests by the set deadline to ensure their availability. M/SJP to move resolution to a second reading.
   M/SJP to approve the following addition:
   RESOLVED: The Academic Senate will work with ITS and ASI to look into the feasibility of developing a central publicly accessible website which will provide information about textbook requirements for Cal Poly courses; and be it further
   M/SJP to table further discussion until the next Senate meeting scheduled for April 11, 2006.

VI. Discussion Item(s): None.

VII. Meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Submitted by,
Gladys Gregory, Academic Senate
NOTE: Although the meeting was billed as focusing on RPT, it was generally concerned with looking at best practices for supporting the newer faculty of the CSU. The RPT process was not a primary focus of the meeting.

I. This meeting was held to follow-up on the findings of a focus group conducted with newer faculty in the CSU on February 18, 2005. The attached report of the February 18, 2005 focus group meeting is entitled:

**Approaching the Tenure Decision**

New CSU Tenure-Track Faculty Share Perceptions and Experiences

II. The Chancellor's Office asked each of the 23 campuses to send a team to represent its campus at the February 24, 2006. Mike Suess facilitated the formation of the Cal Poly team consisting of Sue Elrod, Joe Grimes, David Kann, Mike Suess, and Victor Valle.

III. The meeting of February 24, 2006 was held at the LAX Crowne Plaza Hotel with teams from the 23 CSU campuses present. The meeting agenda consisted of the following:
   - Welcome
   - Background Recap
   - Concurrent Sessions (New Faculty Orientation or Probationary Plans). The presentation regarding the New Faculty Orientation at San Francisco State is on my computer but is too large to send to you as an attachment.
   - Lunch Panel Discussion Featuring Campus Provosts — Nice Presidents for Academic Affairs
   - Concurrent Sessions (Mentoring Programs or Setting Reasonable Limits on RTP Files)

IV. The following Cal Poly campus meetings were held after the CSU February 24, 2006 meeting:

   A. Except for Victor Valle, the Cal Poly campus team met on February 28, 2006 to discuss next steps. The February 24, 2006 meeting and current support for Cal Poly newer faculty were discussed and it was decided that it would be best to ask the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) faculty who work with newer faculty to consider possible improvement in the campus support of the newer faculty and academic administrators. Specifically, it was suggested that the new faculty orientation be expanded consist of a combined meeting of new probationary faculty, department chairs, and deans to discuss the teacher-scholar model adopted at Cal Poly to include for break-out sessions for the deans and chairs to discuss expectations of developing a professional development plan with the new probationary faculty.

   B. The CTL faculty consisting of Wait Bremer, Sue Elrod, Gwen Fisher, Joe Grimes, and Patricia McQuaid met on March 9, 2006 to start the process of following the recommendation of IV A).
Approaching the Tenure Decision
New CSU Tenure-Track Faculty Share Perceptions and Experiences

Introduction

Since 2000, over 3700 new tenure-track faculty have been hired in the 23 campuses that comprise the California State University. This cohort constitutes more than one-third of all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the CSU. By all appearances, the new faculty are highly motivated, interested in students, and committed to teaching. If they are like their faculty predecessors, these now-probationary faculty will earn tenure and will stay in the CSU almost 30 more years. The challenge for the CSU is to make sure that these individuals, who show so much promise now, will find it rewarding and satisfying to have a long career in the CSU and will provide positive contributions to the CSU.

Some new tenure-track CSU faculty have already demonstrated their interest in being good teachers and improving their careers in the CSU. On their own time in June 2004, they attended workshops at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo for two to four days at the CSU Teacher-Scholar Summer Institute, sponsored by the Institute for Teaching and Learning. The faculty discussed subjects such as classroom management, ethical behavior, writing across the curriculum, and using technology. Because this group, through words and deeds, showed that they were interested in the welfare of their students and in improving their own teaching skills, these individuals were invited to a conversation on the aspirations and challenges of new tenure-track faculty as they approach the tenure decision.

Twenty-seven tenure-track faculty members from 14 CSU campuses participated in a focus group at the Chancellor's Office on February 18, 2005. They were asked to talk about their experiences in the CSU in relationship to their teaching and research and to the balance between their professional and personal lives.

The focus group was organized in three strands: (1) teaching, (2) research, and (3) professional/personal balance. Three cohorts of nine faculty each proceeded through the concurrent sessions. The conversations in the strands were facilitated by tenured CSU faculty members.

This focus group was not a formal assessment or survey. Its main purpose was to provide a sample of the interests, successes, challenges, and experiences from within the very large cohort of new tenure-track faculty. The report is organized according to the three strands of the focus group: teaching, research, and professional/personal balance. Readers of the report will notice, however, that there is considerable overlap of issues in the different strands. Hence, prefacing these sections is a statement of two overarching themes that appeared over and over again in all three of the strands.
Two Major Themes Emerged from the Focus Group

The overarching theme emerging from the focus group sessions was that tenure-track faculty found it difficult to balance a heavy teaching load (that included multiple preparations and/or large classes) with the expectation for substantial research productivity. A strongly related theme indicated that, in the perception of new faculty, RTP criteria and expectations for tenure-track faculty were not always clear and consistent. These themes emerged from the focus group sessions on "teaching," "research," and "professional/personal balance."

In exploring these two issues raised by the tenure-track faculty, several questions might be considered: Are expectations as to teaching and research made clear during the recruitment stage? Once hired, are tenure-track faculty given clear and accurate statements of what the expectations are? At the point of tenuring, does the institution make the tenure decision on the basis of stated expectations? Or, to put it another way, will the tenure-track faculty members earn tenure, even if they have not met research expectations? How much of the "pressure" of research production emanates from the individual rather than the institution? Does the institution or the department value the different kinds of scholarship elucidated by Ernest Boyer? Are publications about teaching and learning as valued as research publications? Why or why not? What is the preferred course load for tenure-track faculty expected to be involved in research? What is the actual course load? What is the actual course load over what period of time—a semester, a year, two years? What systems are in place to help new tenure-track faculty in areas such as these: understanding RTP policies, understanding the "unwritten" rules that undergird RTP decisions, writing grant proposals and scholarly articles, and balancing the many facets of the faculty member's life?

What Tenure-Track Faculty Said about Teaching

On the whole, the tenure-track faculty said that they were attracted to a position in the CSU because they wanted to work in a "teaching" institution. Their discussion of teaching opened up several other issues related to teaching, which are discussed below.

A strong focus on students. The participants seemed to relish their teaching responsibilities. They discussed their experiences in the classroom and talked about what was needed to make the student-faculty interaction successful. The group discussed how important it was to understand the students' backgrounds and experiences; to address the students where they are now, not where they should be, according to the syllabus and course description; to "read the audience" and react to confusion or apathy; and to change approaches when necessary. Given that there are three entities in the classroom vying for status—the professor, the discipline, and the student—in the case of this group of tenure-track faculty, the focus was on the student.
The challenge of teaching a heterogeneous student body. The group talked about the extreme diversity of the CSU, not just racially or ethnically, but in terms of students' skill levels, academic preparation, background experiences, goals, and aspirations. Accommodating these wide variances in ability and preparation among students enrolled in the same course is one of the most difficult issues that the faculty face.

Improving teaching skills. The members of the focus group were selected to participate because they had attended the June 2004 Teacher-Scholar Summer Institute (TSSI) at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, and had thus already shown their initiative, their interest in professional development, and their eagerness to learn skills that would improve their work in the classroom. The group once again reaffirmed the value of conferences and workshops in which they could learn strategies to enhance their teaching. Almost all of the participants indicated that they had used the services of their campus faculty development centers, some quite extensively, and that this was an important and valuable resource.

Interest in an environment more conducive to learning. Participants expressed a desire for smaller class sizes as well as a more attractive physical environment, including spruced-up classrooms and technology that worked.

Concerns about students' evaluation of courses. Participants expressed apprehension about the meaning and use of student evaluations. They questioned the nature of the evaluation (one that measures students' perceptions and opinions rather than students' learning), the use of rigid formulas about evaluation data in the RTP process, and the implicit incentive for faculty to inflate grades and cater to students.

What Tenure-Track Faculty Said about Research

Embarking upon their career in the CSU, the tenure-track faculty were made aware that the expectation for research productivity was significant. They understood that being involved in research was integral to a successful teaching career and welcomed that involvement.

A strong focus on students and teaching. The participants indicated that they came to the CSU because of their interest in the CSU's focus on teaching. They enjoy working with their students, including working with students on research projects when possible. They enjoy seeing how positively employers receive their students and the positive impact a CSU education has on the lives of our students. Teaching and interaction with students were stated as the main reasons participants came to the CSU and the main reasons they stay.

Importance of CSU gatherings. Participants were uniformly positive about their experience at the Teacher Scholar Summer Institute. They said that they came away from that experience with information and tools that are useful for their everyday work. They were also positive about other CSU gatherings that brought together faculty from various
campuses and disciplines. They recommend that more such opportunities for sharing best practices be made available to faculty within the CSU. Regional or systemwide conferences and workshops on topics related to research would be helpful (for example: grant writing, sources of funds within and outside the CSU, CSU research symposia, and negotiating a book contract).

**Interest in research.** Most focus group members indicated that they are interested in pursuing research. However, they are unclear as to how research is defined and rewarded in the CSU. Many participants indicated that they have received conflicting feedback regarding the importance and value of research and what "counts" as research. They also stated that they do not have sufficient time to pursue "serious" research, and they often use personal funds to attend conferences and pursue other professional development activities.

**Importance of clear guidelines and expectations.** At least one campus reported the existence of a probationary plan for each tenure-track faculty member. There is agreement on the plan by the faculty member, senior faculty colleagues, and administrators. This plan provides clear expectations for the faculty member's performance to achieve tenure and promotion. Several participants indicated that they would be interested in such plans on their own campuses. RTP criteria vary widely throughout the CSU system by campus and even within each campus. Faculty expressed interest in seeing RTP criteria and standards that are clearer than at present.

**What Tenure-Track Faculty Said about the Balance among Professional Roles and Personal Lives**

**Commitment to students.** Participants identified teaching and working with students as the most time-consuming but rewarding aspect of their professional duties. Although sometimes deplored the rising "consumerism" in student attitudes, a very large majority of the tenure-track faculty said that teaching was the most enjoyable and satisfying part of their job.

**Retirements and budget cuts increase workload.** Although new tenure-track faculty are often exempt from service and governance work in their first few years in the CSU, that is no longer the case. Large numbers of retirements of senior faculty, large numbers of FERPs, and large numbers of lecturers have severely reduced the number of people available to serve on committees at the program, department, college, and university levels. Hence, tenure-track faculty are being recruited to perform service activities, in addition to teaching and research. Traditionally "service" activities, which enhance the institution rather than the individual, are the result of a lengthy attachment to the university, but in the current environment, even relative newcomers have been pressed into service. Furthermore, because of the retirements and the recent budget cuts, new tenure-track faculty are called upon to teach more classes, larger classes, and courses they have never before taught.
Developing strategies to manage time. Although the participants alluded to the high cost of housing, their more immediate concern was finding time to meet their various obligations. Many expressed interest in finding affordable housing close to campus in order to avoid long commutes and to allow more time for work and family. Managing time and coping with a heavy workload were important considerations for the participants. Some tech-savvy faculty, for example, developed hybrid courses that combined face-to-face with online instruction in order to save commuting time for both faculty and students.

Childcare. Although some CSU campuses provide adequate childcare for the children of tenure-track faculty, some institutions do not have sufficient room. On many campuses, children of students have first priority, and that leaves few or no spaces for the children of new faculty members.

Interest in support groups and in genuine mentoring. To manage the stress and tensions of the probationary period (some participants loathed the term "probationary," with its "criminal" overtones), new tenure-track faculty have formed multi-disciplinary support groups that focus on sharing research findings, encouraging the completion of publishable articles, and fostering camaraderie. In general, the group wanted to be able to look for support, guidance, and validation from their academic departments, in addition to support from their tenure-track peers.

Preliminary Recommendations

Emerging from the focus-group discussions are several recommendations that participants believe would improve the lives of CSU tenure-track faculty members and promote the mission of the CSU.

- Clarify CSU priorities at all levels - system, campus, college/school, and department. This would include the definition and importance of research and graduate programs within the CSU, in light of the system's stated mission and focus on teaching undergraduates.

- Initiate discussions on RTP criteria and standards, with a goal of providing clear and realistic expectations for tenure and promotion.

- Explore the use of faculty probationary plans, such as exist on some campuses.

- Explore possibilities for reducing teaching load (for example, fewer class preparations per term).

- Show support at the CSU system level for faculty professional development activities, including the importance of campus faculty centers for teaching and learning.
- Provide CSU workshops and conferences to share best practices. Topics might include: teaching diverse student populations, improving teaching skill, nuts and bolts of teaching (preparing a syllabus, use of Power Point and other media, determining student expectations, speaking in front of a class, etc.), on-line learning, discipline based gatherings to share research and best practices in the discipline, grant writing, and sources of research funding.

- Convene campus and system administrators to share best practices in the areas of new faculty orientation, ongoing mentoring of new faculty, and developing roadmaps to tenure and promotion.

- Initiate discussions about the nature and role of student evaluations of teaching.

- Value and reward faculty in tangible and public ways.

- Provide family- and life-friendly campuses.

Next Steps

Discuss the contents and recommendations from this report with the following constituent groups:

- Chancellor's Office Administration
- CSU provosts and vice presidents for Academic Affairs
- CSU campus associate vice presidents for Faculty Affairs
- Academic Senate CSU
- CSU campus faculty development directors
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WHEREAS, Campus Administrative Policy requires that faculty provide a syllabus for each course that they teach; and

WHEREAS, Students have a need and a right to know the content, expectations, and assessment methods of the courses they are taking; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That every instructor shall make available to each student in her/his class, during the first class meeting, a written course syllabus providing: instructor's contact information, instructor's office hours and location, a list of required text(s) and supplementary material for the course, prerequisites for the course, methods and expectations for assessing (grading) student performance for the course, and other information the instructor deems necessary to assure the student's understanding of the nature and requirements for the course; and be it further

RESOLVED: That each department shall make available to students the expected learning outcomes for the course, preferably in the form of the course proposal; and be it further

RESOLVED: That each instructor shall be required to spend a portion of the first meeting of the class discussing the course syllabus; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the above two Resolved clauses shall become part of Campus Administrative Policy; this policy shall be included in the Faculty Handbook; and this policy shall be communicated to all faculty at least once each year by the Provost or her/his designee.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: March 14, 2006
Revised: March 28, 2006
MEMORANDUM

TO: Joe Vaccaro,
   Chairman of the Board
   DATE: 2/3/06

FROM: Jared Samarin, College of Agriculture

SUBJECT: Resolution 06-09 ASI Supports Guidelines for Course Syllabi

This memo is presented in accordance with the ASI bylaws and is intended to offer background to ASI Resolution 06-09. This resolution was written to provide student perspective to course syllabi use at Cal Poly we have cited as supporting documentation the Academic Senate resolution on course syllabi use as well as the guidelines established by the Senate's curriculum committee. This resolution was also drafted to provide support for the Academic Senate Resolution as well as describe the importance to students of a minimum standard for course syllabi.
WHEREAS: Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) is the official voice of Cal Poly students, and

WHEREAS: The Cal Poly Academic Senate Instruction Committee has recommended approval of Guidelines for a Course Syllabus, and

WHEREAS: Course syllabi are integral to student success by providing important information about academic expectations, grading standards, and course requirements, and

WHEREAS: Course syllabi are a contract between the instructor and student regarding the above stated items, and

WHEREAS: There is not currently public access to course syllabi making it difficult for students to determine which courses best meet their individual educational objectives, and

WHEREAS: A consistent standard for course syllabi would enhance student success and progress, and

THEREFORE
BEIT
RESOLVED: ASI urges the Faculty of Cal Poly to establish and adopt a standard for course syllabi, and

FURTHERMORE
BEIT
RESOLVED: ASI recommends the guidelines include at a minimum: academic expectations, grading standards, and course requirements, and

FURTHERMORE
BEIT
RESOLVED: ASI urges that a written hard copy of the syllabi be distributed to all students enrolled in the course and made available upon request for review by administration, faculty, and students.

CERTIFIED as the true and correct copy, in witness thereof, I have set my hand and Seal of the Associated Students, Inc. this ___ day of __, 2006.

ASI Secretary

ASI Chair of the Board

ASI President

Sponsored by: Jared Samarin, ASI Board of Directors, College of Agriculture
John Azevedo, ASI Board of Directors, College of Engineering
Todd Maki, ASI Board of Directors, College of Engineering

ADOPTED at the regular meeting of the Board of Directors by ______ vote on ____________, 2006.
Adopted:

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

AS-06

RESOLUTION
GRADE FORGIVENESS

WHEREAS, Student success is a guiding principle in policy decisions and
WHEREAS, Class space is limited and courses fill quickly and
WHEREAS, Students may encounter situations that impede their ability to pass a course and
WHEREAS, Some courses are well-recognized as particularly challenging and regularly have a low pass rate and
WHEREAS, Academic advising is an important way to identify and provide guidance for failing students therefore be it
RESOLVED: Students may repeat up to 6 units for grade forgiveness in courses that a grade of D, D-, F or WU was received and be it further
RESOLVED: Any course is eligible for grade forgiveness one time only and be it further
RESOLVED: Each quarter, advisors are encouraged to proactively contact and advise students who have received a failing grade in any course.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: February 2, 2006
Revised: March 2, 2006
BACKGROUND

Because of the new implementation of the PeopleSoft system, we now have a ripe opportunity to consider any changes to our existing repeat policies. Software programming changes are best made during this implementation phase, so if we are ever to consider visiting our policies, now is the time.

Furthermore, it is the sense of the Academic Senate Instruction Committee that there has been too little in the way of active advising of failing students. With this resolution, we have the opportunity to voice that concern with suggestions for improvement.

Current Policy (page 79, 2005-7 Catalog)

Undergraduate students may repeat a maximum of 20 units at Cal Poly for purposes of improving GPA. A course taken at Cal Poly or at another university or college in which a grade of D or less was received may be repeated at Cal Poly with the new grade recorded along with the prior grade. If the second grade is equal to or higher than the first, then the grade earned by repeated the course will replace the quality points, quality hours and earned hours which were previously earned. The original grade is forgiven from GPA computation, but both grades appear on the student's permanent record (transcript). With the exception of the reasons listed below, the repeat adjustment is made automatically at the end of the term in which the course is repeated. If a course is re-taken with credit/no-credit grading, the original grade will not be excluded from the GPA.

A repeat petition is required for the following reasons only:

□ The course was originally taken at Cal Poly before Fall 9-□
□ The course was originally taken at another institution
□ The course has changed prefix or number
□ The course was taken through Cal Poly Extended Education

Repeat petitions for the situations listed above must be turned into the Office of Academic Records by the end of the seventh week of the quarter in which the course is repeated.

If the student repeats a course in which a C- or higher grade was earned, both grades will be calculated in the grade point average, but the duplicate earned hours will not be counted toward the degree.
WHEREAS, The Associated Students, Inc of Cal Poly (ASI) has expressed its concern regarding the rapid rise in textbook pricing by recently approving a resolution addressing this matter.

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly has supported the principles set forth in the ASI resolution.

WHEREAS, The complexity of textbook pricing necessitates a comprehensive study of the issues and a search for solutions.

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly recognizes that the high cost of certain textbooks and coursepacks can adversely affect the affordability of higher education for its students.

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly and the University must protect the academic freedom of faculty in assigning textbooks and other course materials while recognizing the negative impact high textbook prices has on its students therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly encourage its faculty to consider the following steps in managing textbook costs to students:

1. Review prices for different textbooks and textbook packages before ordering.
2. Require new editions of continuing titles only when important changes have occurred in content.
3. Submit textbook requests as early as possible to ensure the availability of textbooks through campus and local bookstores.
4. Use coursepacks, e-reserves, and other cost mitigating formats whenever pedagogically sound and feasible.
Communicate clearly with publisher representatives regarding textbook pricing and options available.

and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly reaffirm the fundamental right and responsibility of faculty to maintain intellectual content and teaching effectiveness as prime considerations when selecting traditional textbooks, alternative formats, and ancillary items of instruction and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly will work with Information Technology Services (ITS) and Associated Students Inc. (ASI) to look into the feasibility of developing a central publicly accessible website which will provide information about textbook requirements for Cal Poly courses: and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly send this resolution to all Cal Poly faculty.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: January 2006
Revised: February 2006
WHEREAS, Current textbook prices are of concern to faculty and students.

WHEREAS, The Associated Students Incorporated (ASI) of Cal Poly has passed a resolution on textbook pricing; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly recognize the students' concerns contained in ASI Resolution #0-06 entitled Support for Campus Leadership in Textbook Price Reduction" (attached) and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the principles contained in ASI Resolution #0-06 and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly urge department chairs and heads to promote timely submission of textbook orders by their faculty and be it further

RESOLVED: That department chairs, heads and deans be encouraged to make teaching assignments as early as possible so faculty can order textbooks in a timely manner and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly follow up on other aspects of textbook, and other textbook materials, pricing by holding meetings of the Faculty Affairs Committee with representatives of El Corral Bookstore, campus textbook authors, students, representatives of publishing companies, and other knowledgeable parties, with the intent of writing a further resolution on this issue and be it further

RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be sent to academic department chairs, department heads, and deans.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: February 2, 2006
Revised: March 2, 2006
Whereas: ASI is the official voice of the Cal Poly student body, and

Whereas: According to a survey by the California Student Public Interest Research Group (CALPIRG) students spent an average of $96 per year on textbooks in the 2005-06 school year, or almost 20% of the cost of in-state fees.

Whereas: According to the same survey a new textbook costs $122 on average, $62 more expensive than the price of an average used textbook, $60.

Whereas: Notices are issued to every facility member requesting which textbooks will be required the following quarter.

Whereas: According to El Corral Bookstore only 20% of faculty respond back to these notices before the deadline causing buyback prices to be severely reduced, and

Whereas: Textbooks often come with bundled supplemental course materials that significantly increase the overall cost of textbooks to students, and

Whereas: CALPIRG reported that 60% of facility rarely or never use the bundled materials in their courses.

Whereas: Faculty and El Corral Bookstore have power to reduce the cost of textbooks to students at Cal Poly.

Therefore
Be it resolved: Faculty are encouraged to respond to textbook requisitions in a timely manner so the bookstore can buyback used books at a higher price and make the used editions available for purchase, and

Furthermore
Be it resolved: ASI encourages El Corral Bookstore to use all means possible to educate students about available discounts options for purchasing textbooks, and

Furthermore
Be it resolved: ASI encourages El Corral Bookstore to use all means possible to ensure that all students receive the fairest prices on new and used textbooks, and