I. Call to Order

A. The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:12 p.m. upon obtaining a quorum.

B. The minutes of the January 13, 1987 meeting of the Academic Senate were approved as mailed.

C. The Chair called the Senate’s attention to President Baker’s response to the Academic Senate Resolution on Support and Maintenance of Excellence in Teaching (adopted last spring).

D. The Chair introduced President Warren J. Baker who came to the Forum to respond to a question originally posed by Senator George Lewis.

II. The Academic Senate Question

What is your position on (external) assessment and what is being done by you, by the other campus Presidents and by the Chancellor to resist its imposition on the CSU System?

A. The President noted that the issue of external assessment has received increasing attention over the last few years. The public’s lack of satisfaction with the state of education has led to the (threat of) imposition of standards and criteria on the academic community by bodies external to it. He noted that at some institutions (e.g., some University of California campuses), teaching becomes an aggravation to faculty members whose real interests lie in other areas, e.g., research. Extreme reactions to this issue have led to performance based budgets where institutions receive funding on a reward system. Of interest to California education is a legislative resolution co-authored by Tom Hayden.
B. President Baker noted that external assessment already exists in the areas of accreditation and teacher certification.

C. President Baker emphasized that legislative-imposed assessment is the wrong way to remedy the improperly-perceived ills in our educational system. Establishing a reward (or spoils) system will stifle academic freedom and creativity.

D. The best way to prevent the imposition of external assessment is to improve our processes of internal assessment: i.e., to improve the mechanism of self-evaluation. We must state clearly what we want to achieve and objectively assess how well we are achieving it. If we do a better job of internal assessment, we will improve our programs and make external assessment unnecessary.

E. President Baker responded to a number of questions and received a round of applause at the close of this portion of the Senate session.

IV. Consent Agenda: None

V. Business Items

A. Resolution on Senior Projects
   1. Charles Crabb moved that the Resolution be returned to First Reading status due to the length of time intervening between its First Reading status in February 1986 (before being returned to the Instruction Committee for additional study) and its re-emergence from the Instruction Committee in January 1987.

   The motion carried with one objection.

   2. Reg Gooden conceded that a "culminating experience" is appropriate to end a student's undergraduate education, but such an experience is not necessarily best-achieved through the imposition of a term-paper. He doubted if a senior seminar would be an allowable substitute for a traditional senior project, even under the proposed revision to CAM 412.

   3. Charles Crabb suggested some amendments that would make the Resolution acceptable to him and to the School of Agriculture.

   4. Crissa Hewitt emphasized that the proposed revisions to CAM 412 de-emphasizes the written component
of a senior project. It does not eliminate the written component. Nor do the revisions necessarily change anything. Some Departments, if they wish, may choose to continue to require the traditional senior project.

5. Bill Forgeng spoke in favor of the proposed resolution and revisions to CAM 412. He argued that each Department knows best what its senior project requirement should entail.

6. Also speaking in favor of the Resolution and proposed revisions to CAM 412 were Jim Ahern, Charles Dana, Marylinda Wheeler, Susan Currier and others.

7. Al Cooper spoke in favor of the Resolution to the extent that it sought to achieve the goals he put forth so eloquently in effort to make the senior project optional on a Department-by-Department basis.

Charles Andrews spoke in favor of Al Cooper's original proposal last Winter 1986. "The responsibility for determining the nature of a senior project should be placed at the Department level, which is its proper place," said Andrews.

8. Bob Wheeler spoke against downgrading the written component of the senior project. "it's not a demanding task (for students) to prepare a formal report of what they've learned /studied..." Also speaking in favor of a traditional senior project were Barbara Weber and Ken Riener.

9. Malcolm Wilson observed an interrelation between the senior project requirement and our efforts to avoid external assessment. Many students are asked about their senior projects at employment interviews. It doesn't make sense for us to back away from something that we do well.

10. Tim Kersten noted that the senior project is not a writing requirement, but is an exercise that involves writing. The senior project requirement is one of the unique features of Cal Poly, a feature which many other institutions are now beginning to emulate. CAM 412, as it exists, is good. It may need a little fine-tuning, but should not be changed drastically.

B. Resolution on CSU Trustee Professorship (AS-222-86), Second Reading
1. This Resolution would incorporate certain changes in AS-22-85 suggested by President Baker.

2. M/S (Kersten /Terry) to adopt the alternative wording (proposed by the PPC in October 1986) for the resolved clause.

3. Jim Rodger asked if a Trustee Professor would be required to teach 12 units of courses, take on senior projects, etc.

   Charles Andrews replied that the duties of a Trustee Professor were not well-defined. "Probably he would just lie low while looking for another administrative position," said Andrews.

4. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Resolution on Allocation of Lottery Funds, Second Reading.

1. M/S (Gooden /Terry) to adopt the Alternative Wording Proposed by Reg Gooden

2. Reg Gooden accepted as a friendly amendment Charles Dana’s motion to change "That a greater proportion of" to "That all but minimal amounts of" in Item 1 of the first resolved clause.

3. Reg Gooden noted that "system-wide authorization" should be changed to "system-wide program authorization" in Item 2 of the first resolved clause.

4. A motion to close debate was carried unanimously.

5. The motion to adopt the Resolution on Allocation of Lottery Funds (with the alternative wording proposed by Reg Gooden) carried on a voice vote.

VI. Discussion Items: None

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.