I. Minutes: Approval of the April 30, 1996 Academic Senate meeting (pp. 2-3 attached).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
A. Steven Marx will be presented with "Resolution Commending Steven Marx" at this meeting.
B. New 1996-97 senators will be introduced at this meeting.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Vice President for Academic Affairs:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. Staff Council representative:
G. ASI representatives:
H. IACC representative:
I. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Information Competence: Connely, member of the Computer Literacy Subcommittee, second reading (pp. 59-60 in your 4.30.96 agenda).
B. Resolution to Approve General Education and Breadth Program Proposed Administrative Structure: Hampsey, chair of the GEB Ad Hoc Committee, second reading (cover memo on pp. 49-52, resolution on pp. 53-56 in your 4.30.96 agenda and pp. 4-5 attached).
C. Resolution to Approve Proposed General Education and Breadth Four Unit Template: Hampsey, chair of the GEB Ad Hoc Committee, second reading, (cover memo on pp. 49-52, resolution on pp. 57-58 in your 4.30.96 agenda and pp. 4-5 attached).
D. Resolution on the Academic Calendar: First Day of Instruction: Freberg, chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading (p. 6 attached).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
MEMORANDUM

Date: May 22, 1996

To: ACADEMIC SENATE

From: GEB Ad Hoc Committee: John Hampsey (Chair), Phil Bailey, John Connely, Glenn Irvin, Steve Kaminaka, and Paul Murphy

Subject: Proposed Revisions to (1) Resolution to Approve General Education and Breadth Program Proposed Administrative Structure and (2) Resolution to Approve Proposed General Education and Breadth Four Unit Template

The GEB Ad Hoc Committee met at length on Friday, May 17, and Monday, May 20, to discuss the various ideas arising from the Academic Senate first reading discussion of the proposals on GEB governance and template. The committee decided, by strong consensus, to offer the following changes to the proposals:

**Governance**

1. Membership on the Governing Board (p. 55 in the 4.30.96 agenda):

   A director and eight board members, two from the College of Liberal Arts, two from the College of Science and Mathematics (the University Center for Teacher Education is included in this unit), and two from each of the four professional colleges will compose the GE&B Governing Board. Board members will serve three-year renewable terms that are staggered to promote continuity.

2. Qualifications of the Director of the GEB Governing Board (p. 56 in the 4.30.96 agenda):

   The director will have a thorough understanding of, and deep conviction and commitment to, the philosophy and goals of the General Education and Breadth Program, extensive experience in teaching, developing, and supervising GEB courses, a background in the Arts and Sciences, and demonstrated leadership experience in curricular matters.

3. Selection of the Director of the GEB Governing Board (p. 56 in the 4.30.96 agenda):

   The director will be appointed by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs after solicitation of nominations and applications and consultation with the GEB Governing Board and the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

**Template**

Technology Elective (p. 58 in the 4.30.96 agenda):

Study into how of technology influences, and is influenced by, and how it influences today’s world.
With regard to the Senate's role in curricular matters, the GEB Ad Hoc Committee would like to reiterate that as with any other academic program, the administrative reporting line is to the Provost, and review and recommendations on curricula and courses are through the Academic Senate. This is, the GEB Governing Board "reports" to the Provost; it forwards curricular and course proposals to the Academic Senate for review and approval.

In addition, the committee looks forward to discussing its response to the other issues raised but not addressed in this memo.
WHEREAS, C.A.M. section 481.B.1 states, "Whenever possible, the first day of instruction in each quarter will be Monday with a 48 day minimum per quarter (49 day minimum spring) and whenever possible the last day of instruction each quarter will be a Friday;" and

WHEREAS, In recent years, including 1996-1997, this stipulation has not been incorporated in the planning of the Academic Calendar; and

WHEREAS, Failure to start Winter quarter on a Monday results in three Monday holidays, which adversely affects scheduling and instruction; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That C.A.M. 481.B.1 shall be revised as follows:

Instructional days—Whenever possible, the first day of instruction in each quarter will be Monday with a 48 day minimum per quarter (49 day minimum spring) and whenever possible the last day of instruction each quarter will be a Friday.

and be it further

RESOLVED, That C.A.M. 481.B.1. shall be given higher priority in planning the academic calendar than sections 481.A.2 (end Summer Quarter before Labor Day) and 481.A.5 (end Spring Quarter before the second weekend in June).

Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
April 18, 1996
MEMORANDUM

Date: May 28, 1996

To: Academic Senate

From: Laura Freberg
Chair, Academic Senate Instruction Committee

SUBJECT: Resolution on abolishing C/NC grading in GE&B courses

Since grading policy is within the charge of the Senate Instruction Committee, we would like to take this opportunity to share our thoughts with you regarding the proposal to abolish C/NC grading in GE&B courses. Although we have discussed these points in committee, I take personal responsibility for the contents of this memo. In our view, the resolution raises significant process and substance concerns.

The process issues are as follows:

- This resolution has had very little consultation outside of the Senate. Such a major change in policy should have wide consultation and discussion, particularly with students, prior to a vote. Traditionally, this campus does not take well to surprises.
- If the resolution is passed, C/NC grading will be allowed in electives only. Since many majors have 9 or fewer electives, perhaps it would be simpler to get rid of C/NC altogether.
- Academic Records staff have expressed concerns about implementation. We recommend that implementation of a successful resolution occur no earlier than Fall 97.

In terms of substance, this resolution raises many interesting issues that merit further discussion:

- Without C/NC, overall GPA’s will certainly go down. Although we advise students planning to go to graduate school to avoid C/NC, Cal Poly students may still be put at a disadvantage relative to students from campuses with liberal C/NC policies.
- We have no way of predicting the impact of this resolution on throughput. Students often use C/NC during quarters in which they take a higher number of units.
- Letter grades do not substitute for excellent teaching. If we can’t convince our students that our material is interesting and/or useful enough to merit their attention, something is terribly wrong. UC Santa Cruz and Stanford produce very well educated students with very liberal grading policies.
- Letter grades are not a Band-Aid for GE&B. Grading policy will not guarantee that the program will be taken more seriously by students or by faculty in other disciplines.

On a more humorous note, we shouldn’t lose sight of the parallels between this resolution and the Chancellor’s rationale for PSSI’s. Theory X management is alive and well in 1996.

Ideally, we would like to see the Senate table this resolution until Fall Quarter, which would allow for further consultation with students and a wider discussion among the faculty. Thank you for your time and consideration.
Adopted:

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

AS- -96/
RESOLUTION ON
CREDIT/NO CREDIT GRADING FOR
GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH COURSES

WHEREAS, Current policy generally disallows the use of coursework taken on a credit/no credit basis to fulfill graduation requirements, the sole exception being coursework taken to satisfy General Education and Breadth requirements; and

WHEREAS, No coursework required for graduation ought to be taken on a credit/no credit basis (unless it is only offered on such a basis); therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That beginning fall quarter, 1997, no course taken on a credit/no credit basis will count as having satisfied any General Education and Breadth requirement (unless that course is only offered on a credit/no credit basis); and, be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy will have no effect on any credit given for coursework done before fall quarter, 1997; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That incomplete grades will be handled according to the policy in force whenever the grade of "I" was assigned.

Proposed May 28, 1997
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

Resolution on Information Competence

Background: It is becoming increasingly apparent that information competence is a bedrock skill for all college students. This is the ability to find, evaluate, use, and communicate information in all of its various formats. *** (See at bottom.)

WHEREAS, it is a primary responsibility to foster such information skills among the students as Cal Poly.

WHEREAS, these skills should be acquired at different levels of competence in relation to entering students, continuing college students, and graduating students.

WHEREAS, these skills should be mastered at levels appropriate to entering students, continuing students, and graduating students.

WHEREAS, such skills need to be integrated into all levels of instruction, both vertically and horizontally as regards the curriculum.

WHEREAS, such integration is beyond the purview of any single major or the General Education and Breadth program.

RESOLVED: That entering students be required to meet basic information competence skills, that continuing college students be required to meet university level information competence skills, and that graduating students be expected to meet advanced informational competence skills related to their majors.

RESOLVED: A university-wide committee will be formed to make recommendations on appropriate skill levels and implementation methods for entering students and continuing college students.

That a university-wide committee be formed to recommend appropriate skill levels and methods of assessing skill levels and assuring mastery of skills for entering students and continuing students.

That the recommendations will be forwarded to the Provost for Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate, and the GE&B Committee.
That the committee will encourage each major to develop and forward a list of skills and knowledge relating to the informational competence appropriate for their graduating students.

Membership:
The membership should represent the key divisions at the university who are involved with information competence.

All memberships are for three years, with staggered terms to be determined initially by drawing lots. The chair will be chosen annually by the committee.

Therefore:

The Committee is appointed by the Provost for Academic Affairs on the basis of the following recommendations:

1. One member from each College, nominated by the Dean of the College.
2. A member from the Library, nominated by the Dean of Library Services.
3. A member from the Center for Teacher Education, nominated by the Director of the UCTE.
4. A member from Information Technology Services, nominated by the Vice Provost for ITS.
5. A representative of the Provost for Academic Affairs, a designee of the Provost.

The Committee will submit an annual report on the University's status concerning the three levels of informational competence to the following:

1. The Chair of the Academic Senate
2. The Provost for Academic Affairs
3. The Deans of the individual Colleges.
4. The Director of the Center for Teacher Education.
5. The Dean of Library Services.
6. The Vice Provost for Information Technology Services.

RESOLVED: That the first charge of the Committee be a review of the issue of computer literacy in the new terms of information competence.