I. Minutes:
Approval of the April 12, 1988 Minutes (pp. 6-10).

II. Communications:
A. Materials available for reading in the Academic Senate office (pp. 2-5).
B. President Baker has approved the following resolutions:
   AS-265-87/PPC Conflict of Interest in Personnel Decisions: CAM 311.5
   AS-276-88/EX Extra Sabbatical Positions for Spring 1988
C. Letter from Choate to Crabb dated 4/4/88 re Operation Civic Serve (pp. 11-15).
D. Memo from Brady to faculty dated 4/5/88 re National Faculty Exchange Program--1989-90 (p. 16).
F. Memo from York to deans dated 4/15/88 re Teacher/Scholar: Summer Institute for CSU Faculty--1988 (p. 18).

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

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Course Information/Syllabi-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, Second Reading (pp. 19-20).
B. Resolution on The Use of the Student Instructional Report-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, Second Reading (p. 21).
C. Resolution on Common Final Examinations-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, Second Reading (p. 22).
D. Resolution on Student Performance Evaluations-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, Second Reading (p. 23).
E. Resolution on Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, Second Reading (pp. 24-26).
F. Resolution on Timetable for Retention, Tenure, Promotion-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, First Reading (pp. 27-28).
G. Resolution on General Education and Breadth Transfer Curriculum-Lewis, Chair of the GE&B Committee, First Reading (pp. 29-34).
H. Resolution in Support of Proposition 71 (June 7, 1988)-Gooden, Statewide Senator, First Reading (pp. 35-36).
I. Resolution on Surveys of Graduates and Employers-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, First Reading (p. 37).
J. General Education and Breadth Proposal: ARCH 316X-Lewis, Chair of the GE&B Committee, First Reading (pp. 38-40).

VI. Discussion Items:

VII. Adjournment:
<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>
Materials Available for Reading in the Academic Senate Office (FOB 25H)
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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)
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>Source</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>
<tr>
<td>2/29/88</td>
<td>The Teacher/Scholar Summer Institute for Faculty in the California State University, June 12-17, 1988 (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/88</td>
<td>Memo from Kerschner to Campus Presidents re Student Suicide (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8/88</td>
<td>THE ACADEMIC PLANS: Summary of Projected Programs (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/88</td>
<td>Initial Release of Faculty Positions for the 1988 Summer Quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/88</td>
<td>Status Report #4-Analysis of the 1988/89 Budget Bill: Report of the Legislative Analyst to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (Cal Poly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23/88</td>
<td>Lottery Revenue Budget 1988-89 (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/88</td>
<td>The Future of the Pacific Rim is Now: Opportunities and Challenges for the CSU (The Pacific Rim Commission of the CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/88</td>
<td>Study of Graduate Education in The California State University (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/88</td>
<td>Modified Eligibility Indices for Admission to CSU-Executive Order No 523 (CSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4/8/88
STATE SPENDING LIMIT (background documents relative to Propositions 71 and 72) (Cal Poly)
Dr. Charles Crabb, Chair  
Academic Senate  
CPSU, San Luis Obispo  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Dear Dr. Crabb:

OPERATION CIVIC SERVE, recently supported by the Ford Foundation and others, will soon be active in many communities near California's public four-year colleges. Our goal is increased community service by students. Our focus is the development of "slots" within school systems, public agencies and private, non-profit organizations so that college students may find rewarding service opportunities.  

AB 1820, the "Human Corps" bill, envisions a vast expansion of student interaction with local communities. The well-respected intern programs are good models, but the size of the projected expansion of student service warrants careful examination.  

We respect the role faculty members must play in current planning. We have some experience in these matters and we also want to learn from your experience. Every campus is different. We can offer our help in 1988 at no cost thanks to our foundation support.  

We have articles and literature on the subject and would be pleased to share them with anyone who is involved. Kindly let us know if we can be of help.  

Sincerely,

Robert B. Choate  
President  

RBC:ma  
Enclosures
Students Flocking To Volunteer Service
Schools Weigh Community-Work Requirement

By Jay Mathews
Washington Post Staff Writer

LA JOLLA, Calif.—For decades, southern California college students have been driving to Mexico for carefree spring weekends, drink and sun and perhaps a little mischief.

From this eucalyptus-studded campus of the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), quite a different kind of movement to Mexico is underway. Students from here and two other local universities have been driving to Tijuana to build houses for poor families, part of a new student-volunteer movement seen on many campuses as a politically potent shift in the social consciousness of American youth.

Next spring, for the first time in a major U.S. city, all seniors in Atlanta's public high schools will have performed a required 75 hours of community service. ACTION, the federal agency, is funding an effort to organize all Minnesota colleges into a mass movement of student volunteers. The Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL), a Washington-based group begun by two recent college graduates, is advising student volunteer programs in 300 colleges.

And in California, the state legislature appears close to passing a bill for a "Human Corps," which would make community service an expected part of every public university student's education. The bill has given focus to a nationwide debate on whether public service should be a required part of every school's curriculum.

"Students are beginning to realize that they can't satisfy all their needs in life if they just go for the high salary, the BMW, the house on the hill," said Randon G. Woodard, director of student government and organizations' support services at UCSD. Several community service promoters suggest the new interest has a political dimension, since it reflects an urge to help welfare and education programs that—in a time of high budget deficits—have failed to get government money.

"I think a lot of really decent people are really becoming aware of a deterioration in the prospects for the future," said James Kielmeyer, University of Minnesota youth studies professor and national director of the National Youth Leadership Council.

In California alone, the surge of student interest in volunteer work has led some experts to anticipate an increase of 100,000 to 400,000 in the number of available community workers, and brought several dozen community planners to a Stanford University Law School conference this month to plan for the deluge.

"I think the pendulum swings on a certain timetable," said Robert Choate, a 62-year-old San Francisco businessman who is credited for much of the new student interest in volunteerism in the West. As organizer of the California Coalition on University-Community Services, he helped set up the Stanford conference and also was the catalyst for last fall's upsurge in student community service in San Diego.

"Last year Bob Choate just called and asked if I might want to get a student volunteer office started," said Ellen Caprio, a recent University of California graduate who helped organize the Volunteer Connection on the campus here. At a volunteer fair in November, the first ever here, 150 students signed up for house-building projects in Mexico and tutoring jobs in disadvantaged San Diego schools. With Choate's encouragement, the group joined with similar groups at San Diego State University and the private University of San Diego to find suitable community projects and to poll volunteers on their good and bad experiences.

Volunteer activists have wondered for several months how their efforts might be affected by a proposal by Assemblyman John Vasconcellos (D-San Jose) to mandate public service for every student enrolled at a state university campus. The bill originally was interpreted as requiring volunteer work for graduation, but to aid its passage Vasconcellos added language encouraging, but not requiring, volunteer work.

Private secondary schools nationwide for years have encouraged voluntary public service by their students, who often have had little first-hand contact with poverty or other deprivation. A survey by the National Association of Independent Schools, however, indicates a recent surge in the number of private schools requiring community service for graduation. Of 277 association members who said they had community service programs, 49 percent had been in operation five years or less and 41.4 percent required students to participate.

In the Washington area, the Sidwell Friends School in 1981 announced it would require a 30-hour community service project for graduation, and the Georgetown Day School instituted a 60-hour community service requirement in 1983.

Mary Ellen Saterlee, associate superintendent for instruction for the Baltimore County schools, said her office has encouraged service projects at all 148 schools, but a proposal to require such activity

(over)
throughout Maryland failed to win approval two years ago.

In Atlanta, Assistant Superintendent Barbara Whitaker said the city's new requirement of 75 hours service for high school graduation has inspired "no more than the usual teen-age complaints." Whitaker said other school districts have called to ask about the program, which requires students to present signed proof of their activity and write a 500-word essay on the experience.

The program began in 1984 and applied only to incoming students, 5,000 of which are expected to graduate in 1988.

"Personally, I don't think it's necessary to make it mandatory," said Robert Hackett, 26, codirector of COOL. "We have found that students always respond, and lots of them." COOL's work coordinating campus volunteer activity began three years ago after codirector Wayne Meisel, 28, visited 70 campuses throughout the Northeast during a 1984 walk from Maine to the District of Columbia.

Cathryn Berger Kaye, youth leadership program director for the Constitutional Rights Foundation, has been coordinating community service clubs in 22 Los Angeles high schools for three years under a $200,000 annual Ford Foundation grant. At first, she said, she also opposed making the program mandatory, but now wonders if making it part of the curriculum might send the important message that community service is at least as important as physical education or algebra.

Choate said a mandatory program makes some sense at the high school level, because students that age "would not be offended, as college students would be, with menial or clerical chores." A university student, he said, will not stay with a project more than a week if he or she does not think the work is meaningful, and his programs emphasize careful review of the work that volunteers do.

Libby Gillingham, a University of California, San Diego junior and director of the Volunteer Connection, said that her group sends a questionnaire to volunteers asking how they rate the work and the experience. As a member of Delta Gamma sorority, Gillingham has been trying to lure the 9 percent of the university's 14,000 undergraduates who belong to fraternities and sororities.

The most difficult hurdle to overcome, she and Caprio said, is the academic pressure on students. High costs also have forced many to take jobs, which further reduce the time available for volunteer work.

Tom Tucker, assistant vice chancellor for undergraduate affairs at the San Diego campus, said he has been careful to leave the volunteer organizing to students and to bar creation of any university bureaucracy to oversee the effort. A recent survey indicates an unexpectedly large amount of student effort.

The survey reported a minimum of 22,917 student hours in public service in the past year, including 45 programs that provide no academic credit and 58 that do.

The growth in the number of student volunteers is so great, Choate said, that he thinks only the schools can absorb them, in the role of remedial tutors and instructors in overcrowded English language classes for adult immigrants. Nonprofit organizations are not going to be able to find enough work for them, he said, "until they totally revamp their approach."
California’s New Version of a Statewide Service Corps

By Robert Choate and Andrea Davis

The passage of AB 1820—the Human Corps bill—gives California cities a new opportunity to stretch their attention to unmet needs. The new legislation, authored by Assemblymember John Vasconcellos (San Jose) and signed by Governor George Deukmejian on September 25th, is the first public declaration by a state government asking college students to volunteer service to their local communities.

If fully implemented, the bill would give both the 19-campus California State University (CSU) system and the nine-campus University of California (UC) system the responsibility of exhorting their students to provide at least 30 hours of service to their communities each academic year. This could amount to over half a million volunteer hours per month to schools, non-profit organizations, and public agencies. In the face of state and federal budget cuts in the area of human service, having such a large and able pool of volunteers could prove to be immensely valuable to California cities—but only if the volunteers are encouraged, trained, and managed effectively.

In August, representatives from off-campus organizations around the state came to a meeting initiated by the California Coalition on University-Community Services to discuss how a volunteer effort could be structured to best serve the needs of both campus and community. Conference participants emphasized the importance of collaboration. New or expanded student volunteer programs should be campus-community partnerships. From the campus side, they said, there must be involvement from the top (chancellor or president), the administration, the faculty, student elected leaders, student service-provider leaders, and alumni. The Greek system and residence halls can be an early focus. From the community side, they insisted, there must be evidence of interest from the mayor, manager, department heads, major advisory groups, and long-time users of volunteered time. Under the mayor’s initiative this group of interests should consider how best to reinforce any college student initiatives to form their own volunteer centers, but with strong ties to more experienced community leaders. If students feel their campus center is their invention, the enthusiasm will be evident, participants felt. If city personnel feel they are active participants in a campus venture, the youthful energies so apparent on a campus may infiltrate public halls.

The new legislation instructs the two university systems—CSU and UC—to establish Human Corps Task Forces on each campus by March 1, 1988. They will include “representatives from groups such as schools, local businesses and government, nonprofit organizations, and philanthropies, as well as students, faculty, and campus administration.”

However, the responsibility for the creation of the Task Forces lies with the universities. Because of that, if there is already a tradition of campus administration being unfamiliar with community needs, the structuring of the Task Forces will reflect that problem. Cities can help correct this by making early contact with the local university president or chancellor and asking to be part of the planning team. A letter should follow the original contact.

If the Task Force is not balanced, the city administration should seek to correct it. It should represent a spectrum of service groups, including schools, formal United Way agency heads, problem-oriented groups coping with hunger and homelessness and organizations with varied ethnic, religious and language familiarities.

A California city would do well to have one person regularly attend early meetings, and to relay the information (continued on next page)
to others, for the first plan may set the stage for future developments. Since schools and non-profit organizations as well as public agencies will be seeking to utilize these volunteers, and since selection, training and evaluation have common characteristics no matter in which area a student chooses to serve, early collaboration between potential "host" groups will serve to pool wisdom — and cut costs.

Volunteer Centers exist in many urban areas; some non-profit agencies are expert in training young people to assume worldly tasks. Several large school districts in the state run major volunteer operations. (San Francisco has such a center with over 1600 volunteers and a 20-year track record.)

Public agencies which deal with social issues can make good use of young volunteers. They are bright, energetic, and curious about the public sector. Agencies tend to become locked into their way of doing things and professionals tend to establish a routine and follow it. Young people may chafe at such formality, but in doing so they may break down prejudices, and enable the agency to become more open to new possibilities.

Young volunteers can attend community meetings and bring back the essence of the discussion. They can interact with community leaders. They may also be the tutors or teachers of adults who need to learn of the processes of public institutions. Much emphasis will be placed on the recruitment of minority volunteers, for they can be role models to their communities.

In these months following the landmark August 17 conference, the California Coalition on University-Community Services is in the process of spawning a non-profit organization to encourage and foster the development of new volunteer programs throughout the state. Known as Operation Civic Serve, this organization is expected to become fully operational early in 1988. In addition to publicizing and promoting the growing student volunteer movement, Operation Civic Serve will offer free consultation services to newly-forming collaborative university-community efforts and, for a period, to cities and towns.

One of the first projects for Operation Civic Serve is the drafting of a typical blueprint by which a community and its public agencies can start a collaborative effort. There are probably one hundred steps to ensure that a new collaboration clicks; a check-off list of linkages to be made can ensure a proper start.

For too long, society's young educated members have gone off into the world of scientific and monetary pursuits without understanding why so many of their fellow beings cannot compete as equals. If community involvement can help them understand better how a society works, or why problems persist, those college students will become wiser voters, and better participants in the democratic process. And thus cities will gain from a more enlightened electorate.

(For those interested in college student community servers, two recent publications can provide a good background. "Student Public Service and the Human Corps" has been published in digest form as Report 87-12 by the California Postsecondary Education Commission at 1020 12th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985. [No cost.] "California College Students and Community Service" has been published by the California Coalition on University-Community Services at Bldg. #111, Fort Mason, San Francisco, CA 94123. Copies are available at $2.00 each, or for less in bulk. The two go well together.)
Memorandum

All Full-time Probationary and Tenured Faculty,
Librarians, Student Services Professionals,
Administrative Personnel

RECEIVED

Memorandum

All Full-time Probationary and Tenured Faculty,
Librarians, Student Services Professionals,
Administrative Personnel

To: All Full-time Probationary and Tenured Faculty,
Librarians, Student Services Professionals,
Administrative Personnel

From: Bonnie Brady, National Faculty Exchange Coordinator
Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: NATIONAL FACULTY EXCHANGE PROGRAM--1989-90

As you may know, this is the third year for Cal Poly's participation in the National Faculty Exchange Program. Those faculty/administrative personnel interested in an exchange opportunity for the 1988-89 academic year were requested to file an application last fall quarter.

With this memorandum, I am initiating the exchange process for those interested in pursuing an exchange during the 1989-90 academic year. The process is initiated by the National Faculty Exchange by requesting that a preliminary application be completed during spring quarter. Attached are the preliminary application materials for this purpose. Any faculty member/ administrative employee who may possibly be interested in an exchange during the 1989-90 academic year is asked to complete the preliminary application and submit it to me by May 9, 1988. Please note that this is a preliminary application only. By completing this form, you are only declaring an interest in an exchange, not making a final commitment for participation. The final application process will occur immediately following the beginning of Fall Quarter 1988.

Exchange programs provide an excellent avenue for additional professional development opportunities for faculty and administrative personnel. If I can assist you in answering questions concerning an exchange opportunity through the National Faculty Exchange Program, please give me a call at ext. 2186.

Attachments
Memorandum

To: P. Bailey, H. Busselen, L. Carter, G. Ding, J. Ericson, P. Lee, K. Walters

APR 8 1988

Date: April 8, 1988

Academic Senate

Copy Nos: W. J. Baker, M. W. Wilson, J. Pieper, S. Wilkins, C. Crabb, H. Sharp

From: Robert A. Lucas, Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, & Faculty Development

Subject: CSU FORGIVABLE LOAN - 1988/89

This is to alert you that the Chancellor's Office has announced it will be sponsoring the CSU Forgivable Loan Program again this year. It will provide forgivable loans of up to $10,000 a year for a maximum of three years for women and minorities to earn the doctorate in the hopes that they will teach in the CSU in disciplines where they are underrepresented. This year the program will support at least 40 doctoral students.

A person does not have to be currently employed by the CSU to qualify. All people must, however, be sponsored by a CSU campus to receive consideration in the competition once it reaches the system level.

For right now we have to do two things. First, we have the opportunity to inform the Chancellor's Office about whether we are interested in sponsoring applicant "walk ins" who may show up at the Chancellor's Office needing a campus to sponsor them. We must report our interest in freelance applicants by April 29 (Attachment D) so please have your forms to me by noon, Wednesday, April 27.

Second, we must locate promising young scholars and scientists among our staff, acquaintances, and students and encourage them to apply. Our campus nominations must be to the Chancellor's Office by June 10. This means that individual department and school nominations must be to my office by May 27 so that there will be time for committee review.

Attached is a draft of material that came with this opportunity. Some items are of special interest. The last, Attachment E, shows the fields that the scholarships will support and the categories of minorities and women applicable for each field. This is important. There is no point in encouraging people to apply for fields in which they are already overrepresented generally unless a case can be made here.

Note also that an important part of each sponsored application is the willingness of the department and school to support that student over the three years they will be studying for the doctoral degree. A student who doesn't have strong sponsorship will be extremely handicapped when the applications get to the CSU-wide level for screening.
From: Marilyn R. York, Campus Coordinator  
Graduate Studies, Research, & Faculty Development

Subject: Teacher/Scholar: Summer Institute for CSU Faculty -- 1988

For the fourth year, the CSU, Office of Faculty and Staff Relations, has announced the offering of several faculty workshops to be held during the week of June 13-17, 1988. The workshops will offer subjects that will assist faculty in the pursuit of both their instructional and their scholarly duties. Some workshops with an instructional emphasis include cross-cultural approaches, intellectual development of students, teaching effectiveness, and a new tool for computer-aided instruction—Hypercard. Others will focus on faculty as writers, getting grant support, and managing time conflicts. In addition, a special workshop will be held to assist campuses in planning and implementing a professional development program.

To assist you in informing your faculty, I am enclosing a copy of the brochure announcing the workshops. It includes details on the Summer Institute and related application information. Flyers announcing this program are also being sent to each full-time faculty member on-campus. You will notice that the pink pages of the brochure have detailed registration information for participants. The last page of the brochure (yellow) is the application form which interested faculty must complete. It is requested that your office duplicate a copy of these pages for each faculty member who wishes to attend a workshop.

The completed application should then be returned to me. This office will notify the Chancellor's Office of those faculty interested in attending. Also, please note that there is an enrollment limitation per campus, and that enrollment is on a first-call, first register basis.

Per diem expenses for selected faculty will be funded through the Chancellor's Office, with transportation expenses borne by the campus departments. Faculty will be encouraged to utilize State cars to minimize transportation expenses.
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.

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.
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 as many of the following items as are applicable:

1. The instructors' 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.

* A syllabus is a written day-by-day or week-by-week list of reading assignments, lecture topics, homework assignments, etc.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 10, 1988
Revised: April 19, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No
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 in the current evaluation system (to be used in any academic quarter in which the University-mandated evaluation is not conducted) in order to provide faculty with direct, confidential, and constructive feedback of classroom performance; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University provide the additional resources necessary to make the SIR forms available.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 5, 1988
Revised April 19, 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 each department head/chair initiate a discussion of the efficacy of common final examinations in central/core courses by placing the topic of common final examinations on the agenda of a special department meeting to be scheduled in 1988-1989; and be it further

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

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 10, 1988
Revised April 19, 1988
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 consultations, workshops, classes, etc., 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., knowledgeable faculty; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University shall provide the additional resources necessary to develop and conduct such consultations, workshops, classes, etc.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 10, 1988
Revised April 19, 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
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.
Background statement: On March 7, 1988, the Personnel Policies Committee unanimously approved the changes indicated on the attached timetable. These changes reflect the committee's concern that there is insufficient time allowed for the following two levels of review:
1. The department head/chair's review of first and second year retention cases.
2. The school peer review committee's review of promotion cases.

AS-____-88/____

RESOLUTION ON TIMETABLE FOR RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION

WHEREAS, A two-day time limit is too short for any/any of review the department head review in 1st-2nd year retention cases; and

WHEREAS, The duties of the school peer review committee have increased substantially; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached timetable be revised as indicated.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
March 7, 1988
Revised April 19, 1988
TIMETABLE FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations Forwarded</th>
<th>Retention (1st-2nd Yr)</th>
<th>Retention (3rd-6th)/Tenure</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review Committee to Candidate</td>
<td>11/24 11/17</td>
<td>1/18/1/11</td>
<td>1/18 1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review Committee to Department Head</td>
<td>12/4 11/24</td>
<td>1/25/1/18</td>
<td>1/25 1/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head to Candidate</td>
<td>12/3</td>
<td>2/15/2/8</td>
<td>2/15 2/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head to Dean</td>
<td>12/10</td>
<td>2/22/2/15</td>
<td>2/22 2/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Peer Review Committee to Candidate</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Peer Review Committee to Dean</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean to Candidate</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>4/1</td>
<td>4/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean to President</td>
<td>1/15</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>4/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>2/15</td>
<td>6/1</td>
<td>6/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event the established deadline falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the date will be extended to the Monday immediately following that date, except for retention and tenure notification, which must be made prior to June 1.
WHEREAS, The Master Plan Renewed calls for a high priority to be placed on improving the rate of transfer of students from California community colleges to the University of California (UC) and The California State University (CSU); and

WHEREAS, The proposal for a general education transfer curriculum has tried to address transfers between all segments of public higher education; and

WHEREAS, The unwarranted expansion of the scope of general education transfer impedes its implementation and undermines the autonomy of individual campuses in the UC and CSU; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the California Polytechnic State University Academic Senate recommend that the application of the general education transfer curriculum be confined to transfer from community colleges to CSU or UC campuses.

Proposed By:
George Lewis
April 5, 1988
REPORT OF THE INTERSEGMENTAL DRAFTING COMMITTEE
FOR A GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CURRICULUM

October 28, 1987

RECEIVED
NOV 2 1987
Academic Senate CSU
Chancellor's Office
REPORT OF THE INTERSEGMENTAL DRAFTING COMMITTEE
FOR A GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CURRICULUM

Following a careful, extended process of deliberation and analysis of existing
criteria and requirements, the Intersegmental Drafting Committee for a General
Education Transfer Curriculum is pleased to submit its recommendations. In doing so, it
has been attentive both to its specific charge and to the broader concerns of our
society with respect to the general education of our postsecondary student population.

The committee believes that the principal role of general education is to develop the
students' abilities to think and that an effective way to meet this standard is to
emphasize that most general education courses should require significant amounts of
writing. General education courses should not merely transmit information, but should
require analysis, criticism, and synthesis. One of the most effective tools for achieving
these goals is the written essay, evaluated with attention to the quality of its writing
as well as the accuracy of its content. In addition, the committee also notes that
speaking, listening, and reading are important abilities that a general education course
should foster. Participation in the intellectual and cultural life of our society requires
sound ability in verbal communication of all kinds.

The committee also believes that courses in the transfer curriculum should be
culturally broad in their conception. They should help students understand the nature
and richness of human culture and social structures through a comparative approach,
and have a pronounced historical perspective.

Similarly, one of the most useful things that students should get from their general
education is an understanding of the modes of inquiry that characterize the different
areas of human thought: the nature of the questions that can be addressed, the way
questions are formulated, the way analysis is conducted and the nature and limitations
of the answers obtained.

The preceding comments should make the clear the committee's intention that the
General Education Transfer Curriculum be intellectually challenging; indeed, it must be
to do a responsible job of preparing students for entry into the upper division of our
demanding four-year institutions and for full participation in the life of the state. It is
equally clear that participation in such a curriculum itself requires adequate preparation.
Finally, the committee takes this opportunity to reemphasize the importance of high
school preparation, and to caution that poor preparation may require students to take
remedial courses prior to entry into the transfer curriculum.

* * * * * * *

Completion of the General Education Transfer curriculum prior to transfer should be
recognized as satisfying all lower division general and breadth education requirements of
the receiving institution. Any receiving institutions that insist upon the completion of
certain of their general education requirements as a prerequisite for transfer must also
accept completion of the full transfer curriculum as satisfying that screening
requirement. However, the receiving institution may legitimately insist that transfer
students complete any general education requirements that must be taken at the upper
division level by non-transfer students, or that must be satisfied by all students by
upper division course work. In addition, transfer students must fulfill all other
admission requirements.
Both the State University and the University have a specific American Institutions requirement that is separate from their general education requirements. Completion of the General Education Transfer Curriculum may not satisfy those requirements. Similarly, general education requirements are separate from lower division requirements for the major. Students pursuing majors which require extensive lower division preparation may not find the General Education Transfer Curriculum option to be advantageous.

All courses offered towards satisfaction of the requirements of the General Education Transfer Curriculum must be baccalaureate in level and must be acceptable for transfer among all segments of public post-secondary education. Advanced Placement credit that is considered equivalent to a course accepted for credit towards the Transfer Curriculum should also be acceptable.

PROPOSED GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER CURRICULUM

Subject Area: English Communication (3 semesters or 4 quarters)

The English Communication requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of three semester or four quarters of lower division courses in English reading, critical thinking, written composition, and oral communication, at least two semesters or three quarters of which must be devoted to written composition. Courses in this area shall include close analysis of a variety of representative texts.

The inclusion of a sequence in English Communication in a program of general education is of basic importance to the remainder of the Curriculum. Ability to read at a mature level, to think critically, to write with clarity, and to speak effectively is fundamental to acquisition of knowledge in other areas of the liberal arts. Transmission and exchange of ideas is an essential part of the activity of a liberally-educated citizen. These courses should enable students to go beyond the level of reception and transmission of information and ideas to the more abstract conceptualization of ideas.

Subject Area: Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning (1 semester or 1 quarter)

The Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of a one-semester or one-quarter course in mathematics or statistics.

Courses on the application of statistics to particular disciplines may not be credited towards satisfaction of the Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning requirement.

The increasingly complex, technological nature of the society in which we live routinely confronts us with a variety of information requiring calculation, comparison, and other forms of analysis for problem solving. In addition, many disciplines require a sound foundation in mathematical concepts. The requirement in Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning is designed to prepare students to respond effectively to these challenges.

Subject Area: Arts and Humanities (3 semesters or 3 quarters)

The Arts and Humanities requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of three semesters or three quarters of coursework which encourages students to analyze and appreciate works of intellectual, literary, aesthetic and cultural importance. At least one course shall be taken in the Arts and one in the Humanities. Courses should provide students with some historical understanding of major civilizations and
cultures, both Western and non-Western, including those of ethnic minorities. In the Arts, students should also learn to develop an independent and critical aesthetic perspective.

Courses that are primarily performance or studio classes in the Arts may not be credited towards satisfaction of the Arts and Humanities requirement.

The Arts and Humanities historically constitute the heart of a liberal arts general education because of the fundamental humanizing perspective that they provide for the development of the whole person. Inclusion of this requirement is, therefore, grounded in the deepest traditions of Western education, with its emphasis on language, literature, and the fine arts. At the same time, the great diversity of contemporary American—especially Californian—society adds a vibrant dimension to our received definition of the Arts and Humanities that opens up great possibilities for expansion of that tradition. To focus on the received traditions of the West and the less familiar traditions of other cultures, including the minority cultures in our own society, is to enrich the education of future generations of Californian citizens.

Subject Area: Social and Behavioral Sciences (3 semesters or 4 quarters)

The Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement shall be fulfilled by completion of three semesters or four quarters of coursework which reflects the integration of human social, political, and economic institutions and behavior. Problems and issues in these areas should be examined in their contemporary and historical setting, as well as present a comparative perspective on both Western and non-Western societies, including those of ethnic minorities. Courses should be presented from a theoretical point of view and focus on core concepts of the discipline rather than on personal, practical, or applied aspects.

Not more than

Only one of the courses taken to satisfy the United States History, Constitution, and American Ideals Requirement (Title 5, California Administrative Code, Section 40404) shall be credited towards satisfaction of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Subject Area requirement.

Each of us is born into, lives, and must function effectively within an environment that includes other individuals. People have, from earliest times, formed social and cultural groups that constitute the framework for the behavior of the individual as well as the group. By taking courses in the Social and Behavioral Sciences students will gain a basic knowledge of the cultural behavior and social organizations in which they exist as well as the cultural behavior and social organizations of other human societies.

Subject Area: Physical and Life Sciences (2 semesters or 3 quarters)

The Physical and Life Sciences requirement shall be fulfilled by two semesters or three quarters of coursework which includes at least one course in the Physical Sciences and one course in the Life Sciences, at least one of which incorporates a laboratory. Courses should emphasize experimental methodology, the testing of hypotheses, and the power of systematic doubt, rather than the recall of "facts." Courses that emphasize the interdependency of the sciences are especially appropriate for non-science majors.
The contemporary world is pervaded by science and its applications, and many of the most difficult choices facing individuals and institutions concern the interface of scientific and technological capability with human values and social goals. To function effectively in such a complex world, students must develop a comprehension of the basic concepts of physical and biological sciences, and a sophisticated understanding of science as a human endeavor, including the limitations as well as the power of scientific inquiry.

Respectfully submitted,

Carmen M. Decker, Committee Chair
Department of English and Spanish
Cypress College

Edward A. Alpers, Dean
Honors and Undergraduate Programs
University of California, Los Angeles

Bernice Biggs
Department of English
San Francisco State University

Brian Federici
Department of Entomology
University of California, Riverside

Ray Geigle
Chair, Academic Senate
The California State University

Theo Mabry
Social Sciences Division (Anthropology)
Orange Coast College

Frieda Stahl
Department of Physics & Anatomy
California State University,
Los Angeles

Maryamber Villa
History Department
Los Angeles Valley College

Mark Wheelis
Department of Bacteriology
University of California, Davis

Connie Anderson
Specialist, Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

Carla Ferri, Coordinator
Undergraduate Admissions &
Articulation
University of California, Berkeley

Chuck Lindahl
Office of the Chancellor
The California State University

EAA/bs: 10/30/87
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS---88/---

RESOLUTION
IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 71 (June 7, 1988)

Background statement: As a result of an initiative (Proposition 4) passed in 1979, the California Constitution now contains Article XIII B which restricts spending at the state and local level. Until 1987-88, the "Gann limit" had not affected budgets for education. This year, as you recall, revenues exceeded the limit and after a prolonged controversy between the governor and the legislature, the "surplus" was rebated to the taxpayers.

The "Gann" amendment is presently computed so as to reflect fluctuations in the U.S. Consumer Price Index and the population of California. Unfortunately, the agencies--such as education, health care, and corrections--which are the major recipients of the state budget, face needs engendered by factors other than those flowing from a strict application of the national CPI or population rate. The rising costs of health care are influenced by providers which, for the most part, reside in the private sector. Correctional demands are as likely to be influenced by laws defining crimes and the penalties assessed with them as the rise in population. The increased demands placed on education reflect a student population which is proportionally greater than the rise in general population. There will be other demands placed on higher education resulting from the recommendations of the Master Plan Renewed and the changing demographics projected for California in the near future.

Because Article XIII B affects such a broad spectrum, attempts to modify it have emerged. Two initiatives have qualified for the June 7th ballot: Prop #71, (The Government Spending Limitation and Accountability Act of 1988); and Prop #72, (The Paul Gann Spending Limit Improvement and Enforcement Act of 1988).

Prop #71 would modify Article XIII B so that (a) the annual cost of living adjustment would be based on the California Consumer Price Index, (b) the annual population adjustment would reflect changes in school enrollment, and (c) gasoline taxes would be designated as "user fees" and be exempted from the limit. The result would augment the amount of the general fund so as to address in a more realistic manner the enlarged responsibility of the state.

Prop #72 would, among other things, not change the current formula for calculating the spending limit but would designate gasoline taxes and fees as user fees and, hence, exempt them from the limit. These fees would remain specified exclusively to meet transportation costs. The result being that transportation would receive a (much needed) bonus while resources for the other projects competing for the general fund would grow increasingly scarce as the discrepancy arising from the current way of formulating the limit continues to diverge from the actual demands placed on state resources.

The Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance estimate that the state’s appropriations limit would increase by $800 million in 1988-89 under Prop 71 while Prop 72 would result in losses to the General Fund but a gain for transportation-related programs of about $710 million in 1991-92.
RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 71 (June 7, 1988)

WHEREAS, The Master Plan Renewed envisions a fuller responsibility for higher education in California; and

WHEREAS, The changing demographics of the state demand a larger role for all segments of education; and

WHEREAS, The formula currently employed by Article XIII B of the California Constitution to determine the limit placed on state spending is flawed so as to cause expenditures to fall increasingly behind actual demand on state resources; and

WHEREAS, There will be two propositions on the June 7, 1988 Primary Ballot purporting to modify the "Gann limit"; and

WHEREAS, Only one of these, Proposition #71, will do so in a manner that will benefit education in the state; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate favor and support Proposition #71 (The Government Spending Limitation and Accountability Act of 1988); and be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, Cal Poly, urge its colleagues, the University President, the Associated Students, and all others representing the University to inform the public of the need to give this resolution serious consideration and active support.

Proposed By:
Reg Gooden
April 4, 1988
WHEREAS, Surveys of graduates one, five or ten (or more) years following graduation can be a valuable source of information about the effectiveness of the education they received and about areas they believe need improvement; and

WHEREAS, A similar survey of major employers of Cal Poly graduates can be a valuable source of information about the effectiveness of the education received by Cal Poly graduates; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That such surveys of Cal Poly graduates and major employers of Cal Poly graduates be carried out (in conjunction with the Alumni Office and the Placement Center) as a Departmental Function with department input no less than once every five years; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a representative advisory ad hoc survey committee be established to design the core of a questionnaire to be sent to Cal Poly graduates and employers of Cal Poly graduates; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ad hoc survey committee would solicit input from departments concerning additional department-specific questions to be added to the survey; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the resources necessary to prepare and administer both surveys be supplied by the University.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee February 5, 1988 Revised April 19, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No

Note 1: As an example, the committee could be constituted as follows: one representative nominated by the Alumni Office, one representative nominated by the Placement Center, one faculty representative from each school, nominated by the Academic Senate Executive Committee and appointed by the President.

Note 2: The delegation of responsibility by this resolution to an ad hoc survey committee does not preclude a department from undertaking its own survey of its graduates and employers of its graduates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</th>
<th>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)</th>
<th>4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)</th>
<th>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
<th>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
<th>7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Miller</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>C.3.</td>
<td>ARCH 316X California Architecture and the California Dream (3) Development of California Architecture as the symbolic expression of the myth of the California Dream. Focus of tracing California's unique contribution to architecture and urban patterns in the United States.</td>
<td>Approves 5-0 (see attachment)</td>
<td>Approves 7-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

To: George Lewis, Chair
   Academic Senate General Education and Breadth Committee

From: John Harrington, Chair
   Academic Senate GE&B Area C Subcommittee

Subject: Course Proposal for ARCH 316X

Date: March 21, 1988

Copies: Sandy Miller
        Glenn Irvin

The Area C Subcommittee unanimously approved adding ARCH 316X, California Architecture and the California Dream, to GE&B Area C.3. Professor Miller worked effectively with the committee to revise the proposal after the committee's original negative vote. The committee has only one reservation, but it is a reservation that applies to all C.3. courses: the subcommittee believes that each course in C.3 should require an appropriate prerequisite in Areas C.1 or C.2 (rather than in C.1) given the structure and original logic justifying the three areas. However, the committee will need to address the issue per se rather than focus upon particular courses at this time.
Experimental Courses are normally valid for two years. Please attach an Expanded Course Outline. Selected Advanced Topics (470, 471, 570, 571) are valid for one quarter only. Please attach an Expanded Course Outline. If the department plans to offer the proposed course for more than 1 quarter, the experimental course vehicle should be used.

Other Subject Courses. The catalog description should indicate that the course has subtopics. For the "Prefix/Number/Title" box, please use the information as shown in the catalog. The individual subtopic title should be shown in "Title for Class Schedule."

Department and School: Architecture Dept., SAED
Date: 9-30-87
Prepared by: Sandy Miller
Revised: 2-15-88

1. PREFIX / NUMBER / TITLE
ARCH 316X California Architecture and the California Dream

2. UNITS
3. GEB Area:
4. GRADING METHOD

5. COURSE DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format; limit to 40 words)

Development of California Architecture as the symbolic expression of the myth of the California Dream. Focus on tracing California's unique contribution to architecture and urban patterns in the United States.

6. PREREQUISITE

ENG 114

7. QUARTER AND YEAR
Fall, Winter, Spring

8. TITLE FOR CLASS SCHEDULE (maximum of 13 characters)
ARCH/DREAM

9. CIS NUMBER(S)
CS 2

10. TYPE OF COURSE

11. MISCELLANEOUS COURSE FEE (MCF form is also needed)
None

12. NUMBER OF SECTIONS ANTICIPATED

1 Winter
1 Spring
1 Summer

13. HOW FREQUENTLY COURSE WILL BE OFFERED
Yearly X Alternate Years

14. AVERAGE CLASS SIZE
45-50

15. ANNUAL W.T.U.
9 (3+3+3)

16. REQUIRED COURSE IN WHICH MAJOR/CONCENTRATION/MINOR
None

17. ELECTIVE COURSE IN WHICH MAJOR/CONCENTRATION/MINOR
Architecture

18. DUPLICATION OR APPROXIMATION OF COURSES NOW BEING OFFERED OR NOW BEING PROPOSED
None

19. STAFFING (Indicate either the need to hire new faculty or how present faculty utilization will be shifted to accommodate this course)
Existing Architectural History Faculty

20. JUSTIFICATION (Explain the need for this course)

California has long been acknowledged as a major trendsetter in national and international architectural circles, specifically, and in the arts in general. The awareness of California's unique contribution to the arts should be general knowledge in the cultural background of educated Californians.

21. FACILITIES, MATERIALS, AND EQUIPMENT NEEDED TO ACCOMMODATE COURSE
Medium lecture hall (50 chairs); screen; 2 slide projectors with remote control; blackboard; lighting control from full lighting to minimum lighting for note taking.

APPROVALS

Dean
School Dean
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
and University Dean

*This form will be returned to the department by the Academic Programs Office with the number noted after the Course Master File catalog number has been assigned by the computer.

**Courses proposed for inclusion in GEB must be submitted to the GEB Committee.