CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

Academic Senate Agenda
February 11, 1986
U.U. 220 - 1500-1700

I. MINUTES:

Approval of the January 14, 1986 Academic Senate Minutes (attached pp. 2-6)

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

III. REPORTS:

A. President/Provost
B. Statewide Senators
C. Governmental Affairs Specialist - Weatherby (attached p. 7)

IV. BUSINESS ITEMS:

A. Resolution on Lead Time for Consultation - Kersten, for Executive Committee (attached p. 8)
B. Resolution on Senior Projects - Cooper, Caucus Chair for SOSAM (attached p. 9)
C. Resolution on Facilitating Curriculum Planning - Williamson, Chair of Curriculum Committee (attached p. 10)
D. Resolution on Distribution of Copies of Catalog Materials - Williamson, Chair of Curriculum Committee (attached p. 11)
E. Resolution on Guidelines for Breadth in New Bachelor's Degree Majors - Williamson, Chair of Curriculum Committee (attached pp. 12-16)
F. Resolution on List of Proposed Changes in the Curriculum for New Catalogs for Use by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee - Williamson, Chair of Curriculum Committee (attached pp. 17-19)
G. Resolution on Accuracy in Academia - Kersten, for the Executive Committee (attached p. 20)
H. Resolution to Establish Standing Committee on Status of Women - Rogalla, Chair of Ad Hoc Committee on Women's Issues (attached p. 21)
I. Resolution on Bylaws for the Status of Women Standing Committee, Rogalla, Chair of Constitution & Bylaws Committee (attached pp. 22-23)
J. Resolution on Use of Lottery Funds - McNeil, Chair of Ad Hoc Committee on Use of Lottery Funds (attached pp. 24-26)
K. Resolution on Assigned Time - Lamouria, Chair of Academic Senate (attached pp. 27-28)

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

VI. ADJOURNMENT:
Memorandum

JAN 29 1986

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Joe Weatherby
    Political Science Department

Subject: CSU Governmental Affairs Specialist Meeting in Sacramento

The first meeting of the 19 campus Governmental Affairs representatives was held in the capitol building on January 21, 1986. We met with a number of state officials who outlined ways in which faculty concerns might be effectively articulated in Sacramento.

The campus representatives agreed to establish an informal network to be used to coordinate efforts on related issues. Several state issues that may be of interest to the local Senate include:

1. Concurrent Enrollment Funds

   The 1986-87 Department of Finance proposed budget proposes to deny the use of these funds to the CSU preferring to "return" them to the state general fund.

2. Governor's Budget

   Cut of $14,501,691 to CSU to cover price increases for utilities and communication costs.

3. Cut Governor's Budget infrastructure $39,504,095 on deferred maintenance that has occurred over the years.

If desired, I am willing to discuss these issues with the local Senate.

Finally, a request was made to the State Academic Senate Government Affairs Committee that they "red flag" government issues for local campus attention on a monthly basis. If this is done, I believe that the local Senate can play a more active role, rather than a reactive role, in dealing with legislative issues of interest to faculty.
WHEREAS, Effective collegial governance of the university requires extensive consultation between administration and faculty and students; and

WHEREAS, Effective consultation between the administration and faculty is often a time-consuming process; and

WHEREAS, The Statement on Collegiality adopted by the Academic Senate of the California State University urges that adequate time be provided for full consultation between the administration and faculty on matters of importance to the university; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, Cal Poly State University, urge the President, the Chancellor of the California State University, and the Board of Trustees, to ensure that adequate time be provided for full and meaningful consultation between administration and faculty on all matters of importance to the university in accordance with the spirit of the Board of Trustees' Statement on Collegiality.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo

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

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

AS—-86

RESOLUTION ON SENIOR PROJECT

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED: That this new policy take effect immediately.

Passed by Executive Committee on February 7, 1986. Proposed by Alan Cooper, Caucus Chair for SOSAM.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California
AS--86
RESOLUTION ON
FACILITATING CURRICULUM PLANNING

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee desires to assist the university departments in the orderly development of their curriculum and timely submission of their catalog proposals; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee has encountered differing emphasis of existing curriculum regulations in different catalog cycles; and

WHEREAS, Curriculum development and catalog proposal regulations are changed by the Chancellor’s Office; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee prepare a memorandum reporting the results of consultations with the Vice Provost's Office, and any other information past catalog cycles have shown to be pertinent, for distribution to the university departments by the fifth week of the Spring Quarter; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the memorandum will include a statement encouraging departments to consult in the early stages of their curriculum planning with other departments that will be affected by their curriculum changes, and describing the benefits such consultation can have on subsequent catalog proposals; and be it further

RESOLVED: That in the Fall Quarter of the school year when catalog proposals are due, a representative from the Vice Provost's Office and each school representative on the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee will meet with the chair of the school curriculum committee of his/her respective school and a representative of each of the departments in that school to discuss preparation of catalog proposals.

Passed by Executive Committee on February 4, 1986. Proposed by Daniel Williamson, Chair of Curriculum Committee.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-—-86

RESOLUTION ON
DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES OF CATALOG MATERIALS

WHEREAS, It is important for copies of the proposed catalog changes received from the academic schools to be available as soon as possible to the faculty in order to learn of changes being proposed by other schools and departments; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate request the Vice Provost of Academic Programs, when compiling the needed number of copies of catalog proposals, ask for enough copies so that one copy can be placed in the Reserve Room of the campus library to be available to all faculty; and be it further

RESOLVED: That copies of the proposals be distributed to the library and to the deans at the same time they are distributed to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee.

Passed by Executive Committee on February 4, 1986. Proposed by Daniel Williamson, Chair of Curriculum Committee.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-____-86

RESOLUTION ON
GUIDELINES FOR BREADTH IN NEW BACHELOR'S DEGREE MAJORS

WHEREAS, The Chancellor's Office has prepared "Policy Guidelines for Breadth in New Bachelor's Degree Majors" which offer campuses guidance on review of such proposals; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate CSU recommends that each campus use these guidelines when approving new degree programs; and

WHEREAS, The pressures toward narrow specialization in New Bachelor's Degree Programs are of particular concern to a polytechnic university; and

WHEREAS, It is essential that the bachelor's degree not sacrifice comprehensiveness and durability for the enhancement of immediate employability; and

WHEREAS, Opportunity for narrow specialization is available through graduate study or through options or concentrations within degree programs at California Polytechnic State University; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University of San Luis Obispo in all reviews of new degree programs endorse the use of the "Policy Guidelines for Breadth in New Bachelor's Degree Majors" in a manner consistent with our mission as a polytechnic university.

Passed by Executive Committee on February 4, 1986. Proposed by Daniel Williamson, Chair of Curriculum Committee.
POLICY GUIDELINES FOR BREADTH IN NEW BACHELOR'S DEGREE MAJORS

Each California State University annually updates its Academic Master Plan—a five-year projection of new degree majors. Recent plans have revealed a trend toward creating new bachelor's degree majors from fields previously offered as specializations within broader subjects. The trend is observable in professional and liberal arts disciplines alike. For example, unique degrees in Small Business Management, previously a subset of Business, and in Publishing and Editing, traditionally part of English majors, have been among those proposed. There is a potential problem if the increasing specialization works against achieving some of the other expressed goals for the bachelor's degree; if it limits students' options in a changing environment; and if, as a result, it does not serve students or society well.

The purpose of this paper is to address one aspect of specialization in bachelor's degrees, namely the development of new degree majors that are highly specialized in title, content, or both. The paper proposes some guidelines for campus use in reviewing Academic Master Plan proposals for bachelor's degree majors when those majors are in specialized subjects not generally or previously offered as majors in four-year colleges. Campuses may wish to add to these guidelines some of their own guidelines relating to specialization in options and concentrations.

Reasons for Increasing Specialization

Advances in knowledge typically cause changes in academic discipline content and structure and sometimes lead to whole new configurations. Some changes are critical to the vitality of the academic enterprise. But it appears that the current trend has among its causes several that are unrelated to a conception of the best ordering of knowledge or optimal ways of imparting values, understandings, theory and competence. The kind of specialization currently observable in new majors (and sometimes in changes within existing majors) appears instead to result from artificial pressures. Some of the pressures arise from business and industry and from public officials concerned about the state of local or regional economies. Some arise from within the university by those anxious to provide an apparent variety of choice in curriculum without major resource expenditure or in response to enrollment pressures. But primarily the pressures are coming from students who associate
specialization of program title, content, or both, with enhanced employability or graduate school admission. In the fall of 1983, the annual ACE-UCLA national survey of freshmen revealed that the ability to get a better job was cited by freshmen more often (76.2% of respondents) than any other reason for attending college. Surveys of faculty have suggested a disjunction between faculty and students in this respect. However, there are genuine differences of opinion about the desirability of narrowing the focus of bachelor's degree majors. On the one hand, Bradford College president Art Levine has called the current curriculum a victim of the survival ethic. Others argue that most if not all important outcomes of college are independent of the major, and that any subject can be taught in ways that produce breadth and perspective.

The Problem

We assume that most students, while generally needing to update their specialized skills and knowledge from time to time, will nevertheless earn only one bachelor's degree in their lives. If we assume that the title and content of that degree continue to carry some kind of lifetime importance, then degree majors should be designed for comprehensiveness and durability—no matter how young or old the student. The comfort of knowing that there will be easy access to continuing education—the lifelong learning society—may lull us into neglecting responsibilities to ensure that the bachelor's degree major is as comprehensive and enduring as it can possibly be. Specialized programs that use identified occupations or skills as their titles and their knowledge bases may enhance immediate employability, but they probably do so at the expense of long term job satisfaction, adaptability, mobility, and employability. It may also be at the expense of limiting the broadening of perspectives which might enhance creativity or the ability to synthesize or to have enriched experiences in the work environment. Specialized programs not related to specific jobs may deny students both employability and breadth. This has always been the case, but it seems especially so given what we can reasonably expect of the future. The "post-industrial society," the "information economy," the "telecommunications age," and the "post-Gutenberg era" may be overused slogans, but they suggest something important about planning bachelor's degree majors: Imbuing the major with any kind of enduring value for students will require
more effort than ever. Even with that effort and with lifetime opportunities for continuing education, that durability is threatened. It has been speculated that within a few decades, everyone in the country will have access to nearly all accumulated information and knowledge. That is good news for those who value knowledge and learning. But even if general education programs succeed in imparting the understandings and skills needed by students to sort and use these quantities of information, we have not done enough for students or for society.

Steven Muller, President of the Johns Hopkins University, has wondered: "If we are serious about educating people to solve problems, is there anything left that enables people to integrate what they know, because we have compartmentalized knowledge so much? Are we in danger of having people who can manipulate data and hide it in compartmentalized ways?"

Some Topics for Discussion

While there are some convincing arguments for durability in the names and the content of bachelor's degree majors, there are some questions and issues which have no easy answers. Some question that the bachelor's degree will survive as currently structured, yet proposals for new majors appear regularly and must be reviewed conscientiously. If knowledge "keeps no better than fish." can we develop and state any reasonable expectations about the durability of the major for any given student? Can expectations about comprehensiveness be framed? What are our obligations to students, many of whom will not again be able or willing to invest the concentrated time required to complete a major? What guidelines will campus faculty use in deciding what kinds of majors should lead to the bachelor's degree? When majors are proposed which have not previously been offered at four-year colleges, what criteria shall be applied to determine their propriety? Can some common understandings, theories, and contexts be identified for these decisions? At least a short list would include the ability to develop and extend knowledge in the discipline--beyond existing limits.

Review Guidelines

Guidelines are needed for campus review of new academic master plan proposals, and those suggested here could be profitably refined after thoughtful campus discussion. The following guidelines are tentatively suggested for situations involving
the elevation of options or specializations to degree status or for cases where highly specialized degrees not usually offered in four-year institutions are under consideration. The guidelines assume that "broadly based degrees of high academic quality" remain the norm in The California State University, and that specialized degree programs are added only when there is compelling academic rationale to add them.

1. Are there alternative curricular structures that would better serve the purposes proposed?—i.e., should the subject be offered as a certificate, a minor, or an option or concentration? Is the subject matter sufficiently complex to consider offering the program as a master's degree only? Might it be appropriate as a post-baccalaureate certificate?

2. Is there a body of knowledge which has become so sizable that unique degree status is a consequence of advancement of knowledge?

3. If the proposed degree program is preparatory to a specific occupation:
   a. Is the occupation likely to exist over the lifetime of the student?
   b. What is the probable lifetime of the knowledge or information that will be imparted in this major? Is the answer one that is satisfactory to the University?

4. Is the preparation narrowly conceived? If so, are there ways that preparation (and title) can be broadened?

5. Is the major accurately named?—i.e., is the title so narrow that it unnecessarily restricts student employment opportunities and mobility?

6. Does the major use as its foundation and prerequisites the methods, processes, skills and knowledge of a core or basic academic discipline? If not, should it be offered at all?

7. Is the size of the major and degree of specialization going to be such as to call into question the broadly based nature of the bachelor's degree itself?

8. What provisions have been made to insure continued breadth in the major?

Division of Educational Programs and Resources
August 1984
Revised February 1985
RESOLUTION ON LIST OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE CURRICULUM FOR NEW CATALOGS FOR USE BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, The proposed changes for a new catalog and their justifications typically constitute many pages; and

WHEREAS, Even a list of the proposed changes from one school may require several pages; and

WHEREAS, The early preparation of a list of changes for distribution to the members of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee for their study is more economical in regard to time and money than having each member prepare his/her own list and allows the committee members more time for evaluating the merits of proposed changes and the necessary interaction with the departments and schools concerning them; and

WHEREAS, Since only the Chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee receives any released time for work on the committee and the amount of released time does not nearly equal the time required to prepare a list of the changes, and since both the faculty and the administration need such a list as they study the proposed catalog changes; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate request a person familiar with curricular matters in the Office of the Vice Provost of Academic Programs, have the responsibility of preparing the list of changes. The list should be in a format useful for review by the Academic Senate. (For example, see the accompanying sheet showing the format used for the list in 1985.) In order to meet the time schedule of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee as it reviews the catalog proposals, the list of changes for one or two schools should be ready a few days after
RESOLUTION ON LIST OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE CURRICULUM FOR NEW CATALOGS FOR USE BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

the catalog proposals are received by the Vice Provost from the schools. Lists of changes from other schools should be available as needed by the time schedule of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee. The Vice Provost’s Office will be kept informed of the time schedule by the Chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee.

Passed by Executive Committee on February 4, 1986. Proposed by Daniel Williamson, Chair of Curriculum Committee.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ACADEMIC SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE FOR PROPOSED CURRICULAR CHANGES FOR THE 1986-1988 CATALOG FROM
THE SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES & EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>C/S</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>title</td>
<td>units</td>
<td>course staffing</td>
<td>approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>mode</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Professional Studies and Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ADD MINOR and CERTIFICATE program in Gerontology. Interdisciplinary, but will be under aegis of the Dean's office in the School of Professional Studies and Education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ED 402 Field Experience in Elementary School Reading (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ED 404 Field Experience in Secondary School Reading (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ED 406 Teaching the Adolescent (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ED 407 Teaching Language Arts in the Elementary School (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ED 408 Teaching Science &amp; Social Studies in the Elementary School (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ED 409 Teaching in the Secondary School (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ED 410 Preliminary Student Teaching (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ED 411 Organization &amp; Management in the Elementary Sch. (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ED 500 Individual Study (1-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ED 501 Problems &amp; Practices in Curriculum Development (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ED 503 Seminar in Language Arts Curriculum &amp; Methods (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ED 504 Seminar in Science Curriculum &amp; Methods (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. ED 505 Seminar in Social Studies Curriculum &amp; Methods (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ED 506 Models of Instruction (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ED 546 Teaching Strategies for the Severely Handicapped (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ED 556 Minority Counseling (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ED 558 Appraising Career Development (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ED 559 Academic Counseling (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ED 559 Career Education (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ED 565 Diagnosis &amp; Treatment Planning (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Co-listed as PSY 565)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 569 Practicum in Counseling (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. ED 570 Nonsexist &amp; Relationship Counseling (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. ED 571 Advanced Marriage, Family &amp; Child Counseling (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. ED 599 Thesis or Project (3) (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly State University consistently has defended academic freedom and responsibility within The California State University system; and

WHEREAS, A new obstacle to academic freedom is an organization entitled "Accuracy in Academia" which has emerged in California and in the rest of the nation; and

WHEREAS, This organization intends to monitor faculty classroom statements "for liberal bias"; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly State University oppose the efforts of "Accuracy in Academia" because it endangers academic freedom and responsibility; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly State University also urge the President of the University to oppose the efforts of "Accuracy in Academia".

Proposed and Passed by Executive Committee on February 7, 1986
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNICAL STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background:
The Ad Hoc Committee on Women's Issues has deliberated and unanimously agreed a standing committee of the Academic Senate be established. Status of Women Committee is a proper title for the committee. The committee is envisioned to be an on-campus focal point for issues of special importance to women. It will fill a void in our current structure.

AS—86

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH STANDING COMMITTEE ON STATUS OF WOMEN

WHEREAS, No central point exists on this campus for collection and dissemination of information concerning issues of importance to women; and

WHEREAS, This campus lacks a women's studies academic program and a women's studies resource center; and

WHEREAS, No mechanism exists for counseling and advising women reentering the work force nor to prepare alumnae for entry into non-traditional fields; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate establish a standing committee to be identified as Status of Women Committee.

Additional Recommendation:

It is suggested that several members of the Ad Hoc Committee for Women be included on the standing committee for this school year. In subsequent years, the committee will be peopled in the traditional manner for all standing committees. The following have agreed to serve if asked:

Person                School/PCS
Nancy C. Morris       Agriculture
Kathryn Foster        Architecture & Environmental Design
Artemis Papakyriazis  Business
Kathleen M. Lant      Communicative Arts and Humanities
Nan A. Byars          Engineering
Lynn M. Jamieson      Professional Studies & Education
Roxy L. Peck          Science & Mathematics
Nancy E. Loe          Professional Consultative Services
Angela M. Estes       Part-Time

Passed by Executive Committee on February 4, 1986. Proposed by John Rogalla, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Women's Issues.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background: Accompanying the adoption of the Resolution to Establish Standing Committee on Status of Women is the following Resolution on Bylaws for the Status of Women standing committee of the Academic Senate, which provides for the bylaw provision of a standing committee on the status of women.

AS-____-86

RESOLUTION ON
BYLAWS FOR THE STATUS OF WOMEN
STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

WHEREAS, The Resolution to Establish Standing Committee on Status of Women (AS-____-86) was adopted on ____________, 1986, recommending the establishment of a standing committee to be identified as the Status of Women Committee; therefore, be it,

RESOLVED: That the following changes be made to the Academic Senate Bylaws of Cal Poly, establishing the membership and charge of the Status of Women (standing) Committee:

VII. COMMITTEES

H. STANDING COMMITTEES

14. Status of Women Committee
14.---Student Affairs---
15. Student Affairs
VII. COMMITTEES

I. COMMITTEE DESCRIPTIONS

14. Status of Women Committee

a. Membership

The ex-officio members of the Status of Women Committee shall be the Student Affairs officer or his/her designee, a part-time faculty member to be appointed by the Chair of the Academic Senate with approval of the Executive Committee, and one ASI representative.

b. Responsibilities

The Status of Women Committee shall be responsible for reviewing the recommendations on resolutions passed by the CSU Commission on the Status of Women. The committee also shall respond to issues that concern women on campus.

15. Student Affairs

Passed by Executive Committee on February 4, 1986. Proposed by John Rogalla, Chair of Constitution & Bylaws Committee.
Background:
Following a request from Vice Chancellor Dale Hanner for campus counsel on lottery funds, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Use of Lottery Funds was established by the Academic Senate Chair.

Guidelines Used in Preparing Report:
The possible uses of lottery funds were developed (insofar as was feasible), consistent with:

- President Baker's October 10, 1985 address "Cal Poly and California in the Next Decade"

- The Trustees' Statement on Collegiality, dated September 18, 1985

- Restrictions outlined by Vice Chancellor Hanner in his December 12, 1985 letter to CSU presidents, particularly that the Lottery Act declares it is the intent "that the net revenues of the California State Lottery shall not be used as substitute funds but rather shall supplement the total amount of money allocated for public education in California...." and that "...all funds allocated from the California State Lottery Education Fund shall be used exclusively for the education of pupils and students and no funds shall be spent for acquisition of real property, construction of facilities, financing of research or any other non-instructional purpose...."

The Committee was guided but not bound by limitations on uses which were called to the attention of the Committee. The reason for this approach was that in order to achieve goal attainment, it may be necessary to strongly support needs which are outside of announced guidelines.

General Statements and Recommendations:
Allocation of funds at School/Departmental levels should be flexible and administered within the guidelines of this document.

The review process for allocation should be ongoing to ensure that funds are utilized according to stated guidelines. Faculty participation in the review process is essential.

The issue of campus procedures for allocation needs to be addressed. The Committee feels that this may be even more important than developing a list of possible uses of lottery funds. This task may be most suitable for the Academic Senate Budget Committee.
Consideration should be given to setting lottery money aside in an endowment fund until procedures are developed on each campus as to where to allocate the money and what the procedures for allocation will be.

The list of possible uses of lottery funds presented is not all inclusive and should be subject to review and change.

AS—86

RESOLUTION ON USE OF LOTTERY FUNDS

WHEREAS, Lottery funds should be supplemental to normal budgeted educational activities; and

WHEREAS, Allocation of funds at School/Departmental levels should be flexible; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate urge President Warren J. Baker, to support the following seven, non-prioritized uses of lottery funds (with examples in each category):

1. Center (non-specified) or Centers of Excellence for Undergraduate and/or Graduate Studies

2. Endowments
   Professional Chairs
   Visiting Lecturers
   Sponsored Symposia
   Women’s Center

3. Graduate Program Development and Implementation
   Teaching Assistantships
   Research Assistantships
   Graduate Thesis Project Support

4. Learning Assistance Activities
   Peer Tutoring Support
   Computer Assisted Information Retrieval
   Funding for Diagnostic and Placement Testing through the Testing Center
5. Professional Development
   Teaching Methodology Improvement
   In-State and Out-of-State Travel to Attend
   Seminars and for Presentation of Papers
   Conference Fees
   Information Transfer
   Preparation and Publication of Papers
   Information Retrieval

6. Staff Enrichment
   Substitute Teachers
   Release Time
   Instructionally Related
   Teaching Advancement
   University Enhancement
   Additional Staffing to Keep Class Size Down
   Compensation for Overload Teaching

7. Teaching Program Enrichment
   Student Assistants
   Field Trip Support
   Senior Project Support
   Internships
   Outreach
   Supervision
   Cooperative Education
   Outreach
   Supervision
   Instructional Materials Production and Acquisition

Proposed by:
Robert McNeil, Chair
Ad Hoc Committee on Use
of Lottery Funds
Background:

The historical level of assigned time support for the Academic Senate has and continues to be 0.4 FTEF. Exceptions have occurred. There is a long and unbroken record of requests from former Senate chairs to administration explaining the need for recognition and the essentiality of increasing the FTEF for both the Senate chair and other functions. In June, November and again in December 1985, attempts (including a Senate Executive Committee resolution to the President) were all unsuccessful in an attempt to increase assistance for the current year.

Your present Senate Chair worked half time this past summer without recompense. Since September 1, 1985, he has, and continues to devote full time to the Senate on an allocation of 0.4 FTEF. The contribution of several of the standing committee chairs is also excessive and with no assigned time.

The need of Academic Senates is recognized state wide. The CSU Academic Senate per Resolution AS-1634-86/FA has urged the Chancellor to adequately support local academic senates.

For comparison purposes, data supplied by Dr. Joan G. Schroeder*, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU, Fresno, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FRESNO</th>
<th>CAL POLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Support</td>
<td>OA II, 12 mo</td>
<td>CA II, 12 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Support</td>
<td>CA III, 10 mo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Chair</td>
<td>0.75 FTEF</td>
<td>0.4 FTEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Other</td>
<td>1.25 FTEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reconfirmed February 6, 1986
WHEREAS, The charge by the Board of Trustees to both the Academic Senate and Administration is shared decision making and complementary achievement; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees in their Statement on Collegiality assigned prime collegial governance responsibilities to faculty; and

WHEREAS, Implementation of faculty prime collegial governance responsibilities requires significant staff and FTEF support; and

WHEREAS, Included in the document, Administration of General Education and Breadth, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, and approved by President Baker on April 4, 1984, is the statement that the Chair of the General Education and Breadth Committee shall receive appropriate assigned time; and

WHEREAS, It is feasible for the President to increase Academic Senate assigned time for both Spring 1985 and beyond; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That President Warren J. Baker be urged to support the following requests for assigned time to better facilitate Academic contributions to campus governance:

1. Effective Spring Quarter 1986
   - 0.5 FTEF for Senate Chair versus current 0.4 FTEF
   - 0.5 FTEF for other Senate needs (assignments based upon recommendation of Academic Senate Executive Committee to the Provost)

2. Effective Summer Quarter 1986
   - 0.25 FTEF for Senate Chair

3. Effective for Fall, Winter, Spring 1986-87
   - 0.75 FTEF for Senate Chair
   - 1.25 FTEF for other Senate needs (assignments based upon recommendation of Academic Senate Executive Committee to the Provost)

Proposed by:
Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate
February 6, 1986