ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA
January 15, 1974
3:15 p.m., University Union 220

I. Approval of Minutes

II. Committee Reports
   A. Executive - Alberti
   B. Budget - Clerkin
   C. Constitution and Bylaws - Johnson
   D. Curriculum - Weatherby
   E. Election - Hooks
   F. Instruction - Fierstine
   G. Personnel Policies - Coyes
   H. Student Affairs - Sandlin
   I. General Education - Scheffer
   J. Personnel Review - Johnston
   K. Research - Saveker
   L. Faculty Library - Krupp - Attachment II-L
   M. University-Wide Committees

III. Business Items
   A. Statewide Academic Senate Resolution on 60/40 - Attachment III-A - Anderson
   B. Learning Assistance Center - Attachment III-B* - Fierstine/Cheek
   C. Senate Directions Committee Report - (See Attachment II-M, November 13 Academic Senate Agenda) - Weber

IV. Announcements and Information Items
   A. Statewide Academic Senate Report - Anderson, Andreini, Olsen
   B. Dean and Department Head Evaluation Status - Alberti
   C. University Car Pools - Labhard
   D. Assigned Time

*Attachment III-B to Senate members only. Copy available for review in Senate office.
To: Robert Alberti, Chairman
    Academic Senate

From: Library Committee of the Academic Senate

Subject: Summary and Interpretation of the Department of Finance Report on Library Cooperation, June, 1973

The Academic Senate's Library Committee has studied the June, 1973 Department of Finance Audit Team Report on library cooperation among the State Colleges and Universities and would like to call attention to the recommendations of the report and its implications for this campus. It seems certain that some reorganization scheme for libraries of the State Colleges and Universities will be put into effect by 1975. It also is likely that the reorganization pattern will follow in some form the recent recommendations of the Department of Finance.

It is the consensus of the committee that the report has basic flaws which apply to the State College and University system as a whole and is menacing for this campus in particular. The following is a summary of what we believe to be the major features of the report as it affects this campus along with an interpretation of the effects of the proposed changes.

The committee would recommend that the Academic Senate give a permanent charge to its library committee to maintain close scrutiny on the implementation of a reorganized library system, and that the Senate also communicate our concern in this matter to the State Academic Senate and to the Chancellor's Office. The committee would also urge the Academic Vice President to survey library cooperation as it develops, keeping in mind the reservations of the faculty.

I. Organization of a northern and southern library consortia within the state.

Summary. The objective is to create two manageable geographical areas in which bibliographic sharing can occur. The major problem springing from this system, and envisioned by the study, is queuing. The report indicates that a minimum of 33% and a maximum of 40% of library collections are of such "low use" that they would be available for loan. Almost the entirety of the report is designed to quantitatively support this thesis, yet there still remains at least two major questions: (1) the use of books within the library cannot be quantified and will decrease significantly the percentage of books that ought to be available for loan; and (2) the assumption that librarians are somehow equipped to gauge the popularity of a title before it is acquired, and thus classify it as "high" or "low" use.

Generally however, there is an indication that there are books (less than the Audit Team believes) within the State College Library system that are used infrequently enough to be loaned. This situation, coupled with budget restrictions and the increasing cost of books makes the implementation of some form of a cooperative system a reality, despite its undesirability.
Interpretation. The critical problem for this campus, given the reality of cooperation, is inclusion in one of the consortia. As of June, 1973 Cal Poly was not included in either consortia; since then the Director of the University Library has received word that the campus will be a part of the cooperative system. The University was originally excluded on the idea that Cal Poly’s benefit to the system was less than the expense of participation. This probably has not changed. The Director of the Library should consequently be concerned whether Cal Poly be granted only a second-class status within the consortia. The danger is the campus receiving the worst of both situations: decreasing library funds, and insufficient bibliographic cooperation. Cal Poly ought possibly to maintain its unique geographical and academic position and press for funds to support a self-sufficient library, or maintain pressure for equality in terms of automation and rapid inter-library loan delivery.

II. Cooperation organized on the basis of subject specialization.

Summary. The report states that the concept of a library as the depository for most scholarly knowledge will only be achieved within subject areas. It is expected that the existing strengths of the various libraries will be the beginning of subject specialization, and that Cal Poly will continue to make an effort to acquire complete scholarly holdings in the sciences.

Interpretation. With each library in the State College and University system engaging in subject specialization there will be a problem created for the low priority bibliographic areas. The report acknowledges that a core of "conventional" books in the non-specialized areas is necessary for all libraries. How broadly this core is defined and the ability of librarians to predict whether a book will become "standard," will have direct relationship to the problem of queuing at various local libraries. The report is premised on the belief that each library’s specialized area will correlate with curricular concentration and consequently local use would correspond to those specialized materials. Students and faculty at an individual campus would consequently need less frequently to increase the cost of the cooperative system by going off campus to obtain materials. The 1972-73 Cal Poly Library Questionnaire results indicates however that the probable bibliographic low priority areas for this campus actually utilize the library to a greater degree than those areas where bibliographic coverage will be most complete. This situation will place a double burden on the Cal Poly Library if queuing is to be avoided. It will necessitate the acquisition of complete scholarly holdings in the emphasis areas along with a broad group of "conventional" materials in the "low priority" areas. The report itself indicates that all libraries participating in the consortia "will maintain its high-use collection in every subject."
WHEREAS, The Trustees and the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges have endorsed Assembly Concurrent Resolution 70; and

WHEREAS, The 60/40 ratio has been damaging to educational standards and the procurement and retention of a quality faculty; and

WHEREAS, There appears to be considerable de facto flexibility in the way in which promotion budgets may be utilized; and

WHEREAS, The only basis for promotion should be merit; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges recommends to all agencies concerned with promotions that the principle of the so-called 60/40 ratio be ignored as a consideration in the granting of promotions in academic rank in the CSUC.

APPROVED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSUC

November 9, 1973
Memorandum

To: Members of the Academic Senate

From: Donald K. Cheek

Subject: Learning Assistance Center

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, at its meeting on January 3, 1974, asked me to present to the full Senate the proposal for a Learning Assistance Center at Cal Poly. This item is on your agenda for the January 15 meeting. I will be present at that time to discuss the matter with you and to ask the Senate's endorsement of the concept—with details and long range feasibility to be studied during the Winter and Spring quarters of 1974. Clearly, support of the faculty is a prerequisite to any success in this endeavor.

Attached is a copy of my November 29 report to Vice President Andrews regarding the establishment of a Learning Assistance Center. I believe this material will give you the essential background in preparation for the January 15 meeting. As a result of my discussion with the Instruction Committee in November, the committee's chairman, Harry Fierstine, wrote the memo reproduced below to me on November 26. I look forward to this opportunity to discuss the proposed Learning Assistance Center with the Academic Senate.

---

To: Dr. Donald Cheek
From: Dr. Harry L. Fierstine, Chairman

Subject: Learning Assistance Center
Date: November 26, 1973

I want to thank you for your fine presentation on the development of a Learning Assistance Center at Cal Poly. Although I have never visited the center at Cal State Long Beach, I feel that I now have knowledge of its purpose and value.

Our committee heartily supports the concept of a Learning Assistance Center and hopes that one will soon become a reality on the Cal Poly campus. As you know, there was some concern that the university administration would not fund a full-time director of the center. If the center is going to fulfill its objective it needs a responsible person with time to give to its administration.

Lots of luck. I hope your final report is well received by both faculty and students.
Memorandum

To: Vice President Dale W. Andrews

From: Donald K. Cheek

Subject: Proposal for Establishing the Cal Poly Learning Assistance Center

Date: November 29, 1973

File No.: 

Copies: 

Background

The desire for fundamental changes within the California State University and Colleges system led to a call for proposals for pilot projects from the Chancellor's Office in March 1972. These experimental programs were expected to test the validity of methods which went beyond the traditional lecture-laboratory instructional process. Subsequently, 138 proposals were reviewed by a Task Force on Innovation, under the chairmanship of Dr. William B. Langedorf, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

By the end of summer, following an intensive review, 37 projects were recommended for funding. One of those pilot projects was the Learning Assistance Systems and Programs (also referred to as the Learning Assistance Center) of California State University, Long Beach. This program demonstrated its ability to realistically provide for the learning difficulties plaguing so many "learners" in general and students specifically. The project defines itself as:

"... a system that attempts to mobilize all existing campus, community, and California State University and Colleges resources -- including people, facilities, programs, research, equipment, and materials; to help all learners learn more in less time with greater ease and confidence."

The specific objectives of the project can be seen in the first three stipulated goals:

1) To assist learners to learn by providing accessible environments for a dynamic interface with equipment, materials and learning facilitators;

2) To prevent learning failures by providing opportunities for students to "learn to learn";

3) To assist faculty and administration in identifying, developing, and delivering appropriate self-paced content learning or institutional information.

The project was funded at approximately $37,000, not including the institutional contribution. In its first six months, the Long Beach Center averaged roughly 280 student visitors a month, although it opened with little fanfare and operated in a distant corner of the library's third floor. The center is open 65 hours a week, including 1 to 5 p.m. Saturday and Sunday, offering its services to students with almost any type of schedule. Private industry as well as visitors from other colleges throughout the 19 campus State University and Colleges system evidenced interest in this approach to a common problem. One of its attractions rested on the fact that it was not a remedial program but a systems approach to the problems of developing learning efficiency at every level and in any occupation—from student to high salaried business executive. The emphasis of this approach is on the development of skills. As the center's one page descriptive handout clearly states,

"The Learning Assistance Center serves students who want to acquire, improve, review, or maintain personal learning skills. Personal learning skills include time management, task organization, study-reading, listening/notemaking, examination strategies, writing skills, computational skills, memory, concentration, reading speed, flexibility, comprehension, and retention."

Obviously these skills could benefit a wide range of students as well as those in various occupational positions and levels of responsibility.

Frank Christ, the coordinator of the experimental Learning Assistance program at Long Beach was invited to Cal Poly on June 6, 1973. At that time he addressed a cross-section of the Cal Poly faculty, administration and staff whereby Mr. Christ provided an interpretation and analysis of the Learning Assistance Center concept. This meeting resulted in a decision to accept the invitation to visit the Long Beach Learning Assistance Center as their guests, with Long Beach defraying the expenses. Two different Cal Poly groups made trips to Long Beach on two occasions. All of the reactions of those making the visit were positive. As a result, on July 24 Vice President Andrews requested that a proposed plan of operation of a Learning Assistance Center be developed for the California Polytechnic State University campus.

Campus Assessment

The value and success of a campus wide program depends very much on the importance and sensitivity to the need that is served along with the awareness and support of the campus community. In order to evaluate the degree of concern about students who are deficient in learning skills, while

---

2Those invited to attend that meeting called by Vice President Andrews were: the School Deans, Dean of Students, B. Alberti, H. Boroughs, D. Cheek, D. Coats, D. Cook, T. Dunigan, D. Grant, J. Heinz, J. Jones, D. Morris, G. Mulder, H. Strauss, H. West, M. Wilson and F. Wolf.

at the same time identifying feelings and attitudes toward the Learning Assistance Center concept, various segments of the campus community were queried. The idea of a Learning Assistance Center for Cal Poly was discussed with all the academic deans, some department heads, program directors, faculty members, students and the two selected student body leaders. The majority of those with whom the project was discussed were conferred with on an individual basis. The few exceptions to this were follow-up meetings with library staff and a discussion with the Instruction Committee of the Academic Senate (see Appendix A). The format at each meeting focused upon the following basic aims:

1) Interpretation of the Learning Assistance Center concept as it could serve student and faculty needs at Cal Poly;
2) A response to questions and concerns while determining the degree of support or resistance;
3) Determining the specific campus wide resources currently available for use in initiating a Cal Poly Learning Assistance Center. These resources were in terms of instructional equipment (hardware and software), space, personnel, funds and/or services.

Over the past few months, conferences were held with over thirty representatives of the campus community. Most of these contacts were noteworthy for their enthusiastic support and generous offers of assistance. A summary of these major contacts along with potential contributions appears in Appendix B. To provide some insight into the spirit of the comments, however, a brief overview of the reactions will be made. This recapitulation will be somewhat chronological so that no importance should be placed on the order in which the remarks are cited.

Early conferences in August, with Mr. Harry Strauss, Director, University Library, continuing until recent follow-up meetings with his staff (including Mr. John Heinz, Director, Audio Visual Services and Production) have produced positive results. With an optimistic view towards accommodating a Learning Assistance Center for Cal Poly, Mr. Strauss and his staff have modified their future plans for library use in order to provide space, personnel and other forms of support. Two large rooms on the library main floor have been suggested as the location for the Learning Assistance Center. The rooms jointly provide 1,100 square feet of space and easily accommodate the proposed floor plan that appears in Appendix C. An adjacent room would allow for expansion. Mr. Strauss feels that the Library could provide a staff person for the Center at the Librarian Assistant I or II category for the remainder of the fiscal year. In addition some funds from a Title II grant could be utilized along with the purchase of a limited amount of equipment and programmed texts. Mr. Strauss is interested in having the Counseling Center jointly involved in the assignment of counselors to the library and the recruitment and selection of future staff people. This is felt to be necessary in view of the professional skills necessary to provide a meaningful individualized service for students. It was also understood that there were expenses involved in housing the Learning Assistance Center that were not covered in the current library budget.
In talks with the Director of Ethnic Studies, Mr. David Sanchez and the Co-Director of EOP, Mr. Carl Wallace, there was the immediate offer of assistance. Mr. Wallace was willing to share some of his full-time staff at the level of Student Affairs Assistant I, while Mr. Sanchez offered to contribute a portion of his budget for funding (approximately $600).

Dean Jon Ericson, School of Communicative Arts and Humanities, quickly endorsed the Learning Assistance Center idea, especially since he supported a proposal to replace the existing language laboratory facility with "an expanded, cross-disciplinary, media-based Campus Learning Center for Personalized Instruction". Dean Ericson was hopeful that part of the forty old language lab carrells could be made available to the Learning Assistance Center. While indicating there was very little in a dean's budget after allocations were made to department heads, Dean Ericson felt he could in some way transfer approximately $500 to the budget of the Learning Assistance Center. He also suggested that graduate students from his school could be assigned to the Learning Assistance Center, if and when it was established.

Dr. Walter Schroeder, Head of the Education Department, was exceptionally helpful in offering assistance to the proposed center, and additionally soliciting the support of his staff (see memo in Appendix D). His department, in conjunction with the Psychology Department, offered the use of an expensive Mark II Auto-tutor. In addition, Dr. Schroeder indicated he would reduce his expenditures so that approximately $400 could be used for funding a Learning Assistance Center. It was also agreed that graduate students could be assigned as credit for course work. One of the faculty members of the Education Department, Dr. Malcom Wilson, a reading specialist, agreed to voluntarily spend three hours a week in the proposed LAC conducting training sessions for staff and/or students. Dr. Wilson also suggested that he would modify one or more of his reading efficiency diagnostic or clinical courses to fit into a LAC program.

Probably one of the most enthusiastic and excited responses came from John Holley and John Ronca, the President and Vice President of Associated Students, Incorporated. They both were very supportive of the LAC idea and met with Vice President Andrews to express their hope that the former A.S.I. tutoring program could be included in the implementation of the proposal (see memo Appendix B). They were particularly hopeful that faculty would be sensitive to the need for this type of student service and consistently volunteer their time and become involved. Mr. Holley felt that monies anticipated for use in an A.S.I. tutoring program could be redirected to the LAC budget. It was uncertain as to the exact amount available, but $2,000 was the suggested estimate to be used for planning purposes.

As mentioned earlier, the Learning Assistance Center concept met with a positive reaction from the Deans of the various schools. Dean George Hasslein of the School of Architecture and Environmental Design was hopeful that the proposed center could benefit from a future property and equipment budget to be received by his school. Dean Robert Valpey, School of Engineering and Technology was quite knowledgeable about self-paced approaches to learning
and was interested in seeing that his faculty was involved in a Learning Assistance Center. After a conference with Dean Clyde Fisher, School of Science and Mathematics, he interpreted the IAC idea to his faculty and department heads. Dean Fisher was able to have them agree to allocate to the proposed center $600 in student assistant money. Acting Dean, School of Business and Social Sciences, Owen Servatius not only was interested that a IAC become established at Cal Poly but on the very day of the discussion he provided four under utilized MAST teaching machines to be used in a future center. Dean Carl Cummins, School of Human Development and Education and Dean J. Gordner Gibson, School of Agriculture and Natural Resources, expressed approval of the idea. Dean Gibson was concerned, however, that a Cal Poly Learning Assistance Center be properly budgeted with University funds specifically designated for the program. He did not feel it was wise to embark upon a program that would risk being underfinanced, a situation that could result from a budget dependent upon "donations" from various segments of the academic community.

Launching a Learning Assistance Center

The following categories are essential areas to be considered if a Learning Assistance Center is to be initiated at Cal Poly:

Space

Two rooms on the main floor of the Library could be used with alterations made to fit the suggested floor plan. If the anticipated contributions in equipment are received the cost involved in electrical work, shelving and painting should be modest.

Equipment

The cost of obtaining the necessary basic equipment is perhaps the single largest expense. The breakdown as seen in Table I indicated a total cost of approximately $5,638. Depending upon the contributions received from various schools this cost could be less.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communo-Center</td>
<td>$485.00</td>
<td>See appendix G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coffey Co. Media Storage Cabinet</td>
<td>$618.30</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>V-M Corp. Cassettes @ $60</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bell &amp; Howell Language Masters @ $250</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Technicolor Film Loop Projector</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastman Kodak Carousel</td>
<td>$215.00</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hudson Filmstrip Viewers @ $24</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading-Development Trainers @ $150</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multiple-choice System</td>
<td>$786.00</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Set of Avid Wireless Headsets</td>
<td>$266.40</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Telex Duplicator</td>
<td>$895.00</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$5,637.70

*Based on providing for half the number of students (200) served by Cal State Long Beach, which is approximately 400 students a month.
Most of the materials necessary in the area of software can be provided by the library. Mrs. Pearl Turner, Curriculum Librarian, has been extremely helpful in acquiring, cataloguing, and processing programmed texts and locating other materials pertinent to learning assistance. Additional expenses include office supplies, telephone charges, Audio Visual maintenance and cost of expendable materials.

**Staffing**

Minimum personnel necessary to staff the Learning Assistance Center would include the following (based upon being open 85 hours a week):

1. coordinator/counselor
2. catalogue librarian (part-time)
3. supervisor/Assistant I or II
4. counselor trainees (Student Affairs Trainees, 20 hours part-time)
5. student assistants
6. work-study aides
7. clerical assistant
8. volunteer tutors
9. faculty advisors

Sufficient commitments, in terms of personnel and funds, have already been received to staff most, but not all, these positions. Depending upon the release time arrangements to be made, there is available temporary staff to launch the Learning Assistance Center until permanent staff can be hired.

**Administrative Structure**

In the initial stages of the Learning Assistance Center it is suggested that major policy decisions be made by a Learning Assistance Center advisory committee. This committee would be structured along the lines of the Automatic Data Processing Advisory Committee. The Learning Assistance Center Advisory Committee would assist the coordinator in developing and carrying out an effective program of services. The committee would develop and recommend objectives and operational policies appropriate to the function of the Learning Assistance Center. The operational procedures and job priorities would be established by the coordinator but the advisory committee could study and recommend solutions to LAC problems presented by those using the service or by the coordinator.

The membership would include one representative from each school, division, the Library and Counseling Center, nominated by the head of each unit:

- Agriculture and Natural Resources
- Architecture and Environmental Design
- Business and Social Sciences
- Communicative Arts and Humanities
- Engineering and Technology
- Human Development and Education
- Science and Mathematics
- Student Affairs
- Business Affairs
- Library
- Director of Library
Summary and Recommendation

The attitude and feelings on Cal Poly's campus are very receptive to establishing a Learning Assistance Center. Tangible support to initiate the program has been offered from various segments of the campus community.

A documented need also exists when one looks at the 1973 Spring Quarter Deficiency List (see appendix ). Over 1,600, or slightly more than 13% of our student population are in the category of having a grade point average under 2.0.

Considering these various factors it is recommended that a Learning Assistance Center be established at Cal Poly beginning the Winter Quarter of 1974. If such a program is launched in January, the early months should be utilized for the following:

1. Advertising and selecting administrative and support staff (temporary and/or permanent).
2. Preparation of physical facility, selecting and ordering equipment, ordering, organizing and displaying instructional materials.
3. Staff organization, in-service training, and development of forms and written materials.
4. When preparations are through, allow students to gradually discover service through word of mouth and referrals prior to a "grand opening" in the spring.

It has been found that extensive and detailed preparation, in advance, for students and faculty, is rewarded by a more problem-free and effective program later on. It has also been shown that a gradual beginning prior to full notice of being open allows for a more controlled "dry run" to work through problems before demands for service are made by large numbers. The success of the program relies upon efficient, effective, personalized and concerned service to students, faculty and the general campus community.

APPENDIXES A-I AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW IN SENATE OFFICE.