I. Call session to order in MCUB room 204 at 3:15 p.m.

J. Business Items

A. Nomination and election of Senate Officers
   Voting will be accomplished on one office at a time.

B. 2nd Reading of Amendments to By-Laws - Corwin Johnson
   (See minutes of April 13th Senate session.)

C. Student Affairs Committee - Bill Boyce
   Revision of resolution previously presented to Senate (See March 9, 1971

D. Personnel Policies Committee - Howard Rhoads
   Resolution concerning Faculty Evaluation of Department Heads appears in
   Attachment B, Agenda, May 11, 1971

E. Curriculum Committee - Dwayne Head
   Resolved that the Academic Senate endorse the recommendations of the
   Curriculum Committee regarding Catalog changes requested by the School
   of Science and Mathematics for 1972-73. (See Attachment C, Agenda,
   May 18, 1971.)

F. Special Committee on the Chancellor's Proposals for Reform in Higher
   Education - Dave Grant
   Resolved that the Academic Senate agree in principle with the "Position
   Paper on the External College," as presented for a first reading March
   8, 1971, at the Academic Senate CSC, and that copies of this resolution
   be forwarded to the President, to the Academic Senate CSC, and to the
   Chancellor's Task Force on Innovation in the Educational Process.

   Resolved that the Chairman of the Academic Senate, Cal Poly, augment the
   membership of the Special Committee on the Chancellor's Proposals by
   two students to serve on the Committee be
   submitted by SAC.

G. Personnel Policies Committee - Howard Rhoads
   Resolution regarding the election of a Cal Poly Representative to the
   CSC Academic Council Committee on International Education. (See attach-
   ment B, Agenda, May 18, 1971.)

III. Announcements

A. Elections Committee - Murray Smith
   The results of recent Senate elections, according to the April 20th
ballot count are as follows:

Senator, CSC Academic Senate: Roy Anderson
Senator, School of Agriculture and Natural Resources: Frank Coyes
 Thomas Lukes
 Howard Rhoads
Senator, School of Architecture & Environmental Design: David Saveker
Senator, School of Business & Social Sciences: Michael O'Leary
 William Boyce
Senator, School of Communicative Arts & Humanities: Roger Bailey
 Barton Olsen
Senator, School of Engineering & Technology: Edward Clerkin
 J. D. Price
 Paul Scheffer
 Orien Simmons
Senator, School of Human Development & Education: Sheldon Harden
 Alice Roberts
Senator, School of Science & Mathematics: Harry Fierstine
 John Lowry
 Arthur Rosen
Professional Consultative Services Senator: Marcus Gold

PERSONNEL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP:

School of Agriculture & Natural Resources: Frank Thrasher, Member
 Roy Harris, Alternate
Professional Consultative Services: Pearl Turner, Member
 Marcus Gold, Alternate

B. A Special election will be held in the School of Engineering & Technology and in the School of Science and Mathematics for members and alternates on the Personnel Review Committee May 18, 1971.

C. Curriculum changes for Senate consideration are scheduled as follows:

May 18th meeting: Curriculum of School of Engineering & Technology
May 25th meeting: Curriculum of School of Human Development & Education
Curriculum of School of Communicative Arts & Humanities
Curriculum of Graduate Programs

D. Dave Grant will present a report from the Special Committee on the Chancellor's Proposals. (ATTACH. D. MEMO MAY 11)

E. The June meeting of the Academic Senate will be held Friday, June 11, 1971 at 10:30 a.m.

IV. Adjournment.
Memorandum

To: Dr. William Alexander, Chairman
   Academic Senate and
   Head, Social Sciences Department

From: Col. William M. Boyce

Subject: Agenda Item for Academic Senate

Date: April 26, 1971

File No.:

Copies:

It is requested that the attached proposed policy on evaluation of faculty teaching ability be included as an action item on the agenda of the Academic Senate for its regular May meeting.

This policy has been revised and approved by my committee for submission to the Academic Senate.

Incidentally, the Academic Senate at Chico State College recently passed a student evaluation of faculty proposal which was virtually identical to that rejected by our Senate on April 13. The measure passed at Chico State by a vote of 23 to 1 and included the provision that evaluations be placed in official personnel files.

You are probably aware that SAC is under a mandate created by a student petition to come up with a student evaluation plan which would be published, be placed in official personnel files and would permit grievance hearings and personnel review board hearings to be open to the public – including students. There is a possibility that, if the Academic Senate again rejects student evaluations, the President may accept most of the SAC proposal.

In the event that the Senate does not pass the attached proposal, I am going to follow immediately with a motion that you appoint 5 members of the Senate as an ad hoc committee to get together with SAC and try to develop a compromise that would be acceptable to both parties. If we do not follow this procedure, I am convinced that we will have student evaluations being performed officially with no faculty input or guidance whatsoever.
I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

A. A meaningful evaluation of the teaching ability of the faculty by students is a valuable instrument to faculty seeking self-improvement in their teaching ability and is one of several indicators helpful in evaluating faculty for reappointment, tenure and promotion.

B. Each department (or school which does not have departments) is encouraged to develop interest in student evaluation of the teaching ability of the faculty of that department. If students enrolled in courses of any department or school evidence a substantial interest, the department head or school dean will request the students to appoint or elect a committee of students to work with a faculty committee elected by tenured and non-tenured faculty from this department (or school).

C. In general, the combined faculty-student committee for establishing evaluations procedures and criteria of each instructional department shall:

1. Consist of students and tenured and non-tenured faculty interested in developing an evaluation of faculty teaching ability, including those teaching abilities unique to that department.

2. Be composed of equal numbers of students and faculty.

3. Develop and establish a system or systems for student evaluation of faculty teaching ability that will be meaningful to the faculty of that particular department and that will have the general approval of the students, the faculty concerned and the department head.

D. The implementation of the procedures developed, and within the criteria established, will be accomplished by students under the supervision of the above committee formed within each instructional unit conducting an evaluation. The results of the evaluation will be presented to the evaluated faculty member, together with all data and information gathered on his evaluation. The results will also be made available to the Department Head and to tenured faculty of the Department (or school).

E. Student evaluations of the teaching ability of the faculty may be conducted by individual instructional departments or by schools. Due consideration should be given to the appropriateness of the evaluation criteria and procedures applicable and meaningful to each instructional unit. If desired, certain standard criteria and procedures could be established for a school with additional separate criteria and procedures established for each instructional unit therein.
II. SPECIAL PROVISIONS

A. It is recognized that because of differences in academic disciplines, size, student enrollment, student majors and the constitution of departments, particular detailed evaluation criteria or procedures may not be appropriate for a given department. However, departmental or other instructional units may wish to give consideration to the following:

1. What should be the frequency of the student evaluations? When should the evaluations be made during the academic year? Should all members of the faculty be evaluated during each evaluation period?

2. Should the student evaluations be submitted to all tenured faculty? If not, to which tenured committee?

3. If the department head's teaching ability is evaluated, how should the results be handled?

4. Should student evaluations be reduced to summary form? Should the summarization or tabulations or individual evaluations be attested to as to validity and signed by the department head or other responsible individuals? (Consideration should be given to the sheer bulk of the evaluation material which may be generated by certain evaluation systems or procedures.)

5. Should separate evaluation procedures and criteria be developed for service courses or for non-majors?

6. What constitutes "substantial" student interest in faculty evaluations?

7. How often should evaluation criteria and procedures be reviewed and revised?
FACULTY EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS, the department head or director is selected to effectively administer a particular department or functional division, including optimum working relations with both the staff as well as the administration, and

WHEREAS, it is desirable that he be made aware of his effectiveness as well as areas of deficiency so that steps for improvement may be undertaken, and,

WHEREAS, only faculty members who have been in the department for an adequate length of time can form a base for detailed evaluation, and,

WHEREAS, this evaluation should be carried out sufficiently often to provide adequate continuity in the evaluation process, and,

WHEREAS, some flexibility in the evaluation instrument and procedure is desirable,

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED:

That the following recommendation on faculty evaluation of department heads be directed to the President. Faculty members shall evaluate department heads and directors in accordance with the following provisions:

1. Each department should evaluate its department head once a year.

2. Department members participating shall have been employed in that department for at least one year.

3. Evaluation shall be conducted by submission to the department head of the completed Department Head Evaluation Form II except that if a department decide by majority vote of those eligible to evaluate that they prefer Form III the evaluation shall be carried out with that form (copies of the forms are attached). The department shall decide, by majority vote of those eligible to evaluate, each of the following questions:

   a. Which evaluation form (I or II attached) shall be used.

   b. Whether evaluation forms shall be submitted directly to the department head or shall be submitted to a committee of no more than three tenured faculty elected by those eligible to evaluate who will summarize the results and comments and submit the summary to the department head.
Department Head Evaluation, Form I

California State Polytechnic College

The following questions are intended to suggest some of the important characteristics and functions of a department head. Comment only on those to which you feel qualified to respond and which pertain to aspects you feel are important to the successful functioning of your department. No signature is required since this evaluation will not be directed sent to other than the department head directly or through the committee.

1. Does the department head handle administrative routines efficiently and effectively? This includes class assignments, budgets, committee assignments, department meetings, and curricular planning.
   Comment:

2. Does the department head provide stimulating academic ideas (his own or others') at appropriate times?
   Comment:

3. Is the department head receptive to suggestions made by his faculty and does he support their innovative efforts?
   Comment:

4. Does the department head encourage faculty members to keep abreast of their field and occasionally even prod them to do research and/or take advanced graduate courses as appropriate?
   Comment:

5. Is the department head alert to progress in his field? Does he make an attempt to maintain his own professional growth?
   Comment:

6. Are the department head's actions sufficiently consistent so that the faculty can develop a sense of confidence in the direction of his leadership?
   Comment:
7. Is the department head forthright and effective in the recruitment of faculty?  
Comment:

8. Is the department head equitable and capable in his handling of personnel matters?  
Comment:

9. Is the department head aware of any actual or potential conflict between individuals or factions on the faculty? Do his actions help to reduce rather than increase discord?  
Comment:

10. Does the department head have good rapport with students, being courteous and interested in them as individuals?  
Comment:

11. Does the department head encourage constructive discussion about the relation of the department to the college and school? Or do negative responses discourage free discussion?  
Comment:

12. Does the department head make optimum use of the talent available in his department?  
Comment:

13. Are there important functions not included above? If so, please comment on them.
Please respond to the following questions. No signature is required since this evaluation will not be directed sent to other than the department head, directly or through the committee.

1. What are the strong points of the department head?

2. What are the weak points of the department head?

3. What suggestions do you have for improving the effectiveness of the department head?
TO Members of the Academic Senate  
FROM Special Committee on The Chancellor's Proposals for Reform in Higher Education  
SUBJECT Progress Report

The function of our committee is to review the Chancellor's proposals, to point out those procedures which demand our immediate attention, and to outline those policies and procedures which merit our continuing attention and which will form the substance of our final report prior to December 1971. While members of the committee have concern for the effects of these proposals upon the entire state college system, our direction has been to study the materials from the viewpoint of Cal Poly, i.e., what will be the effect of these proposals - if implemented - upon the college as a whole? Upon individual schools, departments, programs? What will be the effect upon the students? The faculty? Etc.

As we view the Chancellor's proposals, the main thrust is to provide quality education for more students without materially - or at least directly - affecting the support and capital outlay budgets.

Many of the proposals are already available in current procedures and policies, but for various reasons are not used as widely as proposed. Other proposals represent substantial changes from current policies.

Briefly, the substance of the proposals is as follows:

1. Achievement exams. The GE-Breadth areas should be redefined and accomplished by means of advanced placement exams, national exams, or/and locally devised exams. In degree programs and majors, much of the work could be covered by the National GRE and/or local comprehensive exams.

2. Extension activities. Increased use of extension courses which are comparable to on-campus courses should be developed. Extension centers, perhaps under the supervision of two or more colleges, should be set up. Extension teaching should be considered as a possible part of the regular teaching workload. It might be possible for a student to receive a degree completely through extension work.

3. Tuition proposals. There should be defined maximum units for degrees and majors. Students should be expected to pursue their programs with uniform progress, i.e., students who take excessive units or fewer than normal units should be penalized by monetary...
4. **Facility Utilization.** Classes should be scheduled and held in the late afternoons, evenings, and Saturdays to achieve greater facility utilization.

5. **Faculty Staffing Formula.** The formula will have to be devised to include credit for challenge exams, extension teaching, and such related individualized instruction. The recommendation is for a student/faculty ratio of with flexibility built in to accommodate lower division, upper division, and graduate instruction only.

6. **Immediate Steps to be Taken.** Cost per student studies could be immediately be undertaken to discover which programs and degrees - if any - fall below certain standards. Pilot programs should be developed to explore new or better methods of instruction. Task forces should be set up to study (1) Innovation in the Educational Process and (2) Improving Efficiency in the use of resources.

The Statewide Academic Senate has already responded to the Chancellor's proposals through several resolutions:

a. That pilot programs be carefully set up and evaluated before their conclusions be applied to other state colleges.

b. That the costs for excess or deficient units be deferred until more complete data are available.

c. That extension courses intended to be equivalent to on-campus courses be initiated, staffed, and evaluated on the same basis that regular courses follow.

d. That the 1957 Staffing Formula (revised 1967) be retained for budgetary purposes.

e. "Position Paper on the External College" was accepted for first reading March 8 and will be up for the second reading on May 13-4. Local Senates are being asked to consider this position paper and to respond prior to the dates of the second reading.
agree in principle

Our special committee at this time is requesting the Academic Senate to consider with the position paper on the External College with such amendments or reservations as it may wish to make.

The future work of our committee will be directed toward the specific problems which are listed below. The list is not intended to be complete or exhaustive. Through hearings which will be scheduled in the fall, we hope to have a considerable body of suggestions and information from the faculty.

1. The possibility of re-defining GE-Breadth so that comprehensive examinations are feasible and so that advanced placement can be accomplished.

2. Review of extension course offerings to see what greater use can be made of such courses.

3. Explore the possible use of comprehensive exams in certain degrees and programs.

4. Study the staffing formula presently used to see how credit for individualized instruction and evaluation can be incorporated. The replacement of the current formula by a student/faculty ratio would place many of our Cal Poly programs in immediate danger. Perhaps a better formula would be one which recognizes current staff positions by areas or disciplines and then accepts the application of such factors in a student/faculty ratio.

5. Review the factors involved in facility utilization on this campus.

6. To study the question of student progress to determine what effect - if any - penalties for excess and/or deficient units might have on our students.

7. Review the current use of challenge exams and to explore greater uses which might be made in certain areas.

8. Study the basic premises and assumptions upon which these proposals are based.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate agrees in principle with the "Position Paper on the External College," as presented for a first reading on March 8, 1971, at the Academic Senate CSC, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President, to the Academic Senate CSC, and to the Chancellor's Task Force on Innovation in the Educational Process.

RESOLVED: That the Chairman of the Academic Senate, Cal Poly, augment the membership of the Special Committee on the Chancellor's Proposals by requesting the names of two students such names to be given by the SAC.
A major element in Chancellor Dunke's recent statement entitled "Some Proposals for Change in the California State Colleges" was concerned with the concept of the external college or the so-called open university. He said in part "... Related to this proposal is the possibility of providing degree opportunities for substantial numbers of students other than through an on-campus program as students in residence--students who, under our present rigid systems, we cannot hope to serve. Our extension operations should provide a degree aspirant with an alternative to the on-campus program. The new British 'Open University' concept, with modifications, has within it a number of concepts which might well work in the State College context. The application of modern technology to higher education, televised instruction, correspondence courses, self-study combined with intensive short-course on-campus programs, taped lectures with study guides programmed learning, as well as classroom instruction on or off campus, can be utilized to extend college opportunities to many more students on a self-support basis, with a consequent reduced demand upon on-campus educational facilities and resources. They would also provide for the giving of degrees through extension, and the consequent upgrading of current extension offerings."

Also "... The freeing of the undergraduate from required classroom attendance, as I have just proposed, would enable some existing facilities to be used for continuing education, and the upgrading of extension courses to equivalency with regular academic offerings, together with the ability to mix in a single class students on state support and students on self-support, also open the door to many who could not otherwise be accommodated."

And "... Extension courses, under these proposals, must be made equivalent to the regular academic offerings."

This proposal, as well as others which were delineated by the Chancellor, have been under study by the Educational Policy Committee, and the following remarks are intended to form the basis for consideration of the "External College" idea by the Full Academic Senate C.S.C.

The basic idea appears sound and may well serve to better meet the educational objectives of a significant number of students now enrolled in the regular programs of the California State Colleges. Additionally it holds promise of offering new opportunities for obtaining a modified 4-year college degree to a large group of potential students who would not in the normal course of events have enrolled in the State College System.

We differ, however, with the Chancellor's point of view in at least one fundamental area. He has implicitly stated and emphasized that his goal is to upgrade the level of extension and other types of proposed offerings to equate with the regular junior college program. Such an approach carried to a logical conclusion would lead me to abandon our present extension for this approach, which is based on the promise of a much lower cost-supported
that per student FTE. We feel that this is an unreasonably expensive and that we should recognize the "external college" to be different in some degree to our regular programs and serving a student body, with their own specialized academic aspirations.

Our efforts, instead, should be to establish a meaningful program leading to a credible "external degree." Credibility of the degree has major implications vis a vi our ability to promote broad community acceptance of the degree as reasonable preparation for a variety of life work situations.

The external college should not be expected to subsume our present extension programs. Extension programs are widely participated in by students who either have no formal degree objectives or, in many cases, who are already holders of bachelors and masters degrees. We see the external college meeting the needs of its own special group of students with some transfer both into and out of the regular State College programs and the extension programs.

The external college should be set up as a single system-wide unit with individual campuses contributing in areas of special interest and capability. Students enrolled in the external college would be in attendance over generally extended periods, and would represent a mobile population best served by a single agency. The single external college administrative unit would act in the nature of an accrediting, admissions and standards board approving coursework and other educational experiences for credit towards an external degree.

Credit towards an external degree could be earned in a wide variety of applicable areas.

These might include:

1. Community college transfer units
2. Extension programs from the State Colleges, University of California and private schools
3. Educational TV
4. Correspondence
5. Intensive Workshop and Seminars
6. Evaluation of applicable work experience through professional supervision, oral interviews, comprehensive examinations, etc.
7. Acceptance of certain vocationally oriented training credits offered by a variety of institutions such as hospital programs for medical technologists as a base for proceeding towards a broader external degree.
8. Regular resident credit from California State College programs
It rapidly became obvious that the development of an external college program will require detailed planning that would probably exceed that required for the establishment of a new State College campus. This could be best accomplished by the establishment by the Board of Trustees of an External College Advisory Board appointed with sufficient full-time personnel and augmented by released time for administration that could be furnished from graduates from the various campuses.

The external college is a viable idea that can well move higher education forward in new areas and modes of educational endeavor. It must be approached realistically. It does not represent a cheap way of accomplishing the basic objectives of the present State College system, but it need not be used to unbend ourselves of the responsibility of furnishing quality tuition-free education. Properly conceived, planned, and organized, it can extend educational opportunities that satisfy the special needs of many people.