I. Minutes

II. Announcements

III. Reports

The Chair requests written reports for this meeting.

IV. Committee Reports

The Chair requests written reports for this meeting.

V. Business Items

(For Items A through F, please bring the materials that were attached to the May 1, 1984 Academic Senate agenda. They will not be distributed.)

A. Endorsement of the Document on Responsibilities of Academic Senates Within the Collective Bargaining Context (Weatherby) (2nd Reading)

B. Resolution on GE&B (Gay) (2nd Reading)


D. Schedule for Curriculum Review (Crabb) (2nd Reading)

E. Course Change Proposal (Crabb) (2nd Reading)

F. Course Duplication (Crabb) (2nd Reading)

G. Statement Governing the Role of International Involvement at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (Lucas) (1st Reading) (Attachment)
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

AS-1217-81/EX
March 12-13, 1981

ENDORSEMENT OF THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACADEMIC SENATES WITHIN A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTEXT"

WHEREAS, AS 1091, The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) was enacted on September 13, 1978; and

WHEREAS, The enactment of the collective bargaining legislation necessitates a clarification of the role of academic senates and councils within a collective bargaining context; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges endorse the attached document on "Responsibilities of Academic Senates within a Collective Bargaining Context."

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

May 8, 1981
RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACADEMIC SENATES WITHIN A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTEXT

I. Collegiality and Collective Bargaining

On September 13, 1978, Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. signed into law AB 1091, The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA). (Education Code Section 3560, et. seq.) This legislation provides faculty members of the CSUC an opportunity to determine whether they wish to be represented by an exclusive agent in negotiations on "wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment" (HEERA, Section 3561, r.). This section of the Education Code also specifies the intent of the Legislature to preserve, under collective bargaining, traditional shared governance mechanisms, including consultation, and the principle of peer review in faculty personnel decisions. These intentions are expressed in Section 3561 b. of the HEERA, which reads as follows:

The Legislature recognizes that joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of such institutions, and declares that it is the purpose of this act to both preserve and encourage that process. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to restrict, limit or prohibit the full exercise of the functions of the faculty in any shared
goverance mechanisms or practices including the Academic Senate of the University of California and the divisions thereof, the Academic Senates of The California State University and Colleges, and other faculty councils, with respect to policies on academic and professional matters affecting The California State University and Colleges, the University of California, or Hastings College of the Law. The principle of peer review of appointment, promotion, and retention, and tenure for academic employees shall be preserved.

This document has been prepared to describe the respective responsibilities of the Academic Senate of the CSUC and of local Senates or Councils in this collective bargaining context. The relationships, functions, and responsibilities proposed in this document reflect consideration of HEERA, the Constitution of the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges and tradition and practice in the CSUC.

II. The Traditional Role of the Academic Senate in the CSUC

The Trustees of the California State Colleges approved the Constitution of the Academic Senate on March 8, 1963. Prior to this a majority of the voting faculty at each of a majority of the college campuses had approved the document. Encouragement for the establishment of the systemwide Academic Senate, as well for the creation of an Academic Senate on each campus, came from the Chancellor, members of the Board of Trustees and the California Legislature. The 1961 Legislature adopted Senate Resolution No. 98 and Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 78 requesting the Trustees to establish an Academic Senate at each
college "wherein the faculty members shall be freely elected by their colleagues for the purpose of representing them in the formulation of policy on academic and professional matters."

Senate Resolution No. 20, which resolved that the Trustees consider establishing an Academic Senate for the CSUC system, was under discussion in the Senate Rules Committee when the Senate was created in 1963.

An examination of the Constitution of the Academic Senate CSUC, as approved by the Board of Trustees, reveals the official purposes of the Senate:

It shall be the purpose of the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges to serve as the official voice of the faculties of The California State University and Colleges in matters of systemwide concern; to consider matters concerning systemwide policies and to make recommendations thereon; to endeavor to strengthen the Senates and Councils of the several colleges; and to assume such responsibilities and perform such functions as may be delegated to it by the Chancellor or the Trustees of The California State University and Colleges.

Senate participation in academic, professional, and administrative matters during the 18 years of its existence evidences a tradition of shared governance in the CSUC and suggests appropriate responsibilities for the Senate under HEERA. The collective bargaining act makes explicit provision for the preservation of
this tradition and mandates continuing senate involvement in academic and professional matters. (See HEERA, Section 3561 b., cited above.)

III. Academic Senate Participation in Systemwide Governance

The Academic Senate shall continue to serve as the official voice of the faculties in systemwide academic and professional matters (the Constitution of the Academic Senate CSUC, Article 1, Section 1 a.).

The Academic Senate shall be the formal policy-recommending body on such matters and shall also be the primary consultative body on the academic implications of systemwide fiscal decisions. Normally, recommendations of the Academic Senate shall be addressed to or through the Chancellor.

In respect to systemwide governance, the Academic Senate endorses the following principles:

A. Criteria and standards to be used for the appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure of academic employees shall be the joint responsibility of the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges (HEERA, Section 3562 r.). Criteria and standards determined jointly by the Academic Senate CSUC and the Board of Trustees shall be considered minimal; campus senates/councils may recommend additional criteria and standards.
B. The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall be consulted on the creation of systemwide and intersegmental committees, conferences, or task forces designed to deal with educational, professional, or academically-related fiscal matters, including the charge and composition of such bodies. The Academic Senate shall be responsible for the selection of faculty representatives to serve on or participate in such bodies.

C. The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall be the formal policy-recommending body on general, systemwide policy decisions related to the following matters:
1) minimum admission requirements for students;
2) minimum conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students;
3) curricula and research programs;
4) minimum criteria and standards to be used for programs designed to enhance and maintain professional competence, including the awarding of academic leaves;
5) systemwide aspects of academic planning.

D. The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall be consulted on the following:
1) systemwide aspects of program review;
2) systemwide aspects of the basic direction of academic support programs;
3) systemwide policies governing the appointment and review of presidents and academic administrators.

4) policies governing the appointment and review of systemwide executive officers and academic administrators.

The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall not participate in the process of collective bargaining. Normally, matters affecting wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment shall not be considered by the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate shall endeavor to ensure that educational and professional matters do not become subjects of bargaining.

IV. Campus Senate/Council Participation in Governance

The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall have no authority over those matters delegated to the individual campuses by the Chancellor or by the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges. Furthermore, nothing in this document shall be construed to impair the right of academic senates and councils of the several campuses to communicate through appropriate channels with the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, nor to diminish the authority of the campuses and their senates in campus matters of academic/professional criteria and standards.
Because joint decision-making and consultation between administrators and faculty is essential to the performance of the educational missions of The California State University and Colleges, the academic senates/councils of the campuses shall be the primary consultative bodies regarding educational and professional matters delegated to the individual campuses by the Chancellor or by the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges and shall be consulted on fiscal matters which affect the instructional program.

In respect to campus governance, the CSUC Academic Senate endorses the following principles:

A. Responsibility shall be vested in the faculty or its elected senate/council representatives for:
   1) approval of degree candidates;
   2) development of policies governing the awarding of grades.

B. Through the campus academic senates/councils responsibility shall be vested in the faculty or its elected senate/council representatives for developing policies and making recommendations to the campus presidents on the following matters:
   1) criteria and standards for the appointment, retention, awarding of tenure, promotion and evaluation of academic employees including preservation of the principle of peer evaluation and provision for the direct involvement of appropriate faculty in these decisions;
2) determination of membership in the General Faculty;
3) curricular policies, such as admission and degree requirements, approval of new courses and programs, discontinuance of academic programs, and academic standards;
4) faculty appointments to institutional task forces, advisory committees, and auxiliary organizations;
5) academic standards and academic policies governing athletics.

C. The academic senate/councils shall be the primary source of policy-recommendations to the campus president on decisions related to the following matters:
1) establishment of campus-wide committees on academic or professional matters;
2) the academic role of the library;
3) academic awards, prizes, and scholarships;
4) the academic conduct of students and means for handling infractions;
5) development of institutional missions and goals.

D. The academic senates/councils shall be consulted by the campus presidents concerning:
1) the academic calendar and policies governing the scheduling of classes;
2) policies governing the appointment and review of academic administrators.
E. This outline of functions and responsibilities is intended to provide the essentials for a satisfactory system of shared governance but should not necessarily be viewed as a comprehensive enumeration of such functions and responsibilities.
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RESOLUTION TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH

Whereas, in accordance with section 6, of the administration of General Education and Breadth document, which states "Final decisions on general education and breadth requirements, policies, and procedures will lie within the Office of the President",

Whereas, the President has asked for a review of section 2 of that document,

Resolved, that the wording in section 2, Distribution Area Subcommittees, be amended to: Senate caucuses will solicit and receive applications for membership on the Distribution Area Subcommittees. The slates of applicants will be forwarded to the General Education and Breadth Committee who will appoint members. In making these appointments the General Education and Breadth Committee shall seek to constitute reasonably balanced subcommittees, the majority of which will be chosen from the applicants whose teaching service areas, academic preparation, and/or professional activities are in the relevant distribution areas.
The Role of the PRC in Review and Grievance

The collective bargaining contracts streamline the review process. They neither provide for the PRC, nor eliminate it or comparable agencies of review on other campuses. According to Provost Fort, however, the PRC will not be involved in RPT cases in Spring 1984. Since the Unit 3 CFA contract covers the vast majority of faculty, the rest of this report will focus on the effect of the CFA Agreement on review and grievance procedures.

The Peer Committee review option is the only specified provision for a committee of faculty members to review and make recommendations on a given evaluation case. This process has many of the same features as the PRC, but there are important differences. The panel of eligible faculty members is chosen by the President instead of being elected by the faculty. There are restrictions imposed on who can serve on this committee that are not imposed on the PRC membership. Most importantly, the Peer Review Committee is formed only after the President's initial decision on any given case. Formerly the PRC gave its input prior to the President's decision and, hence, was likely to have a greater chance of influencing the eventual outcome of a case.

We now compare the grievance process that existed with CAM and E.O. 301 with that provided by the CFA Unit 3 Contract. We note that there are three bargaining unit contracts which affect constituents of the Academic Senate. However, in order to avoid the confusion which would be caused by including information from all three contracts, this report will cover only the Unit 3 contract. For reference, we provide a flow chart outlining the different avenues of consultative and appeal procedures.

The Unit 3 Contract contains two grievance procedures, Article 10 (Contract Grievance Procedure) and Article 16 (Faculty Status Grievance Procedure). According to Michael Suess (Director of Personnel Relations), Article 10 deals with disputes over the use, alleged violations, and interpretations of the Unit 3 Contract. Article 16, on the other hand, deals with negative decisions with respect to retention, tenure, and promotion. This subcommittee did not examine Article 10.

Grievance procedures begin with a negative decision from the president. Both sets of procedures ask for an attempt to settle informally. E.O. 301 (sections 1.1 and 4.0) suggests that good faith efforts should continually be made. Article 16 (sections 16.10 and 16.11) requires a meeting with the president to discuss a potential grievance.

Both procedures require formal filing.
E.O. 301

A notice of grievance and proposed remedy (section 7.2) followed by a supplemental notice of grievance (section 7.3). The latter is to detail the grounds for grievance and may consist of a simple listing of alleged infractions.

The major difference is that Article 16 requires the grievant's entire case (description, evidence, and arguments) to be provided prior to the establishment of a Peer Grievance Committee or an Arbitration Panel. E.O. 301 allows the case to be developed during the hearings and presented to the Grievance Committee.

Following filing, Article 16 offers either, but not both, of the two options by which the grievance is to be heard. These are the Peer Committee Review and Arbitration. There are subtle differences in the wording of the two (sections 16.13 and 16.14), e.g., unjustified decisions versus unreasonable decisions. It is not clear whether these subtle differences are intended to offer directions as to which option is to be used. With E.O. 301, filing was followed by the establishment of a Grievance Committee.

GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

Establishment: A panel consisting of no less than 25% of all full-time faculty served as a pool (3.4). A list of potential members of a particular grievance committee was drawn from this pool (8.2). Each party, grievant or administrator, with or without cause, could strike names (8.3).

The major differences are that E.O. 301 provided a potentially large and diverse pool, and permitted parties to challenge the committee make-up. Article 16 requires a previous affiliation, allows for the current practice of restricting the pool size, and offers no provisions to alter the make-up of the committee for reasons of cause or otherwise.

CASE PRESENTATION

E.O. 301

Witnesses: all on duty persons except the president are expected to serve if requested (10.10).

ARTICLE 16

In addition to a notice and statement of alleged violations, sections 16.16 and 16.17 require documentation, materials, and records necessary for a complete understanding of the grievance.

Witnesses: no provisions.
E.O. 301

Chairperson: Section 10.10 defines the duties of the chair.

Hearing: may be open or closed (10.4, 10.5, 10.6).

Attendance: presence of both parties required during the presentation of evidence (10.9).

Rebuttal: Sections 10.9.3 and 10.9.4 allow for rebuttals to evidence, testimony, and arguments presented by both parties.

Tapes: Section 10.14 requires a tape recording of the hearing and gives the grievant access to the tapes.

Decision: is to be based upon materials, evidence, and arguments presented (11.2). To find in favor of the grievant, the grievant's case must be in preponderance (51%).

Both E.O. 301 and Article 16 require reports and recommendations to be made to the president. With Article 16, no further avenues are available to the grievant. On the other hand, E.O. 301 allows the grievant to pursue Arbitration if the president disagrees with the Grievance Committee's recommendations (13.1). Article 16 provides arbitration as an avenue only in lieu of the Peer Grievance Option. Both E.O. 301 and Article 16 have specific procedures by which the arbitration agency is selected. Essential differences lie in the make-up of the Arbitration Panel, evidence to be considered, and the nature of awards.

ARTICLE 16

Chairperson: No provisions.

Hearing: apparently restricted to closed hearings (16.23 - 16.26).

Attendance: the grievant may meet with the committee to present issues (16.24). Note, evidence had already been presented at filing. An administrator may meet with the committee (16.25).

Rebuttal: Since the grievant's total case is made available at the time of filing, the administrators meeting with the committee could be a means by which the administration provides a rebuttal to the grievant's case. However, no provisions are made for the grievant to rebut the administration's arguments. In fact, the grievant may never be apprised of administration arguments.

Tapes: Article 16 does not really allow for a hearing as such. No provisions are made for recording any committee sessions.

Decision: is to be based upon evidence and presentations of both parties (16.26). The level of persuasion is not addressed.
E.O. 301

Make-up: Arbitration is to be considered by an agency arbitrator (14.7, 15.2).

Decision: is to be based upon the Grievance Committee report, materials considered by the Committee, Tapes, and the President's written decision (15.3).

Binding of Award: yes (15.9).

Nature of Award: may include retention, tenure, and promotion (15.7).

ARTICLE 16

Make-up: The arbitration panel consists of an agency arbitrator, administration representative, and a CFA representative (16.3).

Decision: is to be based upon evidence and arguments presented by both parties. This includes the filing package and testimony of witnesses called before the Panel (16.40).

Since membership is not otherwise defined, any or all members could be attorneys.

Binding of Award: yes (16.39).

Nature of Award: Section 16.38c specifically excludes retention, tenure, and promotion.

E.O. 301 allowed for the grievant to be apprised of the basis for the administration's case and for the grievant to prepare a rebuttal to this. This PRC provided the service of investigating possible infractions of the consultative process. Having access to other files (CAM 341.1A, paragraph 4), and interviews with all concerned parties, the PRC could make determinations of probable cause for grievance. This service may have alleviated unnecessary grievances by providing the relative merits of each party's positions. In addition, CAM provided avenues by which a candidate could gain a better understanding of the administration's position and by which he/she could respond to it. For example, CAM 341.1E required the administration to seek amplification. Cam 342.2, paragraph 2g, required the administration to meet with the candidate should the dean's recommendation have differed from the department's. The Unit 3 Contract does not have such provisions. It only provides for the candidate to respond to a recommendation (which may not be stated explicitly), by adding to the promotion package. With the Unit 3 Contract, grievance is the only method provided whereby disputes may be settled. Here, the grievant has limited access to information and evidence, and may never be apprised of the administration's actual case. Thus given the limitations of the Unit 3 Contract, the investigative efforts of the PRC could provide valuable services not otherwise available to both the administration and candidate.
The Past, Present, and Future Role of the PRC

Information from the Archives and Senate Office files indicate the following:

1. The present PRC has been in existence, with some variations in its charge, since 1968;

2. During this time, the purpose of the Committee has been to:
   a. Review personnel actions taken in regard to promotions, reappointments, tenure, termination and sabbatical leave decisions, at the request of the individuals affected by such decisions, to determine if the proper procedures were followed;
   b. Review school and departmental personnel policies to determine if there are procedural irregularities, ambiguities, or other factors that lessen the objectivity with which such personnel decisions are made.

3. At all times, the role of the PRC has been advisory, to call attention to defects which may bias personnel considerations with the hope that such irregularities may be corrected. While it is difficult to measure the success of the PRC in quantitative terms vis-a-vis individual personnel actions, the Committee can properly claim to have instigated personnel policy reforms over the years;

4. Both variations and inadequacies in record keeping make it difficult to construct a won-lost tally for those faculty who have aired their cases before the PRC. Because different administrators react differently to PRC recommendations, the extent of PRC influence is unknown. For example, while an individual who has been turned down for promotion may get a favorable response by the PRC in terms of how the nonpromotion decision was reached, that individual may not be granted promotion by the University president in that promotion cycle, but may be promoted the next. Moreover, the PRC report may be of major or minimal consequence if a grievance is filed;

5. The PRC contacts individuals who have been adversely affected by personnel decisions to inquire as to whether they want the PRC to investigate the decision. Many faculty accept this opportunity while others do not. The PRC records are incomplete over the years to show (1) those adversely affected by personnel decisions; (2) the number who contact the PRC; (3) the PRC recommendation; and (4) the final action by the University president;

6. A strong case can be made that the PRC provides a useful function in its review of personnel policy documents; the PRC serves a symbolic role in that it does call attention to administrators of irregular procedures; second, it informs faculty that proper procedures have been followed--this is a safety valve role which is important; based on how University presidents have subscribed to PRC recommendations in personnel action disputes, the effectiveness of the Committee is less tenable. Since the power of the PRC is only advisory, it would be futile to measure its success by a ratio of recommended actions accepted by the University president.
7. The new CFA contract obviously lessens the influence of the PRC on this campus in personnel actions since it effectively eliminates the advisory role played by the PRC since 1968. This notwithstanding, however, the PRC may continue to provide a useful function for both faculty and administration on this campus by reviewing departmental/school policies relating to promotions, reappointments, tenure, termination and sabbatical leave decisions. The major benefit of such an advisory review would be to call attention to procedural defects in the policies evident by irregular standards or ambiguous language.

A vote of the PRC on October 21, 1983 indicated that a majority of our committee favored (8 yes, 4 no, 2 absent) the continuation of the PRC in its traditional role. We, therefore, recommend that the Academic Senate call upon the President to activate the PRC for the 1983-1984 academic year, conferring upon it the same powers of investigation it has had in the past.
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RESOLUTION ON SCHEDULE OF CURRICULUM REVIEW

Development of curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty of each department. Obviously, the faculty of each department has the expertise and experience to develop the curriculum that will allow their students to get a well-balanced education in their chosen field. The decisions made by one department concerning faculty may impact on other departments within the University. It is important that a mechanism exists for the review of curriculum by the University faculty as a whole.

In the past the curriculum review process did not allow sufficient time for interaction between departments to take place. Often when problems or conflicts existed there was not enough time for the faculty involved to find solutions to the problems. When problems are not resolved by the faculty, decisions are often made by the administration, thus taking important curriculum matters out of the hands of the faculty. The following resolution proposes a change in the calendar of curriculum review which will hopefully result in an improved curriculum review process.

WHEREAS, The faculty in each department have been and must continue to be responsible for the development and evolution of their respective curriculum; and

WHEREAS, There is a need for greater interactions between departments concerning curriculum matters; be it therefore

RESOLVED: The administration of California Polytechnic State University adopt the following curriculum review calendar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>PROPOSED DATE</th>
<th>EXISTING DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>School Deans</td>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>3/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Deans</td>
<td>Academic Senate &amp; Academic Affairs</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>4/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate &amp; Academic Affairs</td>
<td>University President</td>
<td>6/15</td>
<td>6/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the above calendar the following schedule would be followed within the Academic Senate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>Curriculum packages to Curriculum Committee (CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25</td>
<td>Outline of curriculum changes from CC to all Senators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3/25 - completion of
review

Review of curriculum by CC with input
from Senators

5/1-6/10

Recommendation from CC to Academic Senate

The above process will allow all the Academic Senators to review curriculum changes early in the Spring Quarter as the Curriculum Committee begins its review process. Having early access to an outline of the proposed changes would allow time for all faculty to assess the impact of those changes on their own programs. The above schedule will also allow for a greater period of time during which problems can be expressed and problems solved by the faculty concerned.

Those problems which remain unsolved by the time the Academic Senate considers the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee could be brought to the floor of the Senate by the Curriculum Committee or by concerned faculty.
RESOLUTION ON COURSE CHANGE PROPOSALS

A part of the curriculum review process that is time consuming and critical is the consideration of changes to existing courses. Justification is required for new courses but not for changes in existing courses, yet some changes to existing courses can be significant and have impact on other degree programs. To assure that the review process by the Academic Senate includes considering changes to existing courses, the following resolution is proposed.

WHEREAS, The evolution of programs here at Cal Poly requires the periodic changes to existing courses; and

WHEREAS, The changes to existing courses may at times affect other programs at Cal Poly and those proposed changes should be carefully reviewed by the Academic Senate; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Office of the Provost develop and require the use of a "Course Change Proposal" form when the course change proposal includes a name description, prerequisite, or unit change. The form should include information such as the reason for the proposed change, whether the course is a duplication or approximation of courses now being offered, whether the course is a required or elective course for any major outside the department proposing the change, information relative to staffing if the change included a unit change, and new facilities, materials, and equipment that might be required if the change is implemented.
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RESOLUTION ON GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERING COURSE DUPLICATION

WHEREAS, It is desirable to avoid considerable course duplication; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the following procedure should be followed by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee when new courses or course revisions are proposed that appear to duplicate existing courses.

A. The Curriculum Committee will study the following for the courses that appear to be presenting duplicate coverage.
   1. Course descriptions.
   2. Texts.
   3. Expanded course outlines.
   4. Course syllabi.

B. If as a result of the study of the above, duplication is thought to be significant, the Curriculum Committee will proceed as follows.
   1. Consult with the instructors who teach or will teach the courses involved to see if an agreement can be reached that will avoid significant duplication. (This may involve changes in the course descriptions, etc.).
   2. If the problem is not resolved by Step 1, refer the matter to the appropriate Academic Coordination and Liaison Council (if such are established and one exists for the courses in question)

   or

   consult with the department heads and/or deans concerned.

   3. Study the information obtained from the above steps and make a recommendation to the Academic Senate. The Curriculum Committee should keep records of the consultations and any agreements reached. Copies of any agreements regarding course coverage should be sent to the departments concerned.
STATEMENT GOVERNING THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT
AT
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN LUIS OBISPO

This statement is intended to define Cal Poly's philosophy on involvement in international development activities and to describe parameters for expanding this involvement within the instructional setting. It proposes renewed and focused activity in the area of international development. Such activity can lead to an enhanced awareness of the important role the nation plays as a member of the international community.

I. Background

California Polytechnic State University has had a long history of international development activity. The University first became involved in participant training activities in the early 1950's. Groups of students sponsored by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Agency for International Development (AID), and the governments of developing countries themselves, came from all over the world for specifically structured learning activities or degree programs. During the height of this era, there were as many as 100 sponsored international students on campus at a time.

In 1963, Cal Poly signed its first contract with AID to send faculty overseas. A team went to Zambia (then Northern Rhodesia) to assist in the development of the College of Further Education. AID had solicited campus interest in the contract because it believed that Cal Poly's "learn by doing" philosophy could form the basis of a workable technical education program.

From this beginning, several contracts were signed with AID in the mid- to late sixties to establish programs in other less developed countries. Cal
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Poly's reputation became established for its unique contributions in the international arena. Development teams helped several countries set up practical training programs that would not only endure but also show quick results in the field.

In the mid 1970's, however, policy changes in both Washington, D.C. and California made continued involvement in international programs more difficult. In Washington, AID began to issue Requests For Proposals (RFP's) rather than sole source contracts for overseas work, and Cal Poly lost out in a competitive process that seemed biased in favor of land-grant, research institutions. At home, increased enrollment led to the impacting of many majors and to the decision to limit admission of foreign students to those programs. As a result of these pressures, contract work overseas dwindled.

That is now in the past. The creation of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) has enhanced and broadened the role to be played by universities overseas and increased opportunities for post-secondary institutions like Cal Poly. The University's enrollment pattern in certain relevant areas, such as agriculture, now allows room for foreign students. Under new leadership, California Polytechnic State University is committed to a renewed and active role in international involvement and education.

II. Definition and Possible Modes of International Development

International development refers to activities which train the people of less developed countries in how to identify and analyze their own development problems and which help them devise tools and institutions so that they can carry on their own development after the departure of the assisting agency.

There are several modes of development activity for which Cal Poly has historical or institutional potential:

A. The education of international students at Cal Poly.
B. The offering of seminars, short courses, and workshops specifically designed for visitors from foreign countries.

C. The direct involvement of Cal Poly sponsored teams in various development projects in a foreign country. This involvement can range from training teachers and shaping practical agricultural education institutions to on-the-ground developing of farming systems. Any of these activities can profit from the broad range of practical skills and specializations of Cal Poly's faculty members and from their ability to work directly with farmers.

All of these modes can be carried out in cooperative agreements with public agencies and private voluntary organizations as well as through private entrepreneurial organizations. Each mode can involve institutional building and technology transfer, areas that are traditional strengths of Cal Poly.

III. Institutional Characteristics Supportive of International Involvement

The San Luis Obispo area has a climate similar in some important regards to the wet-dry cycling found in many less developed countries. This climatic characteristic is not shared by many universities with an agriculture program; the campus is therefore a good site for training the future leaders of less developed nations. Cal Poly's educational process, imbued with a "hands on" and "learn by doing" approach and backed with sound, academically based practical studies, prepares students to grapple realistically and creatively with the unpredictable problems they will face in development work. Cal Poly possesses a great amount of usable and practical knowledge that can benefit students from developing nations as well.

Cal Poly faculty members have demonstrated that they can work well with the kind of marginal facilities they will find in overseas situations. They also possess specialized, applied expertise, seldom found in other universities or less developed countries.
The campus also has ready support available through its multi-disciplinary International Food and Agricultural Committee. This committee, initiated in the School of Agriculture and Natural Resources, now includes faculty from several schools of the University. In addition, a great many "retired" faculty with prior international involvement live in the immediate area and can be available for assignments.

The Cal Poly Foundation can act as fiscal and organizational agent as programs are defined.

IV. Benefits of International Involvement

The learning experience at Cal Poly will be greatly enhanced by a renewed involvement in international programs. Through such a rebirth, students will become more aware of world issues and more sensitive to global interdependence in economic, political, and social areas. As students from California meet students from foreign countries, their mutual awareness will help break down the ethnocentrism that is a major source of world problems. The ultimate result must be a better informed, more aware, internationally sensitive and compassionate student body and alumni group.

Exposure to international activities can help Cal Poly faculty focus more effectively on real-world problems and the solutions to those problems, thereby strengthening the "learn by doing" educational philosophy. International activities will help promote a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic orientation for which the campus seems ready. Faculty will be offered opportunities to develop appropriate technologies with applications both at home and abroad. Involvement can also give faculty managerial and administrative experience while providing more diverse and stimulating teaching experiences.

V. The Role of International Involvement

The benefits that can accrue to resident students and faculty indicate that an active pursuit of international activities can play an important role in the
cultural development of the institution and in the continued professional development of its faculty. This philosophy statement therefore asserts that international involvement by Cal Poly's faculty constitutes an important form of professional development and is to be encouraged. As faculty pursue these activities, it is expected that their leadership will result in a transformation of campus attitudes towards international involvement.

VI. Policies in Support of International Involvement

Cal Poly is committed to pursuing an active role in international involvement. That commitment has the support of the school deans, the Provost, and the President. To give focus to this intention, the following goals are initiated:

A. Schools and departments should, as appropriate, incorporate into their philosophy, mission, and goal statements references to their commitment and potential contribution to international involvement.

B. Deans and department heads should show a willingness to bring students and faculty from foreign countries into their educational programs. The presence of international students and faculty on campus can be a visible sign of departmental and school commitments to international involvement.

C. Administrators should demonstrate their awareness of the positive contribution of international involvement to the campus by supporting their faculty's efforts professionally, physically, and psychologically. This support is essential both during the faculty member's personal and professional preparation prior to contract work as well as while he or she is overseas.

D. Faculty who anticipate working on overseas contracts should prepare themselves in advance as knowledgeable not only in the technical aspects of their discipline but also in the cultural and linguistic aspects of the less developed countries. Interest in international involvement
also implies a willingness to respond to the intense planning and writing demands inherent in responding to Requests For Proposals.

E. The curriculum may be augmented and modified as necessary to accommodate this new emphasis.

F. Efforts to conduct research related to international involvement should be encouraged and promoted.

G. As facilities are renovated and resources are improved, consideration should be given to ways in which those changes could accommodate instruction in innovative agricultural techniques learned through foreign as well as domestic contact.

H. Programs should be actively sought to offer specialized education to international visitors through intensive short courses or extended seminars given during intersessions and summer periods.

I. Liaison should be developed with selected private organizations, both for-profit and not-for-profit, which directly participate in the development process of less developed countries. Cal Poly should seek to undertake training and other support functions in cooperation with these private enterprises. Cal Poly's graduate training program in international agriculture should include in its priorities preparing students for opportunities offered by private international development organizations.

J. Cal Poly's multidisciplinary character should be drawn upon to provide the flexible development skills needed to produce programs which will be sustainable by the international farming community. This can call for contributions from the social, political, and management disciplines, among others.

We are constantly reminded that the world is becoming smaller and smaller, and that the concerns of less developed countries are intimately ours as well. As Cal Poly continues to mature as an institution, it is important that we make a conscious effort to bring this awareness to our students. This statement and these goals are intended to be a milestone in that effort and renewed commitment.