I. Minutes:
   Approval of the February 23, 1988 Minutes (pp. 5-7).

II. Communications:
   A. Materials available for reading in the Academic Senate office (pp. 2-4).
   B. Memo from Kerschner to Presidents dated 2/5/88 re Request for Proposals for Academic Program Improvement 1988-89 (p. 8).
   D. President Baker has approved the following resolutions:
      AS-264-87/SWC  Resolution on Affirmative Action Facilitators (p. 10).
      AS-270-88  Resolution on Effects of Class Size...of Faculty Workload (p. 11).
      AS-272-88/SBUS  Resolution on Consultative...Faculty Position Controls (p. 13).

III. Reports:
   A. President
   B. Academic Affairs Office
   C. Statewide Senators

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
   A. Resolution on Enrollment Growth to 15,000 FTE and Beyond-Dalton, Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, Second Reading (pp. 15-30).
   B. Resolution on Report on Faculty Position Control-Conway, Chair of the Budget Committee, Second Reading (pp. 31-35).
   C. Resolution on Course Information/Syllabi-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, First Reading (p. 36).
   D. Resolution on The Use of the Student Instructional Report-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, First Reading (p. 40).
   E. Resolution on Common Final Examinations-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, First Reading (p. 41).
   F. Resolution on Course Evaluations-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, First Reading (p. 42).
   G. Resolution on Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, First Reading (pp. 43-45).

VI. Discussion Items:

VII. Adjournment:
Materials Available for Reading in the Academic Senate Office (FOB 23H)

(New reading materials highlighted in bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88 AY</td>
<td>Minutes from the bimonthly meetings of the Multiple-Criteria Admissions Program Technical Study Group (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1987</td>
<td>Documents/statistics/reports/etc. provided at the Student Retention Conference in June 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/10/87</td>
<td>Correspondence from Eric Seastrand re allocation of lottery funds to the CSU and Board of Trustees' Committee on Finance Report on the Lottery Revenue Budget Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22/87</td>
<td>Publications from the Office of the Chancellor re Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/87</td>
<td>CSU Committee of the Whole: New Priority Topics for 1987-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1987</td>
<td>The Master Plan Renewed, Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3/87</td>
<td>Quarterly Internal Report on Enrollment-Summer 1987 (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1987</td>
<td>Subject Matter Assessment of Prospective English Teachers (CSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/87</td>
<td>Capital Outlay Program 1988-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/87</td>
<td>Board of Trustees' Agenda, September 15/16, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/23/87</td>
<td>1986/87 Discretionary Fund Reports (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/87</td>
<td>Executive Review Policies and Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/87</td>
<td>Funding Excellence in Higher Education (CPEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The State's Interest in Student Outcomes Assessment (CPEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Incentive Funding Approaches for Promoting Quality in California Higher Education: A Prospectus (CPEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly Bill #2016 - Higher Education Talent Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/87</td>
<td>State Incentive Funding Approaches (memo from Kerschner to VPAA's dated 10/28/87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/87</td>
<td>Organizational charts of administrative positions throughout the CSU system (CSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/87</td>
<td>Academic Mainframe Computer Replacement Plan (CSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5/87</td>
<td>Earthquake Status Report (CSU, Los Angeles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/87</td>
<td>Quarterly Internal Report on Enrollment-Fall 1987 (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11/12/87  Retreat Rights for Academic Administrators (Cal Poly, SLO)
11/16/87  Summary Notes of the President’s Council Meetings (Cal Poly, SLO)
11/16/87  Status of Current Major Capital Outlay Projects (Cal Poly, SLO)
Nov 1987  Computer-Aided Productivity Center (Cal Poly SLO)
Nov 1987  Development Activities of the University Relations Division (Cal Poly, SLO)
Nov 1987  Recommendations of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan
Nov 1987  Cal Poly IBM Specialty Center (Cal Poly, SLO)
Programs, CSU)
11/13/87  Internationalizing Undergraduate Education Conference Highlights (CSU)
11/13/87  Asilomar Retreat of the Academic Senate CSU (Nov 13-15, 1987). Summary of
the Executive Committee and campus Senate chairs’ meetings (Academic
Senate CSU)
11/30/87  Allocation of MPPP Awards 1987-88 (number of awards to each school) (Cal
Poly, SLO)
12/1/87   Summer Bridge and Intensive Learning Experience: Second Year Evaluation
(CSU)
1/12/88   CSU Systemwide Full-Time Faculty by Tenure Status, Sex and Ethnicity: 1975-
1987 (CSU)
Jan '88   CALIFORNIA DEMOGRAPHICS: IMPACT ON EDUCATION - CAL POLY. HAROLD
HODGKINSON, A LECTURE IN CHUMASH AUDITORIUM (Video Cassette)
CALIFORNIA: THE STATE AND ITS EDUCATION SYSTEM by Harold L. Hodgkinson
(booklet)
1/14/88   Enrollment by Ethnic Categories in the California State Colleges (Cal Poly)
1/6/88    Report of the Technical Study Group on the Multiple-Criteria Applicant
Selection Process (Cal Poly)
1/14/88   Statistical Abstract to July 1986 (CSU)
1/20/88   CSU IBM Academic Mainframe Speciality Center (CSU)
1/22/88   Call for Proposals for Academic Computing Enhancement Institute Project
Funding (CSU)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/27/88</td>
<td>Status Report #3 - FY 1988/89 Governor's Budget (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/88</td>
<td>State Policy for Faculty Development in Public Higher Education (California Postsecondary Education Commission)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/88</td>
<td>Foundation Financial Reports for December 31, 1987 (Cal Poly Foundation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb '88</td>
<td>Exploring Faculty Development in Higher Education (California Postsecondary Education Commission)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/88</td>
<td>Joint Legislative Hearing on the Master Plan (Academic Senate CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/88</td>
<td>Lottery Funding for 1988-89/General Guidelines (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3/88</td>
<td>CPEC High School Eligibility Study (Trustees of the CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/88</td>
<td>Size, Growth, and Cost of Administration at the California State University (California Postsecondary Education Commission)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/88</td>
<td>Request for Proposals for Academic Program Improvement 1988-89 (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/88</td>
<td>Proposal on the Performing Arts Center (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/88</td>
<td>Campus Liability Regarding Personal Property of Faculty Members (Trustees of the CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/88</td>
<td>CSU Admissions Criteria (Academic Senate CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10/88</td>
<td>CPEC Study of State Incentive Funding Approaches (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT 1988-89

Attached is the Request for Proposals for the 1988-89 Academic Program Improvement Grants Program which contains information about proposal categories, guidelines, submission procedures, and application formats. Responses to this RFP should be postmarked no later than April 18, 1988.

Improvement of Teaching and Learning, Internationalizing Undergraduate Education, and Student Outcomes Assessment are the categories for new API grants in 1988-89. These categories were recommended by the API Advisory Committee after consultation with faculty, students, and administrators. Proposals for Second-Year Grants should be submitted under this RFP as well.

API is sponsoring two RFP workshops to assist prospective grantees in developing their proposals:

- Monday, February 29, 1988
- AMFAC Hotel, Burlingame
- San Francisco Airport

- Friday, March 4, 1988
- CSU Office of the Chancellor
- Long Beach

The agenda for both meetings will be the same. Those interested should contact Nancy Arena at ATSS 8-635-5856.

Where a number of faculty are planning to respond to this RFP, we ask that campuses employ local procedures to screen proposals. API coordinators are requested to describe the campus’ review process to assist this office in assessing campus interest in the topics selected and commitment to the proposals forwarded for consideration.

We hope your campus will find some or all of the categories to be of interest. Questions about the API Grants Program may be addressed to Dr. Helen Roberts at ATSS 8-635-5856 or (213) 590-5856.

LRK:na

Attachment

Distribution: Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
            API Advisory Board
            API Campus Coordinators
            1987-88 API Project Directors
            Academic Senate Chairs
            Chancellor’s Office Staff
            Legislative Analyst
Memorandum

FEB 22 1988

Date: February 22nd, 1988

To: Malcolm Wilson
Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Paul T. Adalian Jr.
Chair, UPLC

Subject: Spring, 1988 Sabbatical Report

The University Professional Leave Committee has completed its work on sabbatical requests for spring of 1988. Please note that this is a separate and distinct report from the UPLC's report on sabbatical and difference-in-pay leaves for the 1988-89 academic year.

There were nine applicants for the three one quarter sabbaticals. Members of the UPLC reviewed the nine applicants, took necessary notes, and met Friday, February 19th, 1988 to deliberate.

The Committee recommends the following candidates in ranked order:

1. Howell
2. Apfelberg
3. McCombs

If an approved/awarded sabbatical is subsequently withdrawn/declined, the position shall be offered in accord with the following university-wide list of runners-up:

4. Smidt
5. Zeuschner
6. Harrigan
7. Schumann
8. Mottmann
9. McGonagill

Eldon Li who applied was found ineligible since he did not appear on the 1987-88 Eligibility List for Leaves with Pay.
Memorandum

To: A. Charles Crabb, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
    President

Date: February 8, 1988

Subject: Resolution on Affirmative Action Facilitators (AS-264-87/SWC)

I commend the Academic Senate for its thoughtful background statement and resolution on Affirmative Action Facilitators. It is evidence of the Senate's support of Cal Poly's commitment to Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action.

I am especially pleased by the wording in the second resolved clause: "That the Affirmative Action Facilitator be encouraged to promote collegiality and mentorship between current faculty and new faculty to promote retention of Affirmative Action faculty." Only with the sincere support of Cal Poly faculty members will our efforts to hire and retain minority and female faculty members succeed.

I approve the resolution with the following suggested change in the last resolved clause:

"That the Affirmative Action officer provide an annual report on the Affirmative Action Facilitator program to the Academic Senate in order to determine the success of the program."

I believe that the Senate should receive the report and then direct it to the appropriate committee. Therefore I suggest omitting the words "through its Status of Women Committee."

Please convey my thanks to the Senate membership for their support of this vital program.
To: A. Charles Crabb, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker  
President

Subject: RESOLUTION ON EFFECTS OF CLASS SIZE, MODE AND LEVEL OF FACULTY WORKLOAD (AS 270-88)

The subject resolution is approved, noting however that the University, and therefore the faculty consultative process, must conform with the CSU Capital Outlay calendar dictated by the dates of Trustee and legislative actions. Furthermore, in the capital planning for construction or remodeling of instructional facilities, the Executive Dean begins with a program statement prepared by the faculty in the program or their appointed representatives. Consultation on the facility plans occurs with the concerned faculty or their representatives, and project schematics are reviewed and recommended to the President via the Campus Planning Committee. This practice has been in place for over 25 years.
Memorandum

To: A. Charles Crabb, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
      President

Subject: Resolution on International Education Office (IEO) (AS-271-88/Little)

February 9, 1988

I support in principle the concept of an International Education Office and will ask the Vice President for Academic Affairs to seek a means of providing efficiency, coherence, and leadership for the International Education efforts of the campus. I am not, however, prepared to restrict efforts toward the establishment of an International Education Office to the specific mechanisms contained in the two resolved clauses or to the specifics of the draft proposal for an International Education Office which was attached to the resolution.

In the absence of direct budgetary support for International Education, I believe it is in our best interest to maintain maximum flexibility in seeking creative ways to establish and maintain a central focus for campus international activities.
The subject resolution is approved. As noted in your memorandum transmitting the resolution such consultation is already taking place.
Memorandum

To: A. Charles Crabb, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: Resolution on the Future of Concurrent Enrollment (AS-273-88/EX)

I endorse the efforts of the Academic Senate to oppose the diversion of Concurrent Enrollment money to the General Fund.
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate  Date: February 25, 1988

From: Linda Dalton, Chair, Long-Range Planning Committee

Subject: Revisions to Resolution and Report on "Enrollment Growth to 15,000 FTE and Beyond"

In response to the discussion at the Academic Senate meeting on February 23, the Long-Range Planning Committee has made the following revisions to both the resolution and report.

1. Format -- We completely reorganized the two documents. The resolution now has only one WHEREAS clause and three RESOLVED clauses, essentially putting the resolution in the form of adopting the Long-Range Planning Committee report. As a result, the report has become longer. The numerous WHEREAS clauses from the previous resolution have been incorporated in the Discussion and Findings sections of the report; and the earlier list of RESOLVED clauses have become Recommendations.

2. Content -- The revised report contains a few substantive additions to respond to specific suggestions or issues raised by senators. All of these are marked with an asterisk in the revised report.

   a. Discussion of the premises upon which the report is based;

   b. Clarification of the data regarding admission vs. enrollment at the upper division;

   c. A recommendation regarding more resources for the GE&B program;

   d. Discussion of Cal Poly's responsibility to the Central Coast region vs. its statewide/nationwide reputation;

   e. Suggestion that a range of 16,600 to 17,400 FTE be examined as the enrollment which Cal Poly might reach (if all the conditions established in the report can be met) over the next fifteen years.
Background statement:

During the summer of 1987, Chancellor Reynolds requested Cal Poly (as well as other CSU schools) to consider how to expand student enrollment to meet the growing need for higher education in the state. The Chancellor asked for a report by April 1, 1988. President Baker sought the advice of the Academic Senate (through its Long-Range Planning Committee) and the Deans' Council regarding growth to the current Master Plan limit of 15,000 and possibly beyond in the future.

The Long-Range Planning Committee and Deans' Council held some joint meetings, shared information, and consulted individuals outside Cal Poly for their expertise (such as demographer Harold Hodgkinson). However, no time was available to collect new primary data nor to conduct special studies. The attached report summarizes the findings and recommendations of the Long-Range Planning Committee. In addition, a complete set of the background papers prepared by the committee is on file in the Academic Senate Office.

The following resolution is based on the premises that some growth in enrollment is appropriate to Cal Poly, but that program addition or expansion should be carefully planned so as to respond to external pressures, to take advantage of academic opportunities, and to assure that necessary instructional and non-instructional facilities and services are available to support the increase in numbers.

RESOLUTION ON
ENROLLMENT GROWTH TO 15,000 FTE AND BEYOND

WHEREAS  Cal Poly has been asked to consider when and how it might accommodate an increase in enrollment at two levels -- to 15,000 FTE and beyond 15,000 FTE;
THEREFORE, BE IT
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University adopt the attached report prepared by the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee specifying criteria and conditions for educational equity, composition of the student body, and program addition and expansion; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly enter a first phase of growth in enrollment toward 15,000 FTE no sooner than the 1991-1992 academic year to allow time for the completion of approved facilities and for the approval of funds to alleviate other shortages (in both instructional and non-instructional facilities and services), as specified in the attached report prepared by the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly prepare a comprehensive plan, in consultation with the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee, covering demographic projections, composition of the student body, program addition and expansion, facility location and timing, and community impact to determine whether and how Cal Poly could accommodate an increase in enrollment to a range of 16,600 to 17,400 FTE over the next fifteen years, as specified in the attached report prepared by the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee.

Revisions Proposed By:
Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee
February 25, 1988
Academic Senate
Long-Range Planning Committee

February 11, 1988; Revised February 25, 1988

[Summary of Information and Issues Regarding]

Report on

ENROLLMENT GROWTH TO 15,000 FTE AND BEYOND

The following report summarizes the information used, issues raised, and, in some instances, the reasoning followed during Long-Range Planning Committee deliberations about future enrollment growth. This report builds on AS-220-86/LRPC, passed two years ago, which also addressed enrollment issues. Key excerpts from that Senate Resolution are attached. More complete information is available in a set of working papers on file at the Academic Senate office and from the sources cited in the Reference list attached to this report.

The report and recommendations are based on the following premises:

1. Some growth in enrollment is appropriate to Cal Poly, but the numbers depend upon the nature of the growth that would occur. In other words, growth cannot be thought of as simply expanding what we currently have. Instead, the Committee sought to consider the conditions under which Cal Poly could grow.

2. Enrollment growth at Cal Poly should respond to external demographic changes and pressures that affect higher education, especially in California.

3. Enrollment growth at Cal Poly must also recognize state expectations regarding CSU schools, particularly with respect to the enrollment of transfer students and support for the Community College system.

4. Plans for enrollment growth at Cal Poly should acknowledge Cal Poly's special role as a polytechnic university and the adopted mission statement of the University.

5. The conditions necessary to accommodate programmatic growth to 15,000 FTE include the provision of non-instructional facilities and services as well as instructional facilities and staff. (This basically reinforces and further specifies AS-220-86/LRPC.)

6. Finally, the conditions necessary to consider any programmatic growth beyond 15,000 FTE involve a rate of growth which is sensitive to Cal Poly's impact on surrounding communities; a rate of growth that could be assessed in stages; and a total amount of growth that could be handled by the campus. The Committee was reluctant to indicate a maximum number for future enrollment, because it will take further study to determine how well the conditions for growth beyond 15,000 can be satisfied. To assure that the conditions which must be met in order to accommodate growth would not be overshadowed by the number itself, the Committee
was willing to refer only to a range, with the understanding that it must be tied to a plan that would show how the list of conditions in the recommendations which follow could be met.

I. Demography and Educational Equity

A. Discussion and Findings

The committee examined data on nationwide trends in higher education, on high school graduation and matriculation by ethnic group, on demographic change in California, and on enrollment characteristics of Cal Poly. The committee also met with demographer Harold Hodgkinson to discuss some of the ramifications of change in California for Cal Poly. From this, several key factors emerge:

1. The absolute number of high school graduates is currently declining, but will turn around (in California in 1990).

2. College students are becoming older, on average, and less-likely to enroll full-time and/or complete a degree within 4-5 years. At Cal Poly this decrease in the average student load means that the total number of students enrolled is about 10 percent more than the FTE they generate (i.e., it takes about 15,620 students to generate 14,200 FTE).

3. The increasing non-white population in California is not being reflected to the same extent in college enrollments. (Asians participate at a higher rate; Blacks and Latinos at a lower rate than whites.) Cal Poly enrolls even fewer non-white students than most other CSU schools.

4. Ethnic groups vary significantly according to their choice of major or occupation and their college preferences.

5. Overall, the changing demography in California means that Cal Poly will not be able to continue to draw so many of its students from its traditional pool of predominantly white applicants.

6. The concept of educational equity requires that Cal Poly increase its proportion of under-represented students; yet attaining educational equity requires extraordinary efforts by colleges and universities and special attention to high school preparation and recruiting.

B. Recommendations

1. That any increase in enrollment at Cal Poly give priority to CSU qualified under-represented students:

2. That Cal Poly support, expand or create the following kinds of programs (with sufficient funding) to draw and retain more ethnic minority students (especially Black and Latino): (1) To increase eligibility and recruitment through high school
counseling, and "feeder" or "farm" programs at specified community colleges for certain majors to effectively guarantee transfer to Cal Poly as juniors; (2) To increase community support through residential choice on and off campus, and appropriate social opportunities; (3) To increase retention through faculty and staff models and mentors, academic advising and personal counseling, easing procedures for changing majors and providing students with financial aid.

3. That Cal Poly expand student support services, including record keeping, food service and book store supplies to accommodate the needs of students with different cultural backgrounds and of part-time students and others who do not progress at a "normal" rate or enroll continuously from quarter to quarter.

II. Composition of the Student Body

A. Discussion and Findings

The committee found a need for clarification of the current percentages of undergraduate transfers vs. first-time freshmen. While common knowledge holds that Cal Poly's enrollment represents the reverse of the CSU system in general, the committee found that this is only true of Fall Quarter (which ranges from 42 to 49 percent transfer students). Indeed, data for enrollment across the entire academic year revealed that the percentage of undergraduate transfers has ranged in recent years between 54 and 60 percent -- not far off the state mandate of a minimum of 60 percent.

Further, the Master Plan Renewed calls for four-year institutions to "maintain lower-division enrollment systemwide at no more than 40 percent of total undergraduate enrollment" (p. 15). For Fall Quarter 1987 enrollment at Cal Poly consisted of 37.2 percent freshmen and sophomores and 63.8 percent upper division students. The only schools which enrolled more than 40 percent in the lower division were Engineering (at 44.7 percent) and Science and Math (at 46.7%).

Discussion of any need to increase the relative percentages of undergraduate transfer students vs. first-time freshmen reflects countervailing forces at Cal Poly.

On the one hand, the state legislature and Master Plan Renewed report insist that CSU schools enroll at least 60 percent transfer upper division students. Reasons are partly financial -- it is significantly less costly for students to attend community colleges than CSU or UC schools. In addition, under-represented minority students are more likely to attend community colleges initially, so increasing the proportion of transfer students can also increase the prospects for achieving educational equity goals. Finally, fulfillment of General Education and Breadth requirements at the community colleges relieves CSU schools of much of this burden (both on facilities and faculty), allowing more attention to advanced study (upper division courses) in the CSU.

On the other hand, Cal Poly's practice of requiring students to declare a major upon admission as freshmen means that most majors are designed for a four-five year sequence. Further, many of the polytechnic majors require careful course sequencing to ensure that students have completed pre-requisites before entering advanced courses. Such sequencing has been difficult to
coordinate with community colleges, especially in specialized fields where the community colleges cannot reasonably be expected to provide all of the necessary pre-requisites to allow students to transfer to Cal Poly as juniors.

A further complication at Cal Poly is that many students who may be considered upper division students based on accumulated quarter units have not completed their lower division General Education and Breadth courses either prior to entering Cal Poly nor during their first two years at Cal Poly (if they enter as first-time freshmen).

The role of graduate education has received less attention. While acceptable according to the Cal Poly mission, "to enrich ... the undergraduate experience," graduate programs are small (currently constituting less than 10 percent of all Cal Poly students) and unevenly distributed in the university. (For example, they range from only 2.5 percent in liberal arts to nearly 19 percent in Professional Studies and Education.)

The mission statement does not address Cal Poly's relative responsibility to education in the state versus a more local population. Cal Poly occupies a unique position in the CSU system as a university with nationwide, even worldwide, recognition in some fields. Yet, there is a demand from students who graduate from high school and attend community colleges in the Central Coast region to attend Cal Poly.

B. Recommendations

1. That schools or programs which enroll less than 60 percent upper division students attempt to redesign their curricula (especially pre-requisites and sequencing of courses) to articulate with appropriate preparation at community colleges so as to facilitate the admission of more transfer students;

2. That more resources be allocated to the General Education and Breadth program so that students may be able to meet both lower division and upper division requirements on schedule;

3. That graduate programs be allowed to expand and new graduate programs be added that fit the polytechnic character of Cal Poly and support existing undergraduate programs;

4. That Cal Poly provide support services appropriate to the educational, financial and social needs of graduate students to the extent that they differ from undergraduates;

5. That Cal Poly continue to give some admission priority to the student population from the Central Coast.

III. Program Characteristics

A. Discussion and Findings

The committee looked primarily to Cal Poly's mission statement to discuss what kinds of programs might be expanded or added in the future. Thus, the committee was concerned with
maintaining, indeed capitalizing on, the special polytechnic character of Cal Poly.

In addition, future employment prospects for graduates are critical. However, projection of future demand for specific programs depends upon reliable economic forecasting, which was not available to the committee. (The committee plans to submit a supplementary forecasting report.) Further, individual members lacked sufficient expertise to assess the prospects for specific areas. The committee discussed a few possibilities for the future, such as biotechnology, but concluded that it would be more responsible to establish some criteria for evaluating future program proposals. Thus, proponents of a particular program could be asked to conduct a market analysis and provide the evidence of future demand for the field at the time that they submit a proposal. This approach provides flexibility for the university -- both to avoid remaining committed to programs which are currently popular but may decline in the future as well as to take advantage of new opportunities as they arise.

*Key findings include the following*

1. Recent employment trends and projections for the future show that not all currently impacted programs will continue to be in high demand; and

2. The Cal Poly mission statement emphasizes polytechnic education and the application of scientific knowledge to contemporary problems; and

3. There are opportunities for an interdisciplinary approach to instruction between schools to take advantage of the polytechnic character of Cal Poly;

4. Any program or major can be designed to support or accommodate the polytechnic emphasis at Cal Poly.

**B. Recommendations**

1. That priority for enrollment increases should occur in programs which are impacted at Cal Poly and elsewhere in the CSU system; or in programs which are in newly emerging fields;

2. That enrollment increases in programs at Cal Poly which are also impacted throughout the CSU system only be considered when there is a demonstrated demand for employment in that field continuing to and beyond the year 2000;

3. That all future academic programs (especially in the liberal arts) attempt to embody the special polytechnic character of Cal Poly.

**IV. Growth to 15,000 FTE**

**A. Discussion and Findings**

Although Cal Poly has been budgeted at 14,200 FTE since 1977-78, enrollment has been projected to increase to 14,600 in 1990-91 and to 15,000 in 1991-92. The committee felt that this schedule should be delayed one year, to wait out the decline in high school graduates
which reaches the bottom of the trough in 1990. With respect to programs, the increment from 14,200 to 14,600 has already been allocated to programs which have been approved but not yet implemented.

Facility planning has proceeded accordingly with recent approval by the CSU trustees of key instructional facilities. However, the committee found no assurance that non-instructional facilities and support services would keep pace with the instructional facilities. For example, both the Administration Building and University Union were built for fewer than the current number of students (13,000 and 12,000 respectively). Also, certain computing services and the library budget for periodicals and new acquisitions are insufficient to support current enrollment. Further, outdoor recreation space is at a premium and students lack indoor space for studying and socializing. On the other hand, parking is more than sufficient -- complaints stem from inconvenience rather than lack of space.

*Key findings include the following:

1. A number of new programs which would generate about 517 students (about 470 FTE based on current student loads) have been approved but not implemented;

2. The number of high school graduates in California is expected to reach a low point in 1990 and then begin to increase again;

3. Some facilities, such as the Recreation Center, Dairy Science Instruction Center, addition to Business Administration and Education, and new Faculty Office Building, designed to meet current deficits and/or to support enrollment growth to 15,000 have been approved by the Trustees, but remain subject to continued funding as part of a state-wide bond issue;

4. Other facilities, such as the university union, administration building, library, outdoor recreation space, and student services (even after the new Student Services Building is completed) are inadequate to meet current enrollment levels and/or are inadequate to support an increase to 15,000 FTE, and no specific plans have been approved to expand them;

5. Academic Senate Resolution AS-220-86/LRPC (approved by the President, July 23, 1986) states that facility deficits must be met before any enrollment expansion be considered.

B. Recommendations

1. That the first phase of growth toward 15,000 FTE accommodate programs which have been approved but not yet implemented;

2. That Cal Poly enter the first phase of growth in enrollment toward 15,000 FTE no sooner than the 1991-1992 academic year to allow time for recruiting and counseling efforts to reach students who will be at the forefront of the new increase in high school graduates;

3. That Cal Poly consider entering a second phase of growth toward 15,000 after the
approved facilities have been completed and funds have been approved to alleviate other shortages (including non-instructional facilities and services).

V. Extent and Phasing of Growth Beyond 15,000 FTE

Growth beyond 15,000 is complicated by many factors. A state-wide increase in high school graduates after 1990 creates a need for additional capacity in the CSU system. Indeed, some enrollment growth can be beneficial to individual schools. Increases in enrollment can bring more resources to the university and permit program expansion or addition without jeopardizing existing programs. Further, departments which have been unable to hire any new faculty because of lack of turnover would benefit from an increase in enrollment that would generate new tenure-track positions.

However, because growth beyond 15,000 FTE goes beyond the existing Master Plan for Higher Education and would create a number of impacts, an Environmental Impact Report would have to be prepared. To do so, Cal Poly would need to address how rapidly it would grow, what facilities and other resources would be required, how students would be housed, and how traffic congestion would be handled. The rate and extent of growth would affect the image and character of Cal Poly, both visually and educationally. Basic infrastructure is apparently sufficient (water and sewer), but the campus has very limited space for new buildings within a ten-minute walking radius without giving up open space. Further, internal circulation (of cars, bicycles and pedestrians) becomes more difficult to manage as numbers increase. Just as importantly, unless Cal Poly provides more housing on campus, all new enrollment would lead to a greater demand for student (and faculty and staff) housing in San Luis Obispo and other nearby communities. Already, many of these face constraints on growth due to limits on water supply, sewage treatment and/or buildable land. More commuting would mean more cars, more traffic congestion and more need for parking. Thus, a careful plan to address these issues would be essential.

*Key findings include the following:

1. The number of high school graduates in California is expected to increase steadily after 1990 (at about 3.7 percent per year);

2. Cal Poly's polytechnic emphasis is especially suited to prepare students for future jobs in the state;

3. Some growth in enrollment can create opportunities for educational diversity;

4. Some growth in enrollment can create opportunities for new faculty positions in departments which do not expect to experience any turnover;

5. Some growth in enrollment can bring new resources to the University;

6. The campus infrastructure (utility systems) have excess capacity (the most limiting of which are sewage transmission lines);

7. Cal Poly's campus has a limited amount of space remaining to construct buildings.
within a 10-minute walking radius:

8. New structures increase the density of development and supplant open space on the campus; whereas development in the surrounding area places prime agricultural land at risk;

9. Students rate the geographic setting and appearance of the campus second only to its academic reputation as reasons for selecting Cal Poly;

10. Vehicular ingress and egress from Cal Poly is already inadequate (especially in the event of any areawide emergency);

11. Cal Poly has a significant impact on overall population growth, housing and traffic congestion in the surrounding community, at the same time as it contributes to the area's economy;

12. The growth of the City of San Luis Obispo and surrounding communities is constrained by limitations on water supply, sewage treatment capacity, and buildable land;

13. Population in San Luis Obispo County is expected to grow at about 2.3 percent per year through the year 2000;

14. The communities in San Luis Obispo County which have the greatest capacities for growth are in the southern and northern parts of the County, farthest removed from Cal Poly and least well-served by public transportation;

15. Academic Senate Resolution AS-220-86/LRPC (Approved by the President, July 23, 1986) states that "expansion should only occur after a detailed expansion plan is developed:"

B. Recommendations

1. That Cal Poly consider a modest expansion in enrollment beyond the 15,000 FTE in the current Master Plan for Higher Education;

2. That such growth must fit within the parameters of community growth policies and constraints;

3. That the first phase of growth beyond 15,000 FTE be considered no sooner than two to three years after enrollment reaches 15,000 FTE;

4. That such growth occur in increments, whereby two to three years of growth (of 400 FTE per year) are followed by two to three years of stabilization to permit time for catching up and for assessment of the impacts of growth before considering a new phase;

5. That Cal Poly consider each new phase of growth after facilities have been completed and funds have been approved to alleviate any shortages in instructional space.
non-instructional space, and supporting services:

6. That Cal Poly maintain its visual image of smallness and rural setting, by limiting the size (height and bulk) of new structures, by sensitive placement and landscaping of new buildings, by preserving open space within the campus, and by maintaining open land around the campus;

7. That Cal Poly maintain its ambience of smallness and intimacy by retaining small class sizes, early affiliation of students with a specific program or department, participation in student activities and access to student services;

8. That Cal Poly consider reducing its impact on housing and traffic congestion by adding residential facilities on campus (including necessary infrastructure and supporting services) and establishing a policy of requiring on-campus residence for first-time freshmen;

9. That Cal Poly consider limiting vehicular access to the campus; create more incentives to encourage commuting by means other than the automobile; and provide more facilities for non-auto-users; and be it further

10. That Cal Poly assign a full-time professional staff position to campus planning to work with the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee and coordinate a comprehensive plan, covering demographic projections, composition of the student body, program addition and expansion, facility location and timing, and community impact to determine whether and how Cal Poly could accommodate an increase in enrollment to a range of 16,600 to 17,400 over the next fifteen years.

Attachments

Selected excerpts from AS-220-86/LRPC, "Revised Enrollment Recommendations"

List of Long-Range Planning Committee Working Papers on Enrollment Growth

References

*NOTE: Revisions in language are indicated as follows:

[Language to be removed from the February 11 report is placed within brackets.]

Language added to the February 11 report is underlined. In most cases this language comes directly from February 11 resolution -- the WHEREAS clauses have been incorporated in the Discussion and Findings sections, and the RESOLVED clauses in the Recommendations.

*An asterisk precedes each completely new section to the report.
"There is strong consensus . . . 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." Data for 1985-1986 showed that Cal Poly only had sufficient facilities to support an enrollment of 11,900 FTE (or a facility deficit of 2300 FTE). "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 . . . ."

The Senate approved the Long-Range Planning Committee recommendation that the following issues must be addressed before an increase of 800 FTE could be supported: "(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? . . . 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 or 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. . . . Such facilities should be in place before students."
Academic Senate
Long-Range Planning Committee, 1987-1988

List of Working Papers on Enrollment Growth to 15,000 FTE and Beyond
(Complete set on file in Academic Senate office)

1. Model for considering enrollment options
2. Demographic factors affecting Cal Poly enrollment
3. Selective summary: Master Plan Renewed
5. Potentials for future programs
6. Cal Poly growth to 15,000 FTE
7. How to handle planned growth beyond 15,000 FTE
8. Some thoughts on numbers beyond 15,000 FTE
9. Image/character of Cal Poly
10. City and community consequences of enrollment growth at Cal Poly
11. References

NOTE: These papers are in various states of refinement, and sometimes include personal recommendations or viewpoints held by individual members of the committee which were refined during subsequent discussions.
References


California Department of Finance, Population Research Unit. Sacramento, CA; 1987.

California State University. *Student Needs and Priorities Survey.*


Enrollment Management Considerations. San Luis Obispo: California Polytechnic State University; 1984.


RESOLUTION ON
REPORT ON FACULTY POSITION CONTROL

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University accepts and endorses the recommendations in the attached Report on Faculty Position Control submitted by the Academic Senate Budget Committee.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Executive Committee
February 16, 1988
REPORT ON FACULTY POSITION CONTROL
Submitted by the Academic Senate Budget Committee

INTRODUCTION

For some weeks now the Academic Senate Budget Committee has been considering the issue of faculty position control for Summer Quarter as well as the rest of the academic year. Our consideration of the issue became more focused when the Personnel Policies Committee submitted their Emergency Resolution on Summer Quarter Funding. Our committee took a position in opposition to the resolution and was in the midst of attempting to develop an alternative resolution, when the resolution was withdrawn from consideration. Just because the issue was withdrawn does not mean that the university no longer faces a problem in dealing with faculty position control for Summer Quarter and beyond. Some form of dollar control of faculty positions seems inevitable.

The university wishes to maintain a quality educational program for the Summer Quarter as well as the regular academic year. The university has gone on record arguing the necessity of maintaining Summer Quarter as a fully funded state supported academic term. Some of the reasons for this position include:

1. Student demand
2. Enhanced progress toward graduation
3. The impacted nature of the campus
4. Overutilization of facilities
5. The use of Summer Quarter as a recruitment tool for faculty hires

The Vice President for Academic Affairs office is currently surveying departments to see how much of a deficit will be created, if any, by currently proposed Summer Quarter staffing. Once the amount of the deficit, if any, is determined, then measures to meet the revenue shortfall will have to be addressed. The Budget Committee believes that some guidelines should be proposed for dealing with this potential summer
shortfall, as well as dealing with faculty position control for the academic year(s) to come.

THE CURRENT PROBLEM

There was a substantial faculty salary deficit for 1986-87, which meant that $483,000 had to be transferred from other budget categories including replacement equipment to cover the shortfall. Of the total amount, $180,000 could be attributed to Summer Quarter. A similar deficit could occur in 1987-88.

CAUSES OF THE PROBLEM

Because the university is put in a position where it must hire new and leave replacement faculty positions at a higher rank than Assistant Professor Step 8, and must hire Summer Quarter faculty members at a higher level than Associate Professor Step 12, a deficit is created in faculty salaries. Some of the reasons why this deficit occurs include:

1. The maturing of the faculty in rank at Cal Poly
2. The higher proportion of faculty in DMD (Designated Market Disciplines) positions at Cal Poly. (This problem is addressed in the 1988-89 budget cycle.)
3. The lack of an available pool of lecturers in the community surrounding Cal Poly in many disciplines to cover summer teaching positions and leave replacements
4. Due to market conditions, a similar problem is also created by initial hires and leave replacements being hired at levels above state funding formula

The university has also been facing other fiscal restraints which have exacerbated the problem. In recent years the university has lost much of its ability to reallocate resources internally to meet actual and de facto budget cutbacks/shortfalls. Some of the causes of this situation include the following:

1. In 1986-87 meeting a midyear deficit reduction plan, with Cal Poly's total equaling $393,054
2. 1987-88 reallocation of campus budgets to fund the nonfaculty MSA's (Merit Salary Adjustments) in the amount of $450,000
3. Meeting increased commitments to the OASIS Project to upgrade our inadequate Student Information System

4. Increasing contingency fund balance to help meet shortfalls in other budget areas including enrollment mix changes from part-time to full-time students leading to a revenue shortfall in 1987-88

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the belief of the Budget Committee that any internal budgetary solution to this externally caused problem sends the wrong kind of message to the Chancellor's Office, the Department of Finance, and the State Legislature by setting a precedent in dealing with budget cutbacks/shortfalls.

External - Long-term Solution to the Problem

1. The university should contact the Chancellor's Office, the Department of Finance, and the State Legislature and request additional funding for Summer Quarter 1988, and ask that the formula for determining Summer Quarter faculty positions and academic year new hires and leave replacements at Cal Poly be made reflective of actual experience or on the basis of average rank of faculty at Cal Poly.

2. The university should support an increase in faculty positions based upon 100% of Mode and Level funding instead of the current 92%.

3. The university should support State and Chancellor's Office funding of nonfaculty MSA's.

Internal - Guidelines for Dealing with the Problem

If an internal campus solution of the problem is required after exhausting all other alternatives, then the following guidelines should be applied.

1. In the development of any plan related to faculty position control, full consultation between the administration, faculty, and students will occur.

2. Whatever plan is approved should be applied equally to each of the seven instructional schools.
3. If the proposed plan involves a change in working conditions over past practice, then those changes must be negotiated with the Unit Three bargaining agent, the California Faculty Association.

4. Any plan proposed and later adopted should not indicate that an increased workload is acceptable to the faculty.

5. Prior to any proposed plan development, a full accounting of how these deficits have been met in the past needs to be provided by the administration along with documentation that leave replacement and Summer Quarter hires are the main cause of the budget deficit/shortfall. Also the results of the Vice President for Academic Affairs office's survey on the Summer Quarter situation needs to be distributed to the academic community in a timely fashion.

6. That before any proposed solution is adopted, all budgets including soft money budgets (Foundation, Annual Giving Fund, etc.) be reviewed to see if other funding sources are available to assist faculty salary deficits. A fee increase for students attending Summer Quarter should also be studied as a possible alternative.

7. Any budget adjustments related to funding Summer Quarter positions or leave replacements should be spread across the entire university rather than being taken from only one funding source.

CONCLUSION

The Budget Committee will continue to study this issue, and will attempt to absorb any new information that sheds light on the situation. The Budget Committee welcomes your comments and input concerning any additional guidelines that should be considered. Time is needed to study all the ramifications of this issue before coming forward with a resolution that proposes a specific solution to this complex problem.
RESOLVED, That during the first week of classes an instructor is to distribute to the class members printed information about the course *, including at least the following items:

1. The instructor's grading policy;
2. Required texts and other materials;
3. Course goals, objectives and requirements;
4. Attendance requirements;
5. Policy on due dates and make-up work;
6. Tentative schedule of examinations; and
7. Policy on retention of exams, especially final exams; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the instructor be encouraged to distribute a syllabus to the class.

* It is understood that circumstances may require a change in the course information and /or syllabus distributed during the first week of a class and this resolution does not preclude such changes, nor is it meant to abridge any principle of academic freedom.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 10, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-—-88/——

RESOLUTION ON
THE USE OF THE STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate recognizes the importance of developing the educational quality at Cal Poly to its highest degree; and

WHEREAS, This may be achieved with feedback which is facilitated through an objective course and faculty evaluation; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate believes that the STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT, provided by Educational Testing Services, may fulfill these objectives; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Administration strongly recommend the optional use by the faculty of the STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT to be used in a complementary fashion with the current evaluation system in order to provide faculty with confidential constructive feedback of classroom performance.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 5, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No
Comments: It is not terribly important that the present evaluation forms used are not standard. Each department / school should seek to improve the form it uses, but not necessarily along standardized lines. The Committee agrees with Item #3 of the resolved clause, but believes that item #4 is impossible to achieve.
WHEREAS, Common final examinations may be a valuable means to measure the effectiveness of instruction; and

WHEREAS, Common final examinations are used in some departments where multiple sections of a course are taught each quarter and/or principles covered in that course are necessary for subsequent courses;

WHEREAS, The primary objective of such a common final examination is to determine whether course objectives are being met; therefore,

RESOLVED, That all departments consider the development and use of common final examinations in central/core courses; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the ultimate decision to utilize common final examinations be left to individual departments.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 10, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-__-88/-

RESOLUTION ON COURSE EVALUATIONS

WHEREAS, Instructors examine their students for mastery of course material as stated in the course objectives in many ways; and

WHEREAS, Instructors spend a significant amount of time formulating questions, problems, themes, individual and class projects, and lab experiments for their students; and

WHEREAS, Additional time goes into the preparation and evaluation of design projects and senior projects; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That in-service opportunities for the analysis and improvement of evaluation instruments be routinely provided by the University Administration in the form of (but not limited to) consultations, workshops, classes, etc..

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 10, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No
RESOLUTION ON
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

WHEREAS. The present guidelines are out-of-date; and

WHEREAS. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the California State University and Unit 3 faculty addresses the issue of student evaluation; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Administrative Bulletin 74-1 be deleted from the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the new guidelines be included in CAM as Administrative Bulletin 88-_

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
March 1, 1988
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

1. Student evaluations will be conducted in accordance with sections 15.14, 15.15, and 15.16 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between The California State University (CSU) and Unit 3-Faculty.

2. The primary purpose of this student evaluation program is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program at Cal Poly.

3. The results of this student evaluation program will be used for both the improvement of instruction, and in partial substantiation of recommendations in appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. They will also be considered during the post-tenure peer review process.

4. Annually, a minimum of two (2) classes of each instructor shall participate in this student evaluation program.

5. The student evaluation form and additional procedures used by any department shall be in accordance with these guidelines and shall be endorsed by the department faculty, department head/chair, and dean of the appropriate school. Student opinion regarding the form and additional procedures of any department shall be considered prior to the dean's endorsement through consultation with the student council of the school.

6. The following procedures shall be used in the administration of student evaluations:
   (a) each department is responsible for providing its faculty with copies of these guidelines and any other procedures covering student evaluation of faculty in order to ensure that proper procedures are followed.
   (b) 10-20 minutes of class time will be provided by the faculty member for the student evaluation process in each class in which s/he is being evaluated. During this time, the faculty member shall be absent from the classroom.
   (c) only students officially enrolled in the class will be permitted to participate.

7. Subsequent to the issuance of the grades for the quarter in which a faculty member has been evaluated using this process, the results (as defined in department procedures) of this program shall be made available to the faculty member, his/her department head/chair and the custodian of the faculty member's personnel action file. The results shall be included in the faculty member's personnel action file.

8. If the results of a department's student evaluation form include written comments in addition to quantitative data, then any summary of the written comments must be approved by the faculty member being evaluated. If the faculty member feels that the summary is inaccurate, then all of the written comments shall be placed in the personnel action file.
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

I. The primary purpose of student evaluation of faculty is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

II. Evaluation instruments should be developed with emphasis on those factors which students are especially capable of evaluating (e.g. course organization, quality of presentation, grading procedures, examinations, etc.).

III. All classes (except for individual supervision courses) of every instructor shall participate in the student evaluation of faculty program at least annually.

IV. Only students officially enrolled in an instructor's class will be permitted to participate in the evaluation. No signature or other methods by which individual students could be identified are to be requested on the evaluation form.

V. The results of the annual evaluation will be used for both improvement of instruction and in partial substantiation of recommendations on faculty personnel actions regarding promotion, retention and tenure. There will be only one official evaluation required annually.

VI. Subsequent to the issuance of the grades for the quarter for which the faculty member has been evaluated, the results of the program of student evaluation of faculty shall be made available to the individual faculty member, his tenured colleagues and department head for their deliberations and recommendations regarding personnel actions, and for the individual's aid in improving his performance.

VII. To allow for obvious lack of similarity of various instructional programs, each of the seven schools shall be entitled to its own evaluation form. Additionally, it might be necessary for a department to develop its own evaluation instrument if its best interests will be served in that manner. The specific form, questions and methods of reporting results for the several types of instruction offered in any individual school or department shall be endorsed by the faculty, department head and dean of that department or school. Student school councils are charged with the responsibility of obtaining representative student opinion which shall be considered in the development of the questionnaire.

VIII. Each department is responsible for furnishing its faculty with copies of these guidelines as well as with the necessary instructions to insure that proper procedures be followed in the administration of the evaluation. During any one quarter, faculty will provide not more than twenty-five minutes of any one class for the time necessary to complete the evaluation process. During the evaluation process, the instructor shall be absent from the classroom with the evaluation being administered in the classroom by students.
Elections Announcement
for the March 8, 1988 Senate Meeting

The elections for senators, University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) members, and one statewide academic senator will commence on the 21st of this month. Nominations will be received for these positions from March 21 through April 1 with elections being held the week of April 18.

Each caucus chair has been notified of the number of vacancies within their school. A letter of invitation (and accompanying nomination form) will be mailed to every faculty member during the week of March 14.

Each school will need to nomination the following number of senators to a two-year term:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Vacancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Agriculture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Architecture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Science &amp; Math</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Consultative Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the following schools will need to elect a representative to the University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) for a two-year term:

- Agriculture
- Architecture
- Liberal Arts
- Science & Math
- Professional Consultative Services

There is also one position for statewide senator to be elected to a three-year term. This representative can be elected from any of the seven schools.
Background Information for Items C.D.E.F of the March 8, 1988 Agenda

C. Resolution on Course Information /Syllabi

This resolution is modeled after a Resolution adopted by the Academic Senate at Dominguez Hills. The Committee received a copy of that resolution last fall and modified it to meet local needs.

The Committee recognizes that some persons may feel that it is adequate to state the information contained in this resolution and that there is no necessity to hand out copies of the information. We, nevertheless, believe that having one's policies in writing simplifies explaining course policies to students who add the course after the first day; moreover, it protects the instructor from charges of having changed his policies midstream or of not having stated his policies.

D. Resolution on the Use of the Student Instructional Report

This Resolution is a response to the student presentation of ASI 88-11 to the Academic Senate earlier this quarter. The Committee felt that use of the SIR form would be harmless and may have some benefits provided that its use is optional, in quarters when RPT student evaluations are conducted, and that the results are provided confidentially by ETS to the instructor only.

As agreed upon during the Fall Quarter 1987 the Instruction Committee would develop resolutions based upon the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Measures of Effectiveness in Instruction. In doing so, it would rely on a combination of its own judgment, input from various standing committees of the Senate and input from individuals.

At the beginning of the Winter 1988 Quarter, I met with the Chair of the Academic Senate to discuss the approach to be used in carrying out this charge. In view of the fact that the Committee at that time had received only several memos from individual faculty, it was decided to proceed independently. The Instruction Committee would prepare a sequence of Resolutions designed to effect each of the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations, to discuss these potential resolutions in committee, to
forward a report of its action to the Senate Office. All proposed resolutions which the Committee considered (even those rejected by the Instruction Committee) would be sent to the Executive Committee for its review. The Executive Committee would decide whether to agendize each resolution, including the ones rejected in Committee. The following two items represent amended recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee, supported by the Instruction Committee and agendized by the Executive Committee.

E. Resolution on Common Final Exams

This resolution, together with Business Item F, represent a partial response to the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Measures of Effectiveness in Instruction. The Resolution is based on one of the recommendations contained in Section 1 of that report.

The Resolution seeks only to initiate discussion in each department of the usefulness of common final exams in certain core courses of each department. The decision to utilize such common finals remains with the departments.

F. Resolution on Student Performance Evaluations

This resolution, together with Business Item E, represent a partial response to the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Measures of Effectiveness in Instruction. The Resolution is based on one of the recommendations contained in Section 1 of that report.
Proposed amendment to recommendations in Section V "Extent and Phasing of Growth Beyond 15,000 FTE" on page 26. Add a new recommendation after #6 and renumber the remaining recommendations. The new recommendation is to read:

7. That any growth which requires the conversion of University agriculture lands from its present use be done so after consultation and adherance to University land use policy recommendations.

Background / Justification

As the growth of the University increases the demand for newer and larger facilities, the supply of possible location sites become limited. It is suggested that under these circumstances pressure may be put upon present University agriculture lands that are within a 10 minute walking distance of the the campus core and cause for the development of those lands. Considerations must be given for such development demands upon prime agriculture lands which are used for enterprise projects and other class related labs.
RESOLUTION ON DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE: FOREIGN LANGUAGES DEPARTMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

WHEREAS, The majority of departments in our field have names that reflect our dual reality whereby we teach both language and literature courses; and

WHEREAS, Our department at Cal Poly has matured to the point that we are in line with this national dual reality; and

WHEREAS, We have consulted throughout the campus and have found no opposition to our desire to change our departmental name; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve of a name change for our department from Foreign Languages Department to Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures.

Proposed By:
William Little, Head of the Foreign Languages Department
February 2, 1988
Revised March 8, 1988
Memorandum

To: Charles Crabb, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: William Little, Head
      Foreign Languages Dept.

Subject: DEPARTMENTAL NAME CHANGE

As you requested, the Foreign Languages Department has again consulted about our request to change the department's name. In particular, Mona Rosenman, Chair of the English Department, has just communicated to me that the English Department does not object to our desire to change our name to Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures. I hereby request that this proposal again be put on the agenda for the next Senate meeting.

Thank you for your help in this matter.
Memorandum

To: Malcolm Wilson

From: Jon M. Ericson

Date: May 21, 1987

Subject: Department Name Change Proposal

The faculty of the Foreign Languages Department proposed a change departmental name to:

Department of Modern Languages and Literature

After consultation in the School of Liberal Arts and as a result of deliberation in the School Council, the Council has unanimously endorsed a modified proposal:

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature

The proposed name change is well supported by reasons largely enumerated in the attached memo of April 30 from William Little. It has my endorsement and recommendation for approval.