I. Preparatory:
   A. The meeting was called to order at 3:12 p.m.
   B. The minutes of the March 8, 1988 meeting were approved as submitted.

II. Communications:
   A. The chair noted the list of materials available for reading in the Senate office. Items added since the last Senate meeting are highlighted in bold print.
   B. The chair informed the Senate that President Baker has approved resolution AS-278-88 GE&B Requirements: Course Proposal PSY 494
   C. The chair asked that Senators share the memo from Malcolm Wilson on guidelines for summer quarter staffing with the faculty in their schools.
   D. The chair noted the memo from Geigle to Campus Senate Chairs regarding the Committee to Study Graduate Education Within the CSU.
   E. The chair called attention to the memo regarding the satellite seminar on teaching with technology.
   F. The chair informed the Senate that Senate elections will be held this week. He noted that several schools will need to think about how they will fill vacancies on the Senate resulting from the paucity of nominations in some schools.
   G. The chair announced that nominations are now being accepted for Senate Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary. Petitions are available in the Senate office and are due in by May 3. Elections will be held at the May 10 Senate meeting.

III. Reports:
   A. President: none.
   B. Academic Affairs: none.
   C. Statewide Senators:
      Reg Gooden reported that the Statewide Senate is actively involved in the GE&B transfer curriculum issue. He will provide a full report at a later date.
   D. Academic Senate Chair:
      Charlie Crabb raised the issue of the appropriateness of outside vendors making use of the campus mail system. Ray Macias would like to know how faculty feel about the issue.
      A straw vote was taken, showing the group to be unanimously in favor of restricting outside access to the campus mail system.

IV. Consent Agenda: none.
V. Business Items:
   A. Resolution on Report on Faculty Position Control, second reading.

   M/S (Sharp, Stead) to adopt the resolution.
   Jim Conway stated that it now appears that summer quarter will be run as usual. This report proposes guidelines for dealing with the problem in the future. The resolution is a statement from the faculty to the administration. The resolution passed unanimously.

   B. Resolution on Department Name Change: Foreign Languages Department to Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, second reading.

   This resolution was before the Senate earlier in the year. The Senate had requested input from departments who would be affected by the name change. Charlie Crabb indicated that the appropriate inquires have been made and the proposed name is acceptable to those departments.

   M/S (Zeuschner, Sharp) to adopt this resolution.
   Bill Little stated that the department wanted the name change in order to better identify the course content and expertise of the faculty in the department. It does not represent any curriculum change for the department.

   Reg. Gooden inquired as to whether there might be problems in the future over who would teach a particular literature course.

   Bill Little responded that agreements have been reached with English, and that there would not be any problems of this nature.

   Paul Murphy stated that a case should be made for simplicity. He doesn’t see the need for the change and is against the resolution.

   Joseph Waddell asked if the department teaches literature courses in translation and whether the department would be expanding its literature offerings.

   Bill Little responded that they do teach some courses in translation and that there are no plans to expand their course offerings.

   The motion passed 31 - 2.

   C. Resolution on Course Information/Syllabi, first reading

   Ray Terry stated that this resolution was modeled on a resolution passed at Dominiguez Hills. The Instruction Committee modified it somewhat to obtain the current resolution. It is based on the premise that certain information should be available to students and that it is important enough to be put in writing.
MaryLinda Wheeler stated that P.E. is already required by the Department to provide a written syllabus.

Ray Terry responded that it is not a university-wide policy and that the faculty handbook recommends but does not require the distribution of a syllabus.

George Lewis spoke against the resolution, stating that it is an intrusion on the autonomy of faculty.

Joe Weatherby indicated that he agreed with George Lewis. The resolution would be an intrusion on academic freedom, and he would resent the Senate setting standards for his classes.

Jim Fitzsimmons stated that the syllabus is a useful tool in evaluating transfer students' requests to deviate courses, and that he feels that faculty should provide syllabi.

Paul Murphy responded that the expanded course outlines can be used to settle articulation disputes.

Mike Botwin stated that he is not happy with the resolution. He sees it as trying to legislate good teaching.

Reg Gooden indicated that it is hard to know what to do with the third required item regarding course goals. He would find the resolution difficult to implement.

James Murphy said he doesn't see the need for the resolution. He feels that the information is already being distributed as appropriate for each class.

Charlie Andrews stated that there are faculty who do not convey this information to students. As a result, the students don't know how they will be graded. He does not see this as an intrusion on academic freedom.

Joe Weatherby stated that his objection is not that the students don't have a right to know how they will be graded, but rather is with the presumption of the Academic Senate to decide what is important for his class.

James Murphy indicated that he doesn't see this as a Senate item. If there are problems they should be handled at the school or department level.

Ray Terry indicated that the committee was unanimous in its support for this resolution. If it is not acceptable as is, it will have to be modified on the Senate floor.

This resolution will move to a second reading item at the next full Senate meeting.
D. Resolution on the Use of the Student Instructional Report, first reading.

This resolution is the result of action on the part of the students. ASI reported to the Senate earlier on their work on looking for a form for evaluation of faculty.

Ray Terry stated that the Instruction Committee had reviewed the student’s proposal and the form and felt that it would not be harmful provided that it was optional, complementary to the current RTP evaluations (that is, not to be used in RTP quarters), and confidential with results going directly to the faculty member.

George Lewis asked how much this program would cost. Stan Van Vleck, ASI President, responded that it would cost $30,000 for two years, and that President Baker has told the students that if this is adopted by the Senate he will find a way to fund it.

Joe Weatherby stated that he found the resolution to be an intrusion on the academic process. He feels that the students should negotiate this with the union if they really want to do these evaluations. He feels that if the Senate takes a stand supporting this resolution, the evaluations will become a de facto requirement. He also stated that faculty should be aware that the current evaluation system also started out as both optional and confidential. It is neither today.

George Stanton indicated that many of the existing instruments currently in use are terrible. He feels that a good instrument may give valuable input to a faculty member. He thinks that the resolution provides the appropriate safeguards and seems reasonable.

John Stead questioned the validity of the questions on the SIS. He would want to see more information on the questionnaire before he could decide.

Sarah Lord stated that she has used the proposed SIS. She feels that it is better than the current RTP evaluation forms.

Stan Van Vleck spoke on behalf of the students. He indicated that their goal is to improve academic quality by providing feedback to faculty.

The chair pointed out that this was a first reading item and was not to be debated at this time. He encouraged faculty to stop by the ASI office and pick up a packet of materials on the proposed questionnaire and to take the time to review this information before the next Senate meeting.

This resolution will move to a second reading item at the next full Senate meeting.
E. Resolution on Common Final Examinations, first reading

Ray Terry summarized the resolution. It calls for a discussion of the usefulness of common finals in each department. The resolution has no force.

Joe Weatherby stated that he can't support this resolution for the same reasons he gave in the discussion of the previous two resolutions. He feels that the resolution is beyond the scope of the Senate.

Ray Terry commented that this resolution was derived from the Ad Hoc Committee report. The Senate should not necessarily infer that the resolution has the support of the Instruction Committee.

Lee Burgunder stated that he is against common final exams in any form and that he would not support this resolution. He feels that there is also the potential for use of common finals as a means of comparing instructors.

Barbara Weber indicated concern that the resolution has no content. She feels that it is a weak resolution that doesn't do anything.

This resolution will move to a second reading item at the next full Senate meeting.

F. Resolution on Student Performance Evaluations, first reading

Ray Terry indicated that this resolution is a modification of one of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee Report. The resolution calls for in-service workshops as a means of helping faculty develop good tests and assignments. The Instruction Committee sees this as a harmless suggestion.

Joe Weatherby stated that he is not opposed to the content of the resolution. He offered the suggestion that the Instruction Committee consider modifying the last resolved. The last resolved states that the administration will provide the training. He feels that training should be provided by faculty with the support of the administration.

Jim Fitzsimmons indicated that he supports this resolution. He has seen this type of training at other institutions and feels that it can be an effective way of improving instruction.

This resolution will move to a second reading item at the next full Senate meeting.
G. Resolution on Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty, first reading.

Paul Murphy indicated that this resolution is being brought forward to bring CAM up to date. The current guidelines come from an Administrative Bulletin written in 1974. This resolution would acknowledge that collective bargaining addresses student evaluation, and make CAM consistent with the MOU. The proposed policy requires that every evaluation document for every department must contain an objective part. The results of the objective part must go into personnel files. It would be up to the department whether to put written comments into the file.

Reg Gooden asked if the Personnel Policies Committee has considered putting a time limit on how long evaluations will remain in the personnel file. He suggested that maybe the policy should address this issue, possibly stating that the length of time would be up to the department.

This resolution will move to a second reading item at the next full Senate meeting.

VI. Discussion Items: none.

VI. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.