

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

FILE COPY

Academic Senate Executive Committee Agenda
March 29, 1994
UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

3.1.94 minutes
insert removed

- I. Minutes: Approval of the March 1, 1994 Executive Committee minutes (p. 2).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
 - A. Please mark your calendars: The President's luncheon for the Academic Senate Executive Committee is scheduled for May 25, 1994.
 - B. Attention caucus chairs for CAGR, CBUS, and CLA: Pursuant to the "Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines," each caucus chair is to forward the names of three nominees for the Program Review and Improvement Committee to the Academic Senate office for election by the Executive Committee. CAGR, CBUS, and CLA will have vacancies for the 1994-1996 term. Please commence a college-wide solicitation for interested members to this committee and forward those names to the Academic Senate office as soon as possible. The Executive Committee will hold its election to this committee on April 19.
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair
 - B. President's Office
 - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
 - D. Statewide Senators
 - E. CFA Campus President
 - F. ASI representatives
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. Academic Senate/university-wide committee assignments (p. 3).
 - B. Establishing an ad hoc committee to investigate the use of technology in delivering academic programs/curriculum (pp. 4-5).
 - C. Resolution on Revision of the Faculty Code of Ethics-Terry, chair of the Personnel Policies Committee (pp. 6-8).
 - D. Resolution on Diversity Proposal for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure-Terry, chair of the Personnel Policies Committee (pp. 9-18).
 - E. GE&B course proposals for ENGL 355, SPAN 340, and GRC 277-Vilkitis, co-chair of the GE&B Committee (pp. 19-21).
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
 - A. Report from the California Higher Education Policy Center, "Time for Decision: California's Legacy and the Future of Higher Education" [THIS REPORT WAS MAILED UNDER SEPARATE COVER ON MARCH 9. PLEASE BRING YOUR COPY OF THE REPORT TO THIS MEETING.]
 - B. How can faculty make meaningful recommendations regarding budget allocations to administration?
 - C. Formation of a committee to review/revise the existing program discontinuance procedures.
 - D. "Consultation'...within a Collective Bargaining Context"-Russell (p. 22).
 - E. Academic Senate agenda matters for the remainder of 1993-1994.
- VII. Adjournment:

ACADEMIC SENATE/COMMITTEE VACANCIES FOR 1993-1994

Academic Senate vacancies

Academic Senate Secretary-elect

CBUS one vacancy (replcmt for Andrews, Spring '94 Quarter)

Academic Senate Committee vacancies

CAGR Elections Committee
Status of Women Committee

CAED Constitution & Bylaws Committee
Curriculum Committee
Elections Committee
General Education & Breadth Committee
Personnel Policies Committee
Student Affairs Committee
University Professional Leave Committee
Calendar-Curriculum Committee
Cultural Pluralism Subcommittee
Faculty Committee for Charter Evaluation and Rejection
or Implementation

CBUS Constitution & Bylaws Committee

CLA Long-Range Planning Committee (replcmt for Engle, '93-94)

CSM Constitution & Bylaws Committee
Elections Committee
Status of Women Committee
Student Affairs Committee
University Professional Leave Committee

PCS Curriculum Committee
Elections Committee
Instruction Committee
Library Committee
Long-Range Planning Committee
Personnel Policies Committee

UCTE Faculty Committee for Charter Evaluation and Rejection
or Implementation

ALL COLLEGES

GE&B Subcommittee, Area A (Lang & Crit Thking) one vacancy

GE&B Subcommittee, Area E (Lifelong Undrstg/Dev) one vacancy

Animal Welfare Committee
(one Academic Senate representative whose primary
concerns are in a nonscientific area;
i.e., ethicist, lawyer, clergy) one vacancy

Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) one vacancy

ASI Risk Management Committee one vacancy

To: Executive Committee

FILE COPY

From: Jack Wilson, Chair

Subject: The Virtual University

As we are all aware there is much faculty concern about the place of multimedia and distance learning in higher education. The recent article about The Virtual University in the TT brought to mind some of those concerns. Decisions concerning multimedia and distance learning have and are being made by the administration with little or no faculty input. In the case of the new IBM 9000 mainframe computer the decision by the administration to purchase was made despite faculty opposition. A main reason for purchasing it was to support multimedia. A person has been hired, her salary split between the state and IBM, to support faculty development of multimedia. I could go on and on but it is not productive to rehash past decisions except as they impact academic programs and more specifically curriculum. Curriculum is the province of the faculty and no one else.

Therefore it is time, and in fact past the time, for the faculty to begin the process that sets in place the accommodation of multimedia and distance learning into education here. If we are not careful multimedia and distance learning will drive curriculum and not the other way around. Multimedia and distance learning have their places in higher education, let's get out front and determine what those places are. Then we can set the policy that will insure that multimedia and distance learning don't become the cart that drives the horse called curriculum.

We understand that multimedia and distance learning are different technologies with different applications. I think of multimedia as being primarily a way to supplement the traditional lecture. Therefore it will impact campus instruction. I understand distance learning as a way to reach students off campus who are not able, for a variety of reasons, to attend classes on campus.

We all recognize that it is important to begin to grapple with the program and curricular issues inherent in multimedia and distance learning. This will involve budgets since there is a substantial initial cost of putting into place the technology component of multimedia and distance learning. There is of course the larger question of how these technologies alter learning. That is something we will probably never address, unfortunately, given the propensity in this nation to buy into technology without considering the downside.

At any rate I propose we establish an ad hoc committee composed primarily of faculty which would address the following. First, are these technologies already driving academic programs and curriculum and how? If the answer is affirmative, what does

the committee recommend as steps to insure the integrity of programs and curriculum. Or to put it another way, what steps are necessary to insure that faculty retain control of programs and curriculum?

From the resource angle we would want to get a handle on the resources now being directed to multimedia and distance learning. What have the expenditures involved with those resources bought us?

Where do we want to go with these technologies? What is the place of multimedia in instruction on this campus? What is the place of distance learning for this campus? What if we decide that the campus is at point A and would like to move to point B, what would the cost be? What would be best way to get there? What is the need, and then what is the plan to get there without breaking the bank?

A larger more fundamental question that we might want this committee to look into is the impact of multimedia on instruction and learning.

There is already a committee, composed primarily of faculty that has been appointed by Carol Barnes, Dean of Extended Ed., to look into distance learning. Dennis Nulman is our representative on that committee.

There are as usual a number of ways we can build this committee. My first notion was that we have someone from the budget and instruction committees and someone from the Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing. Then we could select a few other faculty. We would want a student and perhaps a staff person on it also. I believe it is important that we have faculty on this committee who have some knowledge about and practical experience with multimedia, and perhaps distance learning, and yet are open minded about these technologies and their impact on instruction and learning. That is that they realize there are pros and cons. In other words no technophiles wanted. I can think of people who I believe fit the bill.

I visualize this committee receiving a multiple-step charge. There are some things we would like from it so the full senate can act on it this academic year, and there are perhaps other things that could wait until the next academic year.

Give me your input ASAP (can you do it this week?). I'll put together all of our thoughts and based on that try to present a proposed committee makeup and charge for our consideration at our Feb. 1st meeting. Meantime be thinking of people you would recommend for this committee. I would like to get it formed and going by the beginning of the 6th week of this quarter.

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS- -94/
RESOLUTION ON
REVISION OF THE FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS

Background Statement: Throughout the last several years, criticism has been received informally that the existing Code of Ethics is awkwardly written and lacks the force of law in that it does not appear in the Campus Administrative Manual.

During spring 1993, interested members of the Personnel Policies Committee worked on revising the existing Code to remove the awkward "he/she" phraseology, make the Code gender-neutral, and thereby make it more readable and meaningful.

Due to the illness of the committee chair (in April 1993) and the reluctance of a majority of the members of the committee to meet in May 1993, work on the revised Code was not completed. By a memo dated October 25, 1993, Jack Wilson referred the matter to us once again for formal consideration.

By a vote of 6-0-0, the Personnel Policies Committee endorsed the resolution/document which follows. For your ease of reading, please note: Attachment 1 is the existing Faculty Code of Ethics and Attachment 2 is the revised Faculty Code of Ethics (with optional headings). Please choose which you prefer.

WHEREAS, The original Faculty Code of Ethics was taken from an earlier document and redrafted to remove reference to male gender; and

WHEREAS, The present "he/she" format is difficult to read; and

WHEREAS, The present Faculty Code of Ethics appears on pages 1 and 2 of the Faculty Handbook; and

WHEREAS, Official campus policy should be included in the Campus Administrative Manual; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Code of Ethics shall be rewritten in gender-neutral language as indicated on the attached page; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the revised Faculty Code of Ethics shall be included in the Campus Administrative Manual as CAM 370.TBD.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Personnel
Policies Committee
February 16, 1994

FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS

The following Faculty Code of Ethics was developed by the Academic Senate and approved by the President:

The professor, guided by a deep conviction of worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge recognizes the special responsibilities placed upon him/her. His/her primary responsibility to his/her subject is to seek and state the truth as he/she sees it. To this end, he/she devotes his/her energies to developing and improving his/her scholarly competence. He/she accepts the obligation to exercise self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. He/she practices intellectual honesty. Although he/she may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise his/her freedom of inquiry.

As a teacher, the professor encourages the free pursuit of learning in his/her students. He/she holds before them the best scholarly standards of his/her discipline. He/she demonstrates respect for the student as an individual, and adheres to his/her proper role as intellectual guide and counselor. He/she makes every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that his/her evaluation of students reflects their true merit. He/she respects the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. He/she avoids any exploitation of students for his/her private advantage and acknowledges significant assistance from them. He/she protects their academic freedom.

As a colleague, the professor has obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. He/she respects and defends the free inquiry of his/her associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, he/she shows due respect for the opinions of others. He/she acknowledges his/her academic debts and strives to be objective in his/her professional judgment of colleagues. He/she accepts his/her share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of his/her institution.

As a member of his/her institution, the professor seeks, above all, to be an effective teacher and scholar. Although he/she observes the stated regulations of the institution, provided they do not contravene academic freedom, he/she maintains his/her right to criticize and seek revision. He/she determines the amount and character of the work he/she does outside his/her institution with due regard to his/her paramount responsibilities within it. When considering the interruption or termination of his/her service, he/she recognizes the effect of his/her decision upon the program of the institution and gives due notice of his/her intentions.

As a member of his/her community, the professor has the rights and obligations of any citizen. He/she measures the urgency of these obligations in the light of his/her responsibilities to his/her subject, to his/her students, to his/her profession, and to his/her institution. When he/she speaks or acts as a private person he/she avoids creating the impression that he/she speaks or acts for his/her college or university. As a citizen engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, the professor has a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

(Working draft of the revised)

FACULTY CODE OF ETHICS

As scholars:

Professors are guided by a conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge. They recognize special responsibilities to seek and state the truth in a given subject matter and to develop and improve scholarly competence. The faculty member also recognizes an obligation to exercise self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge and to practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, such interests should not compromise freedom of inquiry.

As teachers:

Professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students, while upholding the best scholarly standards of the discipline. Professors should also foster honest academic conduct and assure the honest evaluation of students. Professors should also respect the confidential nature of the student-professor relationship, should avoid the exploitation of students for private advantage, should acknowledge significant assistance from students, and should protect the student's academic freedom.

As colleagues:

Professors have obligations deriving from common membership in the community of scholars. They respect and defend free inquiry and respect the opinions of others. The faculty member [acknowledges academic debts and] strives to be objective in the evaluation of colleagues. Each faculty member should also accept an appropriate share of responsibility for the governance of the academic institution.

As members of the university community:

Professors seek to be effective teachers. Although professors should observe all regulations of the university which do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain the right to criticize and seek revision of such regulations. Each professor should subordinate the amount and character of work done outside the university to their paramount responsibility within it. When deciding to terminate employment, the faculty member should recognize the effect of that decision upon the institutional programs and give reasonable notice of the intention to leave.

As members of the larger community:

Professors have the same rights and obligations as any other citizen. Such rights and obligations are subject to certain responsibilities to the university. Faculty members who are speaking or acting as private citizens should avoid creating the impression that they are speaking for the college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS- -94/PPC
RESOLUTION ON
DIVERSITY PROPOSAL FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Background Statement: By a memo dated September 21, 1993, the Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force referred to the Personnel Policies Committee a Diversity Proposal for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure. In that proposal two statements were made: (1) "The purpose of this proposal is not to be punitive, but to facilitate faculty awareness and involvement in this important issue"; (2) "It is proposed that within each area, diversity-related activities be specifically noted. It is not intended that faculty must fulfill diversity requirements in all three categories. However, diversity-related activities should appear in at least one category."

The Personnel Policies Committee believes that these two statements are contradictory. We agree with the first statement above and, hence, propose that Form 109 be revised so as to permit specific mention of diversity-related activities.

The Committee is opposed to any diversity-requirement in Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.

For ease of reading, please note: Attachment 1 is one way to revise Form 109 to include specific mention of diversity-related activities; Attachment 2 is a second way to accomplish the same result; and Attachment 3 is the Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force's Diversity Proposal for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure and the accompanying letter of transmittal.

WHEREAS, The University is committed to diversity; and

WHEREAS, Faculty members are encouraged to become more involved in promoting diversity; and

WHEREAS, Diversity is broadly defined in terms of "differences in age, country of origin, creed, economic background, ethnicity, gender, physical disability, race, and sexual orientation" (Education Equity Commission, 1992); and

WHEREAS, Diversity-related activities permeate the existing areas of teaching, scholarship and University/community service in which tenure-track faculty are required to show competence; and

WHEREAS The Cal Poly Equal Opportunity Advisory Council has proposed that diversity considerations become an integral part of the retention, promotion and tenure (RPT) process; and

WHEREAS, Form 109 does not preclude mention of diversity-related activities; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force has endorsed the Equal Opportunity Advisory Council's proposal; therefore, be it

**RESOLUTION ON DIVERSITY PROPOSAL
FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
AS- -94/PPC**

RESOLVED: That Form 109 be revised so as to include diversity-related activities as a specific factor of consideration; and

RESOLVED: That faculty members be recognized for the pursuit of diversity-related activities.

Academic Senate Personnel Policies
Committee
February 16, 1994

FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

NAME _____ FACULTY RANK/STEP _____

DEPARTMENT _____ SCHOOL _____ DATE _____

This is an evaluation for (check applicable blank or blanks):

Retention to a ____ 1st, ____ 2nd, ____ 3rd, ____ 4th, ____ 5th, ____ 6th probationary year.

____ Tenure _____ Merit Salary Increase

____ Promotion _____ Other

____ Periodic Review

FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION

Justification for Recommendations (CAM 341.1, D)

Evaluative statements should be accompanied by supporting evidence. If the evidence does not appear to support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the reviewing levels for amplification.

The evaluator should review effectiveness of the faculty member primarily during this evaluation period. The evaluation should reflect both (1) evidence of merit and (2) suggested areas for improvement. Reference any resources used for evaluation; such as class visitation, conferences, and materials provided by the faculty member. If more space is needed, use an additional page.

- *I. Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of course, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student consultations, and other factors relating to performance as a teacher, including diversity-related activities. (Include results of Student Evaluation Program.)

Evidence of Merit:

(Over)

*Nonteaching academic personnel are to be evaluated on their professional performance.

Form FA109
Rev. 1/26/94

(Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance, cont.)

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

- II. **Professional Growth and Achievement:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's original preparation and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies and publications, professional registration, certification and licensing, and diversity-related activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

- III. **Service to University and Community:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement, placement follow-up, cocurricular activities, department, school and university committee and individual assignments, systemwide assignments, and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities, including diversity-related activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

- IV. **Other Factors of Consideration:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's ability to relate with colleagues, initiative, cooperativeness, dependability, ~~and health,~~ etc.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

Form FA109
Rev. 1/26/94

(Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance, cont.)

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

- II. **Professional Growth and Achievement:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's original preparation and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies and publications, professional registration, certification, and licensing.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

- III. **Service to University and Community:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement, placement follow-up, cocurricular activities, department, school and university committee and individual assignments, systemwide assignments, and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

- IV. **Other Factors of Consideration:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's ability to relate with colleagues and students (including diversity-related activities), initiative, cooperativeness, dependability, and health, etc.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

MEMORANDUM

Date: September 21, 1993

Copies:

To: Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee

From: Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force
(Mary Beth Armstrong, Kecia Brown, Lawson Bush,
David Dubbins, Philip Fetzner, Victor Fonseca,
Monet Parham, Refugio Rodriguez)

Subject: Diversity Proposal for RPT

During this past summer, the Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force met to draft various resolutions that would further the achievement of diversity goals at Cal Poly. After reviewing the Equal Opportunity Advisory Committee's Diversity Proposal for RPT, we wanted to acknowledge our support for its recommendations and add the following:

1. We ask that the Diversity Proposal for RPT be addressed as soon as possible;
2. We recommend that some wording be added to indicate that, without changing the Strategic Plan definition of Diversity, we would like to see special emphasis placed on African-Americans, Latino-Americans, and Native-Americans.

Thank you for your consideration of these items. If you have any questions regarding our committee or the comments given above, please contact Margaret (1258) at the Academic Senate office.

Diversity Proposal for RPT

To enhance the University's commitment to diversity and to encourage faculty to become more involved, the EOAC proposes that diversity considerations become an integral part of the retention, promotion and tenure (RPT) process. Currently, faculty are asked to show competence in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and University or community service. It is proposed that within each area, diversity-related activities be specifically noted. It is not intended that faculty must fulfill diversity requirements in all three categories. However, diversity-related activities should appear in at least one category.

Diversity, in this context is defined in terms of "differences in age, country of origin, creed, economic background, ethnicity, gender, physical disability, race, and sexual orientation" (Educational Equity Commission, 1992). Diversity-related activities encompass any activities (broadly defined) included within the three areas of RPT consideration (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and University or community service). For example, if one adds materials related to diversity into lectures or teaches a course dealing with diversity, this would be a diversity-related, teaching activity. Scholarship would include research on diversity topics, attending diversity-related conferences/workshops, making presentations at such conferences/workshops, and similar activities. University or community service would include serving on committees associated with diversity, volunteering for organizations that are diversity related, etc. In essence, the definition of what types of activities fit within each of the three categories of evaluation is to be broadly defined.

The purpose of this proposal is not to be punitive, but to facilitate faculty awareness and involvement in this important issue. Because the omission of information dealing with diversity is an omission of knowledge itself, such activity should lead to better teaching, better scholarship and, in the greater humanity for both faculty and students alike.

General Education¹⁹⁻ and Breadth Proposal

1. PROPOSER'S NAME <div style="text-align: center; font-family: cursive; font-size: 1.2em;">Steven Marx</div>	2. PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT <div style="text-align: center; font-family: cursive; font-size: 1.2em;">English</div>
3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable) <div style="text-align: center; font-family: cursive; font-size: 1.2em;">C.3</div>	
4. THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR: <div style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> New Course <input type="checkbox"/> Change to an Existing GEB Course <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB </div>	
5. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format) <div style="margin-left: 20px;"> ENGL 355 The Bible as Literature (3) Old and New Testaments with historical background. Literary forms and characteristics of Hebraic writing. Appreciation of the far-reaching use of Biblical narrative and reference in literature, speeches, art, drama, and modern film. 3 lectures. Prerequisite: ENGL 114 or equivalent or consent of instructor. </div>	
6. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS <div style="margin-left: 20px;"> The Area C subcommittee unanimously approved the attached proposal for English 355, The Bible as Literature. <div style="text-align: right; font-family: cursive; font-size: 1.2em;">Jim Hampton, chair</div> </div>	
7. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS <div style="margin-left: 20px;"> Approval recommended (3/3/94). This course fully meets the criteria for inclusion as a C.3 geb course. </div>	
8. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION <div style="height: 100px;"></div>	

General Education and Breadth Proposal

1. PROPOSER'S NAME Gloria Velasquez	2. PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT Foreign Languages
3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable) C.3	
4. THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Course (<i>approved by Curriculum Committee & A.S. in 1993</i>) <input type="checkbox"/> Change to an Existing GEB Course <input type="checkbox"/> Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB	
5. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format) SPAN 340 Chicano/a Authors (4) To introduce students to Chicano/a literary accomplishments in order to facilitate their appreciation of Chicano/a literary aesthetics and to increase their understanding of Chicano/a cultural vlaues and lifestyles. Lecture in Spanish. 4 units	
6. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS Subcommittee approval recommended (12/3/93)	
7. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS This course should have been evaluated by our committee last year; it fell through the cracks in the review process. This course fully meets the criteria for inclusion on the C.3 GEB list of courses. Approval recommended (3/3/94).	
8. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION 	

General Education and Breadth Proposal

1. PROPOSER'S NAME <div style="text-align: center;">Mike Blum</div>	2. PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT <div style="text-align: center;">Graphic Communication</div>
3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable) <div style="text-align: center;">F.1</div>	
4. THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR: <div style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="checkbox"/> New Course <input type="checkbox"/> Change to an Existing GEB Course <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB </div>	
5. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format) <div style="margin-left: 20px;">GrC 277 Computer Applications in Desktop Publishing (3)</div> <div style="margin-left: 20px;"> Computer applications, their relationship to print media and publishing. How desktop publishing is influencing and is influenced by society. Use and selection of personal computers, desktop publishing software, and output devices. Terminology, typography, creating, editing, transferring, merging text and graphics. Credit not allowed for GrC majors. Miscellaneous course fee requires--See Class Schedule. 2 lectures, 1 laboratory. </div>	
6. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS <div style="margin-left: 20px;"> Approval recommended February 18, 1994; reservations expressed about resources needed to meet student demand and how often this course will be offered. </div>	
7. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS <div style="margin-left: 20px;"> The GEB Committee recommends approval of this course (3/3/94). We note the concerns of the Area F Subcommittee. These need to be addressed. However, the content of this course meets the criteria for inclusion on the F.1 list. </div>	
8. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION 	

At its meeting of September 27, 1993, the Academic Senate approved the following Report presented by Cecilia Mullen for the Organization and Government Committee.

**"CONSULTATION" UNDER IV.D OF THE STATEMENT ON
ACADEMIC SENATES WITH A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTEXT**

IV.D of the statement covers two matters: the academic calendar and selection and review of administrators. In these two areas, Presidents have said that they are entitled to prepare the initial draft of a policy proposal and are entitled to determine its final form and content. The Academic Senate is to be "consulted", but it is not, unless requested, to revise the President's draft and present its revision to him/her for approval or rejection.

It is suggested that the following procedure be followed for consultation on IV.D policies:

1. The President's draft should be laid before the Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee agrees that the proposed policy comes under IV.D, it should refer the draft to the appropriate policy committee for consideration as stated below.
2. The policy committee should review the draft and prepare a report for the Senate stating its conclusions and recommendations. It should not revise the President's draft but, in its report, may propose changes.
3. The draft and the policy committee's report should be considered by the Senate. The Senate should not make changes in the text of the draft, but should act on the policy committee's report, which it may amend or revise. The report, as approved by the Senate, shall be sent to the President for his/her consideration before issuance of the policy.

James - Spec 3/29/94

14 Feb 1994

From: DU927

James, here is the data you requested re CRI projects. In fy 91/92, there were 5 projects active, direct expenses were 96,670 and IDC recovered 19,336, a total of 116,006. In fy 92/93, 7 projects active, 174,165 direct, 33,950 IDC, total 208,115. This year through December, 8 projects had 155,100 direct, 29,262 IDC, total 184,726. There have been several other projects opened very recently that did not have expenses as of the end of Dec. Hope this helps; give me a call at 1123 if you need more specifics. Don.

	Direct	Indirect	Total	Allocated
91/92	96,670	19,336	116,006	1500
92/93	174,165	33,950	208,115	1074
93/94	<u>155,100</u>	<u>29,262</u>	<u>184,726</u>	<u> </u>
	425,935	82,548	508,847	2574

Incl - Exec 3/29/94

**Statewide Academic Senate Report
March 10 and 11, 1994**

CHAIR'S REPORT

Chair Goldwhite reported that in early February the campuses were sent initial allocation letters requesting that they plan for a 2.6% reduction in general fund support for the academic year 1994-95. Subsequently new information was received from PERS that indicated that the CSU's contribution to PERS for employee health benefits would not change much from the 1993-94 figure. As a result, in late February Vice Chancellor West sent another request to the campuses asking that modified plans be submitted based on a 1.8% reduction in general fund support. Chair Goldwhite emphasized that these figures are dependant upon many unpredictable variables, such as the funding of earthquake recovery, the possibility of federal support for the state's expenses on illegal aliens, and the rate of economic recovery in California.

Chair Goldwhite also reported that the Executive Committee, acting for the Senate, went on record as supporting the WASC Draft Statement on Diversity. The WASC Commission adapted this statement in February. Although the statement did not address all of the Senate's concerns, many Senators believe that this statement was a major improvement over the previous two drafts. Chair Goldwhite also informed the Senate that WASC is now studying its own functioning, and is rethinking its approach to accreditation. WASC has just distributed a paper "Report on the Future of Self-regulation in Higher-education" which suggests that the focus of accreditation be on the quality of the student's education.

The Senate was informed by Chair Goldwhite that Peter Hoff, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, using Academic Program Improvement (API) funds, and in consultation with the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor and the Executive Council, has begun a systemwide approach to strategic planning to address issues of statewide concern. The method to be used will be to bring together a consortia of campuses to address each of these issues. The four issues identified for the current year are: CSU role in K-12 education improvement; underprepared students; time-to-degree; and peer evaluation of teaching.

MEETING WITH CHANCELLOR MUNITZ

Chancellor Munitz informed the Senate that there is no new information on the CSU budget. The Senate Finance Committee has not planned hearings on our budget until sometime in May. Although we have a budget proposal from the Governor, the Chancellor stated that this document is based on some questionable assumptions. The Chancellor stated that the revenues in the Governor's budget may have been too optimistic. The Chancellor explained that it is not yet clear how the State will fund earthquake recovery. If bonds are to be issued for this endeavor, it makes it unlikely that the CSU will be able to float bonds for capital improvement.

Chancellor Munitz also reported on the Legislative Analyst's review of the state budget. In contrast to the Trustees' request of an undergraduate fee increase of 24% and an additional graduate differential of 5%, the Legislative Analyst is recommending a 10% fee increase for undergraduates and an addition \$250 a year fee increase for graduate students.

FACULTY LIABILITY

Fernando Gomez, General Counsel of the CSU, met with the Senate to discuss the issue of faculty liability. Concern for faculty liability arose out of a case involving the firing of a coach in 1991, who then brought suit charging faculty members with retaliation. The CSU lost the case and there was also a finding of malice for which punitive damages were awarded, with faculty members being individually liable. The CSU is now considering appealing this decision.

The concern for faculty is that the Government Code prohibits the state from paying damages out of state funds if there is finding of fraud, corruption or malice. Mr. Gomez informed the Senate that the Trustees were giving this matter their highest priority, and are seeking insurance to protect faculty in these matters.

MEETING WITH VICE CHANCELLOR WEST

The Senate met with Richard West, Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance. The Senate was informed that there were both internal and external pressures to redesign the CSU's budget process. Vice Chancellor West also informed us that the budget process this year was extremely complicated because it is an election year. Although the Governor's budget called for the CSU to get a modest increase and receive more control over its finances, the figures used may be optimistic. The Legislature seems unwilling to make any concrete decisions until after the elections in June. Vice Chancellor West predicted that following the election there would be a frantic two-week effort to get a budget in place.

COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS

The Senate was given a memorandum by June M. Cooper, Vice Chancellor of Human Resources and Operations, detailing compensation increases.

Merit Salary Adjustments (MSAs) for faculty (Unit 3) and Physicians (Unit 1) will be processed during the March pay period and will be paid on April 1, 1994. MSAs for other employees (Units 2,4,5,6,7,8,9, and C99, E99 employees) will be processed during the April pay period and paid on May 1, 1994.

General Salary Increases of 3% for employees in Units 1,2,3,4,5,7 and 9 and C99 and E99 employees will be processed during the April pay period and paid on May 1, 1994.

Min - Exec Com 3/29/94

To: Oversight Committee

March. 26, 1994

From: Jack Wilson, Member

Subject: Role of Faculty in University Governance and Policy Making

There is unanimous agreement among all parties that governance is the key issue in developing a charter campus draft. Almost everything hinges on governance. For example academic programs are and will always be influenced by who governs the university. It is instructive then to consider first what is presently meant by governance and then what governance might become for a charter campus.

PRESENT SYSTEM OF CAMPUS GOVERNANCE

First of all campus governance may be defined as the sharing of power between and among various campus constituencies. Presently the final say on this campus, as well as any university campus in the U.S. rests with the president. Faculty acting through their departments and colleges and through the campus academic senate share in the governance of the campus on those issues which may be defined as involving the 'performance of the educational mission' of the campus. The results of faculty and senate deliberations on such matters are only advisory to the president. He has the final say. The state-wide academic senate functions similarly in an advisory capacity to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees of The California State University system (the CSU).

Although advisory, recommendations by the faculty and academic senate carry significant influence as their responsibility in governance is written into law through The Higher Education Employee-Employer Relations Act (HEERA) which made collective bargaining possible.

Following are quotes from sections of HEERA - which is the law that governs employee-employer relations in California higher education. Section 3561 of HEERA states "The legislature recognizes that joint decision making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of such institutions....". Clearly this establishes the faculty as being responsible, along with the administration, for the educational mission of the university.

Further from Section 3562; "Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to restrict, limit or prohibit the full exercise of the functions of the faculty in any shared governance...including the academic senate..". This section goes on to say "The scope of representation (those matters subject to collective bargaining) shall not include...admission requirements for students, conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students, and the content and conduct of course, curricula, research programs, criteria and standards to be used for the appointment, promotion, evaluation

, and tenure of academic employees, which shall be the joint responsibility of the academic senate and the trustees." It says further "If the trustees withdraw any matter in this paragraph from the responsibility of the academic senate, the matter shall be within the scope of representation (subject to collective bargaining)". Note that the trustees authorize the campus presidents to act in their behalf.

Clearly HEERA in Section 3562 recognizes the responsibility of the academic senate in both campus governance and policy dealing with the educational mission of the university which includes: (1) academic programs including: (a) curricula, (b) content and conduct of courses and (c) admission as well as graduation requirements, (2) research programs and (3) criteria and standards to be used for the appointment, promotion and evaluation of tenure for faculty. Thus in the CSU there is a domain of governance clearly defined by law in which the faculty share responsibility with the campus president and the chancellor. This domain is similar for any university in America.

Students and staff are not mentioned in the governance section of HEERA Section 3562. Why is this? It is much more than simply being the way its always been done. And in no way does it denigrate the importance of students without which there is no need for a university, or the staff without whom this university could not function.

What is the reasoning behind the present governance structure?

What do students hope to achieve while in college? There are probably a number of goals, but two are mentioned frequently. First, and the order of importance can be argued, an education is recognized as being necessary to make it into the middle class. That is many see education as the ticket to a good job and career. A recent poll of Californians concerning higher education named it as the number one reason for getting a college degree. The second reason is of course to prepare the graduate to become a more responsible citizen than she/he might have been without going to college. This is extremely important of course.

Everyone associated with the university understands that not all of a student's education occurs in the classroom. This is especially true at Cal Poly. The over 400 student clubs and ASI and all of their functions are an important part of the education for many students here. Each of those clubs and organizations has to have either a faculty or staff advisor. The extracurricular and cocurricular activities that abound on this campus are an important part of the education of many Cal Poly students.

But academic programs are the heart and soul of any university and Cal Poly is no exception. In the 1989 SNAPS poll taken of Cal Poly students, they listed the reputation of academic programs as the number one reason for matriculating at Cal Poly. One of my mechanical engineering students, who happens to be Mexican-American, related to

me how his high school counselor advised him not to consider college. A few years later upon being accepted here, he went into the counselor's office waving his acceptance notice and stated "Look here, I've been accepted at Cal Poly"! He emphasized Cal Poly. This is only an anecdotal story. Yet I have heard similar stories from numerous Cal Poly students over the years. Cal Poly has a deservedly excellent reputation. Certainly not all of the credit for the success of our academic programs is due to the faculty; excellent students, a dedicated staff and a highly competent administration are essential. But the curricular and peer responsibility of the faculty is central to the university's educational achievements.

Obviously it goes without saying, even if HEERA didn't spell it out, the decisions made regarding academic programs, including curricula and content and conduct of course, research programs, admission as well as graduation requirements and criteria and standards to be used for the appointment, promotion and evaluation of tenure for faculty (all listed in HEERA as the responsibility of the faculty in conjunction with the trustees of the CSU) are a major portion of the governance system of the university. Presently the faculty and the senate through its committees exercises their responsibilities in these areas.

In summary the legislature, in adopting HEERA, recognized the responsibility that the faculty and academic senate must shoulder in governance and the important policy decisions of public higher education. Clearly the faculty and the academic senate at Cal Poly have not taken full advantage of the power afforded to them by HEERA. However, they have acted responsibly in discharging those functions they have chosen to pursue.¹

GOVERNANCE ON A CHARTER CAMPUS

The executive committee of the academic senate believes that the governance responsibilities of the faculty and academic senate spelled out in HEERA Section 3562 cannot be shared with the students or staff at Cal Poly. I would suspect that the Cal Poly faculty are nearly unanimous in agreement with this stand.

However, there are other areas which are adjunct to the 'performance of the educational mission', not spelled out in HEERA and not under the purview of collective bargaining, which are of mutual interest to students, faculty and staff. Conceivably all three of these constituent groups should share with the administration in decision making involving these areas in a charter campus situation. A charter campus might include flexibility in setting student fees and obviously students should have much to say about this. Parking is another issue that affects all constituents at Cal Poly. Input into issues of campus

¹ See the Appendix for elaboration on the reasoning behind the faculty responsibilities for governance spelled out in HEERA Section 3562.

environment should be shared and policy making which affects the day-to-day functioning of the university is clearly an area of importance to all.

On these adjunct issues, shared decision making is both valuable and necessary.

APPENDIX

REASONS FOR FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY FOR GOVERNANCE AS OUTLINED IN HEERA SECTION 3562

Academic Programs - Academic programs are the province of the faculty, as acknowledged in HEERA, for these reasons. First is the education and training of the faculty. Most tenured faculty here have a PhD and those who don't have a master's degree with substantial years of experience in their field. Today the PhD is required for a person to be hired into a tenure track position. Thus faculty must have invested three to five years of their lives, beyond the master's degree, if they are to be even considered for a faculty position here. The PhD is not merely a hurdle that one must vault if she/he wants to teach at the university level. The awarding of the PhD degree demonstrates that the awardee has undertaken and accomplished a program of study that has required much course work beyond the master's degree and in addition successfully completed original, independent research in their speciality field.

In addition to the added years of schooling required of the PhD, many faculty have years of applied experience in their academic discipline. This may involve working and/or consulting in industry. The added education and the experience are essential to faculty when they develop new courses, select a new textbook for a class, develop a laboratory, and for many other things inherent to being a faculty member. They are essential in determining the material to be covered in a class for instance. For example heat transfer is a required course for most engineering students at Cal Poly. It is a 3 unit course and the text used has enough material for at least 2 three units courses. Thus the faculty member must pick the most essential material from the text. That could not be done without having taken two or three graduate course in heat transfer plus having had enough experience to determine how heat transfer might be used by students when they graduate. The insights gained in their education and experiences make faculty uniquely qualified to determine academic program content and structure and how a course should be conducted.

The third reason that faculty must have the responsibility for academic programs is that they bring continuity to the decision making that affect programs. Faculty with 10, 15 and even 20 years of experience are not likely to make rash decisions concerning programs since they see the bigger picture afforded only by experience. Someone has said that the weakness of academe is its reluctance to change, and that its strength is that same reluctance to change. The secret is to know when change is needed. Academic programs continually change in an orderly and thoughtful manner. If you look at the academic programs of 20 years ago at Cal Poly, you would find that they are significantly different from those of today. Today's Cal Poly education is more rigorous and sounder. Faculty cannot afford to become complacent about academic

programs. Suppose, for example, that the faculty in a department in one of the technical colleges offering a program leading to an undergraduate degree become complacent. That is they don't stay attuned to the changes taking place in the industry in which their graduates will work. As a result their graduates are no longer sought after by that industry. The faculty would have failed in their responsibility to their customers; the students, the people of California and the companies who hire their graduates. And not incidentally, the program would be in danger of being discontinued with the resulting loss of faculty and staff jobs.

Responsibility means that those responsible share not only in the success of their decisions, but also must bear the responsibility for any failures. Responsibility for academic programs must rest with those who will be around to see the results of their decisions. And that is why students, although they are the ones most effected, are excluded from responsibility for academic programs. However having responsibility does not mean that they shouldn't have input. They should.

How do the faculty here at Cal Poly exercise their responsibility for academic programs and what part does the academic senate play? Any proposed new course, or a proposed change in curriculum (all such proposals emanate from the faculty at the department level) for a certain major must first be reviewed by the Curriculum Committee of the senate. If a proposal involves general education, that proposal will be referred to the General Education Committee of the senate. Then when those two committees have reached a recommendation, they bring it to the senate for its consideration. It is an involved and time consuming process but one which works quite well due to the dedication of those two committees.

Admission And Graduation Requirements - Admission requirements for students are the responsibility, along with the trustees, of the faculty at Cal Poly. This is spelled out in HEERA because it is the only logical possibility. There are general admission requirements that the CSU imposes. Beyond those, the campus has Multiple Criteria Admissions (MCA) requirements that are partially determined by the colleges and sometimes departments within the colleges. The math requirements of a student matriculating in engineering are quite different, by necessity, than a student matriculating in the College of Agriculture or the College of Liberal Arts. Only faculty can determine what the curricular admission requirements need be for their program. That determination is based on their education and training, their experience and their knowledge of accreditation requirements for a particular program. Although accreditation speaks to the curricula required of a student while at Cal Poly, students matriculated here without the proper course work, spelled out in the MCA requirement, would at the least be slowed considerably in their progress towards graduation.

Graduation requirements, also spelled out in HEERA as the joint responsibility of the faculty and the trustees, result from a number of concurrent requirements. For example

the General Education requirements are spelled out in general by the CSU. The CSU sets down the number of GE&B units required and the general categories. The faculty then determine how the campus will meet those general requirements while infusing a campus flavor into it. The General Education and Breath Committee of the Academic Senate is in the process this year of taking a fresh look at the General Education program at Cal Poly. When they have completed their work they will submit their recommendations to the Academic Senate for consideration. Any changes that might be recommended by the senate would be submitted to the president for his consideration. Final approval rests with him.

Other graduation requirements include those inherent with a particular discipline and are generally divided between major course requirements and support course requirements. In many majors accreditation agencies dictate many of the requirements in both of those categories. Additional requirements are determined by faculty based on their education and experience.

Research - Research policy has been identified by HEERA as the responsibility of the Academic Senate (in conjunction with the trustees of the CSU). Research is the word that automatically comes to mind when the term faculty scholarship is mentioned. However, faculty scholarship is not limited to research. Furthermore President Baker has stated that Cal Poly faculty should keep their teaching mission first and foremost in mind as they plan their research. At this campus, which stresses undergraduate programs, research must complement the undergraduate teaching mission which is the only reason for our existence. The Research Committee of the Academic Senate functions to do the groundwork for the senate on research issues. It is comprised of faculty who are among the most actively involved in research on campus. Thus they bring to this important committee their own substantial personal experience which enables them to function effectively.

Appointment, Promotion and Evaluation of Faculty - Finally HEERA identifies criteria and standards for appointment, promotion and evaluation of faculty as being the responsibility of the faculty and the CSU trustees. This is a faculty, not an Academic Senate, responsibility. Students are a part of the evaluation process at Cal Poly by way of student evaluations of instructors.

Academic programs encompasses more than just curricula and content and conduct of courses. It also is directly affected by admission and graduation requirements, criteria and standards used for appointment, promotion and evaluation of tenure for faculty and of course faculty professional development. The linkages are obvious.

For example diversity is an area which is extremely important to academic programs. The Multiple Criteria Admission requirements which determine who will gain admittance to Cal Poly give bonus points to underrepresented minorities in recognition

of the need to increase diversity on campus. Since admission policy is the joint responsibility for the academic senate and the trustees, diversity also falls under the purview of the academic senate.

Faculty Record in Exercising Their Governance Responsibilities - What is the record of Cal Poly faculty in their decision making regarding academic programs? If the success of Cal Poly's graduates is any measure, and it is, then the faculty here have been extremely successful in tailoring the academic programs to meet the needs of the state. Cal Poly's graduates have been highly sought after by industry. They have been very successful in gaining admittance to law and med schools as well as graduate programs at other institutions. And even in these extremely difficult economic times, Cal Poly's graduates in general are doing better than those from most other universities in the state. And we know that in some fields our graduates are competitive in the job market with those from U.C. Berkeley and Stanford. Of course the students themselves have much to do with this. They are the best in the CSU.

In recent ratings of colleges and universities by U.S. News and World Report, Cal Poly was second among comprehensive universities in the West in the important areas of academic reputation and student demand. We ranked 11th in the West when resources, in which we were dead last among the top 60 comprehensive universities in the U.S., were taken into account. If U.S. News's ratings are accurate, and using as a measure of effectiveness the ratio of academic reputation plus student demand over resources, Cal Poly is the paradigm for comprehensive universities in the U.S.!

Thus the results show that Cal Poly faculty, building upon the university's long history of making undergraduate education its highest priority, have established an excellent, and highly enviable track record in developing and maintaining high quality academic programs for undergraduates. Could they be improved? Certainly. But these difficult financial times also portends the real possibility that program quality may slide. Faculty, students, staff and the administration here would not want that to happen. We all want to see our graduates have the opportunity for good careers as well as being prepared to function as responsible citizens in the state, nation and world.