I. Minutes: Approval of the March 10, 1987 Senate Minutes (attached pp. 2-7).

II. Communications:
A. Elections Committee - nominations received for senator, statewide academic senator, and University Professional Leave Committee vacancies; announcement of election week, time/place ballots to be counted—Page 8-9.
B. Elections Committee - Solicit nominees for Academic Senate offices of Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary.
C. Issues Related to Curriculum Flexibility and Specialization (attached p. 10).
D. Memo from Gail Wilson to Academic Senate re Cal Poly Foundation (attached p. 11).
E. Memo from Malcolm Wilson to Lamouria re Instructional Operating Expense Allocation Model (attached pp. 12-13).

III. Reports:
A. President's Office
B. Academic Affairs Office
C. Statewide Senators

IV. Consent Agenda:
Resolution on Attendance at Conventions, Conferences, or Similar Meetings—Andrews, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, First Reading (attached p. 19).

V. Business Items:
   FOR GE&B AREA DESCRIPTIONS, PLEASE REFER TO YOUR SCHEDULE OF CLASSES OR TO OUR UNIVERSITY CATALOG.
B. Resolution on Fairness Board Description and Procedures—Beardsley, Chair of the Fairness Board Committee/Stebbins, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, First Reading (attached pp. 36-40)
C. Resolution on the Administration of Audiovisual Services—Executive Committee, First Reading (attached pp. 41-44).
D. Resolution on Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards—Executive Committee—Executive Committee, First Reading (attached p. 45).

VI. Discussion:

VII. Adjournment:
NOMINATIONS SUBMITTED FOR
1987-1989 VACANCIES

Statewide Academic Senate (three-year term)
Weatherby, Joseph N
Political Sciences, SLA

University Professional Leave Committee (1987-1989)
SAGR
Harper, Louis W.
Crop Science

SBUS
Nutter, David E.
Accounting

SENG
None

SPSE
None

ACADEMIC SENATORS

SAGR (3 vacancies + 1 one-year replacement for Ahern)
Hellyer, George J.
Agricultural Management
McNeil, Robert J.
Crop Science
Smith, Terry L.
Soil Science

SAED (4 vacancies)
Botwin, Michael R.
Architectural Engineering
Dalton, Linda C.
City and Regional Planning

SBUS (3 vacancies)
Andrews, Charles T.
Accounting

SENG (4 vacancies + 1 one-year replacement for Butler)
Cummings, Russell M.
Aeronautical Engineering
Kalkilah, Faysal A.
Aeronautical Engineering
Mehdizadeh, Amrollah
Mechanical Engineering
Misco, Dragoslav M.
Civil/Environmental Engineering
Moustafa, Safwat M.
Mechanical Engineering
Wilson, Jack D.
Mechanical Engineering
NOMINATIONS SUBMITTED FOR 1979-1980 VACANCIES
Page two

SLA (5 vacancies)
Ditts, Keith W.
McKim, Patrick G.
Sharp, Harry, Jr.
Urist, Alberto (Alurista)
Art and Design
Social Sciences
Speech Communications
Foreign Languages

SPF (4 vacancies)
Lord, Sarah
Murphy, James L.
Home Economics
Industrial Technology

SSM (6 vacancies)
Goers, John F.
Lewis, George M
Terry, Raymond D.
Chemistry
Mathematics

PCS (2 vacancies)
None
GROWS RELATED TO CURRICULUM FLEXIBILITY AND SPECIALIZATION

Technological advancements and societal changes have already brought about significant changes in the ways in which our society functions, and it is reasonable to believe that change will continue to occur at an even faster pace in the future and that such change will create significant pressure on the undergraduate curriculum. At issue are questions regarding the ways in which the undergraduate curriculum can and should most effectively respond to this pressure by preparing graduates for a future which eludes clear definition. With an ever-increasing emphasis on and the rapidity of change in technological areas, the issue becomes particularly germane.

At issue are questions of flexibility which include:

What constitutes an appropriate balance among the core requirements (general education and breadth), major and major-related requirements, and elective leeway in the undergraduate curriculum? How much should we be expected to provide in the way of detailed know-how, while still trying to provide a breadth of education?

What are the advantages and disadvantages of specialization in the undergraduate curriculum? What is the shelf life of highly specialized coursework?

What academic preparation best enables students to productively contribute in new areas of specialization which are encountered after graduation?

Is it an accurate perception that corporate leaders are likely to support flexibility in the curriculum, but that campus recruiters from their companies tend to emphasize specialization in their discussions with students and faculty?
To: Academic Senate
From: Gail O. Wilson
Subject: Cal Poly Foundation Board of Directors Election

March 30, 1987

I hope the Academic Senate will take an active part in the Foundation Board election process. At the very minimum, I hope at least four nominations will be given to the Nominating Committee and that an Academic Senate representative will be at the Nominating Committee meeting and at the "election".

There will be four openings of the seven "elected" Directors, so the faculty should be able to get a representative on the Board of Directors. The positions that will be open are currently held by the following:

- Associate Executive Vice President Howard West
- Vice President for University Relations James Strom
- Dr. Tomlinson Fort
- Dr. Russell Brown

The California Administrative Education Code section 42502 (Contents of Written Agreement, under Functions of Auxiliary Organizations, Requirements for Written Agreements) states, "Service by any state officer or employee shall not be incompatible, inconsistent, or in conflict with his or her duties as a state officer or employee." In my opinion, Associate Executive Vice President Howard West has a conflict of interest because the Board voted to give the President, who is in the same office, a lump sum of $562,025. Also, Vice President James Strom has a conflict of interest because the Board has been voting to give University Relations over $300,000 a year. Although he is not up for re-election, I believe Dean of Agriculture Carter has a conflict of interest because the Board votes on the budget for Agricultural projects.

When the $150,000 for athletic scholarships was added to the University Services budget, around $200,000 of the interest from University program funds was added to the annual funding base. Since the University program funds are generated by the faculty, I think that the faculty would be interested in having a representative on the Board to help decide where the interest from that money goes. In addition, to the $150,000 for athletic scholarships, $65,018 for repaying the 1984 athletic "advance" of $360,000 was listed in the 1987-88 estimate for University Services.

General fund money was also committed at the January meeting to help retire the athletics loans previously made by the Board. The Board voted to spend the PERS contingency Reserve of $240,235, which had come from the General Fund, to help retire the $360,000 "advance" mentioned above and the 1986 $250,000 loan; the latter loan was made with the stipulation that it be repaid by the students.
Memorandum

APR 1 1987

To: School Deans Bailey, Bussele, Carter, Ding, Ericson, Lee, Watters
Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Malcolm W. Wilson
Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Instructional Operating Expense Allocation Model

You will recall that last Fall, at the time that the allocation of instructional operating expense funding was made, I approved the interim use of the model proposed by the OE Model Review Committee. I asked that the Committee reconvene to assess the comments and criticisms forwarded by the various review bodies. The Committee has done so with the majority of the comments being directed at the weighting factors that the Committee had proposed. The School of Business proposed a more drastic revision in the operating expense model calling for two independent sub-allocations for lecture and non-lecture FTE taught. The School of Architecture and Environmental Design comments were primarily focused at the desire for more rigid, quantitatively-based criteria for the assignment of 'X' factors. In addressing these issues, the Committee has offered the following:

The shift proposed by the School of Business, in the opinion of the Committee, would force major policy questions as a result of reductions in funding lab intensive programs on campus. The Committee maintained that the laboratory programs would have to be re-evaluated with a possible shift in mode mix which could result in a loss of faculty positions to the University. The Committee was unanimous in its feeling that operating expense allocations should not drive these types of policy/philosophical debates, but that broader perspectives than those represented by the Committee membership should be involved in any decision to de-emphasize laboratory based instruction.

With regard to the comments from the School of Architecture and Environmental Design, the Committee holds to its position that the relative comparison approach across disciplines is preferable to the more rigid, quantitative criteria that was suggested by the School. The rationale for this position is that the Committee felt that there was a lack of the kind of data that would support a more rigid, quantitative base. The Committee was reluctant to place undue emphasis on historical data and felt that there exists the potential for perpetuating problems if one relies too heavily on this data. Further, the historical accounting is not built on a system that differentiates between expenditures for laboratory and non-laboratory types of instruction, nor is the categorization of expenditures within the supplies and services allotment clear. The Committee concluded that such an accounting system could become quite unwieldy and possibly manipulated by the initiator of the input. The Committee also was cautious with respect to the emphasis on "wish list" data that was sought from the schools in looking at projected needs. The Committee considered this data but, expressed some discomfort with placing too much reliance on this data alone. Thus, the Committee did embark upon some rather extensive interviews with schools. The Committee also discussed the possible use of national comparison data, but concluded that even within the CSU, data-by-discipline does not necessarily transfer conveniently to the situation at Cal Poly. The result of the Committee debate and analysis of the data and other sources of input was to derive relative comparisons.
School Deans  
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March 30, 1987

The Committee acknowledged that subjective judgments do come into play in deriving the relative groupings of 'X' factors. In reassessing the distribution, the Committee maintained the position that, in spite of the subjectivity, the groupings are fair and the model is an effective means of achieving optimal distribution of limited resources.

I tend to agree that at some point in the process, subjectivity does come into play and that this does not necessarily constitute a negative aspect of the model. At this juncture, I am inclined to accept the recommendation of the Committee for use of the model as proposed. However, before granting final approval of the model for use on a regular basis, I am asking for an endorsement from the Advisory Committee on Instructional Program Resources. In the future, this group would be charged with the review of this and other mechanisms for the allocation of resources within the Instruction Program. It is my intention that the OE model be periodically reviewed as dynamics change and as the costs adjust in a relative sense across the disciplines. By copy of this memorandum, I wish to commend the OE Model Review Committee for a job well done and for the improvements made in the mechanism used to allocate instructional operating expense funding.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
   President

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION ON FREE ELECTIVES (AS-214-85/CC)

You forwarded to me on January 21 the action of the Academic Senate on a revised resolution relative to Free Electives. This revised resolution came about as a result of my request for reconsideration by the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate last August. The Vice President for Academic Affairs has had an opportunity to review the recommendation with the school deans as well as other members of the Academic Affairs staff. Based upon that review and my own consideration of the issue, I am hereby approving the resolution on Free Electives as revised by the Academic Senate (AS-214-85/CC).

The thrust of the resolution and its contents are effective immediately although the actual changes in CAM to reflect the revised policy will not occur until the 400 section of CAM is next revised.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
    President

Subject: RESOLUTION ON CAMPUS SMOKING POLICY
    AS-226-86/PFC (Revised)

In August of 1986, the Academic Senate adopted a resolution with regard to the Campus Smoking Policy (AS 226-86/PFC). In September, I requested that the Director of Personnel and Employee Relations and the Vice President of Business Affairs review this matter and make recommendations to me. Subsequently I requested the Environmental Health and Safety Subcommittee of the Public Safety Committee to review the recommendation and to attempt to reconcile the differences between the currently existing policy with the recommendations of the Academic Senate. As a result of that review, a revised policy was proposed which was endorsed by the Academic Senate on February 24 and transmitted to me on February 25.

Based upon the recommendations of the Academic Senate and the Public Safety Advisory Committee, I am approving the revised Campus Smoking Policy. The basic thrust of the policy, which I will officially promulgate through a revised Administrative Bulletin as a substitute for AB 83-3, basically makes clear that the smoking policy is applicable to the entire campus community as opposed to being applicable only to employees and makes clear that smoking is not permitted in any facility on campus except in specific designated areas.
Memorandum

To: Malcolm Wilson
   Interim Vice President
   Academic Affairs

From: Warren J. Baker
      President

Subject: HONORARY DOCTOR OF SCIENCE FOR BURT RUTAN

March 23, 1987

Attached is a copy of a letter from Chancellor Reynolds along with procedures to be followed relative to the honoring of an honorary Doctor of Science (Sc.D.) to Burt Rutan at our June commencement. I have written to him informing him of this; a copy of that letter is likewise attached.

Please note in the attachments the procedures that are to be followed, including the designation of a contact person, the preparation of a draft citation, and the processes that are to be followed in the actual conferring of the degree during commencement.

Would you work with those concerned, including Public Affairs staff, to determine who the campus contact should be and in working out the details required.

Obviously we will need to determine at a later date whether the Chair of the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor will actually participate in the program; but I am assuming that at least Dale Ride, the Chair, will.

Attachments
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Bayer
   President

Date: March 30, 1987

Academic Senate

Copies: M. Wilson (w/o att)
         J. Landreth (w/att)
         S. Bernstein (w/att)

Subject:
ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION RELATING TO
THE BUDGET PROCESS, LONG-RANGE PLANNING,
AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

On March 11 you forwarded to me four resolutions adopted by the Academic Senate, all of which were interrelated and were proposed by the Budget Committee of the Academic Senate as it reviewed the budgetary process and the ways in which the process could be made more effective.

The four resolutions were:

AS-241-87/BC on the Budget Process
AS-242-87/BC on Instructional Program Resources
AS-243-87/BC on Long-Range Planning, and
AS-244-87/BC on Program Evaluation

The first two resolutions called for the establishment of the President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation with specified membership and the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Instructional Program Resources with specified membership. As you are aware, these two committees with the same membership structure as recommended by the Academic Senate were established in the fall of last year and are in fact in operation.

As I understand the thrust of the resolution on Long-Range Planning and the resolution on Program Evaluation, the Academic Senate's Long-Range Planning Committee would be charged with responsibility of recommending policies and procedures for implementation of a long-range planning process that links planning with resource allocation and policies and procedures for an evaluation process which links program evaluation with planning. I trust that as the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee proceeds with the development of proposed policies, procedures, and processes on these two areas that it will work closely with the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the Academic Affairs staff. I look forward to receiving the recommendations of the Academic Senate in this area when the Long-range Planning Committee has completed its activity.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
      President

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION ON PROGRAM CHANGE PROPOSALS
         (AS-245-87/BC)

Date: March 30, 1987

Copy to:
   M. Wilson (w/o att)
   J. Landreth (w/o att)
   S. Bernstein (w/att)

On March 11 you forwarded to me the resolution of the Academic Senate on Program Change Proposals which prioritized possible program change proposals for inclusion in the 1988-89 budget process. The resolution of the Academic Senate has been transmitted to Jim Landreth, Vice President of Business Affairs and Chair of the President's Advisory Committee on Resource Allocations, for use by that committee as it develops recommendations on this subject.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background statement: This resolution is being presented to remove a contradiction between the university's position on faculty professional growth and development policy and CAM 572.3.c.

WHEREAS, The university has adopted a policy on professional growth and development which encourages participation in the presentation of professional papers and research; and

WHEREAS, CAM 572.3.c states: "The criteria for attending conventions, conferences, or similar meetings while on pay status and/or at State expense are as follows: ... c. Except in unusual instances, faculty will not be granted approval to attend when they have teaching assignments"; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That CAM 572.3.c be deleted immediately; and be it further

RESOLVED: That CAM 572.3.d be renumbered to become CAM 572.3.c; and be it further

RESOLVED: That no restrictions on the number of conventions, conferences, or similar meetings a faculty member attends is intended or considered appropriate, if such activity meets the stated purposes set forth in the policy on professional growth and development.

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
April 7, 1987
GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREATH PROPOSAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Reynolds</td>
<td>Art and Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART 101 Fundamentals of Drawing 4 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis, History and Practice of the Art of Drawing. Drawing problems progress from simple geometric shapes to more sophisticated subject matter, expanding visual awareness. Lectures on historical methods and the importance of drawing. Development of individual techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-2 against placing it in C.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2 in favor of placing it in C.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-0 in favor of placing it in C.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
To: George Lewis, Chair
   Academic Senate General Education and Breadth Committee

From: John Harrington, Chair
   Academic Senate GE&B Subcommittee for Area C

Subject: Recommendations for Area C Course Proposals

ART DEPARTMENT

Art 101
The subcommittee recommended 3-2 against allowing Art 101 in Area C.2, and 3-2 in favor of allowing Art 101 in Area C.3. (Both sets of votes included a positive vote from the Art Department representative.)

Those who voted against placing Art 101 in Area C.2 saw the proposal as not meeting the appropriate objectives outlined for Area C.2 (sections 2.E, 2.F, and 2.G of Guidelines in the Final Report on Area C). They viewed the course as marginal, not as strong as actual (or potential) Art History offerings, and lacking the "breadth" and the "exposure to concepts, ideas, and principles" recommended by the Chancellor's Office. Three-fourths of the course content focuses on skills; the remaining one-fourth focuses on history and analysis. This inappropriate imbalance suggests a thin, superficial treatment of history and analysis.

Some subcommittee members found other problems: they wondered which teaching-team member was to be responsible for which area; who, for instance, would be responsible for grading the final examination? Moreover, the course's historical perspective needs to be defined more clearly. Because of these problems, and because the decision to place Art 101 in Area C establishes a crucial precedent for skills courses, some subcommittee members thought it more prudent to consider Art 101 for Area C after it had been taught a few times.

Art 103
The subcommittee recommended unanimously (5-0) against allowing Art 103 in Areas C.2 and C.3. (Both sets of votes included a negative vote from the Art Department representative.)

The subcommittee thought the proposal was not at the professional level of the proposal for Art 101; some members also saw the proposal as not meeting the appropriate objectives outlined for Area C.2 (sections 2.E, 2.F, and 2.G of Guidelines in the Final Report on Area C). They viewed the proposal as less strong than actual (or potential) Art History offerings, and thought it lacked the "breadth" and the "exposure to concepts, ideas, and principles" recommended by the Chancellor's Office. Three-fourths of the course content focuses on skills; the remaining one-fourth focuses on history and analysis. This inappropriate imbalance suggests a thin, superficial treatment of history and analysis.

The subcommittee agreed that, overall, the wording of the proposal was not clear. Moreover, it seemed uncertain which teaching-team members would be responsible for which area: who, for instance, would be responsible for grading the final examination? Furthermore, the course's historical perspective needs to be defined more clearly. Because of these problems, and because the decision to place Art 103 in Area C establishes a crucial precedent for skills courses, some subcommittee members thought it more prudent to consider Art 103 for Area C after it had been taught a few times.

Art 112
The subcommittee recommended unanimously leaving Art 112 in Area C.2 until a stronger Art History course is placed in the GE&B requirements. (We suggested the Art History sequence--Art 211, 212, 213--as a replacement for Art 112.)
1. **PROPOSER'S NAME**  
Crissa Hewitt

2. **PROPOSER'S DEPT.**  
Art and Design

3. **SUBMITTED FOR AREA (Include section, and subsection if applicable)**  
C.2

4. **COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)**  
Art.108 Fundamentals of Sculpture (4)

   Exploration of three-dimensional form through problems in modeling, casting, carving and techniques of assembly. Miscellaneous course fee required. 1 lecture, 3 activities.

5. **SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**

   5-0 against placing it in either C.2 or C.3.

6. **GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**

   5-3-1 in favor of placing it in C.2.

7. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION**
ART DEPARTMENT

Art 101
The subcommittee recommended 3-2 against allowing Art 101 in Area C.2, and 3-2 in favor of allowing Art 101 in Area C.3. (Both sets of votes included a positive vote from the Art Department representative.)

Those who voted against placing Art 101 in Area C.2 saw the proposal as not meeting the appropriate objectives outlined for Area C.2 (sections 2.E, 2.F, and 2.G of Guidelines in the Final Report on Area C). They viewed the course as marginal, not as strong as actual (or potential) Art History offerings, and lacking the "breadth" and the "exposure to concepts, ideas, and principles" recommended by the Chancellor's Office. Three-fourths of the course content focuses on skills; the remaining one-fourth focuses on history and analysis. This inappropriate imbalance suggests a thin, superficial treatment of history and analysis.

Some subcommittee members found other problems: they wondered which teaching-team member was to be responsible for which area; who, for instance, would be responsible for grading the final examination? Moreover, the course's historical perspective needs to be defined more clearly. Because of these problems and because the decision to place Art 101 in Area C establishes a crucial precedent for skills courses, some subcommittee members thought it more prudent to consider Art 101 for Area C after it had been taught a few times.

Art 108
The subcommittee recommended unanimously (5-0) against allowing Art 108 in Areas C.2 and C.3. (Both sets of votes included a negative vote from the Art Department representative.)

The subcommittee thought the proposal was not at the professional level of the proposal for Art 101; some members also saw the proposal as not meeting the appropriate objectives outlined for Area C.2 (sections 2.E, 2.F, and 2.G of Guidelines in the Final Report on Area C). They viewed the proposal as less strong than actual (or potential) Art History offerings, and thought it lacked the "breadth" and the "exposure to concepts, ideas, and principles" recommended by the Chancellor's Office. Three-fourths of the course content focuses on skills; the remaining one-fourth focuses on history and analysis. This inappropriate imbalance suggests a thin, superficial treatment of history and analysis.

The subcommittee agreed that, overall, the wording of the proposal was not clear. Moreover, it seemed uncertain which teaching-team members would be responsible for which area; who, for instance, would be responsible for grading the final examination? Furthermore, the course's historical perspective needs to be defined more clearly. Because of these problems, and because the decision to place Art 108 in Area C establishes a crucial precedent for skills courses, some subcommittee members thought it more prudent to consider Art 108 for Area C after it had been taught a few times.

Art 112
The subcommittee recommended unanimously leaving Art 112 in Area C.2 until a stronger Art History course is placed in the GE & B requirements. (We suggested the Art History sequence--Art 211, 212, 213--as a replacement for Art 112.)
1. **PROPOSER'S NAME**
   Charles E. Jennings

2. **PROPOSER'S DEPT.**
   Art and Design

3. **SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)**
   TO BE APPLIED FROM C.2.

4. **COURSE NAME, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)**
   AMT 112 Survey of Art History (3 units)

5. **SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**
   5-0 in favor of retention in C.2.

6. **GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**
   9-0 in favor of retention in C.2.

7. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION**
George Lewis, Chair  
Academic Senate General Education and Breadth Committee

John Harrington, Chair  
Academic Senate GE&B Subcommittee for Area C

Subject: Recommendations for Area C Course Proposals

ART DEPARTMENT

Art 101
The subcommittee recommended 3-2 against allowing Art 101 in Area C2 and 3-2 in favor of allowing Art 101 in Area C3. (Both sets of votes included a positive vote from the Art Department representative.)

Those who voted against placing Art 101 in Area C2 saw the proposal as not meeting the appropriate objectives outlined for Area C2 (sections 2.E, 2.F, and 2.G of Guidelines in the Final Report on Area C). They viewed the course as marginal, not as strong as actual (or potential) Art History offerings, and lacking the "breadth" and the "exposure to concepts, ideas, and principles" recommended by the Chancellor's Office. Three-fourths of the course content focuses on skills; the remaining one-fourth focuses on history and analysis. This inappropriate imbalance suggests a thin, superficial treatment of history and analysis.

Some subcommittee members found other problems: they wondered which teaching-team member was to be responsible for which area; who, for instance, would be responsible for grading the final examination? Moreover, the course's historical perspective needs to be defined more clearly. Because of these problems, and because the decision to place Art 101 in Area C establishes a crucial precedent for skills courses, some subcommittee members thought it more prudent to consider Art 101 for Area C after it had been taught a few times.

Art 108
The subcommittee recommended unanimously (5-0) against allowing Art 108 in Areas C2 and C3. (Both sets of votes included a negative vote from the Art Department representative.)

The subcommittee thought the proposal was not at the professional level of the proposal for Art 101; some members also saw the proposal as not meeting the appropriate objectives outlined for Area C2 (sections 2.E, 2.F, and 2.G of Guidelines in the Final Report on Area C). They viewed the proposal as less strong than actual (or potential) Art History offerings, and thought it lacked the "breadth" and the "exposure to concepts, ideas, and principles" recommended by the Chancellor's Office. Three-fourths of the course content focuses on skills; the remaining one-fourth focuses on history and analysis. This inappropriate imbalance suggests a thin, superficial treatment of history and analysis.

The subcommittee agreed that, overall, the wording of the proposal was not clear. Moreover, it seemed uncertain which teaching-team members would be responsible for which area: who, for instance, would be responsible for grading the final examination? Furthermore, the course's historical perspective needs to be defined more clearly. Because of these problems, and because the decision to place Art 108 in Area C establishes a crucial precedent for skills courses, some subcommittee members thought it more prudent to consider Art 108 for Area C after it had been taught a few times.

Art 112
The subcommittee recommended unanimously leaving Art 112 in Area C2 until a stronger Art History course is placed in the GE&B requirements. (We suggested the Art History sequence—Art 211, 212, 213—as a replacement for Art 112.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Little</td>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (Include section, and subsection if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR 233 Critical Reading in French Literature (4 units)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected readings from major Francophone authors that show the French literary tradition from the Middle Ages to the present in both France and other French-speaking countries. Includes works by Medieval, Renaissance, Classical, Romantic, post-Romantic, and twentieth century writers as Cretien de Troyes, Rabelais, Moliere, Voltaire, Flaubert, Proust, and Sartre. 4 lectures. Prerequisites: FR 202 or the equivalent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-0 in favor of inclusion in C.2. *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-0 in favor of inclusion in C.2.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION |

*NOTE: Recommendation contingent on approval for '88-'90 catalog.

This recommendation includes removing FR 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, and 203 from C.3.
1. **PROPOSER'S NAME**  
William Little

2. **PROPOSER'S DEPT.**  
Foreign Languages

3. **SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)**  
C.1

4. **COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)**  
GER 233 Critical Reading in German Literature (4 units)

   Selected readings from major German-speaking authors that show the German literary tradition from the Middle Ages to the present in both Germany and other German-speaking countries. Includes works by Medieval, Renaissance, Classical, Romantic, post-Romantic, and twentieth century writers as Wolfram von Eschenburg, Luther, Schiller, Goethe, Rilke, and Mann. 4 lectures.  
   Prerequisite: GER 202 or the equivalent.

5. **SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**  
5-0 in favor of inclusion in C.2.*

6. **GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**  
9-0 in favor of inclusion in C.2.*

7. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION**

---

*NOTE: Recommendation contingent on approval for '88-'90 catalog.

This recommendation includes removing GER 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, and 203 from C.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. <strong>PROPOSER'S NAME</strong></th>
<th>2. <strong>PROPOSER'S DEPT.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Little</td>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **SUBMITTED FOR AREA** (include section, and subsection if applicable)

   C.1

4. **COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)**

   **SPAN 233 Critical Reading in Hispanic Literature (4 units)**

   Selected readings from major Hispanic authors that show the Hispanic literary tradition from the Middle Ages to the present in both Spain and Latin America. Includes works by Medieval, Renaissance, Colonial, Realistic, and twentieth century authors as Juan Ruiz, Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, Martí, Unamuno, Lorca, Neruda, and Borges. 4 Lectures. Prerequisite: SPAN 202 or equivalent.

5. **SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**

   5-0 in favor of inclusion in C.2.*

6. **GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**

   9-0 in favor of inclusion in C.2.*

7. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION**

*NOTE: Recommendation contingent on approval for '88-'90 catalog.

This recommendation includes removing SPAN 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, and 203 from C.3.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</strong></th>
<th>Roger Kenvin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</strong></td>
<td>Theatre and Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)</strong></td>
<td>C.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)</strong></td>
<td>DANC 321 History of Dance (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of dance from prehistoric to modern times. 3 lectures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</strong></td>
<td>5-0 in favor of inclusion in C.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The subcommittee unanimously recommended the adoption of DANC 321 as an Area C.3. course providing a proper prerequisite is required. During discussions with Roger Kenvin, he indicated that the proper prerequisite should be TH 210-Introduction to Theater, and the subcommittee agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</strong></td>
<td>9-0 in favor of inclusion in C.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GE&amp;B's recommendation does not require a prerequisite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. PROPOSER'S NAME
   James C. Daly

2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.
   Statistics Dept

3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (Include section, and subsection if applicable)
   B.2

4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)
   STAT 130X introduction to Statistical Reasoning (3 units)
   A survey of statistical ideas and philosophy. Emphasis will be on statistical concepts rather than on in-depth coverage of statistical methods. Topics include reasons for sampling and experimentation, basic ways of exploring sets of data, study of chance phenomena, and rationale beyond drawing conclusions from data. Credit cannot be received for this course if a student has received credit for a previous statistics course.

5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS
   5-0 in favor of inclusion in B.2.
   The subcommittee felt that STAT 130X is a worthwhile alternative general education statistics course geared specifically for students not planning to take both quarters of the more traditional sequence found in STAT 211 and 212. By emphasizing concepts rather than methodology, the course should have its widest audience among nontechnical majors.

6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS
   9-0 in favor of inclusion in B.2.

7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. <strong>PROPOSER'S NAME</strong></th>
<th>2. <strong>PROPOSER'S DEPT.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEB Area B Subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. <strong>SUBMITTED FOR AREA (Include section, and subsection if applicable)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revision of Area B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. <strong>COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. <strong>SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See attached Memo dated June 25, 1986 from Mueller to Lewis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. <strong>GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-0 concurs with Area B Subcommittee's recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. <strong>ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Memorandum

To: George Lewis, Chair
GE&B Committee

From: Jim Mueller, Chair
GE&B Subcommittee for Area B

Subject: Review of Area B Requirements

During the past year the GE&B Area B Subcommittee has met to re-evaluate all courses in that distribution area. In arriving at the revised list of approved courses, we kept the following points in mind:

1. The general education component of a university education is not static, but rather is dynamically changing and should be under constant review. This viewpoint is consistent with the guidelines established by Executive Order 338 from the Chancellor’s Office.

2. The previous Area B package was not consistent between Areas B1 and B2. Our revisions have sought to correct these differences.

3. The previous list of approved upper division courses was far too extensive. Many of these courses were so specialized as to have lost the "general" aspect of GE&B. As we have seen several times during the past year, this lack of a sharp delineation has encouraged certain departments to seek GE&B approval for courses outside of the basic sciences.

4. In some respects, the entire issue of upper division GE&B is a moot point, since in almost any conceivable case a student will have already satisfied the Area B requirements before reaching upper division status. Granted, there is an upper division distribution requirement for all of GE&B. We note, however, that all but 3 units of this requirement are satisfied by required courses from other distribution areas.

Our report consists of a revised statement of requirements for Area B and a summary list of courses which would be either excluded from or added to the presently approved list. In particular, we view the recommendations for the life sciences as tentative, with the possibility of additional deletions to be considered in the fall. The committee’s desire is that the process of review continue by the solicitation of additional input from all departments in the School of Science and Mathematics.
A minimum of 18 quarter units to include inquiry into the physical universe and its life forms, with some immediate participation in laboratory activity, and into mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning and their applications.

Distribution Area B1. Physical and Life Sciences

All students must complete a minimum of nine units from the approved list of courses in physical and life sciences, at least one course in each. At least one of the courses selected must include a laboratory.

(a) Physical Sciences

Courses may be selected as follows:

ASTR: Any lower division course
CHEM: Any lower division course except 106, 200, 252, 253
GBDL: Any lower division course except 211. 206 may be selected if GBDL 201 or 204 have been completed
PHYS: Any lower division course except 100, 134, 137, 200, 202, 206, 207, 256, 257
PSC: Any lower division course

Any 300 level physical science courses having one of the prefixes ASTR, CHEM, GBDL, PHYS, or PSC and having one of the above courses as a prerequisite may also be chosen, with the exception of CHEM 350, PHYS 315, PHYS 363.

(b) Life Sciences

Courses may be selected as follows:

BACT: Any lower division course
BIO: Any lower division course except 099, 100, 253, and 255
BOT: Any lower division course except 236
ZOO: Any lower division course except 237, 238, 239

Any 300 level life science courses having one of the prefixes BIO, BOT, or ZOO and having one of the above courses as a prerequisite may also be chosen, with the exception of BIO 312, 321, 342.


All students must complete a minimum of two courses in mathematics and statistics, at least one of which must be in mathematics.

(a) Mathematics

Courses may be selected as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATH 114</th>
<th>MATH 115</th>
<th>MATH 118</th>
<th>MATH 119</th>
<th>MATH 120</th>
<th>MATH 121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 131</td>
<td>MATH 141</td>
<td>MATH 201</td>
<td>MATH 221</td>
<td>MATH 328</td>
<td>MATH 327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any 100, 200, or 300 level MATH courses having one of the above as a prerequisite may also be chosen. MATH 327 is excluded.
(b) **Statistics**

Courses may be selected as follows:

- STAT 211
- STAT 251
- STAT 321

Any 200 or 300 level STAT courses having one of the above as a prerequisite may also be chosen, with the exception of STAT 330.
Courses which would be deleted from Area B:

CHEM: 350, 435, 436, 439, 444
GEOL: 211
PHYS: 202, 315, 403, 406, 410, 412, 413, 421, 452, 456
BACT: 322, 333, 342
BIO: 312
MATH: 405, 408, 409, 412, 413, 414, 419, 431, 432, 437, 442, 443, 444,
      506, 507, 508, 512, 513, 515, 516, 518
STAT: 415, 416, 421, 423, 425, 426, 427

Courses which would be added to Area B:

GEOL: 321
BACT: 224, 225
ZOO: 133
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Background statement: The Academic Senate Fairness Board Committee has revised its Description and Procedures statement to accurately reflect the current process. This is the first formal revision since 1979.

AS-___-86/____
RESOLUTION ON
FAIRNESS BOARD DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES

WHEREAS, The present CAM description of the Fairness Board needs to be updated to reflect changes in process and procedures; and

RESOLVED: That Appendix XI, Fairness Board Description and Procedures be modified as attached.

Proposed By:
The Fairness Board Committee
and Student Affairs Committee
On March 3, 1987
FAIRNESS BOARD
Description and Procedures

Description
The Fairness Board (see CAM Appendix 44, pr. 44 XI) is the primary campus group concerned with providing "due process" of academically related matters for the students and instructors at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, particularly in terms of student/faculty relationships. The Board hears grade appeals based on the griever's belief that the instructor has made a mistake, shown bad faith or incompetence, or been unfair. (For cheating, see CAM 674.3) However, the Board may also hear cases involving student/administration or student/student-relationships of an academic nature.

Although in grade appeals the Board operates under the presumption that the grade assigned was correct, should its members find that the evidence indicates that such was not actually the case, the chair will recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs that the grade be changed. In all cases, the Board's authority is limited to actions consistent with other campus and CSU-System policy.

Procedures
A. Any student who still feels aggrieved after failing to receive asked-for requesting relief from both the person allegedly causing the problem and that person's immediate supervisor(s) (e.g., faculty member, faculty member's department head, and faculty-member's school dean) instructor and instructor's department head may initiate an appeal for redress by writing a letter requesting a hearing to the chair of the Fairness Board. The chair may counsel a student as to the relative merit of his/her case, but must accept all written complaints which are ultimately filed-submitted. The chair will provide the student with a copy of "Fairness Board Description and Procedures." The student's letter should contain all pertinent details of the issue(s) raised, name persons involved, list witnesses, list exhibits, and situation, name of the course, section, instructor and term in question, list any witnesses to be called, state redress sought, and include as attachments all relevant documents, including items such as course grade determination handout, exams, papers, letters of support. The student has the responsibility of identifying evidence to himself/herself, the student should understand that in all cases he/she must overcome the Board's presumption that the instructor's action was correct. If the Board decides the case may have merit, then the following actions will then take place:

1. The chair will forward a copy of the above letter to the challenged party and request his/her written reply to the chair within one week of receipt. The chair will share a copy of any reply with the student grievant. The Chair will also send a copy of "Fairness Board Description and Procedures" to the challenged party.

2. The chair will make scheduling arrangements as soon as possible for the hearing which will be conducted informally. At least six Board members, including at least end-one student, must be present before a hearing may begin, and the same six members-end-one student must be present for the full hearing.

3. When a hearing is scheduled, the chair will notify the Board's members and the two principal parties.

4. It is expected that Board members will disqualify themselves from voting-participation in any case if they are a principal or if they feel they cannot be impartial.
The Board will allow each principal party, who may be accompanied by his/her advisor, (not a practicing attorney of law) to present his/her case personally, call and question witnesses, and present exhibits. The Board may ask for copies of any material it believes relevant to the hearing. The student grievant will usually appear first.

6. Each Board member may ask questions of either party or any witness.

7. The Board itself may call witnesses or recall witnesses.

8. The Board will handle all proceedings without undue delay, will keep a summary file of each case, and will tape record the hearing.

9. The Board will close the hearing when satisfied that both sides have been fully heard.

10. The Board will deliberate in private and will make a written summarization of the facts of the case and of the Board's reasoning in its recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

11. The chair will send a copy of its recommendation to each principal party, to the instructor's department, and to each Board member.

12. Should any member(s) of the Board desire to file a minority recommendation, he/she may do so by sending it to the chair, who will forward copies to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, to each principal party, and to each Board member; it will be attached to the Board's majority recommendation.

13. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will inform the Board and each principal party what action, if any, has been taken. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall have final decision regarding any such change, but if the recommendation of the Fairness Board is not accepted, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall indicate the reason(s) why in writing to the Board.

B. The hearings are closed to all persons except the Board and the two principal parties and advisors. Witnesses, if any, shall be present only when testifying. No testimony shall be taken outside the hearing room, but writings written statements from persons unable to attend are admissible. Exceptions to these rules are possible if the Board and both principals have no objections.

C. In the event a situation arises wherein the Board unanimously deems the above rules inappropriate, the Board will modify its procedures to insure that fairness and justice prevail.

Membership
One tenured faculty member from each school, and one tenured member from Student Affairs, all appointed by the chair of the Academic Senate for two-year terms. One two or three student member(s) selected by ASI, with no less than junior standing and three consecutive quarters of attendance at Cal Poly preceding appointment. In the event that any member is unavailable to participate, that individual member is asked to identify someone as a substitute who can continue through the entire case. The Fairness Board g hair is elected by the Board.
ACADEMIC SENATE
FAIRNESS BOARD PROCESS*

Unresolved problem exists between student and the University

Student is strongly urged to go to the Counseling Center for purpose of defining, clarifying and achieving utmost objectivity regarding problem. "A problem clearly seen and stated is half solved" as the old saying goes.

Student and/or the faculty representative takes the problem through appropriate line channels** for resolution

Student feels that problem has not been properly understood or resolved

Student formulates a written complaint
   a. States complaint
   b. Gives background of details
   c. Indicates witnesses that may be called
   d. Attaches relevant documents

Submits to any member of the Fairness Board

Fairness Board reviews complaint and declares the complaint to have:

**EXAMPLE OF LINE CHANNELS:

Instructor
Adviser
Department Head
Dean of School
Etc.

NOTE: Complaints regarding race, creed, color or sex are to be referred to Discrimination Study Committee.

Adopted by Cal Poly Academic Senate on 4-18-69.
Revised March, 1973 to reflect name change to university.
Revised October, 1975 to reflect general membership rather than individuals.
ACADEMIC SENATE FAIRNESS BOARD PROCESS

Unresolved problem exists between student and the university

Student is encouraged to go to the Counseling Center and to his/her advisor for the purpose of defining and clarifying the problem and achieving objectivity.

Student attempts to resolve the problem with appropriate party (e.g., instructor of record) and appropriate line of authority (e.g., instructor's department head).

Student feels that problem has not been resolved and consults with the chair of the Fairness Board.

Student prepares a letter to the Fairness Board indicating his/her problem and submits it to the Board's chair. The letter should:

(a) identify the course, section, term, and instructor of record
(b) state complaint and redress sought
(c) indicate witnesses that may be called
(d) include copies of relevant documents such as course grade determination handout, exams, papers, statements of support made by others, etc.

Fairness Board reviews complaint and declares complaint to have:

**MERIT**
Board requests written response from instructor and schedules a hearing. If a resolution to the problem presents itself, the hearing may be terminated. If no resolution seems satisfactory to the Board and the principals, the hearing will lead to the Board making a recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

**NO MERIT**
Student may rebut with new evidence.

MERIT

NO MERIT

First adopted by the Academic Senate on 4/18/69. Revised 3/73, 10/75, and 2/87.
WHEREAS, Quality audiovisual services are important to many instructional and extra-curricular programs on campus; and

WHEREAS, There is a potential impact to the academic community of the proposed integration of Audiovisual Services with the Information Systems organization; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate concurs with the proposed transfer of Audiovisual Services to Information Systems provided that the quality of the instructional use of Audiovisual Services shall neither be impaired nor reduced by the organizational change.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Executive Committee
April 7, 1987
Memorandum

To: Lloyd H. Lamouria
    Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Malcolm W. Wilson
    Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Proposed Transfer of Audiovisual Services to Information Systems

It is my understanding that you have had discussions with Art Gloster and Norm Johnson regarding the proposed integration of Audiovisual Services with the Information Systems organization. In keeping with the spirit of collegiality, and my desire to inform the faculty of changes with potential impact to the academic community, your comments regarding the attached organizational structure depicting Audiovisual Services as an entity within Information Systems would be appreciated.

Art Gloster and I are available to meet with you and/or members of your executive committee to respond to any questions about the proposed transfer.

Attachment
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, acting in conformity with provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement approved, after consultation with the president, procedures and criteria for the Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate supports the concept of merit and faculty development, it is our opinion that such monetary awards as the Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards are inappropriate in an academic environment which thrives on collegiality; and

WHEREAS, We believe that support and nourishment of all members of the faculty is the proper way to foster excellence in teaching and scholarship; and

WHEREAS, Faculty members of the California State University system all need more financial support and more time for scholarly activities; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the bargaining teams at the next negotiating session use the money set aside for these awards to enrich such already established, but inadequately funded, faculty development programs as sabbatical leaves, released time, travel funds, and grants for research and conferences; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be forwarded to the California State University Board of Trustees; California State University presidents; Ann Shadwick, President, CFA; Ann Reynolds, Chancellor; Warren J. Baker, President, Cal Poly; Malcolm Wilson, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, Cal Poly; school deans; and Cal Poly faculty.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Executive Committee
April 7, 1987