

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE
805.756.1258

Meeting of the ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, August 29, 2000, UU220, 10:00am-12:30pm

*all removed
except 7.6.00*

- I. Minutes: Approval of the Academic Senate meeting minutes for May 16, May 23, May 30, June 1, June 6, 2000 and Academic Senate Executive Committee meeting minutes for July 6, 2000 (pp. 2-12).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Provost's Office:
 - D. Statewide Senators:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. ASI Representatives:
 - G. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Academic Senate Calendar of Meetings:** (p. 13).
 - B. **Academic Senate assigned time allocations:** (p. 14).
 - C. **Resolution on Revision of Fairness Board Description and Procedures:** (pp. 15-18).
 - D. **Resolution on the Graduate Writing Requirement:** (p. 19).
 - E. **Resolution to Raise the Standards for Mathematics at Cal Poly:** (pp. 20-23).
 - F. **Resolution on 1999/00 Program Review and Improvement Committee Report of Findings and Recommendations:** (enclosed with agenda as separate document).
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
 - A. **Summer enrollment.**
 - B. **Centennial celebration.**
 - C. **Other.**
- VII. Adjournment:

MESSAGE

-11-

Dated: 7/19/00 at 14:32

Subject: Academic Senate Executive Committee minutes for 7.6.00

Contents: 2

Creator: Margaret Camuso /cpslo,employee1

Item 1

ORIGINAL

FROM: Margaret R. Camuso /cpslo,employee1

BCC: acadsen-cpfaculty@polymail.calpoly.edu

acadsen-cppcs@polymail.calpoly.edu

Item 2

MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR JULY 6, 2000

I. Minutes: The minutes for the April 18 and May 9, 2000 Executive Committee meetings were approved without change.

II. Communications and Announcements: none.

III. Report:

(Paul Zingg, Provost) (1) Chancellor Reed intends to reevaluate budget allocations in the CSU in terms of funding for future enrollment growth and marginal costs. (2) Of the \$10m state budget one time supplement for high cost programs, it's estimated Cal Poly will receive \$1.8m. (3) The three dean searches are complete and new deans should be on campus by September. (4) The \$5.6m cash grant from Unocal will be "just the tip of the iceberg" with more grant money arriving in stages over the next six months. This is expected to be the largest gift ever made to the University. (5) The final WASC report is due soon and will be made public. This report is expected to be very positive and helpful to Cal Poly.

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

V. Discussion Items:

A. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES: Harvey Greenwald was appointed to the Instructional Advising Committee on Computing (IACC).

B. 2000-2001 CHARGES TO ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES: New and carryover charges to each of the committees was reviewed.

C. CHANGE IN PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE: The proposal from the Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment task force (IALA) which addresses changes in the program review process has been forwarded to Linda Dalton and Paul Zingg for review. The proposal will come before the Academic Senate in early fall.

The proposed process has three steps: (1) The department/program will create a self study document, (2) This document will go to an outside review team who will then visit the campus and make recommendations, (3) The department head/chair will meet with the college dean, the Provost, and Vice Provost to create an "action plan" for implementing the appropriate recommendations. The review will coincide with any accrediting review of the department and use the same report.

Of the outside reviewers, one will be nominated by the college dean, the Senate Executive Committee will nominate one or two members, and the President will appoint two members. The dean's nominee may be from the campus but not from the college of the department being reviewed.

The deans will pay the costs of the review; there will be no template for the departments to work from; and the review will be discipline designed and concentrate on the department's mission.

D1. MAIL CENTER SHREDDING: (Frank Lebens, Vice President for Administration and Financing) Each quarter there are 50 to 70 pieces of outgoing mail that are shredded at the end of the quarter because there is no account number, postage, or return address on the envelopes. The Mail Center makes every effort to determine who sent the piece of mail

and return it, but it cannot open the ⁻¹²⁻envelopes. The Mail Center is aware of faculty concerns.

D2. SUMMER ENROLLMENT: The new Dean for Extended Education will be responsible for summer quarter including promotion of enrollment.

Submitted by:

s/David Hannings
Vice Chair for the Academic Senate

08.14.00

Academic Senate Calendar of Meetings for 2000-2001

All Academic Senate and Executive Committee meetings are held in UU220 from 3:00 to 5:00pm unless otherwise noted.

DATE

MEETING

September 26
October 3
October 24
October 31
November 21
November 28

Academic Senate
Executive Committee
Academic Senate
Executive Committee
Academic Senate
Academic Senate (if needed)

December 4 – January 7, 2001

Finals and quarter break

January 9
January 23
January 30
February 13
February 20
March 6
March 13

Executive Committee
Academic Senate
Executive Committee
Academic Senate
Executive Committee
Academic Senate
Academic Senate (if needed)

March 19 – April 1, 2001

Finals and quarter break

April 3
April 17
April 24
May 8
May 22
May 29
June 5

Executive Committee
Academic Senate
Executive Committee
Academic Senate
Executive Committee
Academic Senate
Academic Senate

The calendar is structured to have an Executive Committee meeting the Tuesday following each Academic Senate meeting. It also allows for at least 14 days between an Executive Committee meeting and the next Academic Senate meeting for the completion and timely delivery of the agenda to the senators before the Academic Senate meetings.

(Proposed) ACADEMIC SENATE ASSIGNED TIME
FOR 2000-2001

1998-99

Chair (includes Sum '98)	26.5
Vice Chair	02
Secretary	00
Budget Chair	04
Curriculum Chair	12
Faculty Affairs Chair	00
Faculty Awards Chair	04
Fairness Board Chair	04
Grants Review Chair	00
Instruction Chair	04
Prog Rev & Imp Chair	01
Research & Prof Dev Chair	<u>04</u>
	61.5

1999-00

Chair (includes Sum '99)	20.5
Vice Chair	04
Secretary	00
Budget & Long Rg Plg Chair	04
Curriculum Chair	12
Faculty Affairs Chair	04
Faculty Awards Chair	04
Faculty Ethics Chair	00
Fairness Board Chair	04
Grants Review Chair	00
Instruction Chair	04
Library Chair	00
Prog Rev & Imp Chair	04
Research & Prof Dev Chair	04
Student Grievance Board Chair	00
US Cultural Pluralism Chair	<u>00</u>
	64.5 (74 WTUs available)

2000-01

Chair	26.5 (includes Sum '00)
Vice Chair	04
Secretary	00
Budget & Long Rg Plg Chair	04
Curriculum Chair	12
Faculty Affairs Chair	04
Faculty Awards Chair	04
Faculty Ethics Chair	00
Fairness Board Chair	04
Grants Review Chair	00
Instruction Chair	04 (tentative)
Library Chair	00
Prog Rev & Imp Chair	04 (tentative)
Research & Prof Dev Chair	04
Student Grievance Board Chair	00
US Cultural Pluralism Chair	<u>00</u>
	70.5 (74 WTUs available)

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-____-00/FB
RESOLUTION ON REVISION OF
FAIRNESS BOARD DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES

1 WHEREAS, Executive Order 320 requires all CSU campuses to implement policies and
2 procedures for grade appeals including annual reporting to the President and
3 Academic Senate; and
4

5 WHEREAS, Compliance with this requirement is monitored as part of the Student Records
6 and Registration Audit conducted by the Office of University Auditor and that
7 said auditors have had difficulty in assuring compliance with the annual
8 reporting process; therefore, be it
9

10 RESOLVED: That section E of the *FAIRNESS BOARD DESCRIPTION AND*
11 *PROCEDURES* be modified as follows to provide for retention and access to
12 a copy of the annual report in the Registrar's office:
13
14

15 E. In accordance with Executive Order 320, at the end of every academic
16 year the Fairness Board chair shall report, in writing, to the Academic
17 Senate and the President the number of cases heard during that academic
18 year and the disposition of each such case. A copy of this report shall also
19 be filed annually with the University Registrar so that it is available for
20 review during the student records and registration audit.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Fairness Board
Date: June 9, 2000

FAIRNESS BOARD
DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES

Description

The Fairness Board is the primary campus group concerned with providing "due process" of academically related matters for the students and instructors at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, particularly in terms of student/faculty relationships. The Board hears grade appeals based on the grievant's belief that the instructor has made a mistake, shown bad faith or incompetence, or been unfair. (For cheating, see CAM 684)

Although in grade appeals the Board operates under the presumption that the grade assigned was correct, should its members find that the evidence indicated that such was not actually the case, the chair will recommend to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs that the grade be changed. In all cases, the Board's authority is limited to actions consistent with system policy.

Procedures

- A. Any student who still feels aggrieved after requesting relief from both the instructor and instructor's department head, may initiate an appeal for redress by writing to the chair of the Fairness Board. The chair may counsel a student as to the relative merit of his/her case, but must accept all written complaints which are ultimately submitted. The chair will provide the student with a copy of "Fairness Board Description and Procedures." The student's letter should contain all pertinent details of the situation, name of the course, section, instructor and term in question, list any witnesses to be called, state redress sought, and include as attachments all relevant documents, including items such as course grade determination handout, exams, papers, letters of support, etc. The student has the responsibility of identifying evidence to overcome the Board's presumption that the instructor's action was correct. If the Board decides the case may have merit, then the following actions will then take place:
1. The chair will forward a copy of the above letter to the challenged party and request his/her written reply to the chair within one week. The chair will share a copy of any reply with the student grievant. The chair will also send a copy of "Fairness Board Description and Procedures" to the challenged party.
 2. The chair will make scheduling arrangements as soon as possible for the hearing which will be conducted informally. At least six Board members must be present before a hearing may begin, and the same six members must be present for the full hearing.
 3. When a hearing is scheduled, the chair will notify the Board members and the two principal parties.
 4. Board members will disqualify themselves from participation in any case if they are a principal or if they feel they cannot be impartial.
 5. The Board will allow each principal party, who may be accompanied by his/her advisor (not a practicing attorney of law), to present his/her case personally, call and question witnesses, and present exhibits. The Board may ask for copies of any material it believes relevant to the hearing. The student grievant will usually appear first.

6. Each Board member may ask questions of either party or any witness.
 7. The Board itself may call witnesses or recall witnesses.
 8. The Board will handle all proceedings without undue delay, will keep a summary file of each case, and will tape record the hearing.
 9. The Board will close the hearing when satisfied that both sides have been fully heard.
 10. The Board will deliberate in private and will make a written summarization of the facts of the case and of the Board's reasoning in its recommendation to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.
 11. The chair will send a copy of its recommendation to each principal party, to the instructor's department, and to each Board member.
 12. Should any member(s) of the Board desire to file a minority recommendation, it will be attached to the Board's majority recommendation.
 13. The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will inform the Board and each principal party what action, if any, has been taken. The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs shall have final authority regarding any change of grade with the provision, however, that no grade change will be made unless it is recommended by the Board. If the recommendation of the Fairness Board is not accepted, the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs shall indicate the reason(s) why in writing to the Board.
- B. The hearings are closed to all persons except the Board and the two principal parties and advisors. Witnesses, if any, shall be present only when testifying. No testimony shall be taken outside the hearing room, but written statements from persons unable to attend are admissible. Exceptions to these rules are possible if the Board and both principals have no objections.
- C. Students should ideally initiate any grade complaint within one quarter as instructors are obligated to retain evaluation instruments for only one quarter. However, the Board will accept grievances for two quarters after an evaluation. If special circumstances exists, such as when an instructor is on leave and not available to the student, the Board may choose to entertain grievances involving grades issued more than two quarters earlier.
- D. In the event a situation arises wherein the Board unanimously deems the above rules inappropriate, the Board will modify its procedures to insure that fairness prevails.
- E. In accordance with Executive Order 320, at the end of every academic year, the Fairness Board chair shall report, in writing, to the Academic Senate and the President the number of cases heard during that academic year and the disposition of each such case. A copy of this report shall also be filed annually with the University Registrar so that it is available for review during the student records and registration audit.

Membership

One tenure-track faculty member from each college, and one tenure-track member from Student Affairs, all appointed by the chair of the Academic Senate for two-year terms. Two student members

selected by ASI, with no less than junior standing and three consecutive quarters of attendance at Cal Poly preceding appointment. The Fairness Board chair is elected by the Board.

ACADEMIC SENATE FAIRNESS BOARD PROCESS

Unresolved problem exists between student and the university.



Student is encouraged to go to the Counseling Center and to his/her advisor for the purpose of defining and clarifying the problem and achieving objectivity.



Student attempts to resolve the problem with appropriate party (e.g. instructor of record) and appropriate line of authority (e.g. instructor's department head/chair).



Student feels that problem has not been resolved and consults with chair of the Fairness Board.




Student prepares a letter to the Fairness Board indicating his/her problem and submits it to the Board's chair. The letter should:

- (a) identify the course, section, term, and instructor of record
- (b) state complaint and redress sought
- (c) indicate witnesses that may be called
- (d) include copies of relevant documents such as course grade determination handout, exams, papers, statements of support made by others, etc.



Fairness Board reviews complaints and declares complaint to have:

<u>MERIT</u>	<u>NO MERIT</u>
Board requests written response from instructor and schedules a hearing. If a resolution to the problem presents itself, the hearing may be terminated. If no resolution seems satisfactory to the Board and the principals, the hearing will lead to the Board making a recommendation to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.	Student may rebut with new evidence. <div> MERITNO MERIT</div>

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-___-00/
RESOLUTION ON
THE GRADUATE WRITING REQUIREMENT**

- 1 WHEREAS, Executive Order 665 of Title V requires that students fulfill the Graduation Writing
2 Requirement (GWR); and
3
- 4 WHEREAS, Students may currently elect to meet the GWR through either the Writing Proficiency
5 Examination (WPE) or approved upper-division coursework offered by the English
6 Department; and
7
- 8 WHEREAS, Students should continue to have the option to meet the GWR through either the WPE or
9 coursework in order to help them speed progress toward the degree; and
10
- 11 WHEREAS, Current policy allows students to be certified through coursework by receiving a grade of
12 C or better and being certified as writing-proficient based on an in-class essay; and
13
- 14 WHEREAS, The new General Education (GE) Program, which takes effect in Fall 2001, provides an
15 opportunity for enlarging the course options for meeting the GWR beyond those currently
16 offered; and
17
- 18 WHEREAS, Many upper-division, writing-intensive GE classes can (at the discretion of faculty
19 members offering the classes) provide opportunities appropriate for meeting the GWR;
20 and
21
- 22 WHEREAS, Students should be encouraged to attempt the GWR early in their junior year, in order to
23 identify writing problems and improve writing skills so as not to delay graduation;
24 therefore, be it
25
- 26 RESOLVED: That students be allowed to satisfy the GWR either by passing the Writing Proficiency
27 Exam (WPE) or by being certified writing-proficient on a GWR essay and getting at least
28 a C as a course grade in a designated upper-division, writing-intensive GE course; and be
29 it further
30
- 31 RESOLVED: That the Writing Skills Committee collaborate with the GE Committee to work out the
32 specifics of how GWR essays will be administered and scored in upper-division, writing-
33 intensive GE classes, and to explore ways to increase the effectiveness of advising that
34 will encourage students to attempt the GWR early in their junior year.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Curriculum
Committee (Endorsed by the Writing Skills Committee
and the General Education Committee)
Date: May 29, 2000

Resolution to Raise the Standards for Mathematics at Cal Poly
Submitted by James G. Harris, CENG Academic Senator
25 July 2000

1. Whereas, K-12 students in the state of California rank near the bottom of the 50 states in standardized math and science testing scores, and the United States ranks in the middle of the developed nations in K-12 math and science testing scores; and
 2. Whereas, a review of the undergraduate programs at Cal Poly show that approximately half of the programs (most in the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Agriculture) require only the satisfaction of Math 118, and that over half of those programs defer to the GE&B area B requirements for satisfaction of college graduation requirements in mathematics; and
 3. Whereas, the current GE&B Area B.1 requirements establish a lower bound of eight course units for a Cal Poly graduate's knowledge of mathematics for graduation, of which four units can be statistics, knowledge that is normally not taught in high school; and
 4. Whereas, the mathematical knowledge and skills covered in Math 118 are taught in required high school courses; and
 5. Whereas, there are few mathematics courses in the catalog that require the material in Math 118 as a prerequisite other than those that teach calculus; and
 6. Whereas, it is recognized that increasing the level of mathematical knowledge and skills will raise the standards of the required education in science for Cal Poly graduates; and
 7. Whereas, raising the minimum standards of knowledge in math and science for Cal Poly graduates has the potential of raising the standards of excellence for those entering the teaching credential programs for K-12 education; and
 8. Whereas, it is recognized that there will require additional resources to develop new required mathematical courses and to teach these courses in addition to those now needed by our entering students; and
 9. Whereas, it is recognized that Cal Poly is a leader in undergraduate technical education in the state and nation, and that the standards required for our graduates can be a model for other CSU campuses; and
 10. Whereas, the attached white paper has been reviewed by a meeting of interesting parties including faculty of UCTE, Liberal Studies and the mathematics department, by the GE&B area B subcommittee, by the curriculum committee of the College of Liberal Arts, and by the chair of the curriculum committee of the College of Agriculture, and has been made available to all chairs of programs within the Colleges of Agriculture and Liberal Arts and to the members of Academic Senate; be it
- A. Resolved: That the Academic Senate charge the GE&B area B committee to prepare by the end of this academic year a revision to the minimum mathematics requirements that adds a requirement for a four unit mathematics course that presents knowledge

beyond that currently taught in high school, and that those courses need not necessarily be based upon the calculus; and be it further

B. Resolved: That the Academic Senate request that the President and Provost develop plans and allocate sufficient one-time resources so that said mathematics courses can be developed, and allocate sufficient operational resources so the said mathematics courses will be operationally available for students by Fall 2003; and be it further

C. Resolved: That the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum committee make reports at least once per quarter to the Academic Senate on the progress of the implementation of this resolution.

White Paper on Mathematics Requirements for Cal Poly Graduates

James G. Harris, 10/18/99

Based upon remarks at Academic Senate on October 5, 1999

Numerous publications have documented that K-12 students in the United States score well below students in other nations in math and science in standardized tests (the tests are a point of controversy). To further exacerbate the situation, K-12 students in California rank near the bottom of the states in standardized tests on math and science. Ironically, after four(or five) years of college, the US undergraduates graduating in Math, Science and Engineering are the envy of the world. It has been stated that Cal Poly is enrolling better students every year if entering GPA and test scores are used as the measure of comparison. In summary, K-12 students in California do not fare well in their understanding of math and science from a national perspective, and fare even worse from an international perspective. However, Cal Poly graduates in the mathematics, science and engineering disciplines have a good reputation amongst their peers in the national and world community.

It is with this background that I made my remarks concerning the GE&B mathematics requirements at the Academic Senate meeting on October 5, 1999. These remarks were provoked by the name change proposed for MATH 327, 328, and 329 from Introduction to Modern Mathematics, Introduction to Modern Mathematics, and Mathematical Applications to Elementary Teaching to Mathematics for Elementary Teaching I, II, and III, respectively. This sequence of courses requires a prerequisite of MATH 118, Pre-Calculus Algebra, a course which consists of material covered in high school, and the name change fairly represents the objectives of the course.

A study of the math requirements for the undergraduate programs at Cal Poly shows that graduates of over half of the approximately 60 degree programs can graduate having taken only MATH 118. Furthermore, over half of these programs defer to the GE&B area B requirements for the satisfaction of college graduation requirements in Mathematics. Most of these programs are administered within the Colleges of Agriculture and Liberal Arts. It is noted that these graduates represent the largest pool of future K-12 teachers within Cal Poly.

The GE&B area B.1 requirements establish an lower bound of eight course units for a Cal Poly graduate's knowledge of mathematics upon graduation. These eight units can consist of both Mathematics and Statistics courses. Statistics normally is not taught in high school, and therefore, can be considered college material. Therefore, assuming a student enrolls in one four unit Statistics course, the issue being discussed is the requirement for one four unit Mathematics course. The proposition is that this single four unit course should contain knowledge beyond a high school proficiency in college preparatory mathematics, i.e., a course that requires Math 118 as a prerequisite.

This proposed increase in the minimum level of mathematical content for graduation from Cal Poly presents at least two major problems. The first problem is that there are no freshman year, or sophomore year, courses with a MATH prefix that require only MATH 118 as a prerequisite other than the calculus, or courses based upon the calculus. Courses in discrete mathematics, mathematical knowledge for the foundation for computation if you will, are no longer available; MATH 124, Finite Mathematics, is no longer offered in the catalog, and CSC 141, Discrete Structures, is taught in the Computer Science department, and requires CSC 102, Fundamentals of Computer

Science II, as a corequisite. The second problem is that this increase in the minimum level of mathematical proficiency for Cal Poly graduates will require additional resources to be allocated for implementation. To illustrate this second problem, assume that half of the incoming freshman satisfy their mathematics course requirement with MATH 118. This means that approximately 2000 students will have to take one additional four unit MATH course, about 8000 SCUs, or about 60 sections for 240 WTUs, or, for the sake of argument, say four faculty positions. An estimate of the cost is therefore approximately \$300K per year, plus expenses to develop the new courses in discrete mathematics.

Again, the goal of raising the minimum standard for the mathematical proficiency of the Cal Poly graduate is to produce better candidates for entering the K-12 teaching profession. Raising the level of mathematical proficiency also will allow a more rigorous treatment within the lower division science courses, which should allow these courses to raise their standards for the students. This proposal is submitted with the faith that entering Cal Poly freshman will rise to the challenge of the higher standard, and with the prediction that eventually through the improved preparation of K-12 teachers, the mathematics and science education of K-12 students, and especially elementary students, will be improved. The proposal also will enhance Cal Poly's reputation for leadership in undergraduate education for publicly supported colleges and universities.