CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO
Academic Senate Agenda
April 22, 1986
U.U. 220 - 3:00-5:00 p.m.

I. MINUTES:
   Approval of the April 1, 1986 and April 8, 1986 Academic Senate Minutes
   (attached pp. 2-13).

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS:
   The Foundation Board is now placing a copy of their agenda on reserve in the
   Kennedy Library for faculty and Senate review.

   Building numbers will be added to all buildings on campus along with the name of
   the building.

III. REPORTS:
   A. President/Provost
   B. Statewide Senators

IV. BUSINESS ITEMS:
   A. Procedural Changes for the MPPP Awards - Andrews, Chair of Personnel
   B. Resolution on Giving of Finals During Finals' Week - Hewitt, Chair of
      Instruction Committee, Second Reading, (attached p. 17) (Terry’s proposed
      amendment to this resolution attached as p. 18).
   C. Resolution on Amendments to Bylaws - Rogalla, Chair of Constitution &
      Bylaws Committee, Second Reading, (attached p. 19).
   D. Joint Report and Recommendations to Eliminate Discordant Provisions of the
      UPLC Bylaws, the Leave with Pay Guidelines and the Academic Senate Bylaws
      - Rogalla, Chair of Constitution & Bylaws Committee/Terry, Chair of
      University Professional Leave Committee, First Reading, (attached pp. 20-24).
   E. Recommendations for Changes in the "Leave With Pay Guidelines" - Terry, Chair of
      University Professional Leave Committee, First Reading, (attached pp. 25-27).
   F. GE&B Report - Lewis, Chair of General Education & Breadth Committee, First
      Reading, (attached pp. 28-35):

         AE 121   Agricultural Mechanics
         CONS 120  Fisheries and Wildlife Management
         FOR 201  Forest Resources
         HE 203  Consumer Role of the Family
         HE 331  Household Equipment
         Bio Proposal  Re ENT/CONS Prefixes

   G. Items from April 15, 1986 Executive Committee Meeting

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

VI. ADJOURNMENT:
Date: February 12, 1986

To: Executive Committee

From: Charles Andrews, Chair
Personnel Policies Committee

Subject: MPPP Awards Procedural Discrepancies

The Personnel Policies Committee has determined there is a problem with the implementation of the current MPPP Awards procedures which needs to be brought to the attention of the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

It has been brought to the attention of the committee that a change in the established timelines occurred when the number of applications/nominations were known at the school level. The events appear to be as follows:

A school dean asked the department heads the number of applications/nominations they had received. The dean, upon ascertaining that fewer were filed than the school was allocated, proceeded to extend the timeline for the school MPPP Awards Committee to receive the nominations/applications from the departments.

Further, some department heads extended the timelines for receiving applications/nominations after having knowledge of the number of persons filing. Other department heads extended the filing timeline before it was known how many faculty were applying or being nominated.

When this issue first came before the PPC, there was substantial discussion without a formal position being taken. The discussion, at that time, did not identify a significant problem since the timelines for RTP actions have been flexible in many schools over the years. This is the position which I presented to the Executive Committee on January 14. The communication of the substance of the PPC discussion led at least one dean to extend the timelines in his school.

It is possible that the changes in the timelines may cause inequities in that a different timeline criteria is applied between faculty in a given department, in a school, and within the university. A person making a timely filing may be denied because a late application/nomination was selected to receive an award, is an example of the potential problem.

The issue which the Personnel Policies Committee brings to the Executive Committee is whether timelines for the MPPP Awards should be firm or flexible. This issue should be addressed in the context of the recommended changes which we are proposing in a separate communication for revising the procedures for the MPPP Awards (attached).
PROCEDURES FOR
MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSIONAL PROMISE AWARDS

I. PREAMBLE

This policy is designed to implement Articles 31.11 through 31.19 of the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three (faculty), agreed to in December, 1984.

Equal Opportunity guidelines govern the granting of MPPP Awards just as they do all other significant personnel actions at Cal Poly -- neither nominating faculty nor subsequent review bodies may discriminate on the basis of race, religion, or sex.

II. ELIGIBILITY

All persons covered by the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three are eligible to apply for or be nominated for Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards.

No MPPP Awards shall be made except under criteria mutually developed and approved by the campus President and the body of the Academic Senate.

No MPPP Awards shall be granted without a positive recommendation from the particular school or appropriate administrative unit MPPP Committee.

III. CRITERIA

Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards shall be given: (1) retrospectively, to recognize excellence in one or more of the following areas -- teaching, professional activity, service and/or (2) prospectively, to promote excellence in one or more of the same areas.

Individual schools may choose whether to develop more specific criteria statements appropriate to their disciplines as long as they do not contradict the general university statement. They are also free to determine whether variable criteria are appropriate for different ranks. If school committees elect to elaborate their own criteria, they are urged to remain consistent with established school criteria for other personnel decisions. School statements of criteria should be distributed to faculty and forwarded to the Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee well in advance of any selection cycle.

IV. APPLICATIONS/NOMINATIONS

Applications and nominations for MPPP Awards must document a candidate's excellent performance in teaching, professional activity, and/or service. Or,

Applications and nominations for MPPP Awards must document proposed projects which would enhance a faculty member's performance in teaching, professional activity, and/or service. (Examples of some appropriate uses are: travel, research support, technical/clerical support, released time, etc.) Or,

Applications and nominations for MPPP Awards may combine the above.

V. SELECTION PROCESS

All members of Unit Three may submit applications or nominations to appropriate department heads by January 10. Past recipients are as eligible as all other unit members.

Every school or appropriate administrative unit shall elect a committee by January 15 to review applications/nominations for MPPP Awards. (Each department or other appropriate
unit elects one representative from faculty who have neither applied for nor been nominated for an award.)

Department heads shall forward all applications/nominations to school committees by January 20. No rankings occur before nominations/applications reach school committees.

School committees will review nominations/applications without prejudice in favor of nominations as opposed to applications or vice versa, and by February 15, forward to the dean or appropriate administrator no more than the same number of applicants/nominees as MPPP Awards allocated to the school/appropriate administrative unit. Only positive recommendations shall be forwarded. School committees need to complete and return data sheets furnished by the Academic Senate before they disband.

If the dean or appropriate administrator concurs with the recommendations, the awards shall be granted as recommended no later than March 1.

If the dean/appropriate administrator disagrees with the recommendations forwarded by the faculty, both the recommendations of the dean or appropriate administrator and those of the faculty shall be forwarded to the President by March 1.

By March 5, the President shall transmit both sets of recommendations for review by the University Professional Leave Committee, which shall forward its positive recommendations by March 20 to the President for his/her consideration in making a final determination by April 1.

If the UPLC makes a negative determination, the committee shall state their reason and shall return the denied application to the originating school committee with the request to forward a substitute recommendation to the dean/appropriate administrator, repeating the original process. Each level of review shall complete and forward its recommendations within five (5) working days.

If the President disagrees with the UPLC, he/she shall state their reasons and shall return the denied application to the originating school committee with the request to forward a substitute recommendation to the dean/appropriate administrator, repeating the original process. Each level of review shall complete and forward its recommendations within five (5) working days.

This process shall be repeated until all the awards are granted or until the nominee/applicant pool is exhausted.

Awards shall be granted no later than June 30.

IV. GENERAL PROVISIONS

A. Recipients as well as the Personnel and Payroll Offices shall be notified in writing within five (5) days of concurrence.

B. Awards shall be paid within 30 days of having been granted.

C. When there is question as to the definition of the appropriate administrative unit for a particular application/nomination, said question shall be referred to the Personnel Policies Committee for resolution.

D. All other questions about procedures and dates should also be referred to the Personnel Policies Committee.
RESOLUTION ON
GIVING OF FINALS DURING FINALS' WEEK

WHEREAS, CAM 484 "Final Examinations" sets forth the California Polytechnic State University policy on the giving of finals during a designated time; and

WHEREAS, This designated time is referred to as Finals' Week; and

WHEREAS, There is an increasing number of finals being given during the week prior to Finals' Week; and

WHEREAS, This practice results in disruption of classes and is in clear violation of CAM 484; and

WHEREAS, Each faculty member is responsible for the administering of his/her finals during the designated time; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate request again that Administration enforce CAM 484.

Proposed by:
Instruction Committee
February 19, 1986
I move to amend the resolution by the addition of a third Resolved clause to be inserted between the present two Resolved clauses. The new clause is as follows:

"RESOLVED: That a list of all dean-approved exceptions (to CAM 484) for each quarter will be made available to each Department Head/Chair by the fifth week of the quarter."

Proposed by:
Raymond D. Terry
March 4, 1986
Background: Chairs of the Academic Senate have occasionally forwarded to the C&BL committee operating procedures for various committees for review. The C&BL committee has reviewed these for compliance with the constitution and bylaws to ascertain their conformance. On October 23, 1985, the Chair requested the C&BL committee to formally accept this oversight responsibility as a portion of the responsibilities of our own committee. This resolution will accomplish the task. It is presented in cross out (stricken wording) and underline (additional wording) format.

AS- --86

RESOLUTION ON
AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS FOR THE CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE

BE IT RESOLVED: Article VII Section I, Subsection 2b, be amended to read.

2. Constitution and Bylaws Committee

b. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee shall review periodically the Constitution of the Faculty and, the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, and operating procedures of standing committees of the senate, and shall recommend such changes to the Constitution and Bylaws as it feels necessary to keep these documents current to assure that they are current and in agreement with University regulations and with the memo of understanding. The procedure involving amendments to the constitution shall be consistent with Article IV of the Constitution. The procedure involving amendments to the Bylaws shall be consistent with Article X of the Bylaws.
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate

From: John Rogalla, Chair: C&B
      Raymond D. Terry, Chair: UPLC

Subject: Joint Report and Recommendations to Eliminate Discordant Provisions of the UPLC Bylaws, the Leave with Pay Guidelines and the Academic Senate Bylaws

President Baker, in a memo dated 12-2-85, indicated that the C&B Report (approved by the Senate on 10-1-85) and the UPLC Report (approved by the Senate on 11-05-85) were unofficially approved. Official approval would be contingent on the resolution of minor inconsistencies within and between the two reports. The inconsistencies fell into three categories.

It is our opinion that the inconsistencies referred to in Items 1a, 1b and 2a of the President's memo resulted from the President's reading of an outdated copy of the Academic Senate Bylaws. No changes are recommended.

The proposed correction noted in Item 3a is valid. The inconsistency resulted from a secretarial error in which Sections A.2. and A.3. of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines" were accidentally deleted. To remedy this inconsistency, the UPLC recommends Senate approval of Amendment No. 1 (below).

The inconsistencies noted in Items 2b and 3b of the President's memo may be partially remedied by changing portions of the Leave with Pay Guidelines and also portions of the Senate Bylaws. The necessary changes in the Leave with Pay Guidelines are incorporated in Amendment No. 2 (below). The same changes in the Senate Bylaws are effected by Amendment No. 3 (below) and Amendment No. 4 (below).

Amendment No. 1: On Page 3 of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines" the following two items will be added:

"A.2. The Associate Personnel Director or his /her designee shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the UPLC.

"A.3. The Provost and his /her designee shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the UPLC."
Amendment No. 2: On Page 3 of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines" Section C shall be replaced by:

"C. Functions

1. Recommend to the Provost after approval by the Academic Senate changes in procedures and criteria for ranking leave with pay applications.

2. Recommend changes in leave with pay application response deadlines to the Provost after approval of the Academic Senate.

3. Review School/Library leave with pay procedures and criteria for compliance with MOU and University Guidelines. Recommended changes shall be directed to the appropriate administrator with a copy to the Provost.

4. Review all applications and the prioritization by School/Library Professional Leave Committees to ensure compliance with approved guidelines and quality of applications; inform the Provost of any apparent inequities in those rankings; and make recommendations based on its findings.

5. Make ad hoc recommendations concerning the filling of such unused sabbatical leave vacancies which occur after the initial awarding."

Amendment No. 3: In Article VII., Section H, the standing committees shall be renumbered as follows:

"Article VII

Section H. Standing Committees

12. Professional-Leaves Research
13. Research Status of Women
14. Status-of-Women Student Affairs
15. Student-Affairs University Professional Leave"

Amendment No. 4: In Article VII, Section I, the standing committees shall be renumbered as in Amendment No. 3 above and wording parallel to that of Amendment No. 2 above shall be used in defining the responsibilities of the UPLC:

"Article VII

Section I. Committee Descriptions

12. Professional-Leaves Research
13. Research Status of Women
14. Status-of-Women Student Affairs
15. Student-Affairs University Professional Leave"
b. The University Professional Leaves Committee shall be responsible for the direction of the professional leaves program of the University.

1. Recommend to the Provost after approval by the Academic Senate changes in the procedures and criteria for ranking leave with pay applications.

2. Recommend changes in leave with pay application response deadlines to the Provost after approval of the Academic Senate.

3. Review School/Library leave with pay procedures and criteria for compliance with MOU and University Guidelines. Recommended changes shall be directed to the appropriate administrator with a copy to the Provost.

4. Review all applications and the prioritization by School/Library Professional Leave Committees to ensure compliance with approved guidelines and quality of applications; inform the Provost of any apparent inequities in those rankings; and make recommendations based on its findings.

5. Evaluate all professional leave applications and recommend a priority ranking to the Provost. Make ad hoc recommendations concerning the filling of such unused sabbatical leave vacancies which occur after the initial awarding.

6. Shall act as the committee to review Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards referred to it by the President."
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
    President

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE BYLAWS CHANGE FOR UPLC
         AND UPLC 1985-86 LEAVE WITH PAY GUIDELINES

Date: December 2, 1985

Copies: Tomlinson Fort, Jr.
         Jan Pieper

I want to acknowledge both your October 19 memo with which you transmitted a proposed bylaws change for the Senate that would establish the University Professional Leaves Committee, and your November 18 memo with which you transmitted the proposed 1985-86 Leave with Pay Guidelines. As you know, both Provost Fort and I were in attendance for at least a portion of the Academic Senate discussion on these two items last Spring as well as earlier this year. While there are some specifics of the two proposals which both the Provost and I would prefer to see modified, we recognize the real differences of point of view among the Senate members and the faculty generally and are willing to accept the general concepts and principles which are embodied in the two proposals.

However, before these documents are officially approved, there are a few minor inconsistencies which I believe should be resolved. Attached is a summary of some of the conflicts between the two documents and/or the documents and the current Senate bylaws which need to be corrected. In the meantime, the UPLC is authorized to operate during the 1985-86 academic year as proposed by the Senate. After the Senate has had an opportunity to assess and take action on the conflicts as outlined, I would appreciate having the documents resubmitted for formal approval.

Attachment
Discordant Provisions of UPLC By-laws, Guidelines and Academic Senate By-laws

1. Academic Senate By-laws
   a. Section VII.B Committees -- should reference that UPLC is an exception to the policy that all committees will have representation from professional consultative services.
   b. Section VII.G.2 should substitute UPLC (elected) for Personnel Review.

2. Proposed UPLC By-laws
   a. If UPLC is to replace Personnel Review Committee, then proposed Section VII.I.12 should be VII.H.12. Also, under current proposal, the title should include the word "University" (University Professional Leave Committee).
   b. Proposed Section VII.I.12.b, Responsibilities, should be parallel with proposed UPLC "Guidelines" Section C, "Functions".

3. Proposed UPLC Guidelines
   a. Section A, "Membership", should parallel "Membership" of proposed By-laws regarding UPLC Section VII.I.12.a.
   b. Section C.6 and F.9 should be compatible.
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate via Academic Senate Executive Committee

From: Raymond D. Terry
Chair: UPLC

Subject: Recommendations for Changes in the "Leave With Pay Guidelines"

During the period February 17, 1986 through March 14, 1986 the UPLC carried out its annual review of school, Library and UPLC procedures and criteria. The UPLC is now prepared to recommend certain changes in UPLC procedures, criteria and the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications.

Background No. 1: The University temporarily departed from school / Library quotas for sabbaticals in 1984 and 1985. In the period before this, school quotas were computed so as to result in a proportional allocation to each school, based on the ratio of eligible faculty in each school to the total eligible in the University. The UPLC, in its effort to restore the status quo recommended Senate adoption of Sect. F.4.b of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines," which was excerpted from a 1980 version of CAM. We subsequently learned that the initial distribution to each school and the Library of one sabbatical leave, as specified in the LWPG's, had not been in effect for some time. The UPLC seeks now to remedy this error by recommending Senate adoption of

*Amendment No. 1: On Page 4 of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines" Item F.4.b. shall be changed to read:

"F.4.b. The sabbatical leave allocation shall be distributed according to the ratio of eligible faculty members in the respective schools and the Library to the total eligible in the University."

Background No. 2: The term of office for each elected UPLC member is two years. Each year half of the UPLC's elected members are subject to (re)election, resulting in a balance of continuity and change. However, due to a variety of reasons, the UPLC is faced with the election this May of six positions; four two-year terms and two one-year terms. To provide additional continuity, especially when more than half the UPLC is replaced, the UPLC proposes:

"A.4. The immediate Past Chair of the UPLC shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the UPLC."

Background No. 3: Often an unsuccessful applicant for a sabbatical later requests a change from a sabbatical leave to a difference-in-pay leave. Infrequently, a request is made to change from a difference-in-pay leave to a sabbatical leave. Such a request was made in Feb. 1985 and was denied on the grounds that the prioritized list of 44 sabbaticals had already been determined. In accord with the 1984-1985 procedures, determining the position of a new application would have necessitated redoing the entire ranking process. One suggested remedy is for each SPLC (LPLC) to submit a common priority list of both sabbatical and difference-in-pay leaves. The UPLC rejects this solution and recommends instead

*Amendment No. 3: Requests by an applicant for a change from a difference-in-pay leave to a sabbatical leave may not be made after the professional leave applications have been forwarded to the UPLC (in early January).

Background No. 4: Each year one or more successful applicants for a sabbatical are led to decline the offer, sometimes to pursue activities which may benefit the University even more than completion of the intended sabbatical. In such cases, the President/Provost often postpones the sabbatical to a subsequent year, without requiring the applicant to reapply and/or be re-ranked. On the one hand, this seems acceptable and even desirable. However, the mandated postponement of a sabbatical has adverse consequences for new applicants of the school (Library) involved and is in conflict with Art. 27.8 of the MOU. The UPLC proposes the following

*Amendment No. 4: Each SPLC (LPLC) should revise its "Procedures and Criteria for the Evaluation of Sabbatical and Difference-in-Pay Leaves" document so as to permit (or not to permit) the carry-over of postponed sabbaticals to the following year (without reapplication). Such a carry-over, if permitted, will effectively reduce the school's (Library's) quota with regard to new applications in the subsequent year. The application, if carried over, shall be forwarded to the UPLC for review and comparison in the light of new applications.

**Amendment No. 4**: If the President or his designee awards a sabbatical to one or more individuals, the number of such awarded sabbaticals shall be subtracted from the total sabbatical application prior to determining the quotas for each school and the Library, as specified in Section F.4.

Background No. 5: Each year the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications needs to be adjusted slightly to account for dates which fall on weekends or holidays. The UPLC proposes

*Amendment No. 5: The Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications [LWPG, Page 6] shall contain the following statement:

"Note: Whenever one of the above dates falls on a weekend or holiday, that deadline is extended to the next regularly-scheduled workday."
Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications

October 15 - Leave with pay eligibility lists are distributed and deadlines are announced by the Personnel Office. School deans / Library Director advise department heads and department heads notify eligible employees of eligibility and deadlines.

November 1 - Candidates are responsible for submitting applications for leaves with pay to department heads.

November 9 - Applications are forwarded to school deans / Library Director with department heads' recommendations following consultation with departmental faculty. The department shall provide a statement to the appropriate administrator regarding the possible effect on the curriculum and the operation of the department should the employee be granted a leave with pay. (MOU 27.6 & 28.8)

November 15 - Applications are forwarded to the SPLC's / LPLC by the school deans / Library Director.

Nov 15/Dec 14 - SPLC's and the LPLC review applications and interview all leave with pay applicants.

December 17 - Priority lists recommended by the SPLC's / LPLC are forwarded to the school deans / Library Director.

January 10 - School deans / Library Director forward a copy of their recommendations and priority lists, the SPLC/ LPLC recommendations, all applications, and a report of the criteria and procedures followed in the recommendation process to the UPLC via the Provost.

Jan 11/Febr 14 - UPLC reviews school / library procedures and criteria for compliance, reviews applications, and develops a priority ranking of all applicants. Recommendations on priority are forwarded to the Provost by Feb. 14.

February 25 - The Provost notifies applicants of action on applications; such actions are subject to fiscal appropriations which are proposed for inclusion in the budget.

Feb 25/Mar 25 - UPLC recommends changes in school / library procedures and criteria to the Provost with a copy to the appropriate school deans / Library Director. The UPLC recommends to the Chair of the Academic Senate and to the Provost any changes in its procedures, criteria or the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>George Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</td>
<td>Agricultural Engr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (Include section, and subsection if applicable)</td>
<td>F.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)</td>
<td>AE 121 - Agricultural Mechanics (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification and use of tools and materials; tool sharpening and care; concrete mixes and materials; simple electric wiring; metal work; pipe fitting; basic woodworking; estimating quantities and costs. 1 lecture, 1 laboratory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</td>
<td>Approves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</td>
<td>Approves 6-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</td>
<td>Biological Sciences Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)</td>
<td>F.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)</td>
<td>CONS 120 - Fisheries and Wildlife Management (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of fisheries and wildlife resources and management practices. Relationships to recreational values, land management, food production, and preservation. 3 lectures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</td>
<td>Approves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</td>
<td>Approves 6-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. PROPOSER'S NAME

NRM Department

2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.

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

F.2.

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

FOR 201 - Forest Resources (3)

Overview of forest resources including basic management, fire protection, and multiple use of forest, woodland, and chaparral lands for water production, forage, recreation, wildlife, timber, energy and urban forest values. Three lectures.

5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS

Approves.

6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS

Approves 8-0

7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>Barbara P. Weber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)</td>
<td>D.4.b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)</td>
<td>HE 203 - Consumer Role of the Family (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study of the individual and family as consumers in the marketplace. Sources of consumer protection and recourse. Influence of selected management concepts on consumption patterns. 3 lectures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</td>
<td>Against. See attached sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</td>
<td>Against 0-6-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: George Lewis, Chair  
GE&B Committee  

January 13, 1965

From: Area D. 4.b. Subcommittee (Burton, Culver, Harris, Preston)

Subj: Evaluation of Home Economics 203

Our Subcommittee has reviewed the appropriateness of HE 203 (Consumer Role of the Family) for insertion into Area D.4.b in the General Education and Breadth curriculum. We recommend against this course in D.4.b based upon our evaluation of the support materials provided to you in Dr. Barbara Weber's memorandum of 21 October 1965.

Specifically, we note the following in our opposition to the course:
1. This course fails to meet the requirement of Area D as established in E.O. 338. It does not adequately address the interwoven nature of "human social, political and economic institutions and behavior" and it makes no effort to examine issues in a non-western context;
2. This course does not meet the Cal Poly GE&B Knowledge and Skills Statement requirements that concern (a) examination of the forces which shape institutions other than our own, (b) recognition of the interaction of communities and institutions, and (c) consideration of the geographical and cultural diversity of the world.

Comment: According to the clearly stated content and goals of Home Economics 203, the course is designed to increase the consumptive awareness of the American citizen. Essentially the course endeavors to help "...the consumer develop an individual consumer perspective, an awareness of sources of consumer protection and recourse, and a broad base of general information to apply management concepts to consumptive patterns." This effort directed at contemporary American consumers does not qualify as a candidate for inclusion in area D.4.b. Home Economics 203 does not examine problems in their contemporary as well as historical setting. It does not include both western and non-western contexts and fails to reflect the fact that human social, political and economic institutions and behavior are inextricably interwoven. Indeed if Home Economics 203 attempted to satisfy the criteria outlined above it would (by its own definition) fail to achieve its stated goals and totally diminish the worthiness of the course to any contemporary American consumer. It is primarily a single issue course and must remain that way in order to fulfill its stated design. As such, Home Economics 203 simply does not qualify in Area D.4.b which is inherently broad based and represents an entirely different realm of study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara P. Weber</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| 4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format) |
| HE 331 - Household Equipment (4) |
| Principles involved in construction, operation, energy consumption, selection, safety, and space utilization of household equipment. 3 lectures, 1 two-hour laboratory. Prerequisite: Junior standing. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approves, with the recommendation that Home Economics majors not be allowed to use this course to satisfy F.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approves  5-0-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some members of the committee expressed reservations about the upper division status of this course. |

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


### PROPOSAL FORM AND ATTACHMENTS

#### 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></td>
<td>Biological Sciences Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (Include section, and subsection if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1.b.</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>To include ENT. and CONS. in the specific prefixes cited in Area B.1.b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against (unanimous)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against. Committee divided the question:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT. 1-6-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS. 2-6-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be modified to include a parenthetical listing the specific prefixes that define the term "life science." The proposed revision would read: Any 300-level life science course (i.e., with a BACT, BIO, BOT, CONS, ENT, or ZOO prefix) having one of the above as a prerequisite may also be selected with the exception of BIO 321, 342. (The added parenthetical statement has been underlined for clarity.)

In March of 1985 the GE&B Subcommittee for Area B, chaired by Dr. Mueller, directed its attention to the vague wording of GE&B, B.1.b. in the 1984 - 1986 catalog. This committee elected to define "life science" as those courses having "one of the prefixes: BACT, BIO, BOT or ZOO." The Bio Sci Department offers several 300-level life science courses having either an ENT or a CONS prefix. All of these courses are acceptable alternatives for Area B.1.b.

The effect of the present proposal would be to enlarge the 300-level life science courses offered by the Bio Sci Department that satisfy the GE&B Area B (B.1.b) requirements.

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

Subject: Biological Science Department: Second Proposal

A meeting of the GE & B Area B subcommittee was held on November 6, 1985 to consider a request from the Biological Science Department to revise the definition of "life science" under GE & B guidelines in the catalog. Present at the meeting were Jim Mueller, Tina Bailey, Don Morgan, and John Pohling.

The proposed revision would expand the definition of "life science" for GE & B to include 300-level courses having the prefixes CONS or ENT. The subcommittee's vote was to deny the request. Our feeling was that courses with these prefixes do not carry the spirit of general education in Area B. Documentation supporting this view can be found in GE & B notes #3, 10/19/81, from the Academic Affairs Office of the Chancellor:

Courses utilized to address understanding of science should be selected with an eye to exposing students to broad concepts and principles. Highly specialized and "how to" courses would not be expected to achieve the objectives of imparting "knowledge of the facts and principles which form the foundation of living and non-living systems" as well as exposing students to the methodologies of science and their limitations.

We reaffirm our decision of April 4, 1985 that the catalog read under GE
B.1.b. Any 300-level life science course (i.e., with a BACT, BIO, BOT, or ZOO prefix) having one of the above as a prerequisite may also be selected with the exception of BIO 321, 342.
February 7, 1986

Dear Faculty and Other Unit Three Employees:

Here are slightly modified MPPP Awards procedures approved by the Academic Senate on ___________ They become effective September 1, 1986. Please note the following:

1. Criteria remain broadly defined at the university level, but individual schools may opt to develop more specific criteria statements. (See III-Criteria)

2. Past recipients of MPPP Awards are eligible for repeated awards.

3. Part-time Unit Three employees are eligible for awards.

4. No rankings occur before nominations/applications reach school committees.

5. School committees need to complete and return data sheets furnished by the Academic Senate before they disband.

6. Equal Opportunity guidelines govern the granting of MPPP Awards just as they do other significant personnel actions at Cal Poly.

Please direct questions as well as suggestions for future procedural revisions to the Personnel Policies Committee of the Academic Senate. Because the awards are relatively small (especially after taxes), and because they do not increase a recipient's salary base, we have attempted to keep the procedures simple and efficient.

Sincerely,

Personnel Policies Committee
Academic Senate
RESOLUTION ON THE PROPOSAL FOR THE PROMOTION OF ED ZUCHELLI

WHEREAS: Due to the untimely death of Mr. Zuchelli;
WHEREAS: Mr. Zuchelli was involved in the normal process of promotion;
WHEREAS: This may set a new precedent; be it
RESOLVED: That the California Polytechnic State University Academic Senate supports and urges the Provost and President promote Mr. Ed. Zuchelli to the rank of professor posthumously.

Proposed by:

Alan F. Cooper
April 22, 1986