

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - AGENDA

February 21, 1984

FOB 24-B

3:00 PM

Chair, Jim Simmons
Vice Chair, Barbara Weber
Secretary, Charlie Crabb

- I. Minutes
- II. Announcements
- III. Business Items
 - A. Foreign Language Requirement Response
 - B. Reorganization Process
 - C. Role of Senate in Collective Bargaining Context
- IV. Discussion Items

Memorandum

To : William E. Vandament, Acting Provost
and Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
The California State University
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802

Date : February 15, 1984

File No.:

Copies : Warren Baker
School Deans
James Simmons
Malcolm Wilson
Robert Bess

From : Tomlinson Fort, Jr.
Provost

Subject: Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo's Response to the Proposed
CSU Foreign Language Graduation Requirement

Since receiving the Report of the CSU Task Force on Foreign Language Requirement which was sent to us from your office on September 20, 1983, and your memorandum to the Presidents on the same subject, dated November 21, 1983, the proposal to establish a foreign language graduation requirement has received much attention on our campus. Thinking has been led by the Head of our Foreign Languages Department, Dr. William Little, who presented a modified proposal to our Academic Deans' Council, and by the Instruction Committee of our Academic Senate. After much discussion and debate, both the Deans' Council and Academic Senate voted against a foreign language requirement as a necessity for graduation from Cal Poly.

These negative votes need to be seen in the proper context. There is a quite general acknowledgement of the importance of foreign language competency by concerned individuals on our campus. However, it is felt that the imposition of a new requirement just after the establishment of a general education program (which was not easy here) is ill timed. The feeling is that foreign languages needed to be considered in the context of general education. In the time available, there was no consensus about what modifications in the general education program would be necessary to accommodate foreign language instruction.

A second issue is that many of the professional programs at Cal Poly would benefit most from having instructions in non-traditional foreign languages, such as Japanese and Chinese. Our increasing involvement in international agriculture would make African languages important for some students. It was not felt that our Foreign Language Department could quickly adapt to this kind of instruction.

There was debate about delaying the imposition of a foreign language requirement until 1988 or later. There was also debate about making foreign language competency an entrance requirement for The CSU. This latter concept was generally endorsed.

On balance, the Cal Poly community would like to see discussion of foreign language instruction continue with a view towards making special opportunities available for selected students. However, there is quite general opposition to imposing a general requirement at this time.

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo

RESPONSE TO
Proposal to Establish
FOREIGN LANGUAGE GRADUATION REQUIREMENT

1. Does the Campus agree with the general assumptions and conclusions of the Task Force concerning resources? If not, please provide information to help us understand your analysis.

Cal Poly does not agree with the conclusion that ample instructional capacity exists to support a 2-semester requirement. On the basis of a sample of incoming freshman for Fall Quarter 1982, the Foreign Language Department and Academic Affairs Staff determined that four additional sections of lower division classes would have to be offered, all existing sections would be filled to capacity, and an additional 1.2 positions would be needed to staff the requirement. These findings do not include any additional enrollments from transfer students. Another resource problem at Cal Poly is classroom availability. We currently utilize our lecture and laboratory rooms in excess of system standards, and the additional requirement could impact the classroom resource problem further.

2. Does the campus believe that it possesses the resources necessary to support the proposed requirement? To the extent that shortfall is perceived, could it be overcome? Does the end justify whatever trade-offs or additional resources that might be necessary?

If the requirement were imposed at Cal Poly we would be required to shift resources away from some areas to meet the additional needs in foreign languages. We do not currently have sufficient staffing in foreign languages to support the requirement, even with the most conservative of estimates of resources needs. Since the campus is at its FTE ceiling, FTE would have to be shifted to allow for an increase in FTE taught in foreign languages. The shift could be accomplished, but would likely occur at the expense of areas where extra efforts have just recently been made to increase availability of instruction, such as business, engineering, and computer science. From the discussions, motions, and resolutions of the various bodies on campus that have discussed the foreign language requirement, one can only assume that the end does not justify the trade-offs and shifts in resource deployment.

3. If the campus intends to suggest modifications or alternatives to the Task Force's proposal, please comment on the campus resource implications of alternatives.

The campus currently has no specific alternative to propose; however, the faculty and deans in their discussions did realize the importance of consideration of language education for many Cal Poly majors. The general thought is that the faculty in the various degree program areas should be allowed to develop language requirements as they perceive the need in their field. For many of the Cal Poly fields this will not be in the areas of traditional foreign language education nor the languages most commonly available in high schools. Since no specific proposals have been made, no resource implication analysis can be made at this time. When proposals do come from departments and majors, the Academic Affairs Staff does a resource analysis to determine the impacts, and the Academic Senate reviews the proposals.

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo

RESPONSE TO
Proposal to Establish
FOREIGN LANGUAGE GRADUATION REQUIREMENT

4. In addition to recommending a requirement for all baccalaureate graduates, the Task Force reached a number of conclusions concerning the nature of the requirement. Please comment on each of these as set forth on pp 17-18 of the report in items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10.
 1. The conclusion is not agreed with by Cal Poly. All university wide groups which considered the proposal disagreed with this conclusion. All recognize the value of foreign language education; however, all felt the decision should be left up to the faculty in a particular discipline. Many expressed the view that foreign language study might be included as an entrance requirement rather than a graduation requirement. This would allow for advanced training rather than basic.
 2. The campus agrees with this conclusion.
 3. The campus agrees with this conclusion provided the campus is responsible for determining the competency level attained and is free to certify satisfactory completion of course work as attainment of that competency. This would preclude the necessity of a graduation competency exam.
 5. The campus does not agree with this conclusion. The level, if set should be no higher than Level II. The level should not be increased in the future, since resources are not adequate to cover the requirements for achieving Level II.
 6. The campus does not agree with this conclusion. Competency should be certifiable by either examination or certified coursework. The Foreign Language Department at Cal Poly believes satisfactory completion of one year (15 quarter units) of coursework would provide at least Level II competency. There is therefore no need of a qualifying examination for those students.
 8. Cal Poly agrees with this conclusion.
 9. The campus is in disagreement with this conclusion. This conclusion assumes implementation of the Task Force recommendation, to which the campus is opposed. The individual faculty in a discipline are best able to determine the appropriateness of foreign language education requirements. As many of the programs move toward a more international perspective, inclusion of foreign language coursework will be integrated into the curricula and the student motivation for study of the language required will be greater because of the perceived need of that language for a successful career. A mandated requirement will not motivate high level achievement of students who might perceive the requirement as a roadblock and try to get by with the minimum effort and learning possible.

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo

RESPONSE TO
Proposal to Establish
FOREIGN LANGUAGE GRADUATION REQUIREMENT

10. This conclusion has great resource implications at Cal Poly. The issue has been discussed, but no real conclusions on this have been reached. This is an area where campus autonomy would probably be best. Proposals to allow all fifteen quarter units to be included in general education and breadth have been discussed and supported by some.
5. If a requirement were to be instituted, when do you believe it should become effective

The Foreign Language Department proposed implementation for Fall 1988 new students. This recommendation was made on the basis that this would provide time for high school students to incorporate foreign language study into their high school program, and might lessen the resource implications on the CSU campuses.

6. Remaining conclusions (4, 7, 12, 13) involve details of implementation which would be addressed later. You are, however, free to comment on them at this time.
4. The campus is opposed to a required qualifying examination as the only means of certifying competency. If such a systemwide examination is adopted, the resources needed to administer and monitor the examination should be allocated to the campuses. This might require special augmentation of the budget for the CSU by the Legislature. If such an examination must be administered and the results monitored for compliance of graduating students, it must not end up like the Entry Level Mathematics examination, with no resources allocated for support.
7. The Cal Poly Foreign Language Department and the campus would recommend that one year of secondary language study equate to one semester of postsecondary language study and that two years of secondary study equate to two semesters of postsecondary study. If this is not adopted, the resource issue at Cal Poly becomes tremendous. A study of the incoming freshman at Cal Poly for Fall 1982 showed that if three years of secondary study were required to equate with two semesters of postsecondary language study, over 50 percent of the freshman would have to take additional language course work at Cal Poly. This would require further shifts of FTE and faculty resources and further exacerbate the classroom resource limitations.
12. The campus has no position on this conclusion; however, the dropping of the requirement for a qualifying examination would somewhat lessen the workload of the committee.
13. This should be done before a final decision is made on the adoption of the requirement. With their limitations in resources, they may not be able to respond to the increased pressure for more language study. We should not be in the position of dictating their course offerings by the imposition of new requirements without consulting with them first.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

AS-1217-81/EX
March 12-13, 1981

ENDORSEMENT OF THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "RESPONSIBILITIES OF
ACADEMIC SENATES WITHIN A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTEXT"

- WHEREAS, AS 1091, The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) was enacted on September 13, 1978; and
- WHEREAS, The enactment of the collective bargaining legislation necessitates a clarification of the role of academic senates and councils within a collective bargaining context; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges endorse the attached document on "Responsibilities of Academic Senates within a Collective Bargaining Context."

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

May 8, 1981

RESPONSIBILITIES OF ACADEMIC SENATES WITHIN
A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTEXT

I. Collegiality and Collective Bargaining

On September 13, 1978, Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. signed into law AB 1091, The California Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA). (Education Code Section 3560, et. seq.) This legislation provides faculty members of the CSUC an opportunity to determine whether they wish to be represented by an exclusive agent in negotiations on "wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment" (HEERA, Section 3561, r.). This section of the Education Code also specifies the intent of the Legislature to preserve, under collective bargaining, traditional shared governance mechanisms, including consultation, and the principle of peer review in faculty personnel decisions. These intentions are expressed in Section 3561 b. of the HEERA, which reads as follows:

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, and declares that it is the purpose of this act to both preserve and encourage that process. 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 mechanisms or practices including the Academic Senate of the University of California and the divisions thereof, the Academic Senates of The California State University and Colleges, and other faculty councils, with respect to policies on academic and professional matters affecting The California State University and Colleges, the University of California, or Hastings College of the Law. The principle of peer review of appointment, promotion, and retention, and tenure for academic employees shall be preserved.

This document has been prepared to describe the respective responsibilities of the Academic Senate of the CSUC and of local Senates or Councils in this collective bargaining context. The relationships, functions, and responsibilities proposed in this document reflect consideration of HEERA, the Constitution of the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges and tradition and practice in the CSUC.

II. The Traditional Role of the Academic Senate in the CSUC

The Trustees of the California State Colleges approved the Constitution of the Academic Senate on March 8, 1963. Prior to this a majority of the voting faculty at each of a majority of the college campuses had approved the document. Encouragement for the establishment of the systemwide Academic Senate, as well for the creation of an Academic Senate on each campus, came from the Chancellor, members of the Board of Trustees and the California Legislature. The 1961 Legislature adopted Senate Resolution No. 98 and Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 78 requesting the Trustees to establish an Academic Senate at each

college "wherein the faculty members shall be freely elected by their colleagues for the purpose of representing them in the formulation of policy on academic and professional matters." Senate Resolution No. 20, which resolved that the Trustees consider establishing an Academic Senate for the CSUC system, was under discussion in the Senate Rules Committee when the Senate was created in 1963.

An examination of the Constitution of the Academic Senate CSUC, as approved by the Board of Trustees, reveals the official purposes of the Senate:

It shall be the purpose of the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges to serve as the official voice of the faculties of The California State University and Colleges in matters of systemwide concern; to consider matters concerning systemwide policies and to make recommendations thereon; to endeavor to strengthen the Senates and Councils of the several colleges; and to assume such responsibilities and perform such functions as may be delegated to it by the Chancellor or the Trustees of The California State University and Colleges.

Senate participation in academic, professional, and administrative matters during the 18 years of its existence evidences a tradition of shared governance in the CSUC and suggests appropriate responsibilities for the Senate under HEERA. The collective bargaining act makes explicit provision for the preservation of

this tradition and mandates continuing senate involvement in academic and professional matters. (See HEERA, Section 3561 b., cited above.)

III. Academic Senate Participation in Systemwide Governance

The Academic Senate shall continue to serve as the official voice of the faculties in systemwide academic and professional matters (the Constitution of the Academic Senate CSUC, Article 1, Section 1 a.).

The Academic Senate shall be the formal policy-recommending body on such matters and shall also be the primary consultative body on the academic implications of systemwide financial decisions. Normally, recommendations of the Academic Senate shall be addressed to or through the Chancellor.

In respect to systemwide governance, the Academic Senate endorses the following principles:

- A. Criteria and standards to be used for the appointment, promotion, evaluation, and tenure of academic employees shall be the joint responsibility of the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges (HEERA, Section 3562 r.). Criteria and standards determined jointly by the Academic Senate CSUC and the Board of Trustees shall be considered minimal; campus senates/councils may recommend additional criteria and standards.

- B. The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall be consulted on the creation of systemwide and intersegmental committees, conferences, or task forces designed to deal with educational, professional, or academically-related fiscal matters, including the charge and composition of such bodies. The Academic Senate shall be responsible for the selection of faculty representatives to serve on or participate in such bodies.
- C. The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall be the formal policy-recommending body on general, systemwide policy decisions related to the following matters:
- 1) minimum admission requirements for students;
 - 2) minimum conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students;
 - 3) curricula and research programs;
 - 4) minimum criteria and standards to be used for programs designed to enhance and maintain professional competence, including the awarding of academic leaves;
 - 5) systemwide aspects of academic planning.
- D. The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall be consulted on the following:
- 1) systemwide aspects of program review;
 - 2) systemwide aspects of the basic direction of academic support programs;

- 3) systemwide policies governing the appointment and review of presidents and academic administrators.
- 4) policies governing the appointment and review of systemwide executive officers and academic administrators.

The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall not participate in the process of collective bargaining. Normally, matters affecting wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment shall not be considered by the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate shall endeavor to ensure that educational and professional matters do not become subjects of bargaining.

IV. Campus Senate/Council Participation in Governance

The Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges shall have no authority over those matters delegated to the individual campuses by the Chancellor or by the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges. Furthermore, nothing in this document shall be construed to impair the right of academic senates and councils of the several campuses to communicate through appropriate channels with the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, nor to diminish the authority of the campuses and their senates in campus matters of academic/professional criteria and standards.

Because joint decision-making and consultation between administrators and faculty is essential to the performance of the educational missions of The California State University and Colleges, the academic senates/councils of the campuses shall be the primary consultative bodies regarding educational and professional matters delegated to the individual campuses by the Chancellor or by the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges and shall be consulted on fiscal matters which affect the instructional program.

In respect to campus governance, the CSUC Academic Senate endorses the following principles:

- A. Responsibility shall be vested in the faculty or its elected senate/council representatives for:
 - 1) approval of degree candidates;
 - 2) development of policies governing the awarding of grades.
- B. Through the campus academic senates/councils responsibility shall be vested in the faculty or its elected senate/council representatives for developing policies and making recommendations to the campus presidents on the following matters:
 - 1) criteria and standards for the appointment, retention, awarding of tenure, promotion and evaluation of academic employees including preservation of the principle of peer evaluation and provision for the direct involvement of appropriate faculty in these decisions;

- 2) determination of membership in the General Faculty;
- 3) curricular policies, such as admission and degree requirements, approval of new courses and programs, discontinuance of academic programs, and academic standards;
- 4) faculty appointments to institutional task forces, advisory committees, and auxiliary organizations;
- 5) academic standards and academic policies governing athletics.

C. The academic senate/councils shall be the primary source of policy-recommendations to the campus president on decisions related to the following matters:

- 1) establishment of campus-wide committees on academic or professional matters;
- 2) the academic role of the library;
- 3) academic awards, prizes, and scholarships;
- 4) the academic conduct of students and means for handling infractions;
- 5) development of institutional missions and goals.

D. The academic senates/councils shall be consulted by the campus presidents concerning:

- 1) the academic calendar and policies governing the scheduling of classes;
- 2) policies governing the appointment and review of academic administrators.

E. This outline of functions and responsibilities is intended to provide the essentials for a satisfactory system of shared governance but should not necessarily be viewed as a comprehensive enumeration of such functions and responsibilities.