WHEREAS, California Polytechnic State University is a noted undergraduate teaching institution; and

WHEREAS, Effective teaching is essential to maintaining a quality undergraduate program; and

WHEREAS, Expertise in a given discipline alone does not ensure effective communication of this knowledge to others; and

WHEREAS, Cancellation of the Education Department's offering amounts to a cancellation of the Cal Poly teacher effectiveness program; and

WHEREAS, This absence of a program for the development of pedagogical skills is contrary to the best interests of the university in maintaining a quality undergraduate program; and

RESOLVED: That California Polytechnic State University establish a program to (1) assist teachers in developing their instructional competence, and (2) encourage experimentation in teacher effectiveness including programs involving interdisciplinary projects.
Memorandum

To : Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
    Academic Senate

From : Warren J. Baker
       President

Subject : RESOLUTION ON SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE
OF EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING (AS-204-86)

On October 2 I wrote to you relative to the Academic Senate resolution on Support and Maintenance of Excellence in Teaching adopted last spring indicating that the matter was under active review by the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs. I have now received a report from Malcolm Wilson, a copy of which is attached, that explains the efforts that have been undertaken by Robert Lucas in the area of providing opportunities for faculty development, which was the thrust of the Academic Senate resolution. I believe that the attached report provides excellent information on the efforts which Dr. Lucas is making in this regard as he has worked with various faculty members and others in the development of specific program initiatives. Please note the last paragraph of Dr. Wilson's memo with regard to his appreciation for the Academic Senate's interest in this matter and the fact that it has served as a catalyst for this area. I trust that this activity responds positively to the resolution adopted by the Senate.

Attachment
Date: January 15, 1987  

To: Crissa Hewitt, Chair  
Academic Senate Instruction Committee

From: Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair  
Academic Senate

Subject: Resolution on Support and Maintenance of Excellence in Teaching (AS-204-86/IC)

Attached is a copy of President Baker's January 8, 1987 response to the above-referenced resolution.

Would your committee please study Malcolm Wilson's December 23, 1986 report of activity within Bob Lucas' office which relates to faculty development. As you examine the report, please keep in mind that the formal responsibility for faculty development is only six months old as far as Bob's office is concerned.

My question is: Are you satisfied that the actions underway and/or proposed satisfy the intent of resolution AS-204-86/IC? Thank you!
Memorandum

To: Warren J. Baker
   President

Date: December 23, 1986

From: Malcolm W. Wilson
   Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Resolution on Support and Maintenance of Excellence in Teaching (AS-204-86)

Thank you for your copy of the October 2 memorandum you sent to Dr. Lamouria on the subject resolution.

As you are aware, a considerable amount has been done to replace the cancelled course formerly taught by Don Maas in Education. Shortly after July 1, when I announced my reorganization plan for academic affairs, I asked Bob Lucas to add formal responsibility for faculty development to his other new duties.

Since then, he has written two successful proposals for lottery funding to support faculty development: one is for a series of outside speakers and workshop leaders who will focus on ways of improving teaching; the other is to support improvement in course content through a series of subsidized computer data base searches in Kennedy Library on the Dialog system.

You are also aware that he has devoted a considerable amount of effort this year to bringing the need for more state support for faculty professional development to the attention of the various review groups currently constituted by the State Legislature to review higher education. He has been actively engaged in promoting the concept in other areas as well. Attached, for instance, is a copy of a letter he wrote recently to a consultant firm hired by the Postsecondary Education Commission to study the need for professional development in California higher education. He has worked closely with Bernie Goldstein of the Statewide Academic senate in providing him with written materials which could be used by the Senate to make its own case.

There are, of course, a number of initiatives that can be taken in this area. I have summarized only a few. My plan was to find a person to take leadership and to ask him to develop a program. As time goes on, I am sure we will hear more from Bob about this important area.

Please thank Lloyd and the Academic Senate for their attention to this matter. Their support will be vital to the success of the initiatives now underway, and they serve as an important source of information on the type of assistance needed.
December 15, 1986

Mr. Dan Weiler
1149 Amador Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94707

Dear Dan:

Congratulations on your pending contract with PSEC to study the professional development needs of faculty in the post-secondary institutions in California! As I mentioned on the phone last week, we have a document to guide our thinking on professional development on campus, which I have attached. It is Administrative Bulletin 85-2, issued close to two years ago.

The document grew out of a statement on the role of research issued four years earlier (see also). When in 1981 research was identified as an "important form of professional development," our faculty senate recognized the need for a statement on professional development itself. It set about defining its outer parameters, and the inquiry spawned the second bulletin.

Many campuses use the word "research" to mean what we refer to as professional development on this campus. On doctoral-granting campuses, where research is understood as part of the mission, the use of the word "research" to cover a multitude of activities, creates no problem. In our system, however, since research is not supported by formula, we try to avoid using research to cover all forms of professional development. No matter how "toney" it sounds, it compromises our arguments for additional funds. If we ask for funds for "research" when we mean "professional development," and the state simply responds (reasonably), "we've already got research covered at UC." The upshot is all forms of professional development are left unfunded for the CSU.

"Assigned" time relates to this. It is a term used by the Chancellor's Office in the California State University to identify faculty time assigned for curriculum development and professional growth. There is, however, no special allocation from the state for assigned time. It is simply the term that is used after the fact to refer to the manner in which the campus handles resources already earned through previous direct instructional activities.
The only way we earn resources is by teaching classes and earning student credit units. After we have an earned position, we can use it for faculty development activity, and it is called "assigned" time, but assigned time activities do not earn their own time back. We still must teach enough students to earn that position back two years later.

Reallocating positions for "assigned" time is made even more difficult by the fact that the CSU is funded at only 92 percent of what its formulas entitle it to. Were we funded at 100 percent of the formula, it would be easier to find resources for assigned time from our allowance.

Now, if "professional development" were recognized as a need for the system, it could be funded up front with its own allocation which would not have to be earned back, and which could be used as venture intellectual capital to improve the system as a whole. As it is, the whole issue is ignored because "we don't do research," and a paper concept for professional development called assigned time is promoted in its place.

As you know, I am vitally interested in this topic and look forward to hearing from you if you'd like to discuss it further. I will be in San Francisco January 20-22, for the meeting of the Commission to Review the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. Perhaps we could visit some time then.

It was good talking to you. I hope we have a chance to meet and talk further.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Lucas, Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development

cc: Malcolm Wilson
Memorandum

Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: RESOLUTION ON SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE OF EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING (AS-204-86)

This will acknowledge your September 29 memo in which you inquired with regard to the administrative action on the subject resolution adopted by the Academic Senate last spring.

The resolution is under review by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Since there are no specific recommendations on content and conduct of such a program, the Academic Affairs staff will be working with appropriate faculty to develop the program, estimate the costs and seek sources of funding. Methods of improving teaching effectiveness are a high priority for the University and the Academic Senate resolution should be an excellent catalyst to spark our imagination to come up with effective and innovative ways of broadly addressing this issue on campus.
Date: September 29, 1986  
To: Warren J. Baker, President  
From: Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair  
Academic Senate  
Subject: Resolution on Support and Maintenance of Excellence in Teaching (AS-204-86)  

Under date of April 15, 1986, the above-referenced Resolution on Excellence in Teaching was forwarded for your consideration (copy attached). Since we show no record of response, would you please advise.