MINUTES: Approval of the October 2, 1990 Academic Senate minutes (pp. 2-4).

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair
B. President's Office
C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
D. Statewide Senators
E. CFA Campus President
F. ASI Representatives

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
   Resolution on Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty—Berrio, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, Second Reading (pp. 5-7).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
WHEREAS, The present guidelines are out-of-date; and

WHEREAS, The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between The California State University and Unit 3 Faculty addresses the issue of student evaluation; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Administrative Bulletin 74-1 be deleted from the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM); and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the new guidelines, as attached, be included in CAM as Administrative Bulletin 90-__.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
June 13, 1990
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

1. Student evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between The California State University (CSU) and the Unit 3-Faculty.

2. The primary purpose of this student evaluation program is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program at Cal Poly.

3. The results of this student evaluation program will be used for both the improvement of instruction and in partial substantiation of recommendations in appointment, retention, tenure and promotion decisions. They will also be considered during the post-tenure peer review periodic evaluation process.

4. All faculty members who teach shall participate in this student evaluation program at the following minimum levels in each academic year:
   
a. tenured professors: two classes (preferably two different courses*)
   
b. tenured Assistant and Associate Professors: four classes (at least two different courses)
   
c. probationary tenure-track faculty and full-time lecturers: six classes (at least three different courses, if possible)
   
d. part-time lecturers: every class taught or six classes (whichever is least less)

   Whenever possible, evaluation averages results of faculty members should be compared with those of other faculty members of their own rank and tenure status. For example, the evaluation of a tenured professor in senior level/level courses in his/her specialty can be expected to be higher than those of an assistant professor evaluated in freshman level courses.

5. The student evaluation form and additional procedures used by any school/department shall be in accordance with these guidelines and shall be endorsed by the school/department faculty, department head/chair, and approved by the dean. Deans shall send a copy of approved forms and procedures, or

* The word "course" includes lecture courses, laboratory courses, and seminars.
revisions thereof, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Student opinion regarding the form and additional procedures of any department shall be considered prior to the dean's approval through consultation with the student council of the school.

6. The following procedures shall be used in the administration of student evaluations:

   a. each department is responsible for providing its faculty with copies of these guidelines and any other procedures covering student evaluation of faculty in order to ensure that proper procedures are followed

   b. 10-20 minutes of class time will be provided by the faculty member for the student evaluation process in each class in which s/he is being evaluated. During this time, the faculty member shall be absent from the classroom

   c. only students officially enrolled in the class will be permitted to participate

7. Subsequent to the issuance of the grades for the quarter in which a faculty member has been evaluated using this process, the results (as defined in school/department procedures) of this program shall be made available to the faculty member, his/her department head/chair, and the custodian of the faculty member's personnel action file. The results shall be included in the faculty member's personnel action file.

8. If written comments from student evaluation forms are included in the personnel file, they may be either in summary form or by inclusion of all the written comments. If a summary is used, it must be approved by the faculty member being evaluated.
NOTES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE BUDGET MEETING

Jim Landreth, Vice President for Business Affairs presented an overview and background on the 1990/91 mandated General Fund Budget Reductions using the first of nine transparencies (see Table 1). The proposed 1990/91 CSU Governor's Budget as submitted to the Legislature in January 1990 contained $71.2 million of reductions consisting of past and proposed unfunded non-faculty Merit Salary Adjustments, workload and unidentified reductions. Planning to meet these reductions was initiated at the system and campus levels during the Winter and Spring Quarter timeframe in anticipation of the budget being passed by the Legislature by not later than June 15, 1990 and subsequently signed by the Governor in order to be effective July 1, 1990. The budget was not actually passed and signed until the latter part of July. Included in the Governor's actions on the final Legislative budget was the addition of Budget Act Section 3.8 which instructed the Director of Finance to further reduce the General Fund agencies' budgets, including the UC and the CSU, by an additional 3%. For the CSU that figure would have represented $51.7 million bringing the total CSU reductions to $122.9 million. Planning was then accelerated to meet the additional proposed reductions with $5.9 million to be offset by using 1989/90 budget balances and 1990/91 special repair funds, $34.5 million from Lottery alternatives, and $82.5 million from campus, systemwide and Chancellor's Office budgets. It was learned that in the pressure of the closing of the budget session some misunderstandings developed. One was that a fee increase in both the State University Fee and Out-of-State Tuition would be implemented but that it would be used to offset the required CSU reductions. However, the final Legislative budget anticipated the fee increases and were implemented in the calculations. Therefore, the revenues resulting from the fee increases were not available to offset the $122.9 million in reductions. The UC President and the CSU Chancellor appealed to the Governor for reconsideration of the 3% reduction called for by Budget Act Section 3.8. That appeal was successful and the CSU's additional reduction was reduced from $51.7 to $36.5 million (2.1%), for a reduced total of $107 million vs. the original $122.9 million. The $107 million in reductions has been met by using $4.6 million rolled forward from 1989/90 budget balances and reductions in 1990/91 special repair funding, $6.3 million from construction bond payments, $34.5 million in lottery alternative reductions and $62.3 million in reductions in campus, systemwide and Chancellor's Office budgets.

Jim Landreth made two closing comments. They dealt with (1) Lottery revenues, and (2) the general State revenue picture. Some State agencies receive Lottery funds in the current year and defer use of them until the subsequent year. The CSU receives and expends their share of Lottery funds in current year. Thus, the CSU is particularly interested and sensitive to actual Lottery vs. projected revenues. In the first quarter of 1990/91 the CSU share of Lottery funds fell short by approximately $1 million of projections, and has created concern in terms of the balance of the year. The system and the campus will be carefully monitoring future Lottery revenue data. In addition some economists and others are forecasting that the State revenues projected for 1990/91 may not be achieved. While Proposition 111 raised the State Allocation Limit (SAL), corresponding increases in revenue have not materialized. This factor will likewise be carefully monitored. Jim Landreth concluded by commenting that he is often asked what is the financial outlook for the 1991/92 fiscal year. His answer at this point in time is "The same or possibly worse, but not better."

A.S.I. feels that this resolution as a whole is a positive step in furthering the benefits that can be gained by students, faculty and administration through an organized student teacher evaluation process.

However, regarding the last sentence in paragraph five, which deals with student input; A.S.I. feels that "consultation with the student council of the school", does not insure that the student opinion is properly considered. So we ask that the Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee, consider rewording paragraph five to establish the following: A committee composed of that school's dean, department heads of that school, and a balanced number of faculty and students from that school, that would discuss and vote on the approval of the proposed form and additional procedures used by that school. The student members of the committee could be selected by a process established by the student council of that school.