I. MINUTES:
   Approval of the May 13, 1986 Academic Senate Minutes (attached pp. 3-8).

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS:
   A. Note: At 4:30 p.m., newly-elected senators and new caucus chairs will be introduced by the current caucus chairs.
   B. Note: At 4:45 p.m., election of officers will be conducted by Bill Kellogg, Chair of the Elections Committee.

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

IV. BUSINESS ITEMS:
   A. GE&B Report-Lewis, Chair, General Education & Breadth Committee, First Reading, (attached pp. 9-14):
      ART 208 Sculpture
      HUM 302 Human Values in Agriculture
      MATH 201 Appreciation of Mathematics
   B. Resolution on Distinction Between Options and Concentrations-Williamson, Chair, Curriculum Committee, First Reading, (attached pp. 15-19).
   C. Resolution on Free Electives-Williamson, Chair, Curriculum Committee, First Reading, (attached p. 20); Substitute Resolution on Free Electives, First Reading, (attached p. 21).
   D. Bylaw Change to Delete Ex Officio Members from the UPLC-Rogalla, Chair, Constitution and Bylaws Committee, First Reading, (to be distributed).
   E. Resolution on Foundation Election Process-Greenwald, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on the Cal Poly Foundation, First Reading (attached p. 22).
   F. Resolution for Recognition of Deceased Faculty. Prepared by Charles Andrews and accepted by Alan Cooper in place of previous resolution submitted by Cooper, Second Reading, (attached p. 23).
   H. Conflict-of-Interest Policy for Principal Investigators-Andrews, Chair, Personnel Policies Committee/McNeil, Chair, Research Committee (attached pp. 25-29).
   I. Revised Enrollment Recommendations-French, Chair, Long Range Planning Committee, First Reading, (attached pp. 30-33).
   K. Resolution on AIMS Quarterly Budget Reporting-Pohl, Chair, Budget Committee, First Reading, (attached p. 38).
   L. Resolution on CSU Trustee Professorship-Andrews, Chair, Personnel Policies Committee, First Reading, (attached p. 39).
   M. Resolution re Vacancies Remaining After an Election, (Resolution on Amendments to the Bylaws for the Elections Committee), Rogalla, Chair, Constitution & Bylaws Committee (attached pp. 40-41).

Continued on Page Two
V. INTRODUCTION OF SENATORS:

A. Introduction of Incoming Campus Senators by Current Caucus Chairs.

B. Election of Senate Officers-Kellogg, Chair, Elections Committee: In accordance with Academic Senate Bylaws, Article VII.I.5.b.(4).b), the Elections Committee announces the following nominees as eligible for the respective offices named:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Lloyd H. Lamouria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Lynne Gamble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Raymond Terry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. DISCUSSION:

VII. ADJOURNMENT:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art 208 Sculpture (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration of three-dimensional form through problems in modeling, casting, carving and techniques of assembly. Miscellaneous course fee required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 lecture, 2 laboratories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS and |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This course was referred back to committee for possible inclusion in Area C.3., after having been considered and rejected for Area C.2. The Area C Subcommittee reaffirmed its support for including Art 208 in Area C.3. Nevertheless, the GE&amp;B Committee rejected this proposal by a vote of 4-5-0. The members opposing such inclusion felt that Area C would not be strengthened by the inclusion of skills, studio, or performance courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. <strong>PROPOSER’S NAME</strong></th>
<th>2. <strong>PROPOSER’S DEPT.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stan Dundon</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. <strong>SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.3. (and F.2. by Chair of GE&amp;B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4. **COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)** |
| HUM 302-Human Values in Agriculture (3). 3 lectures. |
| Nature of values at issue in agriculture which impact on the wider community. Technical-factual foundation of needs of agriculture which contribute to value conflicts, ethical principles and devices yielding resolutions. Interdisciplinary team taught, with guest lecturers and possible field trips. Literary and historical materials dramatically expressing values. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. <strong>SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area C Against 1-3-0 (Chair not voting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area F Against</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. <strong>GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area C.3. Approves contingent upon course not being cross-listed with an AG prefix. 8-1-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area F.2. Against 1-8-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See attached remarks by Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION** |
REMARKS

Rarely is there as much divergence between the recommendation of an area subcommittee and that of the GE&B Committee as has occurred in the proposal to include HUM 302 in Area C.3.

When originally proposed for C.3., the Chair of GE&B also referred the course to the Area F Subcommittee for possible inclusion in F.2. The Area F Subcommittee recommended against its inclusion in F.2. on the basis that its orientation was toward social and humanistic aspects of technology rather than to applications of technology to, practical problems in, and practical skills required by (in this case) agriculture.

Likewise, the Area C Subcommittee recommended against its inclusion in C.3. primarily because the course content was not suitable for that area. In doing so, the Area C Subcommittee expressed concern that too often courses of an interdisciplinary nature that are proposed for GE&B, are routinely proposed for Area C.

The General Education and Breadth Committee in its deliberations expressed the view that an interdisciplinary course dealing with such a timely topic as HUM 302 does, should be included in the General Education program at Cal Poly, and that being a course in applied ethics, it was indeed appropriate for Area C.3.

While the Chair respects the views of both subcommittees and that of the GE&B Committee as well, he is troubled by the apparent disregard for HUM 302 in relation to the General Education & Breadth Knowledge and Skills Statement 7.A., 7.B., 9.A., and 9.B. These items would seem to apply directly to HUM 302, and have been attached for your perusal.
7. **CAL POLY GRADUATES, BY VIRTUE OF THEIR EDUCATION AT A POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, SHOULD UNDERSTAND HOW TECHNOLOGY INFLUENCES AND IS INFLUENCED BY CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS, THE APPLICATIONS OF TECHNOLOGY TO CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS, AND THE POTENTIAL OF TECHNOLOGY TO BOTH POSITIVELY AND NEGATIVELY AFFECT INDIVIDUALS AND SOCIETIES.**

Outcome number 7 can be achieved by including the following:

A. **Students should gain an awareness of their increasing dependence on technology, and how it is guided, managed, and controlled.**

B. **Students should be able to evaluate and assess questions of value and choice underlying technologies and how, in the course of their development, these questions have been addressed and answered.**

C. **Students should gain a basic level of computer skill and literacy.**

---

9. **CAL POLY GRADUATES, BECAUSE THEY WILL BE LIVING IN A TECHNOLOGICAL WORLD, SHOULD BE EXPOSED TO COURSES TAUGHT WITHIN THE TECHNOLOGICAL AREAS, SO THAT THEY WILL HAVE A BASIS FOR DEVELOPING A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF HOW TECHNOLOGY INFLUENCES AND IS INFLUENCED BY PRESENT DAY CULTURES AND OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS.**

Outcome number 9 is addressed by courses which emphasize the following:

A. **Students should develop an awareness of typical problems addressed by technology, such as methods of world food production, applications of the computer, or the production, distribution, and control of energy.**

B. **Students should have an opportunity to learn the difficulties inherent in solving technological problems. The emphasis should be on the application of theoretical knowledge to practical matters such as:**

   1. **The consequences and implications of applied technology for environmental factors of climate, water quality, soil, and plant resources.**

   2. **Problems stemming from the interactions of population growth, technology and resource consumption, such as climate change, the energy crisis, world hunger and soil erosion.**

   3. **Contributions of technology in enhancing the availability of food and shelter, harnessing energy, and improving the quality of life.**

C. **Students should develop an awareness of issues raised by the interaction of culture and technology.**
# 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>Mathematics Department</td>
<td></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.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Course Prefix, Number, Title, Units, Description, etc. (Use catalog format)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math 201 - Appreciation of Mathematics (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary mathematics and the relationship between mathematics and our cultural heritage. Intended to develop an appreciation for the role that mathematics plays in society, both past and present. 3 lectures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Subcommittee Recommendation and Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approves (unanimous).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. GE &amp; B Committee Recommendation and Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approves 5-4-0. See attachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those members opposing felt that the integrity of the mathematics requirement would be better sustained by a traditional algebra course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note that Math 113 is a prerequisite in the '86-'88 catalog.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Academic Senate Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: George Lewis
Via: Lloyd Lamouria

From: Paul Murphy

Subject: Math 201

Date: October 1, 1985

The Mathematics Department would like to have the course Math 201, Appreciation of Mathematics, added to the list of allowable G.E.B. electives, in area B.

I am enclosing an expanded course outline of the course. I am also having letters sent to you from department heads in other departments, expressing the opinion that this course would be valuable to their majors.

Math 201 has been carefully designed to replace our former Math 100, Mathematics for General Education. For many years we offered Math 100 as an elective for students who did not need any particular mathematical skills for courses in their major or in their support courses. The course had no prerequisites, and the course outline gave the instructor a great deal of freedom. In 1982, the G.E.B. Committee decided not to include Math 100 in its list of allowable electives.

In the last several years, the entrance requirements for admission to Cal Poly have been substantially toughened, in mathematics as well as other subjects. This development has allowed our Curriculum Committee to design a new course which can meet the needs of students in the same majors as did Math 100, but which is considerably more rigorous and challenging.

In particular, Math 201 has a prerequisite of Math 113 or two years of high-school algebra. And since students are required to pass the ELM exam before they take any mathematics class at Cal Poly, instructors of Math 201 can be certain that their students will have basic algebra skills. With this in mind, we have chosen a text for Math 201 which is probably the most advanced of the texts which were used for Math 100. (Math 100 allowed the instructor to choose the text, and there were sometimes as many as four or five in use in a given academic year.) More important, this text, Faces of Mathematics by Roberts and Varberg, fits the goals expressed in Executive Order 338 and Cal Poly's "Knowledge and Skills Statement" extremely well. That is, the course and the text are designed to teach students "not ... merely basic computational skills, but ... as well the understanding of basic mathematical concepts" (E.O. 338, section IV B). Most instructors who used this text for Math 100 were very pleased with this aspect of the text; if they had any complaint, it was that the text was a bit too hard for many Math 100 students.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need additional information or supporting materials.
RESOLUTION ON DISTINCTION BETWEEN OPTIONS AND CONCENTRATIONS AT CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

WHEREAS, The distinction made in CAM 411 between options and concentrations appears primarily to be based on the number of units contained in the curricular alternative; and

WHEREAS, There appears to be confusion at California Polytechnic State University, at the Chancellor's Office, and on other campuses both within and outside of the CSUC system as to California Polytechnic State University's distinction between options and concentrations; and

WHEREAS, A survey by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee of academic departments indicates no opposition to the concept of using only one such curricular alternative; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the following changes be made to CAM 411 and that these changes be implemented with the 1988-90 catalog:
411 Guidelines for Majors, Minors, and Concentrations

A. Recognized Categories of Curricular Concentrations Alternatives

(Note: For the purpose of computing grade point average at graduation, “major” is defined as follows in 1. and 2. below.)

1. Major (B.S.)

(a) For the B.S. degree, the major shall consist of no less than 54 or more than 70 quarter units of courses required for graduation in each curriculum.

(1) Of the units in courses designated as major, at least 27 must be in 300 or 400 series courses.

(2) Of the units in courses designated as major, at least six must be required in the freshman and at least nine in the sophomore year.

(b) The courses in the major, designated as “M” courses, must be exclusive of those used to satisfy the general education requirement. The “M” courses generally are those with the major departmental prefix although others may be included.

2. Major (B.A.)

(a) For the B.A. degree, the major shall consist of no less than 48 or more than 60 quarter units of courses required for graduation in each curriculum.

(1) Of the units in courses designated as major, at least 24 must be in 300 or 400 series courses.

(2) Of the total of 186 quarter units required for the degree, at least 60 must be in 300 or 400 series courses.
(3) Of the units in courses designated as major, at least six must be required in the freshman year and at least six in the sophomore year.

(b) The courses in the major, designated as "M" courses, must be exclusive of those used to satisfy the general education requirement. The "M" courses generally are those with the major departmental prefix although others may be included.

3. Minor

No minor is required for the bachelor's degree.

Teaching minors consist of a minimum of 30 quarter units in a specific field. Teaching minors are designed to meet credential regulations and should not be confused with concentrations.

4. Option

An option is a curricular alternative in a department having 30 or more quarter units of specified courses not common to other curricular alternatives and designed to give the student substantially different capabilities than the other alternatives.

5. Concentration

A concentration is a block of courses to be chosen with the approval of the student's adviser comprising from 18 to 29-39 quarter units providing essentially different capabilities for the student. A minimum of 12 of these 18-29-39 units must be in specified courses.
Guidelines Relating to Options

1. The basic curriculum display in the catalog should show only those courses common to the two or more option alternatives.

2. Following the basic curriculum display, the courses required to complete the major in each option should be listed in the manner shown in the catalog.

3. In addition to courses offered by the major department, options may include required courses from other departments.

4. No maximum number of units are presently specified for options. However, it appears that 39-quarter units is a reasonable maximum. Although some existing options of over 39-quarter units have been allowed, strong justification will be required for approval of additional options of over 39-quarter units.

Guidelines Relating to Concentrations

1. The basic curriculum display in the catalog should show only those courses common to the concentration alternatives.

2. Following the basic curriculum display, the courses required to complete the major in each concentration should be listed in the catalog.

3. A footnote in the catalog should indicate the number of elective units which must be selected with the approval of the adviser to form the concentration.

Example: "At least 18 quarter units shall be chosen with the approval of the adviser in one of the concentration areas of Production, Management, or Science-Teaching."
Available concentrations should be named and may be described briefly in the departmental introductory material.

A list of those courses which are required and eligible for use in a specific concentration must be provided to the Evaluation Technician and departmental advisers by the appropriate school dean.

Guidelines Relating to Both Options and Concentrations.

All units in an option must be specified. If the 30- or more-quarter units cannot be specified, the concentration route should be used.

A student must select one of the available curricular alternatives concentrations recognized and/or displayed in the catalog.

"M" courses may appear in an option or a concentration as well as in the core or basic curriculum display.

A concentration within an option-a concentration is not appropriate.

There must be a discrete bachelor's degree program. That is, options concentrations requiring a bachelor's degree program to run into the graduate year will not be approved.

Proposed By:
Curriculum Committee
April 8, 1986
Background statement:

The Provost has asked the Academic Senate to review the present requirement that a minimum of nine units of free electives exist in each major curriculum at Cal Poly. After gathering opinions from both school deans and school curriculum committees, the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate finds the University faculty as a whole and itself to be evenly divided on this issue. We therefore submit two opposing resolutions for the full Senate to discuss and act upon.

AS-___-86/____

RESOLUTION ON FREE ELECTIVES

WHEREAS, Students are required to take a broad spectrum of courses by the General Education & Breadth requirements; and

WHEREAS, The units for General Education & Breadth requirements have been increased in recent years; and

WHEREAS, California Polytechnic State University's hands-on, learn-by-doing philosophy may require many more design and project units than other schools; and

WHEREAS, This has made it difficult if not impossible for a number of disciplines to maintain their traditional quality of program within a four-year degree; and

WHEREAS, The spirit of collegiality vests curricular formulation responsibility within the faculty; and

WHEREAS, The faculty, department heads/chairs, and school deans thoroughly review the curricula for which they are responsible; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the curricula of majors at California Polytechnic State University need not include any free electives.

Proposed By:
Curriculum Committee
May 5, 1986
Background statement:

The Provost has asked the Academic Senate to review the present requirement that a minimum of nine units of free electives exist in each major curriculum at Cal Poly. After gathering opinions from both school deans and school curriculum committees, the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate finds the University faculty as a whole and itself to be evenly divided on this issue. We therefore submit two opposing resolutions for the full Senate to discuss and act upon.

**AS-86/86**

**SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION ON FREE ELECTIVES**

**WHEREAS,** It is desirable for all students to have the freedom to take courses of their own choice in the attainment of a bachelor’s degree; and

**WHEREAS,** The Campus Administrative Manual (CAM) Section 411.1 requires 12 units of electives, 9 of which may not be restricted in any way by the student’s department; and

**WHEREAS,** In recent years exemptions have been granted to this Section 411.1 requirement to the extent that some majors have had no free electives; therefore, be it

**RESOLVED:** That no exemptions from the requirements of CAM Section 411.1 be granted under any circumstances.

Proposed by:
Curriculum Committee
May 6, 1986
Background statement:

The committee has received extensive testimony from administrators, faculty, and students concerning the Cal Poly Foundation. The committee has also obtained input from the Executive Director and the Associate to the Executive Director of the Foundation.

The present election process for the Foundation Board of Directors has not been effective in communicating openings on this Board to either students or faculty. In addition, the present process provides for the election of new Board members by the current Board thus enabling the Directors to re-elect themselves. The result has been a Board that has effectively been closed to new individuals and new ideas.

RESOLUTION ON
THE FOUNDATION ELECTION PROCESS

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

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

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

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

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

Proposed By:
The Ad Hoc Committee on the Cal Poly Foundation
April 29, 1986
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-_____86/_____

RESOLUTION FOR RECOGNITION
OF DECEASED FACULTY

WHEREAS, There currently is no policy at California Polytechnic State University to provide for the recognition or honoring of those faculty members who have died while employed at California Polytechnic State University; and

WHEREAS, The university has no policies or procedures as to identifying such deceased faculty members who have made a major and significant contribution over many years to the academic mission and goals of the university; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That any faculty member who has at least 15 years of continuous employment at California Polytechnic State University immediately preceding death, and is employed at California Polytechnic State University at the time of death, or retired within the previous 12 months, and who can be identified as having made a significant contribution to an academic program through teaching, student relations, alumni relations, program development, or other documentable activities directed toward enhancement of the educational mission of California Polytechnic State University, shall be recognized and honored by being awarded the title of Honorary Professor, posthumously; and be it further

RESOLVED: That any person nominated for said recognition shall be evaluated for recommendation of action to the Academic Senate and the President by an ad hoc committee appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, with inclusion on the committee of a representative from the deceased's department; and be it further

RESOLVED: That public acknowledgment of this recognition shall be at the next following university commencement exercise; and be it further

RESOLVED: That it is recommended to the president that the names of all university employees and retirees who have died in the preceding year be read at the fall convocation and those persons honored with a moment of silence.

Proposed By:
Charles Andrews
May 13, 1986
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background: Women's Week has been celebrated at Cal Poly every year since 1982 in conjunction with National Women's History Week. The presentations focus on important aspects of women's role in society. Financial support has come, for the most part, through Student Affairs. Interest and attendance at Women's Week has continually grown, so that this past February, there were 31 presentations, including lectures, a poetry reading, luncheon, fun run, films and a theatrical performance. Well over 1100 attended the events; 90% of whom were students.

AS--86/

RESOLUTION
RECOGNIZING WOMEN'S WEEK AT
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

WHEREAS, Women's Week has been celebrated at California Polytechnic State University every year since 1982 in conjunction with National Women's History Week; and

WHEREAS, Interest and attendance at Women's Week has significantly grown during that time; and

WHEREAS, The study of women's accomplishments in history, art, music, science, and other endeavors is an integral part of students' education; and

WHEREAS, Women's Week represents a collaborative effort of California Polytechnic State University students, staff and faculty, and other universities; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recognize Women's Week as an important aspect of California Polytechnic State University's educational offerings; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate urge all academic departments to support Women's Week in whatever manner deemed appropriate.

Proposed By:
Elie Axelroth and
Nancy Loe of Professional Consultative Services
April 8, 1986
PROPOSED CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY FOR
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR OF
NONGOVERNMENTAL SPONSORED RESEARCH

I. General Guidelines

A. This policy is intended to implement the Fair Political Practices Commission's (FPPC) the approved CSU Conflict of Interest Policy. (For the purpose of this document, the term "Principal Investigator" will also refer to the Project Director of a research activity.)

B. Pursuant to CSU Conflict of Interest Code, Principal Investigators will be required to disclose investments in and income from any private, nongovernmental entity which he or she intends to ask for funds, or in the case of a project completion statement, has provided funds to support, in whole or in part, the research project for which the filer is the Principal Investigator.

C. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be the President's Designee for ensuring compliance with this policy, and shall annually appoint an Independent Review Committee to review and make recommendations on individual cases.

D. The Director of Research Development shall chair an Independent Review Committee and provide a copy of this policy statement to Principal Investigators at the time of application for a research project to be sponsored by a nongovernmental entity through a grant or contract.

Instructional deans will provide a copy of these guidelines to faculty who are requesting or have received a restricted gift for research from a nongovernmental entity.

E. A Principal Investigator is required to file the "Principal Investigator's Statement of Economic Interest" (FPPC Form 730-U) with the Director of Research Development and such research may not proceed without completion of the financial disclosure statement.
The Principal Investigator must complete the application and project completion disclosure statements (1) whenever he or she makes application for a new or renewal contract or grant with a nongovernmental entity, (including applicable non-profit organizations, if they are not on the Fair Political Practices Commission's approved list), or (2) whenever a gift is specified by a donor for a specific research project for which the Principal Investigator is responsible. The disclosure must be made on a "Principal Investigator's Statement of Economic Interest" form (FPPC Form-730-U) before the proposed gift is accepted or application is made for a new or continued nongovernmental funded research project or grant. A second Form-730-U "Principal Investigator's Statement of Economic Interest" must be filed within 90 days after the gift funds are exhausted, or the research project is completed.

Financial interest is defined as:

1. any business entity and/or real property in which the Principal Investigator has a direct or indirect investment or interest valued at more than one thousand dollars ($1,000);
2. any source of income (other than from a commercial lending institution which makes loans in the regular course of business on terms available to the public without regard to official status) which has yielded two hundred fifty dollars ($250) or more in value provided to the Principal Investigator within twelve months prior to the time when the decision is made; or
3. any business entity in which the Principal Investigator is a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or holds any position of management.

When disclosure indicates that a financial interest exists, an independent substantive review of the disclosure statement and research project shall
take place with appropriate documentation before a contract, grant, or gift is accepted. (See Section II)

I. Department heads/chairs shall disqualify themselves from approving a research proposal for a project to be funded in whole or in part by a nongovernmental entity in which they have a financial interest.

J. Failure by a Principal Investigator to make the required disclosure or by a department head/chair to disqualify himself or herself may result in a state enforcement proceeding as well as University sanctions.

K. If the financial disclosure by the Principal Investigator indicates that he/she had no financial interest in the granting or contracting concern, then the research does not require the review of the Independent Review Committee.

L. If a Principal Investigator has a financial interest as defined in I.G. above, he/she shall not make, participate in making, or use his/her position to influence the making of any decision by Cal Poly which will foreseeably have a material financial effect on the sponsor. This provision does not apply to decisions that will need to be made in the course of research.

M. If, during the course of a research project, the status of the Principal Investigator with the nongovernmental sponsor or donor changes, then an additional "Statement of Financial Interest" must be filed.

II. Composition and Function of the Independent Review Committee

A. Composition

1. Annually, the Director, Research Development, shall appoint and chair an Independent Review Committee consisting of the following:
   a. a faculty member selected by the Academic Senate;
   b. Foundation Executive Director’s designee;
   c. Chair, University Research Committee or designee.
2. An ad hoc alternate will be appointed by the chair if a member of the Independent Review Committee is in the same department or occupational area as the proposed Principal Investigator.

B. Function of the Independent Review Committee

1. The purpose of the Independent Review Committee is to conduct a substantive review of a research project and the financial disclosure statements of a Principal Investigator when a financial interest, as defined in Section I.G., exists between the Principal Investigator and the nongovernmental sponsor or donor.

2. In making a recommendation to the President, the Independent Review Committee will consider at least the following criteria:
   a. Is the research appropriate to the university?
   b. Are the teaching and research environments open?
   c. Is there freedom to publish and disseminate the results of the project?
   d. Is the use of the university facilities appropriate and properly reimbursed?
   e. Is the nature of the Principal Investigator's financial interest in the nongovernmental entity such that a substantial conflict of interest is unlikely to occur and would not compromise the quality and objectivity of the research?

3. On completion of its deliberations, the Independent Review Committee shall file a report with the Vice President for Academic Affairs. At a minimum, in the case of a grant, the report by the Independent Review Committee will consist of:
   a. name of Principal Investigator
   b. name of project, topic, or research activity
   c. period of performance
   d. date reviewed by the independent review committee
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e. funds proposed or awarded
f. documents reviewed by the Independent Review Committee
g. nature of financial interest
h. criteria used by Independent Review Committee
i. assessment of the probability of the financial involvement leading to a conflict of interest

On the basis of the review, the Independent Review Committee will recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, or designee, whether funding for the research project should be accepted and, if so, whether any conditions are needed.

III. University Action

After considering the report submitted by the Independent Review Committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will determine whether to accept a contract or grant sponsored in whole or in part by the nongovernmental individual or entity, or a gift earmarked for a specific researcher or a specific research project. Copies of the disclosure statements, the Independent Review Committee’s recommendations, and the written decision resulting from the independent review process are to be provided to the Campus Conflict of Interest Filing Officer and the President. These documents will be available on campus to the public upon request.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Long Range Planning Committee

Subject: Revised Enrollment Recommendations

These enrollment management recommendations were developed by the Long Range Planning Committee in response to your request of 6 January 1986. The Resolution on Strategic Planning adopted by the Academic Senate in April 1985 also identified enrollment as an area with several key issues related to Cal Poly's future over the next decade.

There is strong consensus on the Long Range Planning Committee to hold the size of Cal Poly at 14,200 FTE until such time as the current shortages of facilities (e.g. classrooms, laboratories, faculty offices) are corrected (see Figure 1). This would suggest that any increase in enrollment beyond our authorized 14,200 should only occur when currently planned physical plant expansion projects are completed in 1990-91. We understand that 1985-86 enrollment is already somewhat greater than the 14,200 FTE for which we are funded. This suggests some short term decrease in the number of students is needed.

The 1990-91 completion of the adequate facilities needed to serve our current enrollment level coincides with a projected short term decline in the number of students graduating from California high schools (see Figure 2). The committee understands that the CSU is likely to expand considerably over the next ten years due in part to changing eligibility standards. It is important to note, however, that although the total number of high school graduates in 1994 will be nearly equal to the number in 1987, the ethnic mix of these students will be very different. This factor may actually decrease the number of applicants to Cal Poly.

Before the committee can support an increase of 800 FTE students we feel that two issues must be carefully considered: (1) How will these additional 800 students be distributed among new and existing programs? (2) How and when will the whole range of additional staff and facilities be added to handle these new students? The committee strongly recommends that any such expansion should only occur after a detailed expansion plan is developed. Such a plan would address the number and timing of new students, their level (freshman, transfer, or graduate) and their school and area. It would also address the timing and location of facilities to serve these students. Such facilities would include not only classrooms and laboratories, but also faculty offices (at least 50 at present student-teacher ratio on campus), parking, recreation (land and facilities), housing and support staff. The committee reiterates its recommendation that such facilities should be in place before students.
The committee understands even with limited expansion careful scrutiny of both new program proposals and existing programs is needed. The committee feels that such limits need not preclude curriculum adjustments to the changing economic, technological, and population trends. It does, however, suggest such adjustments must be made by shifting enrollment and resources within the university. We feel that such adjustments can only be made in consultation with individual departments and faculty.

In terms of the mix of first time freshman and transfer students for the campus as a whole, the committee recognizes that the current mix at Cal Poly (approximately 60% first-time freshman, 40% transfer) is nearly the reverse of the CSU as a whole. The committee also recognizes that Cal Poly and the CSU system have a unique responsibility in providing community college students an opportunity to complete their educations. It should also be noted that transferring from the community college system provides increased access to the increasing proportion of minority and ethnic students. The proportion of these students among California high school graduates will increase dramatically over the next fifteen years. We also note that an increased proportion of graduate and transfer students should place less demand on the currently overstressed areas of general education. The smaller size of upper division classes allows more focus on individual students, but greatly expands faculty loads in the major departments. However, the committee also recognizes that the effects of radically different admission ratios for first time freshman and transfer students are not clear, particularly as they may effect already heavily impacted departments. More careful study of this issue is needed.

To make informed decisions on detailed enrollment management issues such as growth areas and possible program reductions, the committee suggests that three things are needed:

1) The faculty at all levels (i.e. the Academic Senate, the Executive Committee, the faculty at large) needs to be better informed on the consequences of various enrollment policies;

2) a more structured process for faculty involvement in the decision-making process must be developed; and

3) proposed enrollment management decisions should be discussed with the affected departments before they are finalized.
### Comparison of Available Capacity to Planned Enrollment Growth by Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Planned Growth</th>
<th>Capacity Surplus</th>
<th>Capacity Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cal Poly's facilities are 2300 FTE short of 1985-1986 enrollment.

Capacities are based upon California Postsecondary Education Commission adopted utilization standards. February 3, 1986.
Figure 2

ACTUAL AND PROJECTED GRADUATES

Total Grads

Source:
State of California, Department of Finance
Population Research Unit (6/25/85)
MMW/3-13-86

*Projected
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background Statement:

In April 1985, Provost Fort requested the Academic Senate to have the Personnel Policies Committee review and make recommendations as to the most appropriate means of evaluating deans and department heads by the faculty. The Personnel Policies Committee has been working on a new format for the dean's evaluation instrument, which is the basis for this resolution.

RESOLUTION ON SCHOOL DEAN EVALUATIONS

WHEREAS, The dean has primary responsibility for leadership of the school in the allocation and utilization of financial resources, quality of academic programs, admissions and dismissal of students, appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion action, long-range direction of the school, development of external financial resources, and the representation of the school both internal to the university and to external constituents; and

WHEREAS, The faculty of a school is directly affected by the dean's performance in meeting these responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, Faculty members are in the closest relationship with the dean to observe his/her performance in fulfilling these responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, The dean's evaluation by the faculty is utilized for the purpose of providing evaluative information to the Academic Vice President, and

WHEREAS, Each probationary and tenured faculty member, including those persons in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP), has a professional responsibility to complete the evaluation form each year, in order to provide useful and timely input to the Academic Vice President; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached evaluation form be adopted for use by the faculty in evaluating the dean of each school; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends that said evaluation results be a major part of the Academic Vice President's evaluative consideration of each dean.

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
May 20, 1986
ANNUAL EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC DEANS

Each probationary or tenured faculty member has a professional responsibility to submit an evaluation of their School Dean. Your participation is of utmost importance if the evaluations are to be given serious consideration by the Academic Vice-President in his evaluation of the Dean. Good performance should be recognized and inadequate performance should be identified.

Dean being evaluated: __________________________________________

Please indicate how frequently you interact professionally with your Dean:
  a. On an individual basis?
     Weekly  Monthly  Quarterly  Annually  Never
  b. As part of a group?
     Weekly  Monthly  Quarterly  Annually  Never

Using the scale provided for each of the following items, please circle the number corresponding to how you rate your Dean's performance during this academic year.

Can’t  Unsatisfactory  Outstanding
Say  0  1  2  3  4  5

I. SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

A. Engages in long-range planning  0  1  2  3  4  5
B. Promotes improvement in curricula  0  1  2  3  4  5
C. Promotes improvement in goal policies and procedures  0  1  2  3  4  5
D. Encourages professional development  0  1  2  3  4  5
E. Recognizes professional accomplishments of school faculty  0  1  2  3  4  5
F. Works to enhance the professional reputation of the school  0  1  2  3  4  5
G. Adequately represents department positions and concerns to the university administration  0  1  2  3  4  5
H. Supports recruiting of high-quality students  0  1  2  3  4  5
I. Supports recruiting of high-quality faculty  0  1  2  3  4  5
J. Recruits high-quality support staff for Deans office  0  1  2  3  4  5
K. Fosters alumni relations  0  1  2  3  4  5
## II. MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Can't Say</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Objectively enforces established policy  
B. Makes decisions effectively  
C. Allocates budget and resources properly and fairly  
D. Provides faculty with a report on use of state funds  
E. Obtains resources as required  
F. Provides faculty with a report on use of discretionary funds  
G. Manages within-school personnel relations effectively  
H. Effectively implements affirmative action  
I. Handles conflicts and differences fairly  
J. Provides suitable working conditions  
K. Assures appropriate use of facilities  

## III. COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Can't Say</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Explains matters completely  
B. Communicates with clarity  
C. Provides information on a timely basis  
D. Is diplomatic  
E. Solicits faculty input as appropriate  
F. Consultants with faculty on matters which affect them personally  
G. Keeps the school adequately informed about relevant issues  

## IV. PERSONAL QUALITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Can't Say</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Is current and informed in the appropriate professional areas  
B. Is open and flexible regarding alternative points of view  
C. Demonstrates integrity in performing his responsibilities  
D. Is available as needed  

Overall, how do you rate your Dean? 0 1 2 3 4 5
V. WRITTEN COMMENTS

A. Please describe any actions by your Dean that you have been either especially pleased or displeased with during the year.

B. What suggestions do you have for how your Dean could improve his functioning?
MEMO

TO: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair  DATE: May 5, 1986
                      Academic Senate

FROM: John Rogaila, Chair  COPY:
                   Constitution & Bylaws Committee

SUBJECT: Vacancies Remaining After an Election

This resolution passed Constitution & Bylaws Committee May 1, 1986. The vote was unanimous.

Discussion of this problem lead to several startling facts. At least to me they were startling. Newer members of the faculty evidently are not aware of the importance or procedures used by the Senate. This was especially true with respect to elections - the nomination process and balloting.

Possibly the Senate needs to have an indoctrination session during Fall Conference to make new faculty aware of:

1. The "new" position and responsibilities of the faculty vs. the old line Administration which has existed on campus. Possibly some in Administration should attend, as well.

2. The Role of the Senate.

3. The method of becoming involved - Responsibilities and benefits.

(Somehow the Deans, etc., must be made aware of the importance of faculty participation and consider it for R.P.T.)
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background statement:

The faculty has been charged with responsibility for recommending policy impinging upon academic matters. This is an important responsibility which requires full participation of the faculty through the Academic Senate. In the past, the Executive Committee has appointed replacements for vacancies which occur due to resignations or leaves. Such temporary appointments are made until the next regular election. No provision has been provided for the current situation: vacancies after an election because of a lack of nominees for the positions. Some of these vacancies are on committees, for which members must be elected. This puts a significant additional burden of workload upon the Elections Committee at a busy time of the year. This recommendation will put the burden upon the faculty who will lose representation rather than the Academic Senate to avoid such situations in the future.

AS--86/____

RESOLUTION ON
AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS FOR THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, Senate positions have not been filled during the regular election process due to an insufficient number of nominees from specific electorates; and

WHEREAS, The current solution to have a special election to fill these vacancies puts an additional burden on the Elections Committee at a very active time of the school year; and

WHEREAS, The burden of ascertaining representation should rest upon the faculty who are to be represented; and

WHEREAS, Faculty would be apprised of an impending problem if notified one week before the deadline for nominations of any vacancies for which there were insufficient nominees; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That subsection (h) be added to Article VII.1.5.b.(1).

VII. COMMITTEES
5. Elections Committee
b. Responsibilities
(1) General

(h) ... one week prior to a nomination deadline, shall notify the chair of the caucus involved of any vacancies for which insufficient nominations have been received.

Proposed By:
Constitution and Bylaws Committee
May 20, 1986
MEMORANDUM:

TO: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
    Academic Senate

FROM: John A. Rogalla, Chair
    Constitution & By Laws Committee

SUBJECT: Resolution on Amendment to Bylaws for the UPLC Committee

Background

The senate on October 1, 1985 accepted Bylaws for the UPLC and on November 5, 1985 approved operating procedures for the UPLC. There were differences in the substance of the two actions which were noted by President Baker in a memo to the Chair of the Senate on December 2, 1985. The President stated tentative approval for this year until the documents were brought into agreement. At the May 13, 1986 senate meeting the senate amended the proposed amendments to bring the documents into agreement. Thus the Bylaws must be amended to provide agreement in the documents so that the president can give final approval for the established procedure.

Resolution

Whereas, the Memo of Understanding Article 27.5 and 28.7 specify a Profession Leave Committee composed of tenure faculty shall be elected, therefore be it

Resolved that Article VII Section I. Subsection 15 be amended to read
  'a. Membership

1. Members of the University Professional Leaves Committee shall be elected. The member representing the Library shall be elected from and by the Library faculty rather than from Professional Consultative Services in general.

2. Faculty eligible for membership are tenured, not on School/Library Professional Leaves Committee, and not applying for a leave with pay.
9. Ex officio members of the University Professional Leaves Committee shall be the Associate Personnel Director or his/her designee and the Provost. Ex officio members shall be non-voting.
REFERENCES FOR RESOLUTION: OPTIONS AND CONCENTRATIONS

3.1 Undergraduate Programs

3.1.1 Guidelines for Majors, Options, Concentrations, and Minors

A. Recognized Categories of Curricular Concentrations

(Note: For the purpose of computing grade point average at graduation, "major" is defined as follows in 1. and 2. below.)

1. Major (B.S.)

(a) For the B.S. degree the major shall consist of no less than 54 or more than 70 quarter units of courses required for graduation in such curricula.

(1) Of the units in courses designated as major, at least 22 must be in 300 or 400 series courses.

(2) Of the units in courses designated as major, at least six must be required in the freshman and at least nine in the sophomore years.

(b) The courses in the major, designated as "M" courses, must be exclusive of those used to satisfy the general education requirements. The "M" courses generally are those with the major departmental prefix although others may be included.

2. Major (B.A.)

(a) For the B.A. degree the major shall consist of no less than 48 or more than 60 quarter units of courses required for graduation in such curriculum.

(1) Of the units in courses designated as major, at least 24 must be in 300 or 400 series courses.

(2) Of the total of 186 quarter units required for the degree at least 50 must be in 100 or 400 series courses.

(3) Of the units in courses designated as major, at least six must be required in the freshman year and at least six in the sophomore year.

(b) The courses in the major, designated as "M" courses, must be exclusive of those used to satisfy the general education requirements. The "M" courses generally are those with the major departmental prefix although others may be included.

3. Minor

No minor is required for the bachelor's degree.

A minor is a formal aggregate of classes in a specific subject area designed to give a student documented competency in a secondary course of study. In contrast to options and concentrations it stands alone and is distinct from and outside the student's degree major. It is intended that the minor will be completed along with the requirements for the bachelor's degree. The student's transcript will certify completion of the minor.

The minor consists of 24 to 30 quarter units, of which at least half must be upper division. Twelve or more of the units in the minor must be in specified courses with the remainder, if any, to be chosen from an approved list.

Minors require the same academic review process and justification in terms of purpose, resources, need, etc., as do options and concentrations.

4. Option

An option is a curricular alternative in a department having 30 or more quarter units of specified courses not common to other curricular alternatives and designed to give the student substantially different capabilities than the other alternatives.

Reviewed January, 1981

Added April, 1982
The Pesticide Dilemma

Social and Political Dilemmas Hit Agriculture Research

cropland needs erosion protection:

THE ANTIBIOTIC CONTROVERSY

the Family Farm


STAN DUNDON, PHILOSOPHY DEPT.

ALLEN ROSEIFELD, AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT DEPT.

TOM RUEHR, SOIL SCIENCE DEPT.

HUM 302 HUMAN VALUES IN AGRICULTURE

TUESDAY, THURSDAY 12 - 1:30; BLDG. 5, ROOM 100
MEMORANDUM

Date: 4/7/86

To: Members of Academic Senate

From: Stan Dundon

Subject: HUM. 302, Human Values in Agriculture as an Area C course

Members and a Chair of a subcommittee which had not perceived Hum. 302 as principally an applied ethics, or professional ethics course told me that had they seen some of the materials attached to this memo they would have voted differently. For this reason I supply them to you. But for those of you who have seen the great volume of technical material contained in our text, I must emphasize that applied ethics is not a critique of a profession, but an effort to use appropriately evaluated technical information to make ethical decisions concerning the use of technology under the guidance of consensus ethical first principles. Mere consideration of relative volume of readings reveals little about the course in a professional ethics course since the volume of such consensus principles is small and the applications are many. Nevertheless in Hum. 302 all technical topics are chosen as tools to bring out the areas of serious ethical/human values conflicts in agriculture, to make those values explicit and to provide a basis for practice in the process of ethical decision making. A course with this goal is by nature interdisciplinary, appropriately taught by an interdisciplinary team, if resources permit. It is my assumption that the integrative purposes of general education provide an a priori favorable bias toward integrative courses. It is also my assumption that if a course must be listed in a single category, then that category should be the one which includes the discipline which provides the integration, the method, the principles and purposes of the course. In Hum. 302, all of these are derived from ethics.

I append the table of contents of our text (which costs about $22 Kinko’s), of which the first three chapters (part one) deal with ethics as a discipline capable containing technical and scientific information in its arguments, ethics as a method of applying its principles to difficult cases (principle of double effect, called risk/benefit analysis in modern jargon) and debates about judicial and administrative use/abuse of the method.

ALL STUDENTS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL THREE CHAPTERS ON ETHICS. ALL STUDENT WORK IS GRADED ON THE ETHICAL METHODS LAID OUT IN CHAPTER TWO.

Six chapters (part two) contain agricultural technical materials to which the students apply the materials of the ethical portion of the text. STUDENTS ARE REQUIRED TO CHOOSE FOR MASTERY. ONLY ONE CHAPTER AMONG THESE SIX FOR THE FOCUS OF THEIR WORK, ALTHOUGH THEIR MIDSERMS WILL EXAMINE THEIR READING OF
SEVERAL ADDITIONAL CHAPTERS. A Bibliography of the 40-50 short scientific or technical articles which make up this part of the text is available in the Hum.302 package available in the Senate Office.

Because this course was supported in its development for two years by an Academic Program Improvement Grant, the Chancellor's office paid for three independent external evaluators. In the first year one evaluator evaluated the overall impact of the Hum. 302 as an ethics course (Dr. Marilyn Sutton, now returned to English Dept. Cal State Dominguez Hills), one to evaluate the adequacy of the agricultural materials (Dr. Glenn Hawkes, Associate dean in charge of curriculum, U.C. Davis, now chairman of the department of behavioral sciences, U.C. Davis.) In the second year, a single evaluator of both aspects of the course, Associate Dean Charles Asbell of Cal Poly Pomona.

Evaluators Sutton and Asbell both visited the campus twice, spent about four hours each interviewing large numbers of the students, attended classes and administered both formal student evaluations and open ended essay evaluations. Dr. Sutton's report is 20 pages long, but I supply her executive summary. I supply Dr. Asbell's summary which is of interest because his experience of the course supports an Area C classification.

Other material available in our package in the Senate office contains Dr. Hawkes evaluation, and the segment of Dr. Sutton's report dealing with the Defining Issues Test. Dr. Sutton had the foresight to require that we administer a 45 minute pre-post test to our students. The test is the Defining Issues Test (DIT) developed by a center for values education at the University of Minnesota. The excerpt I provide shows that our students, regardless of their widely differing entry levels, all grew in their ability to recognize relevant factors to consider in making ethical decisions. But most importantly, for those who may fear that Hum. 302, while being an ethics course, is too "applied" or too narrow, the DIT deals with ethical decision making totally outside of agricultural issues. This means that what we teach the students in ethics is a general method which is fact generalizable with success by the students. Some confusion arose because of a recent request by the school of agriculture that Hum. 302 be cross listed as Ag. 302. The teachers of Hum. 302 feel that a true professional ethics must enhance the ability of the profession to serve the common good. Hence we have always wanted to discuss all issues in the presence of non-agricultural views energetically defended by non-agricultural students. Hence we favored the cross listing as a means of getting those non-agricultural students into the course. But this cross listing has become a matter of little or no importance since non-agricultural students now make up 50% of the class, which we consider adequate. The course can provide an excellent values-oriented introduction to a technical/scientific area and does achieve the citizenship goals of that introduction in an excellent manner. But apparently the larger number of electives enjoyed by non-technical students makes it possible to take Hum. 302 without receiving G.E. technical credit, which the School of Agriculture has not sought at this time in any case.
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HUMAN VALUES IN AGRICULTURE
First Year Evaluation, Spring 1984
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
(Marilyn Sutton, Dominguez Hills)

The first year of the funded interdisciplinary program Human Values in Agriculture was intended to test a curricular model wherein the ethical issues inherent in agricultural decision-making could be examined from the perspectives of several disciplines. As a team-taught offering, the course would draw on the expertise of diversely trained faculty; likewise, the intended student population would evidence diverse training and interests. Within this forum, the course was intended to make students familiar with the "technical-factual foundation of the needs of agriculture which contribute to values conflicts, to enable them to discriminate between resolvable and unresolvable conflicts, and to present ethical principles and devices for yielding resolutions." (project proposal)

This report is designed as a partial evaluation; the project directors will report on student outcomes as demonstrated in improved performance on essay questions, and an independent specialist, Dr. Glen Hawkes, University of California, Davis, will provide an assessment of the technical component of the course materials.

The evaluation plan for this portion of the evaluation is designed to assess: 1) the impact of the course on the student population in Spring 1984. Subordinately, the evaluation inquires into the impact of the project: 2) on faculty teaching the course; 3) and on the curriculum at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. 4) Finally, a judgment is offered as to the adaptability of the course for other CSU campuses.

The major findings of the evaluation of the 1983-84 project follow:

1. The class provided a highly successful forum for raising values issues and for establishing the importance of technical information in ethical decision-making.

2. The Spring 1984 offering was successful in teaching problem-solving approaches for ethical dilemmas. Students reported modest success in this regard but the results of the Defining Issues Test are even stronger.

3. The class was highly successful in engaging student interest as evidenced by student projects and the sophistication of understanding in student interviews.

4. Faculty and students found the class effective as a forum where a wide variety of views was considered.

5. The funded project proved an effective opportunity for faculty development. Faculty found they broadened their knowledge of key policy issues, came to see their specialties through the eyes of colleagues in other disciplines and participated in a
team-teaching enterprise where healthy mutual critiques were encouraged.

6. Human Values in Agriculture was successful as a curricular innovation. In a relatively unprecedented manner, the course addressed a goal currently being identified nationally and certainly within the range of the CSU General Education revisions. The success of the Spring 1984 offering has been limited by the fact that the course has not been proposed or accepted into the regular curriculum.

7. As a cross-disciplinary effort, where clear communication among departments is essential, the 83-84 project has been less successful than in other areas, considerable ambiguity and misinformation continuing to exist. The identification of a single project spokesperson would alleviate this problem in the future.

8. As a pilot project for possible replication in the CSU system, the project has been successful in generating preliminary interest but no campus has yet indicated a willingness to present a similar offering.

Second Year Evaluation, June 1985
(Assoc. Dean Charles W. Asbell, Cal Poly Pomona)

The course, "Human Values in Agriculture" (HU 302), as developed and taught on the Cal Poly San Luis Obispo campus, reflects the energies, ingenuities and efforts of several faculty members from the schools of Agriculture and Communication Arts. This offering provides a classroom forum whereby some of the ethical decision-making concepts as taught in humanities are brought into relevancy by utilizing real, contemporary agricultural related issues.

Due to the structure of this course, the qualitative nature of the subject matter, and the way it is taught, it serves as a role model to other CSU campuses as it responds to the "spirit" and mission of the Chancellor's Executive Order #338. That is, it is interdisciplinary in its contemporaneous cogent subject matter and is team taught by the faculties of two distinct schools within the university....

The teaching of HU 302 during the winter quarter of 1985 had a significant impact upon the students who took the course, the instructors and the faculties from the schools of [Humanities] Communication Arts and Agriculture who provided the course staffing. News concerning the quality and reputation of the course became known to the student body and by the end of the seventh week of the Winter quarter 1985, twenty-five students were already enrolled in the course as indicated by the Spring 1985 CAR I reports. Unfortunately, HU 302 was not offered during the
Spring term as necessary funds were not available.

Clearly, the teaching of "Human Values in Agriculture" (HU 302) at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo has been most successful. I would therefore recommend that HU 302 become a permanent course listing at CPSLO and that the Chancellor's office again provide funding for this most successful role model.

Along with the qualitative, integrated treatment of ethical and agricultural problems, it also serves as a model in addressing the "spirit" of the General Education-Breadth Requirements of Executive Order 338, i.e.:

1. It is interdisciplinary and integrative in nature (I., E).
2. It is team taught by the faculties of two separate schools within the university.
3. There is a large oral and writing component requirement (II., A).
4. The students are required to critically analyse and "synthesize" the information presented in class (II., B).
5. The course requires that the participants critically evaluate and appreciate the application of ethical values (II., C).
6. The scope of this course is not limited to the application of ethical principles to California, the United States or "western" agriculture but the "global" (western and non-western) implications are considered (IV., D).

On page 2, paragraph 7 of Executive Order No. 338, the text states:

The intent is that the General Education-Breadth Requirements be planned and organized in such a manner that students will acquire the abilities, knowledge, understanding, and appreciation suggested as interrelated elements, not as isolated fragments.

My perceptions of the "Human Values in Agriculture" course, based upon information used in this review, indicated that the spirit of this quotation has and is being addressed.

[Additional materials in the Senate Office give more excerpts from the text, an idea of what kinds of oral and writing assignments students do, the application of ethics upon which their grades are based, and more evaluative materials from our three external evaluators.]