I. Minutes:

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. ASI Representatives

IV. Consent Agenda:
   Resolution on Degree Name Change for the Materials Engineering Department
   (to be distributed).

V. Business Item(s):
   (page numbers refer to the May 22, 1990 Academic Senate Agenda)
   A. Resolution on Education Department Reorganization-Hagen, Chair of the Long-
      Range Planning Committee, Second Reading (distributed at the 5/22/90 Senate
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MEMORANDUM

Date: May 24, 1990

To: ACADEMIC SENATORS

From: James L. Murphy, Chair Academic Senate

Subject: Academic Senate Meeting of May 29, 1990

Some of the Business Items from the May 22 meeting have been carried over to the May 29 agenda. Any first reading items which are not moved to a second reading on May 29, will come before the Academic Senate Executive Committee (acting on behalf of the full Senate) in July, 1990.

For your information, the following items have been enclosed for the May 29 meeting:

1. A new agenda page for the May 29 meeting
2. A copy of Ken Palmer's memo dated May 21, 1990 regarding the Long-Range Planning Committee's resolution on Education Department Reorganization
3. Consent Agenda Resolution on Degree Name Change for the Materials Engineering Department

If you have any questions concerning this agenda, please give me a call. Thank you.

Enclosures
TO: Jim Murphy, Chair
   Academic Senate

FROM: Kenneth F. Palmer, Interim Head
       Education Department

SUBJECT: Academic Resolution

I've just received a copy of the resolution generated by the Academic Senate Long Range Planning Committee, and quite frankly, I am a little perplexed by its content. Among other things, most of the points made in the resolution are so vague that it's difficult to respond to them, or they simply represent assumptions which are not supported by any data nor are they supported by any parts of the reorganization proposal. In fact, I am further puzzled by the fact that Chuck Hagen had sent out a packet of material to the Long Range Planning Committee in a memo dated May 16th for discussion at a May 18th meeting. It seemed to me nearly all of the questions raised in the resolution were questions that were dealt with by the thoughtful responses reflected in that material.

I've discussed the resolution with several faculty members, both within Education and outside Education, and they are equally perplexed. Based on these discussions, I would like to offer some thoughts related to the various assertions and/or concerns reflected in the resolution. Looking at the second WHEREAS, "The proposal involves a departure from the university's normal organizational structure." Frankly, I don't have a clue as to what "normal" organizational structure might be. If it suggests that it deviates from the status quo, that is, of course, the intent of the proposal. The status quo has been an unproductive and unsatisfactory organizational arrangement for all of the reasons cited in the original proposal.

The third WHEREAS which suggests that this departure from the status quo will change the character of the Associate Vice President's position may be true, depending on what "character" of the position means. If it suggests that the job description of that position may change a bit, I expect that is true. The intent is to create an all-university teacher education responsibility, and if there are any adjustments required in the job descriptions of various management personnel to accommodate that reality, so be it. I would hope these positions exist to serve the needs of the university, and as those needs change, the responsibilities associated with the positions would change.

The fourth WHEREAS suggests "a small unit of the kind proposed will lack fiscal flexibility and will in fact face considerable fiscal vulnerability." I know of no factual data to support this assertion, and for that matter, I'm not sure what fiscal vulnerability means. It is true that it would be the responsibility of the coordinating council to distribute resources from the schools and from the university to do teacher education on this campus. The viability of the Teacher Education Center will be dependent upon the integrity, professional responsibility, and the good will of the university deans involved. These same considerations govern the "flexibility" and "vulnerability" of any cost center on campus.
The fifth WHEREAS speaks to role of the "All-university Advisory Committee" on Teacher Education. Vice President Bailey, it seems to us, has wisely not been overly specific in his proposal. He stated that the proposal was designed as a framework for soliciting input and reactions from across campus. In the case of the All-university Advisory Committee, several of us have reflected that, because of the all-university faculty of the Teacher Education Center such an all-university committee might not be necessary. Clearly, once the organization is put in place the issue will become: Have we adequately addressed the need for all university involvement in teacher education? If the all university faculty and the coordinating council addresses that issue, fine. If it doesn't, then we would set about establishing an advisory committee that does. It's as simple as that. The issue is an effective university response to the need for teacher education—not whether or not we have Committee X, Y, or Z as part of that function.

RTP: RTP procedures have been adequately spelled out in the form of education faculty being divided into two departments—a Graduate Studies Department and a Multiple Subjects Department. The first level of RTP would take place within these departments. RTP proceedings would then go to the all university education faculty, the Director, and to university committees as appropriate. All-in-all, quite a straightforward proposition.

There are two related WHEREASES. One speaks to the role of education department faculty members who are not "directly involved in teacher education" and the other raises the issues of housing the Liberal Studies and M.S. Program in Counseling. With the exception of one or two faculty members associated with the M.S. Degree in Counseling, all current members of the education faculty are involved directly in education. Some of them spend a good deal of their time in graduate programs such as Education Administration, Counseling and Guidance, Special Education or Reading. These specializations would be housed in the Department of Graduate Studies in the Teacher Education Center. Their role and status as faculty members would not change. With regard to Liberal Studies and the M.S. programs it has been suggested that perhaps the M.S. program either now or at some future date should be moved to Psychology. This is not a particularly complex issue, and it is assumed that that decision would be made as part of the reorganization effort. With regard to Liberal Studies, the Vice President has a set of opinions from across campus as to where it might most logically be housed. After studying the various positions offered by respondents, then the assumption is that a decision will be made...At least in terms of the decision making process not a terribly complex process.

Finally, the last WHEREAS is perhaps the most puzzling. The suggestion is that the proposal focus on administrative structure without addressing issues of "program content and quality." Exactly what "issues" of program quality and content does the committee suggest be addressed? Education on this campus is engaged in a continuous and on-going process of assessing content and quality. Over the last five years, virtually every aspect and every course in teacher education and education graduate studies programs have been studied, assessed, revised, or reconstructed. This will culminate in a Commission on Teacher Credentialing visit next year which will look into every facet of our programs and render judgement as to their continuance or discontinuance. Yes, it is true that this proposal focuses on a management structure. But I cannot think of any basis for calling into question program content or quality.

While the focus is on structure, more importantly, the issue is one of philosophy, and that is: "Is teacher education an all-university program that should be
responsive to, and managed by, the 'university as a whole' or should it continue to be a rather isolated department-based program?". Vice President Bailey's proposal clearly and forthrightly suggests that the former is most appropriate—a position with which I agree.
WHEREAS,
The Materials Engineering Department requests that the name of its degree be changed to Bachelor of Science in MATERIALS ENGINEERING; and

WHEREAS,
The request for a degree name change has been approved by the Dean for the School of Engineering, the School of Engineering Council, and the Academic Senate School of Engineering Caucus; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the name of Materials Engineering Department degree be changed to Bachelor of Science in MATERIALS ENGINEERING.

Proposed By: The Materials Engineering Department
May 29, 1990
WHEREAS, the Ad Hoc MCA Committee has issued a progress report distributed under a cover memo dated May 22, 1990, co-signed by John Lindvall, Chair, and Philip Bailey, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, and

WHEREAS, the report indicates agreement has been reached on most of the major issues concerning the admission of freshmen and underrepresented students, and

WHEREAS, the report specifies that the Committee intends that a "substantial portion of each major's admissions be based solely on the Academic Ranking Model" described therein, and

WHEREAS, the report specifies that the Academic Ranking Model will accommodate weighting variations on variables to allow for differences among Schools/majors, and

WHEREAS, the Committee has concluded that an auxiliary Student Diversity Model is needed to assure the admission of CSU qualified underrepresented students consistent with (1) the changing demographics of the state, (2) legislative and Chancellor office directives, and (3) the University goal of achieving a diverse student body, and

WHEREAS, the objectives of the proposed Student Diversity Model are to (1) achieve targets established through a consultative process involving the Vice President for Academic Affairs, deans, and faculty, (2) admit the underrepresented students who rank the highest in the Academic Ranking Model, and (3) not contradict the principle that all models under consideration will admit a substantial portion of the students to each major based solely on the Academic Ranking Model, and

WHEREAS, the report specifies that the list of students to be admitted must be analyzed for its diversity characteristics before notice of admission is sent to applicants, and

WHEREAS, it is the Committee's intent that the Academic Ranking and Student Diversity Models be used for all admissions except for EOP, athletes, hardship, president's and deans' prerogative, and non-resident students, and

WHEREAS, the Committee has pledged to work expeditiously on corresponding models for transfer students, and

WHEREAS, Interim Vice President Bailey has pledged to use all
reasonable means to implement the new models effective with the Fall 1990 admissions cycle; therefore be it

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate support (1) the conclusions expressed in the Committee's progress report, (2) the Committee's continuing efforts to develop appropriate transfer models, and (3) Vice President Bailey's pledge to secure immediate implementation; and be it

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate Executive Committee, acting on behalf of the entire Senate, stands ready to participate in any appropriate way in resolving any issues pertaining to the consultative processes called for in the Committee's report; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Ad Hoc MCA Committee monitor the implementation of its recommendations and report to the Academic Senate on the results thereof at such times as it sees fit, but not later than March 1, 1991.

Proposed by:
School of Business Caucus
May 29, 1990
RESOLUTION ON
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT REORGANIZATION

WHEREAS, The Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Education Department, has proposed a reorganization of teacher education on campus; and

WHEREAS, The proposal involves a departure from the University’s normal organizational structure; and

WHEREAS, The proposal puts an academic unit under the immediate supervision of the associate vice president for academic affairs, thereby changing the character of that position; and

WHEREAS, A small unit of the kind proposed will lack fiscal flexibility and will in fact face considerable fiscal vulnerability; and

WHEREAS, The proposal as it stands does not discuss the precise nature and role of the All-University Advisory Committee on Teacher Education; and

WHEREAS, RPT procedures are not fully spelled out in the proposal; and

WHEREAS, The proposal does not explain what the role and status of members of the current Education Department who are not directly involved in teacher education will be when there is no longer an Education Department as such; and

WHEREAS, Liberal Studies and the masters program in counseling are not teacher education programs and may not belong in the new unit; and

WHEREAS, The proposal focuses exclusively on administrative structure without addressing issues of program content and quality; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That until satisfactory answers to these questions and details of the procedures are presented to the Academic Senate for examination the reorganization proposal should not be approved.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee
Approved: 7-0-1
May 18, 1990
Adopted:

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

AS-90/
RESOLUTION ON
SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

WHEREAS, There is a lack of accountability for the administration of sexual harassment prevention programs and the implementation of the campus policy on sexual harassment; and

WHEREAS, There is a lack of professional training programs for advisers (defined in the Sexual Harassment Policy) and management employees; and

WHEREAS, There is a lack of educational programs for employees and students aimed at the prevention of sexual harassment, therefore, be it faculty, staff, and students; and

WHEREAS, Prevention through education is the best tool for the elimination of sexual harassment; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Affirmative Action Officer (AAO) should be responsible for all campus policies and programs dealing with sexual harassment. Specifically, the AAO is responsible for:

(a) the effective and timely implementation of the Sexual Harassment Policy (AB 88-5)
(b) the development and implementation of training and education programs dealing with the prevention of sexual harassment; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the AAO, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, should select a Training Development Team of three qualified employees to develop educational programs for faculty, staff, and students and training programs for Sexual Harassment Advisers and management employees. Each management/employee upon completion of training, should be prepared to implement education programs dealing with sexual harassment for employees under his/her direction.

The AAO should meet regularly with the Training Development Team in order to monitor their
progress and coordinate their efforts with the Personnel Office, Academic Affairs Division, and Student Affairs Division. Members of the Team should be compensated (through assigned time) for their work; and, be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Sexual Harassment Advisers should meet once a month during the academic year and should elect a chair. The chair, in consultation with the AAO, should set the agenda for the monthly meetings. The general purpose of these meetings should be continuing education for the Advisers and sharing of ideas and experiences related to advising; and, be it further

**RESOLVED:** That every fall, commencing no later than fall 1991, the Training Development Team should offer educational programs for faculty, staff, and students, sensitizing them to behavior that constitutes sexual harassment; and, be it further

**RESOLVED:** That every fall, the AAO should send the list of Advisers (along with their campus phone numbers and addresses) to all students and campus employees. The AAO should emphasize that a complainant is free to meet with any Adviser.

Proposed By: The Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
May 15, 1990
Revised May 15, 1990
Academic Senate
of
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA

Resolution on
the Reorganization of Education

Whereas, the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Education community, both on and off campus, has proposed a reorganization of Teacher Education; and

Whereas, the proposal has the support of all parties involved in Teacher Education on this campus; and

Whereas, the proposal has the support of school districts in the service area of Cal Poly; and

Whereas, the proposal has a strong all university commitment to the education of teachers for California schools; and

Whereas, the proposal calls for the new unit to develop systematic procedures for R.T.P., advisor committees, Liberal Studies waiver programs, faculty placement; and

Whereas, the university will insure that the proposed unit will have fiscal resources to carry out its mission; therefore be it

Resolved that the Academic Senate approve reorganization of Education as proposed; be it further

Resolved that the Academic Senate and University administration annually review fiscal efficiency, program effectiveness, and mission attainment; and be it further

Resolved that the Vice President for Academic Affairs report to the Academic Senate by April 1, 1991, on the progress achieved in the transition, including positive and negative concerns.

Proposed by the SAGR Caucus
May 29, 1990
To: Jim Murphy, Chair of Academic Senate
From: David Hafemeister, Chair GE&B

Re: Area F Subcommittee Inputs to the Resolution on Policies for F.2.

Sept. 29) Proposals sent to Area F Subcommittee for courses taught by professors outside of Ag/Arch/Eng/IT, and for exemptions by some departments.

Oct. 20) Jim Murphy and John Connely meet with GE&B Committee on "who teaches and who takes" Area F.2 courses.

Nov. 1) Area F subcommittee asks "for clarification of the charge of the committee" on who takes and teaches F.2 courses, for the specific proposals of Sept. 29. Area F listed the F.2 criteria they are using, "Technologically oriented courses which teach an understanding of how technology interacts with cultural and social factors. Such courses will address the broad cultural and social applications and implications of technology in today's world." On the other hand, Area F requested the GE&B to reaffirm the old definition that only Ag/Arch/Eng/IT can teach in this area, and only their students are given exemptions from F.2.

Nov. 17) GE&B Committee meets with Area F Subcommittee on "who takes and who teaches" F.2 Courses. GE&B instructs Area F to continue to use their present guidelines until the Full Committee acts on the long term proposals. "Major changes in policy will be presented to the Academic Senate for approval/denial before implementation."

April 25 and May 7) The resolution on "New Criteria and Policies for Area F.2" passes GE&B Committee unanimously. The third resolve on exemptions from Area F.2 passed by a vote of 4 to 2; this was the only provision which did not pass unanimously. There has been a procedural error by the 1988-89 GE&B Committee. The new Home Economics Area F.2 exemption has not been voted upon by the Academic Senate. The split in vote represented a difference of opinion on how to handle the Home Economics exemption. The 1989-90 GE&B Committee feels that this issue must be addressed by the Academic Senate.
A Report on the Intersegmental Faculty Seminar  
Summer 1989

Submitted by

Raymond Zeuschner  
Speech Communication

During July 1989, thirty-three faculty members from the CSU and California Community Colleges participated in a week-long seminar which focused on teaching general education. Specific purposes were to examine instructional problems and to find effective, creative approaches to their solutions; to assist faculty in venturing beyond the limits of their own specializations and environments in search of transferable ideas and the universal of good teaching; to celebrate good teaching; to stimulate the exchange of information and ideas within public higher education by building an expanding network of communication among the faculty; to promote an attitude of introspection and self-appraisal by providing a relaxed setting and an open, human climate in which participants can seriously review and consider their attitudes, methods, and behavior as faculty; and to renew commitment to teaching. Raymond Zeuschner represented Cal Poly at this seminar, with James Murphy as alternate.

While the format involved 16 individual sessions (dealing with Cognitive style, Evaluation of Students, Internationalizing the Curriculum, General Education in the Year 2000, Motivating Students, Evaluating and Motivating Faculty, Burnout, "Ultimate Course 101," Critical Thinking, Transfer Education Curriculum, Part-time/Full Time Faculty Interaction, Collaborative Learning, Small Group Processes, Cultural Differences, Interdisciplinary/Integrated Learning, and Getting Students Involved in their Own Learning) three notable elements are especially worth relating in this report: the Teaching Innovation Papers, the Statement on General Education in the Year 2000 and Beyond, and the Goals and Rationale for General Education.

All thirty-three participants presented papers concerning some aspect of teaching innovation. (Murphy presented, "Problem-Based Curriculum in a Capstone Course," and Zeuschner presented, "Development and Application of an Assessment Instrument for Communication-Related Lesson Plans.") In a seminar format, ideas were evaluated and adapted to use by participants. Other papers included such topics as "Problem-Based Biology Laboratories" (Meeker, CSU-Sacramento), "Approaches to Teaching Writing and Critical Thinking" (Moody, CSU-San Bernardino) and "Student Internships in Human Services" (Ray, San Joaquin Delta College). See Attachment A for a complete list. This part of the program was especially useful as it gave a clear academic focus through the development and presentation of papers at the conference, while allowing us to appreciate the variety of approaches taken by our colleagues on other campuses or in the community.
The second area of concern in this report concerned the all-Seminar development and endorsement of the "Statement on General Education in the Year 2000 and Beyond." Zeuschner, Kegley (CSU-Bakersfield, and Maddox (Santa Monica College) were the subcommittee assigned to develop the statement, which was then submitted and approved by the seminar.

GENERAL EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR 2000 AND BEYOND

General Education has traditionally reflected the culture of the society in which it was taught. However, to borrow from T.H. White (The Making of the President, 1960), the culture of the United States is unique because it is composed of people from all cultures of the world who came seeking equal opportunity and fair government; as a nation we can not claim to have a single, unifying culture. The greatness and richness of our country's purpose is its ability to contain and utilize diversity. If we lose this purpose, then we become nothing but the "off-scourings and hungry of other lands."

The future course of General Education in this country should reflect the changing characteristics of our increasingly diverse population, the multiplicity of our historical origins, the demands of our environment for new solutions to problems, and ways to live peacefully with diverse systems and values.

The "ideal" general education program would have as its goal the outcome of enabling students to have cognitive, affective and skill competencies which empower them to become effective humans -- to be happy and free, to be competent, caring and contributing members of their emerging society.

We foresee a program of the future which provides:

1. Knowledge. To acquire the facts, know the principles, understand the interrelationships in and among central areas, such as history, language, culture, environment, sciences and mathematics and the arts.
   To understand various modes of inquiry and expression appropriate to natural sciences, mathematics, the arts, behavioral/social sciences, humanities, etc., which address and explore such central questions of all people as "Who am I? Where do I come from? Where am I going? What is the world I live in? What is my purpose?"

2. Feelings. To be sensitive, alert, attendant, adaptive, responsible, self-aware and world-conscious, tolerant of ambiguity, and respectful of the views and styles of others.
3. Abilities. To continue to acquire, evaluate, reformulate and communicate
knowledge, feelings, values and skills in order to act effectively and responsibly in a
changing, diverse world.

The final area concerns the rationale for General Education which could apply to
both the CSU and Community College systems. It was developed by a sub-group headed
by Prof. Son Le of Mission College, and reviewed and augmented by the entire seminar.

This rationale focused on four dimensions or central questions about the nature and
purpose General Education: For Whom? What is the Purpose? What is the Content?
What is the Mode of Instruction? Each of these areas will be discussed briefly.

The question of "For Whom?" was relatively easy to answer across the two systems.
The participants agreed that all students need a general education program, beginning as
entering freshmen in either system, required of every degree program and having elements
in both lower and upper division. The Cal Poly program is an excellent model of such
an approach to General Education.

Next, "What is the Purpose?" found participants agreeing that General Education
has an important function to provide students perspective before choosing a major, to
broaden knowledge of a variety of academic fields and help students understand new ideas.
It should assist colleges and universities to produce vital citizens of the world community
in the areas of job skills, communication skills, and historical awareness. The participants
also sought a general education approach which fostered responsible and responsive world
citizens who would value education, ideas and their interaction. It should help students
realize that they are moving into a new stage of life which now includes academic culture,
values, and behaviors, and should help them succeed in such a culture. General Education
should produce a broad intellectual background that will inform latter, more specialized
study. In essence, general education empowers students to enter the sphere of educated
persons. It is the gateway to personal and social success.

Third, "What is the Content?" was answered with near unanimity as well. Especially
important and most frequently identified as key elements were general intellectual skills:
writing, oral communication, critical thinking, critical reading, and human relations. The
traditional liberal arts areas of humanities, social, physical and natural sciences, music, art,
etc., should address both current and historical issues, western and non-western
perspectives, and introductory as well as advanced levels of study opportunities. General
Education should be comprehensive and integrated. Skills (critical thinking, written and
oral communication, socialization) and awareness (cultural diversity, gender sensitivity,
historical perspectives, etc) should be integrated into the process and content of each
discipline to the greatest extent feasible.

Finally, "What is Mode of Instruction?" found a variety of answers coming from
seminar participants -- lecture, small seminar, collaborative, team teaching, interdisciplinary and integrated were all mentioned, with the emphasis on the variety. Participants saw that the mode was less important that the instructor. Even though instructors are more important than the technique, the use of many modes is encouraged to accommodate different learning styles. Curricula and syllabi that are interdisciplinary are strongly encouraged. Sequencing of courses, with the more basic, general areas, the skill areas to be completed before moving to the more focused, major or upper level work.

While the Cal Poly General Education program does meet most of the goals, the policy on this campus runs counter to both the notion of general education as a pre-major program, and that of sequencing of courses being part of the experience. Practice on the campus is also counter to the recommendation that courses be interdisciplinary and integrated in themes, and team taught.

Future Intersegmental Seminars are planned to include representatives from the University of California, and a continuing dialogue will be maintained between CSU and CCC participants. Such a program in being offered in July 1990 at the Bass Lake conference site.

This report is presented in part to express my appreciation at being selected to attend and in part to bring my colleagues into the process to consider these ideas and proposals, especially if they have merit and applicability to the general education pattern at Cal Poly.

In addition to my participation and notes, I found the document, "A Report on Teaching in Lower Division General Education," by Cindra J. Smith, California Association of Community Colleges, very helpful in providing the wording of some area reports and the complete list of papers and participants. A copy of that paper is available from me. I express my appreciation to Ms. Smith for her work on that report and to Mr. James Murphy for supporting my participation in the seminar.
Karen Bell, Philosophy, CSU, Fresno. Approaches in teaching philosophy in lower division courses: creating environments and attitudes.

Roger Bell, Philosophy, Sonoma State University. Analyzing film to provide a relationship between classical philosophical themes and contemporary culture.

Glen Bell, Administration of Justice, Napa Valley College. Critical thinking templates, essays, and testing.

David Bernstein, History, CSU, Long Beach. Effective lecturing in large courses.

Patricia Beyer, Center for Effective Teaching, CSU, Los Angeles. The "expert" activity, promoting student participation.


Winifred Dunn, Business/Black Studies/Consumer and Home Economics, San Diego CCD. Critical reading and writing skills.

Cecil Green, Business Administration, Riverside Community College. Curriculum based on MICROSIM.

Patricia Green, Nursing, Imperial Valley College. Clinical nursing performance evaluation.

Charles Frost, Social Work, CSPU, Pomona. Student handbooks on assertiveness and burnout.

Jacquelyn Ann Kegley, Philosophy, CSU, Bakersfield. Students teaching students.


Keith Lilley, Library, Cuesta College. Library resources orientation by self-paced workbook.
Ann Maddox, Learning Disabilities, Santa Monica College. Individual learning styles
Fran McBrien, Business Management, San Jose City College. Student presentations.
Gary Meeker, Biology, CSU Sacramento. Problem-based biology laboratories.
Tom Moody, Philosophy, CSU San Bernadino. Approaches to teaching writing and critical thinking.
James Murphy, Industrial Technology, CSPU, San Luis Obispo. Problem-based curriculum in a capstone course.
Monroe Pastermack, Biology and Health Science, Diablo Valley College. Nutritional analysis software assignment.
Donis Perrott, Mt. San Antonio College. A testing technique which eliminates guessing.
Robert Rasmussen, Biological Sciences, Humboldt State University. Writing across the curriculum in a general botany course.
Lisa Gray-Shellberg, Psychology, CSU, Dominguez Hills. Testing approaches in introductory psychology
David Simon, Criminal Justice, San Diego State University. Ideological Content Analysis.
Kay Sims, Nutrition, Yuba College. Mapping/outlining to improve reading skills.
Kathy Sucher, Nutrition and Food Science, San Jose State University. Diet analysis using SJSU developed software.
Carol Welsh, Life Science, Long Beach City College. Establishing laboratory partnerships to enhance student learning.
Michele White, Mathematics, College of the Redwoods. Decreasing students' feelings of powerlessness in general mathematics.