I. Minutes: Approval of the January 27, 1987 Senate Minutes (attached pp. 2-7).

II. Communications:
President Baker's response to Resolution AS-204-86, Support and Maintenance of Excellence in Teaching (attached p. 8).

III. Reports:
A. President's Office
B. Academic Affairs Office
C. Statewide Senators
D. The Academic Senate Question - Addressed to President Baker: What is your position on assessment and what is being done by you, other campus presidents, and the Chancellor to resist its imposition on The California State University?

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Senior Projects—Executive Committee, (attached p. 9). This item was referred to the Instruction Committee for study on February 11, 1986. Amended Resolution on Senior Projects—Hewitt, Chair of the Instruction Committee, Second Reading (attached pp. 10-12). TO BE CONTINUED AT THE FEBRUARY 10th ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING.
B. Resolution on CSU Trustee Professorship, AS-222-86/Weatherby, revisions suggested by President Baker, Second Reading (attached pp. 13-16).
C. Resolution on Allocation of Lottery Funds—Executive Committee, Second Reading (attached p. 17). This item was tabled at the January 13, 1987 meeting to permit Reg Gooden time to submit amendments (attached pp. 18-19).

VI. Discussion:

VII. Adjournment:
Memorandum

Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate

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
Background: The senior project was initiated for the purpose of developing student capability in report writing, or in writing a scholarly proposal. At the time it was begun, many students lacked competency in these areas and needed a practical way to gain this writing experience. It is now possible that in many departments this need is met as a regular part of the curriculum and that an alternative experience would be more meaningful.

The senior project is as close as we come to a "sacred cow" and it should be looked at very carefully on a school and departmental basis in order to provide meaningful flexibility.

AS-—-86

RESOLUTION ON SENIOR PROJECT

WHEREAS, The present policy on senior projects is inflexible and may no longer be needed in some disciplines at California Polytechnic State University; and

WHEREAS, There has been considerable faculty complaints, most especially that senior projects are most often taught as an overload; and

WHEREAS, The failure to complete senior projects has prevented many otherwise deserving students from graduating; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the present policy on senior projects be changed to allow individual disciplines to make it optional.

RESOLVED: That this new policy take effect immediately.

Passed by Executive Committee on February 7, 1986. Proposed by Alan Cooper, Caucus Chair for SOSAM.
WHEREAS, The present policy on senior projects at California Polytechnic State University is inflexible; and

WHEREAS, A student’s education is enriched by culminating experiences which integrate all facets of his/her discipline; and

WHEREAS, Each department at California Polytechnic State University is best able to decide what culminating experience should constitute a senior project for its students; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the present guidelines on senior projects (CAM 412) be modified to allow each department to decide, in consultation with its faculty, the nature of the senior project for students in the various curricula; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these revised guidelines take effect immediately.

Proposed By:
Instruction Committee
January 27, 1987
412 Guidelines for Senior Projects

412.1 Definition

The Senior Project at the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo is a formal report of the results of a study, or experiment, or project selected and completed under faculty supervision by each student prior to the receipt of the bachelor’s degree. The types of problems which form the bases of the study or experiment are directly related to the student’s fields of employment or intended employment.

412.2 Expected Outcomes

A. Ability to reduce a general problem to specific points of analysis
B. Ability to organize points of analysis into a logical sequence
C. Ability to estimate hours of labor and cost of materials necessary to complete a project
D. Ability to apply competencies acquired in other courses to the successful completion of a specific project
E. Ability to obtain information necessary to the solution of a problem by library study, experimentation, and/or correspondence and personal contact with people who have had experience in the field
F. Ability to follow a work outline without overlooking any major points or significant details
G. Recognition of the fact that completion of a project on schedule is an essential element of successful work
H. Ability to organize, illustrate, and write a clear, concise, and correct report of the investigation
I. Ability to work for a supervisor who desires quality performance with a minimum of supervision

The expected outcomes are to be determined by the faculty of the departments as referenced in the expanded course outlines for Senior Project.

412.3 Requirements

A. Every student must complete satisfactorily the Senior Project prior to the receipt of the bachelor’s degree.
B. The total number of quarter units of credit for Senior Projects must be within the range of 2 to 4.5.
C. The specific number of units required would be the same for all students in a given curriculum, but not for all students in the university, because of the nature of the various curricula.

D. A minimum of 30 hours of student work will be required for each unit of credit granted.

E. The character of each curriculum will determine the method of organization of the course requirement; i.e., lecture or activity.

F. One or two quarters of work may be specified for the various curricula depending upon the nature of the curricula.

G. The responsibility for costs for materials and supplies used in the project will be determined in advance by the university. Costs should be borne by the student when the product of the project is for personal use.

H. The number of students involved in any given project should not be so large as to limit individual experience or responsibility and initiative. Each student should be required to meet meaningfully the 30 hours per unit of credit minimum.

412.4 Library Copy

A. At the option of the academic department, one copy of each Senior Project may be sent by the academic department to the University Library where it will be copied on microfiche. The departmental policy on library copies shall be uniform for all students with a given curriculum. A microfiche copy of the project will become part of the Library's collection where it will be available for public use. One copy of each microfiche project will also be deposited in the University Archives.

B. Each student is required to pay a fee for copying his/her Senior Project on microfiche.

C. After being copied on microfiche, the original project will be returned to the academic department of its origin. Non-print media (slides, audio/video tapes), however, comprising all or part of a project will be permanently retained in the Library collection.

D. All Projects submitted to the Library will follow standardized format for title page, approval page, and abstract. Details of this format are found in Procedures for Submitting Senior Projects to the Library, available from the University Archives in the Library.
WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees of The California State University has established a faculty position known as Trustee Professor; and
WHEREAS, The position is specifically designated to be occupied by the tenured former President, Chancellor, or Vice Chancellor; and
WHEREAS, A person appointed to said position may request such an appointment to be on any campus in the system; therefore, be it
RESOLVED: That any President, Chancellor, or Vice Chancellor holding an appointment as Trustee Professor and wishing to move from his/her campus of tenure to California Polytechnic State University, must first obtain the concurrence of the receiving department at California Polytechnic State University after an evaluation of the individual and an affirmative vote by the tenured faculty of the department.

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
May 20, 1986
Memorandum

OCT 27 1986

Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate

Date: October 21, 1986
File No.: 
Copies: Malcolm Wilson
Jan Pieper

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: RESOLUTION ON CSU TRUSTEE PROFESSORSHIP

This will acknowledge your October 14 memo with which you transmitted the report of the Personnel Policy Committee regarding my earlier response to the Academic Senate resolution on the CSU Trustee Professorship (AS-222-86). With one exception the proposed alternative resolved clause as suggested by the Personnel Policy Committee, is satisfactory to me. The concern that I have is with the terminology utilized at the very end of the resolved clause stating "... faculty's recommendation being forwarded to the President for his concurrence."

Since the President of the University is not now required to concur in various appointment actions relative to faculty, it does not seem appropriate that that terminology be used in this particular instance. It is my suggestion that the wording in the latter part of that statement be changed to "... his/her consideration."

With this one modification the proposed alternative resolved clause would meet with my approval.
Date: October 8, 1986
To: Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
    Academic Senate
From: Personnel Policies Committee
Subject: Resolution on CSU Trustee Professorship (AS-222-86)

This is in response to your memo of August 5, 1986 regarding the above topic as
addressed in President Baker's memo to you dated August 1, 1986.

You ask if President Baker's response to the Senate Resolution (AS-222-86) is adequate.
The opinion of the PPC is that the response is not adequate and avoids the issue.

The middle paragraph of the President's memo is not related to having the faculty and
the President concur on accepting such a request. The last sentence of that paragraph
states "The Trustees have specifically delegated authority to approve such
requests to the Presidents." It is the belief of the Committee that the same
authority has been delegated to the Presidents for all faculty appointments, not just to
CSU Trustee Professorships.

The Committee believes their recommendation to the Senate only asks for the same
collegial participation as is available in the appointment process for any new faculty
appointment. Although President Baker states he "...will fully consider the
Academic Senate's concerns, and those of the academic department which
would be affected," his response does not provide an established policy nor
mechanism assuring faculty collegial participation in an area of primary importance
to the faculty.

As an alternative, the resolution could be returned for amendment, with said
amendment having the resolve clause read:

That any individual holding an appointment as Trustee
Professor and wishing to hold such an appointment at Cal
Poly, shall be evaluated by the faculty of the affected
department in accordance with the policies, criteria,
standards, and procedures used to make any other faculty
appointment, with the faculty's recommendation being
forwarded to the President for his concurrence.

It is the opinion of the PPC that this issue can be resolved through constructive
consultation to the satisfaction of President Baker and then resubmitted for Academic
Senate approval.
I have considered the resolution on the CSU Trustee Professorship passed by the Executive Committee acting as the Academic Senate on July 8, 1986 (AS-222-86/PPC). I have also consulted with the CSU Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations.

According to current Trustee policy, a request by a President, Chancellor, or Vice Chancellor to receive a Trustee Professorship appointment to a specific campus is to be directed to the Board of Trustees for initial approval. If approved by the Trustees, the request would be referred to be appropriate campus President for a final decision. The Trustees have specifically delegated authority to approve such requests to the Presidents.

Should such a situation arise, I will make sure that Cal Poly's current procedures for appointment/assignment are followed, and will fully consider the Academic Senate's concerns, and those of the academic department which would be affected.
WHEREAS, The people of California, in approving the State Lottery initiative, voted for "additional monies to benefit education" and for funds which "shall supplement the total amount of money allocated for public education in California"; and

WHEREAS, The Office of the Chancellor, in devising procedures for the distribution of State Lottery funds within the CSU, has created a number of rigid categories, ignoring the specific needs of the nineteen campuses; and

WHEREAS, The Office of the Chancellor has requested the campuses to submit proposals for lottery funds, usually with unreasonably tight deadlines, and in some instances has simply aggregated proposals by categories without evaluating each one; and

WHEREAS, The repeated adoption of new and revised plans for allocating lottery money has resulted in extensive wasted effort and resultant anger and cynicism about the process; and

WHEREAS, The best judges of the most effective use of lottery funds "to benefit education" are the individual campuses; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That it is the sense of the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University:

1. That all lottery funds should be allocated to the individual campuses of the CSU on a uniform formula basis with no withholding of funds by the Office of the Chancellor;

2. That the only restrictions or controls imposed on the campuses in using these funds should be such as are required by law or are necessary for accounting and auditing purposes;

3. That any lottery funds not expended by a campus at the end of a fiscal year be available to that campus the following year, to allow for the prudent use of funds, including the accumulation of funds for larger projects; and be it further

RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be sent to the Board of Trustees and Chancellor, to the Academic Senate, CSU, the Senates on each CSU campus, and to the Senators and Assemblymembers representing the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo service area in the California State Legislature.

Proposed By:
Executive Committee
January 6, 1987
Revised January 13, 1987
WHEREAS, The people of California, in approving the State Lottery initiative, voted for "additional monies to benefit education" and for funds which "shall supplement the total amount of money allocated for public education in California"; and

WHEREAS, The Office of the Chancellor, in devising procedures for the distribution of State Lottery funds within the CSU, has created a number of rigid categories, ignoring the specific needs of the nineteen campuses; and

WHEREAS, The Office of the Chancellor has requested the campuses to submit proposals for lottery funds, usually with unreasonably tight deadlines, and in some instances has simply aggregated proposals by categories without evaluating each one; and

WHEREAS, The repeated adoption of new and revised plans for allocating lottery money has resulted in extensive wasted effort and resultant anger and cynicism about the process; and

WHEREAS, The best judges of the most effective use of lottery funds "to benefit education" are the individual campuses; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That it is the sense of the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University:

1. That a greater proportion of the lottery funds should be distributed, on a uniform formula basis to the campuses for their independent determination;

2. That the categories presently being developed for system-wide authorization be stabilized;

3. That the only restrictions or controls imposed on the campuses in using these funds should be such as are required by law or are necessary for accounting and auditing purposes;

4. That any lottery funds not expended by a campus at the end of a fiscal year be available to that campus the following year, to allow for the prudent use of funds, including the accumulation of funds for larger projects; and be it further
RESOLUTION ON ALLOCATION OF LOTTERY FUNDS

RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be sent to the Board of Trustees and Chancellor, to the Academic Senate, CSU, the Senators on each CSU campus, and to the Senators and Assemblymembers representing the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo service area in the California State Legislature.

Proposed By:
Executive Committee
January 6, 1987
Revised January 13, 1987
Revised January 27, 1987
STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

A Tool for Improving Teaching & Learning in the CSU

California State University
Conference
October 15-17, 1986
Kellogg West Conference Facilities
Assessment of educational gains is a critical topic in higher education in California. Pursuant to Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 141, the California Postsecondary Education Commission is studying the desirability and feasibility of instituting state-mandated assessment for all public institutions of higher education in California. National interest in this topic is also high. The Association of State Governors has endorsed the concept, at least eleven state legislatures have already mandated assessment for public postsecondary institutions in their states, and accrediting agencies are considering adoption of assessment standards. The need to understand the ramifications of student outcomes assessment as an educational policy issue is clear.

As a first step, The California State University sponsored a conference on student outcomes assessment. Supported from the CSU's Academic Program Improvement Fund, this conference brought together approximately 125 persons concerned with higher education at Kellogg West on October 15-17, 1986. Participants included, in addition to CSU faculty and administrators, legislative aides, the Governor's education advisor, campus equity officers, representatives from the California State Student Association, the University of California, California Community Colleges, California Postsecondary Education Commission, and other interested individuals. The program featured nationally recognized experts, including Dr. Peter Ewell from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Dr. Alexander Astin from UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute, Dr. Lee Kerschner, Executive Director of the Master Plan Review Commission, Dr. Daniel Resnick, Carnegie Mellon University, a distinguished panel of state legislators, as well as faculty and administrators from postsecondary institutions in Florida, Missouri, New Jersey, and Tennessee. Conference proceedings will be published in the Summer 1987 edition of New Directions for Higher Education (Jossey-Bass).

Participants' attitudes towards student outcomes assessment shifted markedly in a positive direction as a result of what was learned at the conference according to evaluation questionnaires. Following is a summary of salient issues aired in the presentations and discussions.

THE CASE FOR ASSESSING OUTCOMES

The quality of a postsecondary institution has traditionally been measured by its faculty's research reputation or by the size and diversity of its programs and facilities. By contrast, the outcomes approach seeks to assess what and how much students learn while in school, and how this has affected their lives. Attention to outcomes allows institutions to determine the difference between where students are when they enter the university and where they are when they graduate. By measuring the net gains in knowledge and skills and changes in attitudes and behaviors contributed by specific components of their experience in the institution, the educational effectiveness of each can be determined. This information enables institutions to assign priorities for improvement and to evaluate the impact of changes made to achieve it. Emphasis on student outcomes gives visible priority to undergraduate education.

USES OF OUTCOMES DATA

Conference participants heard from faculty and administrators involved in the most frequently discussed assessment models in the nation about the impact of these programs on their institutions. They learned that the educational benefits reflect very much the uses to which the outcomes data is put. Below are three general categories of uses of assessment.
1. Program Improvement

Assessment is used as feedback to inform individual students of their progress and as a tool to make instruction and curriculum more effective in meeting specific institutional goals in both Northeast Missouri State's "Value Added" approach and the New Jersey program. The results clearly indicate higher levels of student achievement and satisfaction.

2. "Gate Keeping"

Employment of achievement tests to screen out students apparently underprepared to continue study at the junior level has had unforeseen, unintended negative effects, as have occurred with Florida's College Level Assessment Test. Imposition of this program is reducing costs of remediation at the price of abandoning goals of educational equity and enhancing the human resource base of the state.

3. Budget Decisions

The "Performance Funding" approach in Tennessee links an (increasing) percentage of funding to aggregate data about students' performance on standardized tests. Serious problems in the validity of using standardized test results as the sole or prime indicator of educational quality were brought to participants' attention by prominent scholars in the field of testing. In addition, a sizeable bureaucracy is required at both the campus and state level to administer such budget approaches.

SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS

Although there is considerable diversity in the way state legislatures and individual institutions have designed their outcomes assessment, there are several factors common to successful programs. These include:

1. Multiple and varied measures are always more desirable than a single standardized examination. A good mix would include nationally normed instruments (e.g., ACT's COMP exam), examinations prepared by local faculty (e.g., senior comprehensive exams), and use of readily available measures that are typically kept by institutional research offices (e.g., scores on nationally normed entry exams, grade point averages, retention rates, alumni surveys).

2. Faculty involvement and support in all aspects of the program is the sine qua non of a successful program. External, top-down pressures are often met with skepticism and resistance. If the main purpose of assessment is program improvement, then those responsible for shaping the curriculum must be involved in the procedures used to assess its effectiveness.

3. Performance-based funding should be derived from additional resources. Any plan to tie major portions of campus funding to performance measures is likely to result in conflict, both among and within the segments of higher education. If a performance incentive is used, the funds should be in addition to those generated via usual funding formulas and should be limited to a relatively small proportion of each campus' general operating budget.
4. Outcomes assessment should be used for program decision making. It is an inappropriate measure for retention and tenure decisions for faculty. Faculty and administrative good will is essential to the successful utilization of the information outcomes assessment provides.

5. The type of data collected should reflect the campus master plan. Different sorts of outcomes would be expected from an institution that has made a commitment to liberal arts education than from one that has made research a major component of its mission. Individual campuses must have the flexibility to determine how outcomes assessment can best be achieved.

6. Value added (or talent development) measures that emphasize educational gains are preferable to exit-only data (e.g., GRE scores) because they measure growth during the college years and not just a level of achievement at graduation.

7. Most campuses are already doing a considerable amount of outcomes assessment. Unfortunately, much of it is fragmented and cannot provide a comprehensive evaluation of program or campus effectiveness. Good assessment designs are programmatic and coordinated. They require careful planning of campus wide activities.

8. A program of student outcomes assessment will cost money, especially during its first year of operation. Specific funding will be needed to cover data collection and analysis costs if an institution is expected to undertake a campus wide effort to assess its effectiveness.

SUMMARY

In summary, there are many potential benefits of assessing educational outcomes, but a hastily executed or rigid program can create ill will and worthless or misleading information, all at considerable cost.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

CSU Academic Senate leaders, faculty and administrators have already initiated discussions about student outcomes assessment in their campus settings. University assessment committees have been established on some campuses. The Office of the Chancellor has committed a portion of the Academic Program Improvement fund for a three year period to assist campuses wishing to design and implement programs to assess student outcomes. Student outcomes projects have been initiated this year on the Pomona and Bakersfield campuses.

Report prepared by: Dr. Diane Halpern
Conference Coordinator
CSU, San Bernardino

December 22, 1986