I. Minutes: Approval of the April 14, 1987 Senate Minutes (attached pp. 2-6).

II. Communications:
B. Single Faculty Office Issue, Memo from Baker to Lamouria (attached pp. 8-9).
C. President Baker’s Response to Resolution on the Foundation Process (attached pp. 36-38).

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, Second Reading (attached p. 10).

V. Business Items:
B. Resolution on Fairness Board Description and Procedures—Beardsley, Chair of the Fairness Board Committee/Stebbins, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, Second Reading (attached pp. 26-30).
C. (Amended) Resolution on Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards—Terry, Second Reading (attached p. 31).
D. Catalog Changes for 1988-90: Engineering; Science and Math—Dana, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, First Reading (to be distributed).
E. Resolution on Cooperative Education Courses—Dana, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, First Reading (attached p. 32).
F. Resolution on Goals and Objectives—French, Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, First Reading (attached pp. 33-34).
G. Resolution to Ensure Confidentiality in the Consideration of Candidates for an Honorary Doctorate—Lamouria, First Reading (attached p. 35).

VI. Discussion:

VII. Adjournment:

NOTE: CALENDAR CHANGE

Per the request of the Curriculum Committee, the Academic Senate will hold an additional meeting on May 19, 1987, 3-5pm, in UU220. This will replace the regularly scheduled Executive Committee meeting on that date.
Checklist for review of catalog material -- 88-90 cycle

1. For new course proposals look for:
   -- duplication of existing courses
   -- material being taught is in a department other than that which has primary responsibility for that subject
   -- suitable prerequisites for the proposed level of difficulty
   -- number of expected students
   -- appropriate C/S number
   -- staffing -- who is teaching (new hires needed? shift from existing courses?)
   -- which departments require the course, if any

2. For course deletions:
   -- were these courses required or recommended in other departments? Have these departments been informed of the deletions?

3. For course changes look for:
   -- Is a new course really being proposed under the label of changing an existing one e.g.,
     -- (new description drastically different
     -- simultaneous changes in descriptions, title, number, units, etc.

4. For proposals for new degrees, minors, concentrations, specializations look for:
   -- quality of the program
   -- breadth vs specialization
   -- justification for need for the new program (student demand, job opportunities, etc.)
   -- staffing needs
   -- similar programs in other universities

5. Consider the number of new courses vs the number of course deletions, but don't be dogmatic or hard-nosed about it. More appropriately, examine the number of courses that will exist vs the number of faculty to teach them. If the ratio is more than 4 or 5, then raise concern that this can lead to overloading the faculty due to too many preparations.

6. Be alert for "hidden" requirements in curricula:
   -- for example, required courses which have prerequisites which are not included in the curriculum

7. For all curriculum layout changes look for:
   -- conformation to requirements according to CAM and/or Title 5, for example:
     -- units in major
     -- 300-400 level courses
     -- electives (and free electives exemptions requests if needed)
To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
   President

Subject: SINGLE FACULTY OFFICE ISSUE

Malcolm Wilson briefed me on the Executive Committee meeting of the Academic Senate held on Tuesday where the issue of legislative support for single faculty office projects in our Capital Outlay Program was discussed. I appreciate the efforts that many faculty have made in helping us put together a program that involved both systemwide policy changes and careful negotiations with the Chancellor's Office, the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's Office, and we have continued to press this issue as a very high priority for the University. I'd like to bring you up to date on this effort.

First, it is my understanding that someone indicated to the Executive Committee that we really did not support single faculty offices and used the example of our failure to succeed in including a provision to convert double offices to single offices in the repair of the Engineering West fire damage. In fact, I was told it was alleged that I stopped the project. The notion that I stopped the project is nonsense. I suspect this opinion stems from a lack of understanding of State regulations on facility modifications and required approvals for fund expenditures. In fact, I attempted to use this repair project as an opportunity to increase single faculty offices.

However, the cost associated with accomplishing that was in excess of the allocation of Special Repair funds to refurbish the facility, and Special Repair funds cannot be used to make capacity modifications of this type. Further, we were prohibited from use of any other State funds, e.g., Minor Capital Outlay Funds, that we might be able to identify to supplement the Special Repairs appropriation to accomplish this because it would constitute a reconfiguration of a State facility. This requires separate project approval and that approval would not be granted because the reconfiguration would increase the office space deficit on the campus. Consideration was also given to raising private funds to accomplish our objectives, but for the reason just stated and the conclusion after raising the issue with the School was that it would not be realistic to expect this approach to succeed. Hence, with respect to the Engineering West damaged offices, we are left...
with no alternative but to return them to their original condition. I share in the obvious disappointment; however, in view of the efforts we have made, I don't understand how a view exists that I do not support single faculty offices. The facts don't support that view.

The following summarizes our progress to date:

1. Some two years ago, recognizing the difficulties that we face with faculty office facilities, we worked with the Chancellor's Office in the development of a Trustee policy statement which would provide a basis for moving toward a programmed effort of providing single faculty offices throughout the campus.

2. The University then submitted as part of its Five-Year Capital Outlay Program two specific projects dealing with this issue — the Remodel of the Business Administration and Education Building and the Faculty Offices I Project. In connection with a site visit in the fall by the Department of Finance, Legislative Analyst, and Chancellor's Office staff, we worked with the Chancellor in obtaining a written interpretation of the Trustee-approved policy which would make it clear that the two projects in our Capital Outlay Program which dealt with the issue of eliminating substandard multiple faculty offices would qualify within this Trustee policy.

3. Subsequently both projects were included in the Trustees' Budget Request for 1987-88, were included in the Governor's Budget Proposal, and at this point have been supported and included in the budget in action by the Assembly Ways and Means Subcommittee and the full Assembly Ways and Means Committee.

4. I have just returned from a trip to Sacramento during which I met individually with the three members of the Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee as well as others involved in the legislative process; and at this point, I have reason to believe that these two projects will be supported in that subcommittee as well. While we can never guarantee anything in the political legislative process, and we will continue to move forward with a carefully preplanned program to gain Senate support, I have every reason to believe that these projects will be funded.

It is important to note that the legislative process relative to the budget is a particularly sensitive one this year, and I would hope that no actions by individuals from the University would result in upsetting the carefully planned program which we have embarked upon.
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.

RESOLUTION ON ATTENDANCE AT CONVENTIONS, CONFERENCES, OR SIMILAR MEETINGS

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

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

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

3 periods activity: 1 lecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. <strong>SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</strong></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. <strong>GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-3 in favor of placing it in C.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. <strong>ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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.
# GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH PROPOSAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crissa Hewitt</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_108 Fundamentals of Sculpture (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration of three-dimensional form through problems in modeling, casting, carving and techniques of assembly. Miscellaneous course fee required. 1 lecture, 3 activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-0 against placing it in either C.2 or C.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-3-1 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 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles W. Jennings</td>
<td>Art and Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (Include section, and subsection if applicable) |
| TO BE DROPPED FROM C.2. |

| 4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format) |
| ART 112 Survey of Art History (3 units) |

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

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.)

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

| 7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION |
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)
FR 233 Critical Reading in French Literature (4 units)
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. Prerequisite: FR 202 or the equivalent.

5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS
5-0 in favor of inclusion in C.1. *

6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS
9-0 in favor of inclusion in C.1. *

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.
## GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH PROPOSAL

<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>

### C.1

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

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.1.*

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

9-0 in favor of inclusion in C.1.*

### 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.
GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH PROPOSAL

<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>SPAN 233 Critical Reading in Hispanic Literature (4 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected readings from major Hispanic authors that show the Hispanic literary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tradition from the Middle Ages to the present in both Spain and Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes works by Medieval, Renaissance, Colonial, Realistic, and twentieth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>century authors as Juan Ruiz, Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Sor Juana Ines de la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz, Marti, Unamuno, Lorca, Neruda, and Borges. 4 Lectures. Prerequisite:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN 202 or equivalent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-0 in favor of inclusion in C.1.*</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.1.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*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>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roger Kenvin</td>
<td>Theatre and Dance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

C.3.

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

DANC 321 History of Dance (3)

History of dance from prehistoric to modern times. 3 lectures.

5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS

5-0 in favor of inclusion in C.3.

The subcommittee unanimously recommended the adoption of Dance 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.

6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS

9-0 in favor of inclusion in C.3.

GE&B's recommendation does not require a prerequisite.

7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION
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**
1. **PROPOSER'S NAME**
   - GE&B Area B Subcommittee

2. **PROPOSER'S DEPT.**

3. **SUBMITTED FOR AREA** (include section, and subsection if applicable)
   - Revision of Area B

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

5. **SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**
   - See attached Memo dated June 25, 1986 from Mueller to Lewis.

6. **GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**
   - 9-0 concurs with Area B Subcommittee's recommendations.

7. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION**
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.
Distribution Area B

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
GEOL: Any lower division course except 211. 206 may be selected if GEOL 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, GEOL, 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 238
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:

MATH 114 MATH 131
MATH 115 MATH 141
MATH 118 MATH 201
MATH 119 MATH 221
MATH 120 MATH 328
MATH 121

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
STAT: 415, 418, 421, 423, 425, 426, 427

Courses which would be added to Area B:

GEOL: 321
BACT: 224, 225
ZOO: 133
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

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 VH-p.-H 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 grievant'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 CSUC-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 dean) 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 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, etc. The student has the responsibility of identifying evidence to however, 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 and one student must be present before a hearing may begin, and the same six members and 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.
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5. 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 grade 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. Students should ideally initiate any grade complaint within one quarter as instructors are obligated to retain evaluation instruments for only one quarter. However, the Board will accept grievances for two quarters after an evaluation. If special circumstances exist, such as when an instructor is on leave and not available to the student, the Board may choose to entertain grievances involving grades issued more than two quarters earlier.

D. 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 tenure-track faculty member from each school, and one tenured tenure-track member from Student Affairs, all appointed by the chair of the Academic Senate for two-year terms. One two student members selected by ASI, with no less than junior standing and three consecutive quarters of attendance at Cal Poly preceding appointment. The Fairness Board’s chair is elected by the Board.
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:

MERIT

Board hears plaintiff and defendant
If a resolution of problem occurs, Fairness Board Hearing ceases.

If complaint is unresolved, Fairness Board will recommend action to the President of the University

NO MERIT

Student and/or faculty representative may rebut with new evidence

MEMBERSHIP OF FAIRNESS BOARD:

One tenured faculty member from each school, and one tenured member from Student Affairs, all appointed by chair of Academic Senate for two-year terms. One student member selected by ASI, with no less than junior standing and three quarters consecutive attendance at Cal Poly preceding appointment. Chair is elected by the Board.

**EXAMPLE OF LINE MEMBERSHIP OF FAIRNESS BOARD:

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, 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 has historically supported the concepts of merit and faculty development; and

WHEREAS, It is our opinion that such monetary awards as the Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards are inappropriate means to foster merit and faculty development 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 propose to 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:
Raymond Terry
April 7, 1987
Revised April 21, 1987
WHEREAS, Converting Cooperative Education classes from extension courses to regular university courses will bring to our campus the resources needed to operate the program; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee has examined documentation of the procedures to evaluate students' performance; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee feels those procedures are equivalent in rigor to those for regular university courses; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approves of the conversion of Cooperative Education courses to regular courses of the university.

Proposed By:
Curriculum Committee
April 11, 1987
Background

Over the past several years there has been increasing interest at Cal Poly in the question of where the university is going in the next ten to twelve years. Numerous actions and activities have been undertaken to help set a direction for the university. In 1983 the Mission Statement for the university was prepared and adopted. In April 1985 the Academic Senate unanimously passed a resolution calling for the university to undertake a strategic planning process, which would identify the opportunities and constraints facing the university in the next decade. In an October 1985 meeting with the entire faculty President Baker addressed the topic of Cal Poly and California in the next decade. In May 1986 the Academic Senate passed a resolution recommending that future enrollment planning be subject to the availability of adequate staff and facilities and that faculty be fully involved in all enrollment planning activities. During this period various administrative groups have been active in preparing plans for specific areas, most notably in the areas of information systems (Campus Information Resources Plan) and buildings and facilities (Campus Master Plan). The President's cabinet has been considering various long range planning issues through its committee structure. Most recently the Budget Committee identified a need to link long range planning with incremental budget decisions and with program evaluation. Clearly, planning is being done for the university and some areas show more planning than others.

Cal Poly's activities have not been taking place in a vacuum. At the state level the Master Plan for Higher Education in California is examining the appropriate roles of the University of California, the California State University and the community college system. Several other institutions in the CSU are involved in various long range planning efforts, most notably Cal State Fullerton, Cal State Fresno and Sacramento State. The statewide Academic Senate and the Chancellor's Office have also been considering a number of issues in this arena.
Resolution on
Developing Goals for Cal Poly in the 1990's

Whereas, Planning for likely changes in its social, demographic, technologic, and institutional environment provides Cal Poly a mechanism to adapt to these changes and shape its own future;

Whereas, A shared vision of the ways in which the university should develop in the future would help to guide day-to-day decision making and provide greater consistency among individual decisions;

Whereas, Cal Poly's Mission Statement provides guidance, but lacks the specificity to serve as a policy guide for decision making;

Whereas, the University Academic Planning Committee is the body charged by CAM with recommending goals for the university and the most orderly and effective ways in which to achieve those goals; therefore be it

Resolved; That the University Academic Planning Committee be instructed to develop a set of Goals and Objectives which more precisely define the mission of the university; and be it further

Resolved; During the development of these Goals and Objectives the views of relevant University, Academic Senate and ASI committees as well as the Dean's Council, the President's Cabinet and relevant administrators should be solicited and considered by the Academic Planning Committee; and be it further

Resolved; That these goals should be specific enough to provide a framework for individual decisions and should address important issues related to Enrollment, Curriculum, Land and Facilities, and Faculty and Staff; and be it further

Resolved; That the committee should produce such a set of Goals and Objectives by the end of Winter Quarter 1988 to be reviewed and discussed by the Academic Senate and other appropriate campus bodies during the Spring of 1988; be it further

Resolved; That the magnitude and importance of this task warrants that members of this committee be given reduced workloads in Fall 1987 and Winter 1988 which allow them to give this task adequate attention.
Background statement:

Under date of July 19-20, 1983, the CSU Board of Trustees approved Guidelines for the Awarding of Honorary Degrees. Problems can arise if confidentiality is breached. This can be especially embarrassing and possibly damaging to both the candidate and the university when a favorable faculty response is not obtained.

RESOLUTION TO ENSURE CONFIDENTIALITY IN THE CONSIDERATION OF CANDIDATES FOR AN HONORARY DOCTORATE

WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees awards honorary degrees at the doctorate level; and

WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees stipulates that utmost care is to be taken to ensure confidentiality; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate empower its Executive Committee to consider and act upon nominations for honorary degrees in closed session; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall report its recommendations solely to the President of California Polytechnic State University; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the President of California Polytechnic State University shall advise the Academic Senate only on those recommendations which result in honorary doctorate awards by the CSU Board of Trustees.

Proposed By:
Lloyd H. Lamouria
April 21, 1987
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
       President

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION ON THE FOUNDATION ELECTION PROCESS

As I have shared with you, I had James Landreth, Vice President for Business Affairs, and Malcolm Wilson, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, conduct a detailed review of the implications of the Academic Senate Resolution. In addition, I requested and received an analysis of corporate and Education Code law on related issues from the Foundation's legal counsel.

After reviewing in detail the information which was provided to me and after discussion with a number of individuals, I have concluded that there are no compelling reasons for asking the Foundation to change its bylaws regarding the composition and selection of the Foundation Board of Directors in the manner proposed in the Senate resolution.

However, the Academic Senate Resolution and resulting review has raised an issue relating to the faculty members serving on the Board of Directors which I intend to pursue further. As I know you are aware, Title 5 of the California Administrative Code requires that Board of Directors of CSU auxiliary organizations such as the Foundation contain membership from four broad groups of individuals: administration and staff, faculty, students, and non-campus personnel. By virtue of this policy and in practice, the Foundation Board of Directors has included in its elected director membership two members of the faculty for at least the last 20 years. I have no reason to believe that the Foundation would modify this practice, and I would oppose any effort to do so. I do believe, however, that the matter upon which we need to focus is the question of how we might more effectively address the concerns raised by the Academic Senate relative to the selection of faculty members.

As we proceed, it is important that we keep in mind the thrust of the legal issues conveyed to you by Fred Dalton, University Auditor, for the CSU Trustees. In his November 7 letter to you, Mr. Dalton stated: "The primary purpose of a board of directors is to run the entity for which the board has responsibility. A director's primary responsibility under the law is not to the area he is nominated or originates from, but the good faith management of the best interests of the corporation. We have found in our audits that directors are financially responsible for actions they take as members of a board." Thus, while it is clear from Trustee policy that auxiliary organizations must have faculty on their board of directors, it is also clear that there is a legal corporate responsibility which such members assume as contrasted with constituency representation.
The terms of office of the two faculty members presently serving on the Board of Directors of the Foundation do not expire this year. One's term of office continues through 1988, and the other through 1989. I am assuming that they will continue to serve out their elected terms. Within this framework, I have asked University staff to pursue and develop for my consideration some alternative processes whereby we can achieve the objective of more effectively addressing the concerns raised by the Academic Senate relative to the selection of faculty members for the positions on the Board of Directors. I intend to have an acceptable alternative in place in time for utilization in connection with the selection/election process when the term of office of one of the current faculty members expires in May of 1988. Whether or not it will require a request to the Foundation Board of Directors for minor modifications in the bylaws will not be known until alternatives have been developed.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-216-86/AHCCPF

RESOLUTION ON
THE FOUNDATION ELECTION PROCESS

WHEREAS. The current process by which the Board of Directors of the California Polytechnic State University Foundation is elected has resulted in a Board that has effectively been closed to new individuals and new ideas; and

WHEREAS. The current process has not resulted in sufficient equity and balance among the various constituencies; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the process of selection/election to and membership of the Board of Directors of California Polytechnic State University Foundation be altered to be:

1. The University President or his/her designee;
2. Three administrative staff members of the University selected to serve three-year terms. The process is to be determined by the University President in consultation with the Board;
3. Three tenured faculty members of the University selected to serve three-year terms by the Academic Senate. The process is to be determined by the Elections Committee of the Academic Senate. No members shall serve more than two consecutive terms;
4. Three students of the University selected to serve one-year terms as determined by the University President. The process is to be consistent with Resolution #86-03 of the Student Senate;
5. At least one, but no more than three, off-campus members selected to serve one-year terms by the University President; and be it further

RESOLVED: That in the event that a vacancy occurs on the Board, a replacement shall be selected to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term of office of that individual by the same process by which that individual was selected.

Proposed By:
The Ad Hoc Committee on the Cal Poly Foundation
April 29, 1986
From: H. Mallareddy, Acting Head
Civil & Environmental Engineering

Subject: FINAL CURRICULUM COMMITTEE ACTIONS ON 1988-90 PROPOSALS

The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee has recommended for disapproval our request for reinstatement of ENVE 435 course to our Department Curriculum for the 1988-90 Catalog cycle. However, the addition of this course has been approved by the School of Engineering Curriculum Committee and in the Department Faculty. The changes were made in response to suggestions from the 1984 ABET accreditation team to more fully integrate the ENVE and CE curricula.

By way of this memo, we respectfully petition to take action for overriding the Committee's recommendations. The following are some of our reasons for the reinstatement of ENVE 435:

1. To restore the course to its original place in the ENVE Curriculum as an introductory course in the water and wastewater treatment for ENVE students only.

2. To eliminate the duplication of some topics in CE 440 and ENVE 438.

3. To increase the depth of coverage of the CE 440 and ENVE 438 courses.

4. No additional units have been added to either curriculum. The total units still remain at 210 for CE and 209 for ENVE. We have accommodated the additional three units for ENVE 435 by rearranging the units within each curriculum.

5. No change in WTU units will result as a result of these changes.

6. CE 440 and ENVE 438 are required courses for both the CE and ENVE curricula; therefore, they will have full enrollment (30) in each quarter. ENVE 435 will be offered once a year as a required course for ENVE students.

The Committee is recommending dropping CE 487 from the catalog on the premise that it has not been taught in the past two years. However, this course was indeed offered in Fall 1986, as shown on the attached printout. We request that this error be corrected and the course reinstated in the 1988-90 catalog.