I. Preparatory:
   A. The meeting was called to order at 3:14 p.m.
   B. The minutes of the April 12, 1988 meeting were approved as submitted.

II. Communications:
   A. The chair called attention to the list of materials available for reading in the Academic Senate Office. These now include some background documents relative to Propositions 71 and 72, which will appear on the June ballot.
   B. President Baker has approved the following resolutions:
      AS-265-87 Conflict of Interest in Personnel Decisions: CAM 311.5
      AS-276-88 Extra Sabbatical Positions for Spring 88
   C. The chair noted the letter from Choate on Operation Civic Service, pointing out that it deals with community service by students.
   D. The chair noted the Memo from Brady regarding the National Faculty Exchange Program. Senators were encouraged to make this information available to faculty in their school.
   E. The chair called attention to the memo from Lucas regarding the forgivable loan program. This is being distributed in order to maximize exposure of this program.
   F. The chair asked Senators to read the memo from York regarding the Teacher/Scholar Program. Senators were encouraged to take a close look at this program. More information is available in the Senate Office.

III. Reports:
   A. President: none.
   B. Academic Affairs Office: none.
   C. Statewide Senators: none.

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

V. Business Items:
   A. Resolution on Course Information/Syllabi, second reading
      M/S (Burgunder, Havandian) to adopt this resolution.
      M/S (Gooden, Silvestri) to amend the first resolved to read:
      Resolved, That the Senate recommend that during the first week of classes an instructor announce to the class members information about the course. The information may be in writing and may include: (list of items same as before)
Ray Zeuschner spoke against the amendment. He felt that it dilutes the resolution to the point where it doesn't do anything.

Terry Smith concurred with Zeuschner.

The amendment failed on a vote of 12-23.

Discussion of the main motion is summarized below:

Munroe: His department didn't understand the term grading policy. Ray Terry responded that the term meant grading procedure.

Ciano: He has served on the Fairness Board and finds that it is a big help in resolving complaints when an instructor provides this kind of information in writing.

Havandjiab: Indicated surprise that there would be opposition to this resolution. He complies with this resolution and it works well.

Weber: Indicated that she thinks that the Senate has dealt with this issue in the past.

Terry: Stated that if the Senate has dealt with the issue before, there is no evidence of it in CAM. It is in the faculty handbook as a recommendation. This resolution differs from the handbook in that it proposes that distribution of course information not be optional and states that course information should be in writing.

McGary: Indicated surprise that this isn't already being done, but expressed concern about how it would be enforced if it were passed.

Zeuschner: He saw two issues. The first is whether faculty should do what is recommended in the resolution. The second is whether the Senate should be involved in this issue. He felt that the answer to the first question is yes, but that the answer to the second is no.

Andrews: Stated that the students could enforce the policy if it is approved. If a written course information sheet is not provided, it would be a violation of policy and students have a recourse.

The resolution passed on a vote of 21-18. There were 4 abstentions.
B. Resolution on the Use of the Student Instructional Report, second reading

M/S (Wheeler, Helyer) to adopt the resolution.

Discussion of the resolution is summarized below:

Murphy: He feels that we already have student evaluation of faculty. He is against the resolution because faculty are evaluated enough already and he feels that the proposed system, if implemented, should be run by and paid for by the students.

Botwin: He stated that he is for student evaluation. He sees that it serves three purposes: fulfills contractual obligations, provides feedback to faculty, and gives the students a chance to express themselves. He does not think that the proposed form does the first two well, and if the purpose is to allow for expression of student opinion then the students should take care of this themselves.

Reiner: He stated that he favors the resolution. His only reservation is that participation would be optional. He feels it should be mandatory.

Dalton: She spoke against the resolution. She thinks that the proposed form is the wrong instrument to achieve the stated goals. She doesn’t think that the questions asked on this form would provide useful feedback, and therefore the cost of implementing it is not justified.

Cooper: He stated that when the current evaluation system was implemented that faculty were told that they would never be used for evaluation. They are now part of the RTP process. He feels that this has led to both grade inflation and the lowering of academic standards. He polled 108 faculty and only 2 said that grades and academic standards are not affected by the evaluation process.

Zeuschner: He stated that he thinks that everyone would benefit from accurate and complete feedback. The only question is which form to use. He would like to experiment with different forms, and sees this resolution as a possible first step in that direction.

McNeil: He indicated that we already have mandated student evaluations and that he doesn’t feel that there is a need for more. Although the resolution states that participation would be optional, he thinks that it may become required.

Burgunder: He stated that the current form in the School of Business gives the faculty member no feedback at all. He has experimented with other forms, but hasn’t found a reliable one. He would support the resolution as an experiment to see if it turned out to be a useful way of getting student feedback.
Gooden: He indicated that he is concerned with duplication of effort. We already have evaluations. If some schools have problems with their forms, it should be resolved at the school level.

Wheeler: She stated that she sees this as a way of providing feedback with the goal of improving teacher effectiveness. She thinks funding is a separate issue and that the resolution should be supported without worrying about who is going to pay for the implementation.

The motion failed on a vote of 15-22. There were 6 abstentions.

C. Resolution on Common Final Examinations, second reading
M/S (Smith, Kolkailah) to adopt this resolution
Reg Gooden indicated that he would like to offer a substitute resolution.
M/S/P (Zeuschner, Cooper) to table this resolution to the next Senate meeting.

D. Resolution on Student Performance Evaluations, second reading
M/S (Kolkailah, Zeuschner) to adopt this resolution.

Ray Terry indicated that the Instruction Committee had made some changes in response to suggestions made at the first reading.

The motion passed on a vote of 33-5. There were 3 abstentions.

E. Resolution on Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty, second reading.
M/S (Murphy, Andrews) to adopt the resolution.
There was no discussion.
The resolution passed unanimously.

F. Resolution on Timetable for Retention, Tenure, Promotion, first reading.
Paul Murphy explained that when the Personnel Policies Committee looked back over last years personnel cycle they found two problems. This led to the proposed changes in dates which will hopefully improve the process. The changes give the department leaders more time on first and second year retention and gives the school PRC more time on the 3rd - 6th year retention and promotion cycle. He also indicated that there will be another resolution forthcoming that will address the problem of early evaluation of first-year faculty. It will propose that the initial appointment for tenure-track faculty be for two years.

This resolution will move to a second reading item at the next full Senate meeting.
G. Resolution on General Education and Breadth Transfer Curriculum, first reading.

George Lewis provided the Senate with some background information on the GE&B transfer curriculum issue. He feels that somewhere along the line the Intersegmental Committee lost sight of its original goal, which was to facilitate transfers from community colleges to the four-year colleges. The document as it is now written applies to any transfer. He feels adoption of the proposed plan would ultimately lead to two GE&B curriculum on campus—one for students who planned to stay at Cal Poly and one for those who did not plan to stay.

Zeuschner suggested that the whereas clauses might also address the issue of GE certification by the community colleges.

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

H. Resolution in Support of Proposition 71 (June 7, 1988), first reading

Reg Gooden stated that the upcoming June ballot will contain two resolutions that address the issue of distribution of general funds for the State. Proposition 71 will be beneficial to education by changing the way in which the spending limits are modified from year to year. Proposition 72 provides more money for transportation and would not directly benefit education. If both resolutions pass, the one with the most votes will decide in areas where the resolutions are in conflict.

M/S/P (Sharp, Hellyer) to move this resolution to a second reading item.

The resolution passed with one negative vote.

I. Resolution on Surveys of Graduates and Employers, first reading

Ray Terry indicated that the changes that appear in the resolution were made in response to input from the Executive Committee. It now states that the surveys would be a university function, with input from the various departments.

A summary of the discussion appears below:

Botwin: He indicated that he thinks that this will cost a lot of money.

Wheeler: She would prefer changing the resolution so that departments would be able to request a specific type of survey that would meet their needs.

McGary: He also indicated that he would prefer departmental control over the survey of graduates.

Smith: He stated that he thinks that the first whereas extends the time frame too far (ten or more years from graduation).
Hewitt: She stated that she would like to see these surveys as optional, but would hope that some funding would be set aside for such surveys.

Sharp: He stated that he would like to see some estimates of the cost of implementation. As he sees it, the resolution reads that four surveys will have to be done each year.

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

J. General Education and Breadth Proposal: ARCH 316X, first reading.
This course received a positive recommendation from both the area subcommittee and the GE&B Committee.

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

VI. Discussion Items: none.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.