I. Minutes (April 23 and April 30 Special Meetings) 

II. Committee Reports 
A. Vice President for Academic Affairs Selection Consultative Committee - Ward 
B. Budget - Clerkin 
C. Constitution and Bylaws - Johnson 
D. Curriculum - Weatherby - (See Attachment II-D) 
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 
M. University-Wide Committees 

III. Business Items 
A. Appointment of Instructional Department Heads/CAM - Coyes (See Attachment III-D, Academic Senate Agenda, April 23, 1974) 
B. Bookstore Policy on Faculty Non-Published Materials - Fierstine (See Attachment III-C, Academic Senate Agenda, April 9, 1974) 
C. General Education Report - Scheffer (See Attachment III-C) 
D. Professional Development Proposal - Alberti (See Attachment III-D) 
E. Academic Senate Officer Elections - Hooks 

IV. Discussion Items (none) 

V. Announcements and Reports 
A. Commencement
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate Members

From: Joe Weatherby, Chairman
Curriculum Committee

Subject: Curriculum Proposal of the School of Agriculture and Natural Resources

The Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate supports the proposals and amendments submitted by the School of Agriculture and Natural Resources provided the following committee recommendations are also included:

- **MarE 222**  
  Survey of Maricultural Engineering (4) - Defer pending clarification of title change

- **AgM 303**  
  Agricultural Management Research Methods (3) - Approve with strong recommendation that Engl 218, Report Writing, be retained in the major

- **AgM 318**  
  Agricultural Trade Policies (3) - Disapproved (2 yes, 5 no, 1 abstention) because duplication with courses now being taught in both Economics and Business

- **AgM 500**  
  Graduate Reading and Conference in Agricultural Management (1-3) - Disapproved since course must be submitted from the School and not the Department

- **NRM 339**  
  Wildlife Resource Management (4) - Disapproved (1 yes, 6 no) because of duplication of conservation course
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee of Academic Senate

Date: May 1, 1974

From: General Education and Breadth Committee

Subject: Proposed Revision of the General Education Breadth Requirement

A. The General Education and Breadth Committee proposes the following revisions for the 1977-79 catalog be considered an agenda item for the Academic Senate:

Reduce the minimum required quarter units from 63 to 60. This is to be done without changing the minimum or maximum required units by sub-heading. The reasons are to accept certification of completion of the General Education Requirements by junior college transfer students. This should result in attracting as many students as possible by eliminating the present hurdle of three additional units and to reduce the department and evaluation office paperwork in determining which three units the student must take or deviate.

Secondly, under Humanities change the wording "No more than 3 units each in Art, Dr, Mu" to "No more than one course each in Art, Dr, Mu." The reason is many courses are being changed to 4 units, and this would allow the student to receive full credit. (One or two unit "skills" or "activity" courses are not ordinarily acceptable for Humanities general education credit.)

It was recommended that Note 2 be included in the wording. Under Humanities, the above phrase in parenthesis, be added as a proposed note.

The last is to change under Basic Subjects to "written communication (Engl) (one course), oral (Sp) communication (one course)." This would require a student to take at least one course in written communication and one course in oral communication rather than the present requirement of one course in written communication, and would give the student or department a choice between a second course in either written or oral communication. The Committee felt both types of communication are needed.

B. The Committee also recommends to the Executive Committee that they send to the appropriate committee the proposal for use of multiple prefixes. A number of departments have similar courses to those offered in departments listed under General Education Requirements. They have requested, in some cases, their course also be counted for General Education. The use of common prefixes, used in a number of other universities, would help solve the problem.
To be eligible for graduation with a Bachelor's degree from California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, the candidate must complete a minimum of 60 quarter units of general education as specified below.

No course shall be used for this purpose if it has a prerequisite unless such prerequisite is also counted as general education. Only degree credit courses in the 100, 200, and 300 series may be counted as general education. No more than six units in the major academic discipline of the student may be counted as fulfilling the general education requirement.

Natural Sciences
At least 15 units chosen from courses in the natural sciences, with at least one course in life science (Bact, Bio, Bot, Cons, Ent, Zoo), and at least one course in physical science (Astr, Chem, Geol, PSc, Phys). Up to six units of "broadly-based" course work in the Schools of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Architecture and Environmental Design, or Engineering and Technology may be counted in this category, provided that these units are taken outside the School in which the student is enrolled. No more than three courses having the same prefix may be counted to satisfy the natural science requirement. Maximum 24 units.

Social Sciences
At least 9 units chosen from courses in Ant, Ec, Geog, Pol Sc, Psy, Soc Sc, Soc. All students must take Pol Sc 201. No more than two courses having the same prefix may be counted in this category. Maximum 16 units.

Humanities
At least 15 units chosen from courses in Art, Dr, Hum, literature (in English or in a foreign language), Mu, Phil. All students must include two courses in literature, or two courses in philosophy, or one each. All students must take Hist 204 and 205, or equivalent. No more than 5 units one course (excluding skill courses) each in Art, Dr, Mu, nor 6 units in Hist, may be counted in this category. Maximum 21 units.

Basic Subjects
Mathematical sciences (CSc, Math, Stat) (at least a 3-unit course), written communication (Engl) (one course), oral (Sp) (Fax Fax communication (Fax Fax 1 one course). Minimum 12 units, maximum 16 units.

Other Subjects
Physical Education Activity or Health Education (3 to 5 units, at the option of individual Schools). Any 6 to 4 units (depending upon P. E. requirements of individual Schools), provided that these additional units are taken outside the department in which the student is enrolled. Minimum 3 units, maximum 9 units.

Note 1. In the Humanities category all students are required to take Hist 204 and Hist 205. Also, no more than 6 units in history may be counted in the Humanities category. It is intended that history courses which may count here are limited to the two named courses or their equivalent. Students may, of course, elect to take additional history courses for other purposes.

Note 2. One or two unit "skills" or "activity" courses are not ordinarily acceptable for Humanities general education credit.

Note 3: In some cases, the total units in courses designated to satisfy a category may exceed the maximum units for that category. However, the excess units over the maximum may not be used to satisfy any part of the minimum of 60 total units in general education.

Note 4: The title of the 5th category, "Other Subjects," is intended to exclude natural sciences, social sciences, humanities (as listed), and courses in mathematical sciences and in oral or written communication. The intent here is to encourage breadth in keeping with the Trustees' designation: General Education Breadth Requirement. Specifically, the "Other Subjects" category should not be used to circumvent the limitations in the first four categories.
Memorandum

To: Executive Committee, Academic Senate

From: Robert E. Alberti

Subject: CSUC Professional Development Program Proposal

The attached proposal comes immediately upon the heels of our Academic Senate's decision that "procedures and programs for faculty development" is to be a major area of Senate responsibility. It is my recommendation that the Executive Committee endorse the proposal and submit it for Senate approval, subject to the following provisions:

1) A program of professional development for the faculty of CPSUSLO must be endorsed by the Academic Senate on behalf of the faculty.

2) Participation in any professional development programs must be voluntary on the part of each individual faculty member. In the event a department, by majority vote of its faculty, may elect to involve itself in any such program, the right of an individual faculty member to exclude himself must be honored.

3) The campus "director" of a professional development program must be a tenured member of the Cal Poly faculty, selected by the faculty through the Academic Senate. He/she must be an experienced and effective teacher, knowledgeable and should be skilled in the several areas suggested in the CSUC program proposal (instructional development, seminar programs, evaluation of teaching, skill development, affective development, student learning, faculty retraining).

4) An advisory committee to the campus professional development program should be appointed, with a majority of its members to come from the teaching faculty (to be selected by the Academic Senate), and including representation from students, non-teaching staff, and administration.
I need to find out as soon as possible and certainly prior to May 15 what our position would be should we be given an opportunity to operate such a program for three years at this campus. I am, of course, personally in favor of it but unless the total administration and faculty are behind it, my endorsement would be meaningless.

I would appreciate it take this matter up with the Academic Senate, or the appropriate committee of that body, and give me the position of that group on the matter.

Attached is a copy of a proposal that was submitted January 9 to Ms. Virginia Smith, Director of the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, HEW. Ms. Smith had requested of Dr. David Provost an opportunity to discuss this proposal with a group of the presidents of the system during a conference call. The phone call was held at 11 a.m. Wednesday, May 1. The presidents involved, in addition to myself, were Messrs. Borm, Pfau, Cazier, Bunzel and Cleary.

The proposal is for a three-year project at a total cost of $406,000. It involves setting up from four to six campuses where models of professional development programs would be undertaken. The six presidents attempted to reassure Ms. Smith that the system did indeed support the proposal and that the individual campuses selected would be capable of handling the proposed models. I have no idea on what basis Dave Provost selected the six presidents to talk to Ms. Smith; I may have been included because I am chairman of the Council of Presidents; others may have been included because they have already been involved in some kind of campus professional development programs. The biggest issue, evidently, in the mind of Ms. Smith, is the criteria for the selection of the four to six campus models. As a result of that concern we have placed this item on the agenda for the Council of Presidents meeting for May 15-16.

Immediately after this conference call, I called Dave Provost to report back to him on what had happened during the conference call and asked him to be prepared with members of his staff to come to the May 15-16 meeting and present the proposal, with emphasis on the criteria to be used. I asked him whether they had criteria already in mind and he said they did; it would be based on having some institutions large, some small, some rural, some urban and some with specialized programs. It is obvious that we might be one of those that could be selected.
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

SPALDING HOUSE - LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90030 • (213) 828-8281

CHANCELLOR

January 9, 1974

Ms. Virginia Smith
Director
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. - Room 3119
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Ms. Smith:

I am pleased to submit to the Fund for its review a Final Proposal in the New Incentives Structures Program Category. The proposal, which is that of the CSUC Foundation, would provide for the creation of a Center for Professional Development to serve the California State University and Colleges system and, thereby, encourage and facilitate teaching improvement and faculty-development programs at each of the nineteen campuses of the system. We believe that this Center, and its proposed activities, will develop model programs for potential duplication throughout our system and will be of interest to other institutions and faculty concerned about the quality and methods of undergraduate education.

We will be most pleased to respond to any questions you and the staff may have concerning the proposal.

Sincerely,

Glenn S. Dumke
Chancellor

Enclosure

cc: Mr. B. E. Brakebill
Dr. Alex C. Sherriffs
Dr. David H. Provost
Dr. Jerry G. Gaff

PROPOSAL FOR CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES SYSTEM

BACKGROUND

The new realities in higher education emanate from what a Carnegie Commission study by Earl Chelton (1970) has called a "new depression," which includes a leveling off of enrollments, increased difficulties in meeting rising financial costs, and growing concern for accountability in the expenditure of funds. As increasing numbers of institutions are having to cope with a "steady state," they find it more difficult to develop new programs; and because they are becoming "tenured in," many institutions are unable to recruit the young blood to provide the fresh perspectives and new ideas which are essential to the maintenance of a vigorous educational climate.

Faculty members, too, find the going hard. Faced with the tightest job market in memory, they are finding it difficult to find jobs, to change jobs, or even to obtain tenure in their own institutions. Increasingly, faculty careers will be confined to one institution, and they will have to look to that school to provide the enriching experiences they need to grow professionally and personally. Already academics are beginning to regard the 1960's as the "good old days" when higher education was a rapidly expanding growth industry.

There are, however, potential benefits in this new era. Because the pressures associated with numerical growth - constructing facilities, acquiring staff, gaining resources, managing sprawling institutions - are reduced in magnitude, academic leadership may concentrate its energies on improving the quality of its instructional programs. Indeed, improvement of instructional quality will be required if colleges and universities are to compete effectively for students in today's marketplace.

Although the quality of instruction has tended to be neglected during the expansion of recent years, this neglect is, in general, not due - as some have asserted - to a lack of interest in teaching among individual faculty members. On the contrary, there is considerable evidence that professors are, by and large, interested in their teaching, work many hours at it, and derive much satisfaction from it (McGee, 1971; Sanford, 1971; Gaff and Wilson, 1971). Rather, the neglect can be traced in large measure to the fact that college professors, however knowledgeable they may be about their fields of specialization, seldom have been prepared for their roles as college teachers. Few have received training for teaching as a part of their graduate study, and in-service training programs, which are common in other professions, are rare among academics. There is both a need and an opportunity at this time to supplement the education which faculty members have received as physicists, sociologists, or philosophers, for example.
with in-service education and supportive services designed to help them become better teachers.

Recent changes in instructional methods, settings, and clientele require faculty members to alter their traditional teaching practices and adopt new relationships with students. Traditional lecture and seminar methods are being supplemented by such techniques as independent study, self-paced instruction, mediated approaches, and community action projects. Interdisciplinary programs and courses which focus on intellectual themes and social problems are increasingly common; these approaches require faculty members to range beyond their familiar specializations in conventional academic disciplines and to work collaboratively with colleagues in other fields. New structures, such as external degree programs and sub-campuses, are providing new environments for learning and teaching. New students, such as ethnic minorities, first generation college students, and adults require teachers with special sensitivities and with techniques suited to them.

The need to help faculty members improve their teaching and develop their professional and personal competencies in a stable environment is particularly serious in those institutions whose primary reason for existence is to provide an effective education to undergraduate students. The California State University and Colleges is a nineteen-campus system which offers the bulk of the baccalaureate education for students in the State. If this multi-campus system is to fulfill its mission in the years ahead, it will have to develop systematic ways to improve the instruction of students and the continuous renewal of its faculty.

Several promising developments have already taken place within the system which are relevant to this problem and are important to this proposal.

1. Within The California State University and Colleges Office of the Chancellor, the Division of New Program Development and Evaluation was created in 1972 as a mechanism to stimulate innovation within the member campuses. Since that time it has administered a State appropriated Fund for Innovation, from which more than seventy-five separate projects have been conceived, implemented, and evaluated, including major efforts in time-shortened degree programs, self-paced instruction, use of media, credit by examination, independent study, and interdisciplinary studies. This Division continues to serve as a stimulus for innovation within the system by funding short term innovative projects designed to improve the educational process.

2. Several new educational structures have been created within the system during recent years. The new CSUC Consortium is supplementing earlier established campus-based external degree programs and by developing new systemwide outreach programs for non-traditional students. New structures within

individual campuses also have been created, such as the Small College (time-shortened degree program) at Dominguez Hills, the three cluster schools at Sonoma, and New College at San Jose. These contexts provide new opportunities for students and faculty, but they also mean that faculty members will be expected to play new instructional roles.

3. The directors of the media centers on the member campuses recently have resolved to change the names of their offices to Instructional Resource Centers, as a step toward changing their functions, and providing more assistance to faculty members who seek to improve their courses. This change in emphasis and function of media centers is consistent with the national trend for institutions to create special offices with responsibility for faculty development activities. However, competent staff members to fill these new positions are scarce and hard to identify, there being no recognized educational program to prepare staff development personnel.

4. The Project Director for this proposal is currently engaged in a research study of teaching improvement and faculty development centers and their various programs to improve instruction. The study, sponsored by the Exxon Foundation, is designed to identify existing centers in colleges and universities around the country, describe their structure and functions, analyze their work in relation to current knowledge about teaching and learning, and evaluate their programs. This project should provide valuable knowledge about the different kinds of faculty development efforts currently in use and about the strategies most likely to improve instruction within this system.

5. Considerable campus interest in faculty development has been evidenced. For example, eleven separate proposals were submitted to the Office of New Program Development and Evaluation seeking special project funding.

The time is appropriate for The California State University and Colleges to build upon these several efforts by developing a systemwide program which will assist member campuses to provide, on a permanent and continuous basis, in-service education and supporting services for faculty members.

THE PROPOSED CENTER

This proposal made by The California State University and Colleges Foundation on behalf of The California State University and Colleges calls for the establishment of a Center for Professional Development as an organizational framework for facilitating teaching improvement and faculty development programs on member campuses. The Center for Professional Development will seek to achieve the following goals: a) devise alternative models of teaching improvement programs, b) work through campus Instructional Resource Centers or other appropriate offices to implement these models on four to six campuses, c) train staff members from participating institutions
to use a variety of staff development procedures, d) provide supportive written materials for use in campus programs, e) plan and convene meetings of campus faculty development staff members so they may share experiences with each other, f) coordinate a careful evaluation of the impacts of the alternative programs on the quality of teaching and learning in the different institutions, and g) disseminate the results of staff efforts and otherwise assist other schools, both within and outside the system, in adopting effective teaching improvement programs. Because the aim of this plan is to implement systematic, ongoing programs on several campus campuses with the aid of a small central staff, the Center for Professional Development either will be phased out after three years, or its mission reconceived.

PROGRAM OF THE CENTER
The several facets of the program for the proposed Center will be discussed separately for each of the purposes of the plan.

A. Devise alternative models.

A survey of current faculty development programs reveals a wide array of activities undertaken for the purpose of improving teaching. The following are examples of rather distinct types of programs that will be further elaborated in the alternative model programs which will be adopted by participating institutions.

1. Instructional development. This model program seeks to enhance instruction by applying principles of the systems approach to courses offered students. The major activities will consist of assisting faculty members to specify behavioral objectives for students, plan course content and learning experiences to achieve those objectives, utilize media and other non-traditional approaches in the learning experiences, and evaluate the achievement of students. Workshops will be held to convey the concept and general approach of instructional development and to assist faculty to develop the skills necessary to apply this approach to improving their own courses. Project staff will work intensively with selected faculty members to apply the instructional development approach to their courses; particularly important will be those courses which are taken by large numbers of students.

2. Discussion about higher education. In order to remedy the limited knowledge among faculty members of teaching and learning techniques and approaches in postsecondary education, one model program will focus on seminars. The content of these programs might vary widely, depending on the interest of participants, but they may include such general topics and themes as the history and philosophy of higher education and the rights and responsibilities of members of the teaching profession, as well as topics more directly related to the teaching function of faculty members, such as innovations in instruction, alternative teacher-student relationships, and research findings about factors which do, and do not have, an influence on teaching and learning. The implementation of this model involves inviting lecturers to teach faculty on contemporary educational issues, forming formal and informal discussion groups among interested faculty members, working with interested departments to incorporate substantive educational discussions into their faculty meetings.

3. Skill development. Teaching involves the use of a wide variety of communicative and interpersonal skills. This model program will seek to perfect several of them. Workshops will be held to help faculty members acquire specific communication skills, such as listening and questioning; develop sensitivities to such factors as affective tone and interpersonal dynamics in a classroom; improve common instructional strategies, such as preparing and delivering lectures and leading seminar groups; and adopt new approaches, such as preparing learning contracts or serving as resource persons. In some instances individuals may wish to use micro-teaching as a way to learn certain skills. Possibly a “teaching fair” could be staged for the entire faculty in which several concurrent workshops offering various skill development opportunities would be offered.

4. Teaching evaluation. This model teaching improvement program will emphasize evaluation of teaching by students and/or colleagues. Relying on the assumption that teaching may be improved if faculty members gain accurate feedback about the way their teaching is perceived by others, this program will set up procedures and develop instruments to give faculty the opportunity to learn how others see them. Unlike most current evaluation efforts, however, this model will go beyond the simple measurement of teaching effectiveness and reporting of the results. Teaching evaluation will be viewed as a diagnostic device to identify areas of strength and weakness, and specific follow-up activities will be suggested in consultation with faculty members, as to how they may improve their performance. Also, because most change and improvement in an activity as complex as teaching is gradual, a system of continuous evaluation will be used to give faculty members information about their progress, stability, or regression over a period of time.

5. Affective development. Some individuals maintain that improving teaching requires more than the mastery of content, techniques, or the acquisition or development of such skills as important as these may be. They maintain that the task requires faculty members to become aware of the affective
component of teaching behavior. This model program will seek to make faculty members aware of their values, attitudes, and emotional makeup as these factors affect their teaching practices. Typical activities of this model program will include role-playing, gaming, interviewing, and taping teaching episodes, as well as discussions of these activities which will allow faculty members to explore the assumptive and affective bases of their teaching behavior. Such exploration and analysis can help faculty members clarify their feelings and attitudes toward teaching, thus freeing them to grow and change in their teaching roles.

6. Learning rather than teaching. This model program will seek to improve teaching by helping faculty members become sensitized to the learning styles and needs of the diverse student population as well as helping them learn about the mechanisms by which curricular and individual teaching strategies may be responsive to them. Workshops having both cognitive and affective components will be developed to acquaint faculty members with the needs of students who vary in terms of intellectual ability, racial and/or cultural background, learning style and personality orientation. Faculty also will be provided information about techniques designed to individualize instruction, including self-paced learning, independent study, curricular contracts, and criterion-referenced evaluation.

7. Retraining. Some faculty members are faced with the difficult situation of finding their subjects in less demand among today's students. They and/or their colleagues in the same fields find their very futures threatened. Other faculty members seek renewal at certain points in their careers by branching out or developing new fields of specialization. These faculty members will be assisted by programs designed to help them explore their specializations or acquire new ones which may be more satisfying to them and more popular with students. Information will be provided about projected demands for faculty members in different fields, guidance will be provided for individual faculty members who may want to re-tool, and activities will be developed to assist faculty members to master new areas. These activities will consist of encouraging faculty members to sit in on courses taught by their colleagues, holding seminars on different content areas, and developing interdisciplinary, team-taught courses which may facilitate faculty growth as well as provide valuable educational experiences for students.

Although each of these model programs rests on different assumptions, employs different strategies, and requires different kinds of staff expertise to implement, they all seek to improve the knowledge, skills, and sensitivities of teachers in an effort to improve the outcomes. Each model has promise for improving teaching and learning within stabilized institutions and enhancing the professional development of faculty members.

B. Implement model programs on participating campuses.

In a "pure scientific" sense, it would be ideal for each of the participating campuses to adopt different models to provide a clear test of the consequences of each. However, these models are not mutually exclusive, and in reality the several programs may complement and reinforce each other. Therefore, the Center staff will work with each campus to determine the most appropriate model program, or combination of programs, for it.

Four to six campuses will be selected for this demonstration project. This number is large enough to test the several alternative models in different geographical settings, but small enough to allow the Center staff to concentrate its limited resources on a few schools.

To select campuses for participation and to plan their activities, soon after the Center for Professional Development is established, each president of the CSUC campuses will be invited to indicate his interest in having his campus participate in the project. Campuses will be selected on the basis of the following criteria: support of the campus administration, support of the campus faculty, willingness to work with the Center for a period of at least three years, and commitment to allocate the necessary human and fiscal resources to the project. The latter means the appointment of a full-time director of the campus project, allocation of at least one other full-time equivalent professional staff position, and provision for supportive services and materials.

When a school is selected, it will be expected to appoint a representative campus advisory body - a group of key administrators and faculty members - to provide support and guidance for the program as it evolves and to conduct analyses of the faculty. This latter part will consist of a detailed needs analysis to determine faculty interest in, and receptivity for, different kinds of professional development programs and a Resource Analysis to determine specific human and material resources which may be used in the program. These analyses will provide an empirical basis for planning the specific program for each campus. Throughout the life of the project, the major responsibility for planning and operating the various professional development programs will remain with the individual campuses; the Center staff will play a coordinating and facilitating role by providing expertise, indicating the experiences of other campuses, sharing new perspectives, and generally serving as resource persons to each campus.

C. Train campus staff.

In so far as possible, campus staff will be selected who possess the necessary professional and personal potential for working with faculty members in teaching improvement endeavors.
However, it is likely that all staff members could perfect whatever skills they have and expand their repertoire of skills. Training of staff members will be done at each campus.

Individuals possessing expertise in the activities called for by each model program will be invited to spend two or three days discussing their work with campus staff and their advisory committee members. Staff members from other campus programs will also be invited to participate. In addition to discussing the rationale behind their work and their experience with various approaches, the consultants will be expected to demonstrate their techniques by working directly with faculty members at the host campus. Subsequently, they will be expected to supervise the staff members as they attempt to apply the same techniques. A total of six days of staff training will be provided on each campus each year, which in aggregate allows each staff member access to a total of 30 days of training time.

The following is a list intended to be suggestive, rather than definitive, of individuals who, though they have not been contacted, might be asked to help campus staff prepare for their new roles in different model programs:

**Instructional Development**
- Irwin Goodman, Brigham Young University
- Robert Diamond, Syracuse University
- Frank Vottasso, Colorado State University
- Frank Finger, University of Virginia
- Robert Wilson, University of California, Berkeley
- Donald Hoyt, Kansas State University
- Calvin Taylor, University of Utah
- Kiyu Morimoto, Harvard University
- Joseph Katz, Wright Institute
- Mildred Henry, World College West
- Arthur Chickering, Empire State College
- Alan Cartter, University of California, Los Angeles; Keith Schurway, Ottawa University

The above procedure will assure that each campus staff has specific training to implement the primary model programs set forth by their institutions. By involving staff from other campuses in the training sessions, each staff member will be able to develop skills in more than one area. This procedure will constitute the primary training program, but staff members will learn about their work in two additional ways. First, repeated practice in applying their new skills in working with faculty members will allow staff to enhance their competencies. Because many will be "learning by doing," it is important that there be at least two staff members on each campus to that they can share their experiences and make them as educational as possible. Second, staff members from participating schools will be convened regularly by the Center staff so that they may share their problems and successes, and insights. In this way each staff member will learn far more than he would if he were working only within the framework of his own institution.

**D. Provide supportive materials.**

The Center staff will compile and make available to the campus professional development programs a variety of supportive materials. Bibliographies on selected topics concerned with teaching and learning, descriptions of new educational programs or instructional approaches, summaries of research findings on various aspects of teaching and learning, and reports from other teaching improvement projects around the country are examples of the kinds of supportive materials which the Center will provide. These materials will be useful in each of the campus programs. Because they will be prepared centrally, each campus will have access to more materials without duplication of effort.

**E. Convene meetings of campus staffs.**

Campus staff members may expect to encounter several problems in their efforts to implement the model programs. How do they motivate faculty members to use their services? How does one break down faculty defensiveness about discussing their teaching practices? How can a program best use limited staff resources to make a maximum impact? In order to provide staff members with an opportunity to discuss problems such as these, the Center will hold regular meetings for the campus staff. These meetings will constitute an important part of the staff training experiences, allow Center staff to be informed of campus activities, and permit individuals to address problems as they arise rather than after they become compounded because of inaction.

**F. Coordinate an evaluation of campus model programs.**

Throughout this project the campus will be the focus of attention, and the Center for Professional Development will play a facilitating role to help campuses improve the quality of the educational experience. For that reason the evaluation, too, will be campus based. As specific model programs are planned for each campus, an evaluation plan will be prepared. The Center staff will assist campus staff to specify their assumptions about the quality of education on their campuses, indicate their goals and expectations for the faculty development programs which are established, and voice their concerns about possible negative consequences. These articulated assumptions, expectations, goals, and concerns will then serve as the focal point of the evaluation design. The Center staff will lend its
expertise in preparing instruments for gathering relevant evidence and will analyze the data on the computer. However, the primary responsibility for evaluating the success of the model programs will rest with the campuses themselves.

The fact that the Center will coordinate the separate campus evaluations gives it a rare opportunity to make comparisons across institutions and across different kinds of teaching improvement programs. This comparative approach to the evaluation will provide valuable information about the consequences of alternative faculty development programs, thereby allowing individuals concerned with improving instruction to make rational choices about effective ways to help faculty members improve their competencies in their central professional role of teaching.

Since the specific evaluation of a given campus program will depend upon its nature and focus, the content of the evaluations cannot be specified at this time. However, a few general characteristics of the campus evaluations may be stated. First, evidence about success will consist of "hard" data, i.e., as objective and behavioral as possible. Second, "soft" data will be utilized to obtain faculty, staff, and administrative views about various aspects of the program so that modifications may be made if necessary. Finally, an attempt will be made to design pre-test and post-test data collections to determine the changes, both cognitive and affective, which take place among individuals served by the programs.

Sample questions which will be addressed by the Center staff in its comparative study of the consequences of the alternative model programs are the following:

1. Which programs hold the greatest interest and generate the greatest use among the faculty?
2. What barriers exist to the full utilization of each kind of program?
3. Which programs generate the greatest changes in the actual teaching practices of faculty members?
4. What kinds of faculty members are most assisted by faculty development programs? What kinds are assisted the least?
5. How do the various programs vary in their cost effectiveness?

Answers to questions such as these will provide an important knowledge base and suggest practical guidelines for several current efforts to enhance the professional competencies and the teaching effectiveness of faculty members.

Disseminate the results.

The activities of the Center, the activities of the participating campus programs, and the results of each will be communicated in various ways. A newsletter will be published about three times a year. Although it will be a vehicle for describing the work of this project, the newsletter also will contain information about other faculty development programs, research reports relevant to teaching and learning, and items about innovative educational programs. This newsletter will be available for distribution to all faculty members in the participating schools, to selected other individuals throughout the system and the country, and to interested other individuals and organizations.

The dissemination of the results of the demonstration projects to other campuses within the system will be a special concern of the Center. For that reason, systemwide workshops will be held to acquaint faculty members and administrators from the other campuses of the system with the work of the Center and the participating campuses. These workshops will be conducted by the Division of New Program Development and Evaluation in connection with its workshops on innovative education.

In addition, papers will be delivered at professional meetings, and articles will be written for professional journals and periodicals.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE CENTER

The Center for Professional Development will be staffed by two full-time professional persons, will draw upon the services of consultants to carry out its programs, and will have one secretary. Responsibility for conducting and supervising the work of the Center will rest with a director. It is proposed that Dr. Jerry G. Gaff, the primary author of this proposal, be the director. Dr. Gaff's resume is attached.

The Center will be established under the general direction of a Policy Board composed of individuals drawn from system institutions, central administration, faculty, and student body. The Board is comprised of 25 members as follows:

One representative from each campus who is a recognized leader in innovative education, appointed by campus president;

One representative from the Statewide Academic Senate, appointed by the chairman of the Senate;

Three student representatives, appointed by the Chancellor;

The Dean for New Program Development and Evaluation;

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who will serve as the chairman.

Because of the necessarily large size of the Board, much of the policy guidance for the Center will be the responsibility of a smaller
Steering Committee. The Center Steering Committee will include the following members:

Three appointees of and from the Program Policy Board, representing individual campuses;

The Statewide Academic Senate representative serving on the Program Policy Board;

One director of a participating campus faculty development program;

The Dean for New Program Development and Evaluation, who will serve as the chairman.

This Steering Committee will assist the Center staff in selecting institutions, providing general policy advice and guidance, and assisting the dissemination efforts, particularly to other institutions in the system.

EVALUATION OF THE CENTER

In addition to evaluating the consequences of the various reaching improvement models adopted by the individual campuses, the Center itself will undergo an evaluation. Two consultants, with experience in faculty development and program evaluation, will be asked to conduct an evaluation of the several aspects of the Center's work. They will be asked to provide primarily formative evaluations during the first two years of the Center's existence, so that the staff may improve its operation. During the final year, they will be asked to conduct a summative evaluation, so that judgments may be made about the effectiveness of the concept of a Center within a multi-campus system as well as the several aspects of the programs.

Although the evaluators will have the freedom to raise their own questions and obtain whatever data they think relevant, they will be expected to obtain the viewpoints of the Center staff and the Steering Committee members, and on each participating campus, the views of faculty development staff members, academic administrators, and some faculty members.

SCHEDULE OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES

Some of the more important milestones of the Center's program during its first year of operation, July 1, 1974 through June 30, 1975, are listed below:

July 1, 1974 - Center is established

Summer, 1974 - Appoint and convene Steering Committee
Select staff and set up office
Select institutions

Fall, 1974 - Assist institutions to conduct Needs Analysis and Resource Analysis
Help institutions plan programs
Help institutions design evaluations

Winter, 1974 - Conduct initial training sessions for campus staff
Develop evaluation instruments
Publish first newsletter

Spring, 1975 - Conduct training sessions for campus staff
Coordinate campus evaluations
Conduct evaluation of Center's first year of operation
Publish second newsletter

Summer, 1975 - Analyze data from campus evaluations
Reconsider campus programs, making modifications where called for

The activities of the second and third years will follow the general plan for the first year, but they may be modified to reflect the experience and knowledge gained from the earlier efforts.

EVIDENCE OF COMMITMENT

Commitment to the Center and its programs will be made both by the Office of the Chancellor and by the participating campuses. The Office of the Chancellor will provide policy guidance and administrative supervision for the Center, support workshops which will disseminate results to other campuses in the system, and contribute computer programming and computer time to analyze the coordinated campus evaluations.

Each participating campus will demonstrate both institutional support and financial commitment. The campus administration and campus Academic Senate will be expected to indicate support for the project, each of which is a condition which seems to be necessary for the successful operation of campus professional development projects. In addition, each campus will be expected to designate a full-time director of the campus program and to provide at least one additional full-time equivalent staff position for its program. This level of staffing seems to be the minimum required to implement a successful campus professional development program.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

The expected major outcomes of the proposed Center for Professional Development include the following:

1. The delineation of several alternative models of faculty development programs.

2. The implementation of several model programs in four to six institutions of a major state system of higher education.
Although these programs will receive support from the Center for only three years, they will be designed to be a part of the normal functioning of the institutions so that they may continue beyond the life of this project.

3. Reliable knowledge, derived from a systematic and comparative study, of the consequences of alternative approaches to teaching improvement.

4. Dissemination of the results of the several demonstration projects so that other individuals and institutions may make effective use of the knowledge and wisdom gained from this enterprise.

REFERENCES


Sanford, N., "Academic Culture and the Teacher's Development," The Wright Institute, Berkeley, California, mimeo, undated.

BUDGET

1st Year Only

(Use same format for each continuing year)

BUDGET ITEM

A. Direct Costs:

1. Salaries & Wages
   a. Professional* $ 45,384
   b. Consultant* 3,000
   c. Clerical 12,980

2. Employee Benefits 8,755

3. Travel* 17,550

4. Materials & Supplies 3,500

5. Equipment (Purchase or Rental)* 3,500

6. Production (Printing, Reproduction, Audio-visual)* 3,500

7. Other* (Evaluation) 5,000

B. Indirect Costs: 22,924

TOTAL $122,924

Institutional Support (1st-year total) $203,728

2.0 FTEF per participating campus, 4-6 campuses (est. 5 campuses), faculty salaries $15,960, Associate Professor, Step III, .44 clerical position per campus ($3,511) plus staff benefits (15%).

System coordination contributed through Division of New Program Development and Evaluation

*Items to be detailed in Budget Narrative, if applicable.
### BUDGET 1st Year Only

#### BUDGET ITEM

**A. Direct Costs:**

1. **Salaries & Wages**
   - a. Professional* $45,384
   - b. Consultant* 3,000
   - c. Clerical 12,980
2. **Employee Benefits** 8,755
3. **Travel** 17,550
4. **Materials & Supplies**
5. **Equipment (Purchase or Rental)** 3,500
6. **Production (Printing, Reproduction, Audio-visual)** 3,500
7. **Other** (Evaluation) 5,000

**B. Indirect Costs:**

**TOTAL** $122,593

- **Projected Institutional Support (1st-year total)** $200,000

From system and/or campus funding, support will be provided to the project to include the equivalent of two positions per participating institution.

System coordination contributed through Division of New Program Development and Evaluation.

---

### BUDGET 2nd Year Only

(Use same format for each continuing year)

#### BUDGET ITEM

**A. Direct Costs:**

1. **Salaries & Wages**
   - a. Professional* $49,921
   - b. Consultant* 3,000
   - c. Clerical 14,278
2. **Employee Benefits** 9,630
3. **Travel** 19,305
4. **Materials & Supplies**
5. **Equipment (Purchase or Rental)** 3,850
6. **Production (Printing, Reproduction, Audio-visual)** 3,850
7. **Other** (Evaluation) 6,500

**B. Indirect Costs:**

**TOTAL** $135,711

- **Institutional Support (2nd-year total)** $224,101

2.0 FTEF per participating campus, 4-6 campuses (est. 5 campuses), faculty salaries $17,556, Associate Professor, Step III and .44 clerical position per campus ($3,862).

System coordination contributed through Division of New Program Development and Evaluation.

*Items to be detailed in Budget Narrative, if applicable.
## BUDGET

**3rd Year Only**

(Use same format for each continuing year)

### BUDGET ITEM

#### A. Direct Costs:

1. **Salaries & Wages**
   - a. Professional* $54,912
   - b. Consultant* 3,000
   - c. Clerical 15,705
2. **Employee Benefits** 10,593
3. **Travel** 21,236
4. **Materials & Supplies**
5. **Equipment (Purchase or Rental)** 4,235
6. **Production (Printing, Reproduction, Audio-visual)** 4,235
7. **Other** (Evaluation) 6,500

#### TOTAL

**$148,112**

#### B. Indirect Costs:

**$27,696**

**TOTAL**

**$175,808**

---

**Institutional Support (3rd-year total)** $246,503

---

**Projected Institutional Support (3rd-year total)** $245,000

2.0 FTEF per participating campus, 4-6 campuses (est. 5 campuses), faculty salaries $519,311, Associate Professor, Step III and .44 clerical position per campus ($4,248).

System coordination contributed through Division of New Program Development and Evaluation.

*Items to be detailed in Budget Narrative, if applicable.*
BUDGET

Direct Costs 1974-75 1975-76 1976-77 Total
1. Salaries and Wages
   a. Director (A&I IV, Step 1 @ $2,084/month) $25,008 27,508 30,258 82,774
   b. Assistant Director (A&I II, Step 3 @ $1,698/month) 20,376 22,413 24,654 67,443
   c. Secretary (Clerical III B, Step 1 @ $665/month) 7,980 8,778 9,655 26,413
   d. Temporary help 5,000 5,500 6,050 16,550
   e. Staff benefits (15%) 8,755 9,630 10,593 28,978
   Total staff 67,119 73,829 81,210 222,158
2. Consultants for training staff
   a. Honoraria (6 man-days for 5 campuses @ $1,000 per day) 3,000 3,000 3,000 9,000
   b. Travel (3 trips to 5 campuses @ $350. per trip) 5,250 5,775 6,353 17,378
3. Staff travel
   a. In-state (150 trips by Center and campus staff @ $50. per trip) 7,500 8,250 9,075 24,825
   b. Out-of-state (7 trips by Center staff & 400. per) 2,800 3,080 3,388 9,268
   c. Policy Board & Steering Committee Travel (40 mem/trips @ $50. per trip) 2,000 2,200 2,420 6,620
4. Office equipment: Audio-visual & other 3,500 3,850 4,235 11,585
   b. Publication 3,500 3,850 4,235 11,585
5. Evaluation 5,000 6,500 6,500 18,000
Total Direct Costs 99,669 110,334 120,416 330,419
Indirect Costs (23%) 22,924 25,377 27,666 75,967
Total Costs 122,593 135,711 148,082 406,416

It is requested that the grant be made to The California State University and Colleges Foundation, a non-profit corporation organized to administer grants and contracts from governmental and private sources for research, special programs, and other activities of The California State University and Colleges and for the benefit of that system. The Foundation in turn will execute the necessary agreements with the Office of the Chancellor and CSUC institutions for faculty assigned time and other resources and services necessary to meet the proposal requirements.

JERRY C. GAFF
425 Spruce Street
Berkeley, California 94708
December 1, 1972

Personal Details

Birthdate: February 5, 1936
Wife: Sally S. Gaff
Children: David Bradley Gaff, Amy Elizabeth Gaff

Educational History

A.B. DePauw University, 1954-1958 (Psychology)
Ph.D. Syracuse University, 1958-1965 (Social Psychology)

Work History

Visiting Professor of Psychology, Department of Nursing, California State College, Sonoma
Visiting Professor, Center for Educational Research, University of Leyden, Leyden, the Netherlands
Associate and Assistant Research Psychologist, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley
Postdoctoral Research Fellow, American College Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa
Assistant Professor of Social Science (Psychology), Raymond College, University of the Pacific
Instructor, Department of Sociology, Hobart & William Smith Colleges

Professional Societies

American Psychological Association
American Sociological Association
American Association for the Advancement of Science

Major Intellectual Interests

Personality and Social Psychology
Higher Education

Publications

BOOKS


Publications

PAPERS


