I. Minutes:
Approval of the March 8, 1988 Minutes (pp. 5-11).

II. Communications:
A. Materials available for reading in the Academic Senate office (pp. 2-4).
B. President Baker has approved the following resolution:
   AS-278-88/GE&B GE&B Requirements: Course Proposal PSY 494
C. Memo from Wilson to School Deans re Guidelines for Staffing-Summer Quarter 1988 (pp. 12-13).
D. Memo from Geigle to Campus Senate Chairs re Committee to Study Undergraduate Education Within the CSU (p. 14).
E. Memo from Mills to Presidents dated 3/17/88 re Seminar by Satellite: Teaching with Technology (pp. 15-20).
F. Academic Senate Elections: nominations received for Senate positions (pp. 21-22).
G. NOMINATIONS ARE NOW BEING ACCEPTED FOR THE OFFICES OF ACADEMIC SENATE CHAIR, VICE CHAIR, and SECRETARY. Petitions can be picked up at the Academic Senate office (FOB 25H) and are due in the Academic Senate office by May 3, 1988. The election of officers shall be held (by secret ballot) at the May 10, 1988 Academic Senate meeting in UU220.

III. Reports:
A. President: none
B. Academic Affairs Office: none
C. Statewide Senators: Reg Pader
D. Academic Senate Chair-vendor use of campus mail

IV. Consent Agenda: none

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Report on Faculty Position Control-Conway, Chair of the Budget Committee, Second Reading (pp. 23-27).
B. Resolution on Department Name Change: Foreign Languages Department to Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures-Little, Department Head for Foreign Languages Department, Second Reading (pp. 28-30).
C. Resolution on Course Information/Syllabi-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, First Reading (pp. 31-32).
D. Resolution on The Use of the Student Instructional Report-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, First Reading (p. 33).
E. Resolution on Common Final Examinations-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, First Reading (p. 34).
F. Resolution on Student Performance Evaluations-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, First Reading (p. 35).
G. Resolution on Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, First Reading (pp. 36-38).
H. Proposed Revisions to the Sexual Harassment Policy-Duerk, Chair of the Status of Women Committee, First Reading (pp. 39-48).
I. Resolution on the Curriculum Review Process-Dana, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, First Reading (pp. 49-54).

VI. Discussion Items:

VII. Adjournment: 4:40
Business items H. "Proposed Revisions to the Sexual Harassment Policy" and I. "Resolution on the Curriculum Review Process" were sent back to committee at the 4/5/88 Executive Committee meeting. They will not be brought to the Senate floor at this time. Pages 40 through 54 have been removed from the agenda.
Materials Available for Reading in the Academic Senate Office (FOB 25H)

(New reading materials highlighted in bold)

1987-88 AY Minutes from the bimonthly meetings of the Multiple-Criteria Admissions Program Technical Study Group (Cal Poly, SLO)

June 1987 Documents/statistics/reports/etc. provided at the Student Retention Conference in June 1987

6/10/87 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

6/22/87 Publications from the Office of the Chancellor re Teacher Education

7/14/87 CSU Committee of the Whole: New Priority Topics for 1987-88


July 1987 The Master Plan Renewed, Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education

8/3/87 Quarterly Internal Report on Enrollment-Summer 1987 (Cal Poly, SLO)

Aug 1987 Subject Matter Assessment of Prospective English Teachers (CSU)

9/4/87 Capital Outlay Program 1988-89

9/15/87 Board of Trustees' Agenda, September 15/16, 1987

9/23/87 1986/87 Discretionary Fund Reports (Cal Poly, SLO)

10/12/87 Executive Review Policies and Procedures

10/20/87 Funding Excellence in Higher Education (CPEC)
The State's Interest in Student Outcomes Assessment (CPEC)
State Incentive Funding Approaches for Promoting Quality in California Higher Education: A Prospectus (CPEC)
Assembly Bill #2016 - Higher Education Talent Development


10/28/87 State Incentive Funding Approaches (memo from Kerschner to VPAA's dated 10/28/87)

10/30/87 Organizational charts of administrative positions throughout the CSU system (CSU)

11/2/87 Academic Mainframe Computer Replacement Plan (CSU)

11/5/87 Earthquake Status Report (CSU, Los Angeles)

11/6/87 Quarterly Internal Report on Enrollment-Fall 1987 (Cal Poly, SLO)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/12/87</td>
<td>Retreat Rights for Academic Administrators (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/87</td>
<td>Summary Notes of the President’s Council Meetings (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/87</td>
<td>Status of Current Major Capital Outlay Projects (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1987</td>
<td>Computer-Aided Productivity Center (Cal Poly SLO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1987</td>
<td>Development Activities of the University Relations Division (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1987</td>
<td>Recommendations of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1987</td>
<td>Cal Poly IBM Specialty Center (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/87</td>
<td>Internationalizing Undergraduate Education Conference Highlights (CSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/87</td>
<td>Asilomar Retreat of the Academic Senate CSU (Nov 13-15, 1987). Summary of the Executive Committee and campus Senate chairs’ meetings (Academic Senate CSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/87</td>
<td>Allocation of MPPP Awards 1987-88 (number of awards to each school) (Cal Poly, SLO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/87</td>
<td>Summer Bridge and Intensive Learning Experience: Second Year Evaluation (CSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/88</td>
<td>CSU Systemwide Full-Time Faculty by Tenure Status, Sex and Ethnicity: 1975-1987 (CSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan ’88</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA DEMOGRAPHICS: IMPACT ON EDUCATION - CAL POLY. HAROLD HODGKINSON, A LECTURE IN CHUMASH AUDITORIUM (Video Cassette)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALIFORNIA: THE STATE AND ITS EDUCATION SYSTEM by Harold L. Hodgkinson (booklet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14/88</td>
<td>Enrollment by Ethnic Categories in the California State Colleges (Cal Poly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6/88</td>
<td>Report of the Technical Study Group on the Multiple-Criteria Applicant Selection Process (Cal Poly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/14/88</td>
<td>Statistical Abstract to July 1986 (CSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20/88</td>
<td>CSU IBM Academic Mainframe Speciality Center (CSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/22/88</td>
<td>Call for Proposals for Academic Computing Enhancement Institute Project Funding (CSU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials Available for Reading in the Academic Senate Office (FOB 25H)  
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1/27/88 Status Report #3 - FY 1988/89 Governor's Budget (Cal Poly)

1/28/88 State Policy for Faculty Development in Public Higher Education (California Postsecondary Education Commission)

1/29/88 Foundation Financial Reports for December 31, 1987 (Cal Poly Foundation)

Feb '88 Exploring Faculty Development in Higher Education (California Postsecondary Education Commission)

2/1/88 Joint Legislative Hearing on the Master Plan (Academic Senate CSU)

2/3/88 Lottery Funding for 1988-89/General Guidelines (CSU)

1/3/88 CPEC High School Eligibility Study (Trustees of the CSU)

2/4/88 Size, Growth, and Cost of Administration at the California State University (California Postsecondary Education Commission)

2/5/88 Request for Proposals for Academic Program Improvement 1988-89 (CSU)

2/8/88 Proposal on the Performing Arts Center (Cal Poly)

2/8/88 Campus Liability Regarding Personal Property of Faculty Members (Trustees of the CSU)

2/9/88 CSU Admissions Criteria (Academic Senate CSU)

2/10/88 CPEC Study of State Incentive Funding Approaches (CSU)

2/29/88 The Teacher/Scholar Summer Institute for Faculty in the California State University, June 12-17, 1988 (CSU)

3/3/88 Memo from Kerschner to Campus Presidents re Student Suicide (CSU)

3/8/88 THE ACADEMIC PLANS: Summary of Projected Programs (CSU)

3/15/88 Initial Release of Faculty Positions for the 1988 Summer Quarter

3/21/88 Status Report #4-Analysis of the 1988/89 Budget Bill: Report of the Legislative Analyst to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (Cal Poly)

3/23/88 Lottery Revenue Budget 1988-89 (CSU)

3/24/88 THE FUTURE OF THE PACIFIC RIM IS NOW: Opportunities and Challenges for the CSU (The Pacific Rim Commission of the CSU)

3/24/88 Study of Graduate Education in The California State University (CSU)

3/25/88 Modified Eligibility Indices for Admission to CSU-Executive Order No 523 (CSU)
Memorandum

To: School Deans Bailey, Busselen, Carter, Ding, Ericson, Lee, Walters

From: Malcolm W. Wilson
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Guidelines for Staffing - Summer Quarter 1988

Based on the discussions of our workshop of March 9, 1988 regarding Summer Quarter 1988, I want to outline the understandings reached to ensure consistency in implementation and effective utilization of our limited faculty resources.

Staffing for Summer Quarter 1988 will be subject to the following:

1) Low enrollment classes will be cancelled based on the following enrollment levels utilizing MIR I data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower Division</th>
<th>Upper Division</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer C1-C2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer C3-C6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity C7-C14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab C15-C16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Supervision courses are to be assigned to 12-month faculty/department chairs where practical/possible and not utilized to round-out the loads of other teaching faculty.

3) All school assigned time must be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and will be restricted only to special circumstances.

4) High demand GE&B coursework is to be given preference.

5) Elective courses and experimental courses will require special justification and will not be offered if they are less than break-even.

6) Summer Quarter courses with a C4 classification are permitted to exceed the 35 student limit as long as a justification memorandum from the department chair indicates that this is necessary to avoid offering multiple sections with low enrollment.
It was also determined that the basis of workload for all faculty will be 15 WTU's with a fulltime tenure track faculty being assigned 12 weighted teaching units of instruction and 3 weighted teaching units of instructionally related responsibilities. Regular tenure track faculty given a part-time assignment, i.e., less than 12 WTU's of teaching, will have the 3 WTU's instructionally related responsibilities proportionately reduced.

I appreciate your efforts in reaching agreement on the treatment of Summer Quarter and want to impress upon you the need to optimize the utilization of our very limited faculty resources.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Campus Senate Chairs

FROM: Ray Geigle, Chair

SUBJECT: Committee to Study Graduate Education Within the CSU

The Academic Senate CSU is jointly sponsoring, with the Chancellor, a study of graduate education. The committee, consisting of faculty, administrators, a student, and a CFA representative, is charged with analyzing graduate education from the standpoint of quality, access, and resources and recommending systemwide guidelines for the maintenance and growth of programs of quality.

The Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU is chaired by Professor Gene Dinielli, Department of English, California State University, Long Beach (213-498-4223). It has met twice, and, at its second meeting, had for the first time its full complement of appointed members. I mention this to underscore the point that the committee is still in the early stages of its job of work and, by this memo, to announce to you that it is sending a working draft on quality, a discussion paper on graduate education, and a questionnaire to your graduate dean. This is an initial step in a process in which the committee will query department chairs, graduate coordinators, students, and others by way of interviews and questionnaires.

It is my belief that you will be advised of all stages of this process by your faculty administrators, and it is my intention to keep you apprised of all actions at this level.
Date: March 17, 1988

To: Presidents

From: Ralph D. Mills
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Subject: Seminar by Satellite: Teaching with Technology

On March 9, I sent you an initial announcement concerning seminar by satellite to be offered under the auspices of the California State University Commission on Instructional Technology. The seminar will be presented by Dr. William H. Graves and will deal with the use of personal computing in the undergraduate curriculum, especially in the humanities and social sciences.

The Seminar is scheduled for May 13, 1988, from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m.

Dr. Graves is a professor of mathematics and special assistant to the provost at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. As a result of the success he enjoyed in helping faculty introduce the computer into the curriculum at his home institution, Dr. Graves was designated by IBM as a "Consulting Scholar" and IBM has supported his efforts to present his seminar at institutions of higher education across the nation. The attached article about Dr. Graves, his colleagues and the IBM Consulting Scholar program, appeared in the March 2, 1988 issue of the CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

As was pointed out in the earlier announcement, during his presentation, Dr. Graves will demonstrate software in different areas of the curriculum — from history to mathematics — on the way in which instructional technologies can strengthen teaching and learning and will discuss what institutional policies, faculty development programs, and support services are most likely to integrate technology into the curriculum.

Distribution: Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
Vice Presidents, Administration
Associate Vice Presidents/Deans, Faculty Affairs
Deans, Extended/Continuing Education
Directors, Media Services
Directors, Computer Centers
Chairs, Academic Senates
Chancellor's Office Staff
Attached is the technical information regarding the transmission. I hope that interested faculty and administrators will take advantage of the CSU's recently completed satellite network and participate in Dr. Graves' seminar. While it will originate at the campus of California State University, Sacramento, the program will be viewed by interested faculty at institutions across the nation.

There is no fee associated with the program. It is sponsored for the benefit of interested members of the academic community — faculty, students and administrators — by the system's Commission on Instructional Technology.

If you have questions, please contact Ms. Bette Meredith at ATSS 8/635-5980 or (213) 590-5980.

RDM:pw:0260M
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SATELLITE NETWORK

SEMINAR BY SATELLITE: DR. WILLIAM H. GRAVES

TECHNICAL INFORMATION

DATE: Friday, May 13, 1988
TEST SIGNAL: 9:00 a.m.
BROADCAST: 9:30 – 11:30 a.m.
C Band Only
SATELLITE: Space Net I
TRANSPONDER: 4
POLARIZATION: Vertical
AUDIO SUBCARRIER: 6.2 and 6.8
NETWORK TROUBLE NUMBER: (916) 273-7539
INCOMING TELEPHONE NUMBER: (916) 278-7907
## THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
### SATELLITE VIEWING FACILITY COORDINATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS</th>
<th>CONTACT PERSON</th>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>Reza Azarmsa</td>
<td>833-2391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>Lesslie Wright</td>
<td>895-6105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>Frank Paine</td>
<td>516-3704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Russ Hart</td>
<td>294-3066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>Ruth Truman</td>
<td>773-2611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Roger Parker</td>
<td>881-3693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>Terry Flindt</td>
<td>826-3322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Lynn Henricks</td>
<td>494-8455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Ted Krok</td>
<td>224-3616; 3396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>Elizabeth Perrin</td>
<td>885-2355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>Bob Threlkeld</td>
<td>869-2277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Diane Stewart</td>
<td>278-5763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>Robert Senour</td>
<td>887-7296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Sandie Strauss</td>
<td>265-4705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Frank Moakley</td>
<td>338-2636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Ron McBeath</td>
<td>924-2850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Jan Gould</td>
<td>756-2211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Mark Anderson</td>
<td>664-2117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>Dick Alter</td>
<td>667-3111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's Office</td>
<td>Johnetta Anderson</td>
<td>590-5596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal & Professional

‘Consulting Scholars,’ Backed by IBM, Help Colleges Explore the Role of Computers in Academic Life

6 professors get stipends and unlimited travel budgets to visit campuses and learn about the field

By JUDITH AXLER TURNER
COLUMBUS, OHIO

James S. Noblin says that he and William H. Graves are just "plain-vanilla faculty members with unlimited travel budgets." So here they are, finishing a $7.33 breakfast (fruit cup and bran muffin for Mr. Noblin, fried-egg sandwich for Mr. Graves) at the coffee shop in the Holiday Inn next to the Ohio State University campus, where rooms are $60.21 with tax.

They're headed for the university's Faculty Club, where they will spend the day talking about computing.

Is this any way to spend an unlimited travel budget? Yes, they say. They've been visiting campuses and talking about computing for eight months and still are excited about it.

Spreading the Word

"I don't want to paint myself as some kind of computer zealot, but I believe there is something there," Mr. Graves says. That "something" is more than computer hardware and software, he says. "It's a whole social, educational phenomenon. We have to rethink where computing should fit. This is a good way to come to grips with it, to test ideas out, to argue the ideas."

Mr. Graves and Mr. Noblin are scholars in the sense that they are trying to understand something and transmit their understanding to others, they say.

The International Business Machines Corporation called them "Consulting Scholars" when it offered unlimited travel budgets and sabbatical stipends to Mr. Graves, Mr. Noblin, and four others last year. Their job, the company told them, would be to learn about academic computing and spread the word.

No "plain-vanilla" faculty members, despite their claim, each of the scholars has written software, used computers in education, or promoted academic computing on their campuses.

Mr. Graves, a professor of mathematics and special assistant to the provost at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, started and ran a program at North Carolina to help faculty members create computer-based teaching and learning materials across the core curriculum, with special emphasis on the humanities and social sciences.

Mr. Noblin, a professor of linguistics at Cornell University, has written "Systeme-o," software that combines a data base with a word processor, bilingual dictionary, a reference feature that allows users to check grammar, and examples of word usage. The first application has been

Continued on Following Page
Consulting Scholars Help Colleges Explore the Role of Computers

until we learn to use the technology as extensions of ourselves in the classroom, we will not understand it.

Mr. Noblin points out that many professors—particularly in the humanities—are worried that time spent on computing will distract them from their real work.

Emphasis on the Classroom

"People often react to computing as if they don’t know if it will be any good," he says. "They want to see it evaluated before they put their energy into it. But they need to understand that it is already here.

Add Mr. Graves: "Professors are paralyzed by the system of tenure, rank, and reward. We facilitate discussion of the bigger issue.

As far as Mr. Graves is concerned, the bigger issue is the classroom.

It is a message that he delivers on campuses and in meetings with I.A.M. executives.

"Until we learn to use the technology as an extension of ourselves in the classroom, we will not understand it," he says.

This morning about 30 people showed up, trickling in slowly as classrooms ended. A show of hands indicates that administrators make up more than half the audience, and most of the faculty members are from engineering and science, Mr. Graves and Mr. Noblin tailor their presentations to the audience, playing the computer keyboard that controls the large-screen projection system like stand-up pianists leading the band and bringing out the melody at the same time.

Mr. Graves demonstrates a program that plots equations on the fly. Mr. Noblin demonstrates "Système-0.

In the afternoon the audience is made up mostly of faculty members, most of them from the humanities and social sciences. Mr. Noblin shows "Système-0" again: Mr. Graves shows a psychology program.

Purity Educational Interest

The two men had been invited to Ohio State individually, but decided to make their presentations together. Consulting Scholars generally go wherever they are invited, the men say. They spend most of their time on campuses, but also attend conferences—at least one a month sponsored by I.A.M. itself. Each scholar is free to work out his own schedule.

I.A.M.'s interest in the scholars is purely educational, both men say.

"I.A.M. has put a lot of money into education," says Mr. Graves. "We are spreading the word about what has come out of it. But we are not I.A.M. salesmen. We are selling ideas, not hardware and software. We’d be instantly unbelievable if we pushed I.A.M. equipment." Their job, they say, is to help academe explore the effect of computability on academia.

"The information about computing is substantial, but it is scattered on campuses," Mr. Graves says.

"The consulting-scholars program is an attempt to build a human network, a network of experience. What comes out is not so much an answer as a way to identify a spectrum of the possible."
Elections for academic senators, statewide academic senator, and University Professional Leave Committee membership will be held the week of April 18, 1988. Ballots will be counted on April 22, 1988 at 4pm in Faculty Office Building room 24B.

### ACADEMIC SENATORS

#### SAGR (5 vacancies + 1 one-year replacement for Hellyer)
- Chizek, Gaylord
- Crabb, A. Charles
- Grinnell, Robin
- McGary, Stephen
- Vilkitis, James
- Wheeler, Robert
- Wooten, Rudy

**Departments:**
- Agricultural Management
- Crop Science
- Agricultural Engineering
- Agricultural Management
- Natural Resources Management
- Animal Sciences and Industry
- Food Science and Nutrition

#### SAED (4 vacancies)
- Berrio, Mark
- Borland, James
- Dwyer, Gary

**Departments:**
- Architectural Engineering
- Construction Management
- Landscape Architecture

#### SBUS (4 vacancies)
- Bertozzi, Dan
- Boynton, William
- Burgunder, Lee

**Departments:**
- Business Administration
- Accounting
- Business Administration

#### SENG (4 vacancies)
- Anderson, M.L. "Andy"
- Clark, Neill
- Mallareddy H.
- Pokorny, Cornel
- Sefiodini, Ahmad
- Walsh, Daniel

**Departments:**
- Civil and Environmental Engineering
- Engineering Technology
- Civil and Environmental Engineering
- Computer Science
- Industrial Engineering
- Metallurgical and Materials Engineering

#### SLA (5 vacancies)
- Urista, Alberto "Alurista"
- Havandjian, Nishan
- MacCurdy, Carol
- Mori, Barbara
- Simmons, James
- Zeuschner, Ray

**Departments:**
- Foreign Languages
- Journalism
- English
- Social Sciences
- English
- Speech Communication

#### SPSE (5 vacancies)
- Chambers, William
- Freberg, Laura
- Stead, John
- Weber, Barbara

**Departments:**
- Industrial Technology
- Psychology and Human Development
- Industrial Technology
- Home Economics
SSM (5 vacancies)
Murphy, Paul                            Mathematics
Peck, Roxy                              Statistics

PCS (2 vacancies)
Aceto, Jeanne                           Placement Center
Dobb, Linda                             Library
Murphy, Norm                            Counseling Services

Statewide Academic Senate (1988-1991)
Reg Gooden                              Political Science, SLA

University Professional Leave Committee (1988-1990)
SAGR                                    None
SAED                                    None
SLA                                     None
SSM                                     None
PCS                                     None

Some schools should

Modify bylaws
causes effects
one year after

UPLC - none
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-___-88/____

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.
WEREAS, The majority of departments in our field have names that reflect our dual
reality whereby we teach both language and literature courses; and
WEREAS, Our department at Cal Poly has matured to the point that we are in line with
this national dual reality; and
WEREAS, 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
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

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.

Date: May 21, 1987

File No.: 30

Copies: Glenn Irvin
Department Heads/Chairs
School of Liberal Arts
Bessie Swanson
Background Information for the Following Instruction Committee Resolutions

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.

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 was to develop resolutions based upon the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Measures of Effectiveness of 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, and 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 by the Instruction Committee.

The following item represents amended recommendations of the ad hoc committee supported by the Instruction Committee and agendized by the Executive Committee.

Resolution on Common Final Exams
This resolution represents a partial response to the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Measures of Effectiveness of 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.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-____-88/_____

RESOLUTION ON
COURSE INFORMATION / SYLLABI

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

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
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

AS--88/____

RESOLUTION ON
COMMON FINAL EXAMINATIONS

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, be it

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.

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

AS-____-88/____

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 ensure 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.
RESOLUTION ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the attached Interim Sexual Harassment Policy as revised.

Proposed By:
Status of Women Committee
April 5, 1988