

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

**Executive Committee Agenda**  
**Thursday, March 20, 1986**  
**FOB 24B, College Hour (11:00am)**

<u>MEMBER:</u>	<u>DEPT:</u>	<u>MEMBER:</u>	<u>DEPT:</u>
Ahern, James	Ag Mgmt	Kersten, Timothy	Economics
Bonds, Robert	LAC	Labhard, Lezlie*	Home Econ
Botwin, Michael	Arch Engr	Lamouria, Lloyd H.	Ag Engr
Cooper, Alan F.	Biology	Olsen, Barton	History
Fort, Tomlinson Jr.	Adm	Riener, Kenneth	Bus Admin
Gamble, Lynne E.	Library	Tandon, Shyama	EL/EE
Gooden, Reg H. Jr.	Political Sci	Terry, Raymond	Mathematics
Hallman, Barbara	History		

\*for Larry Gay on leave Winter '86

**Copies:** Baker, Warren J.  
 Irvin, Glenn W.

*minutes removed*

- I. Minutes: Approval of the February 25, 1986 Executive Committee Minutes (attached pp. 3-7)
- II. Announcements:
- III. Reports
  - A. President/Provost
  - B. Statewide Senators
- IV. Business Items:
  - A. UPLC Report - Terry (Chair, UPLC).
  - B. GE&B Report - Lewis (Chair, GE&B) (attached pp. 8-15).
 

AE 121	Agricultural Mechanics
CONS 120	Fisheries and Wildlife Management
FOR 201	Forest Resources
HE 203	Consumer Role of the Family
HE 331	Household Equipment
Bio Proposal	Re ENT/CONS Prefixes
  - C. Select nominee(s) for Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs.  
 (Senate has a March 21 reply deadline.) Some names which have been mentioned:
 

Busselen, Harry	Gordon, Raymond	Mark, Walter	Valpey, Robert
Coe, Robert	Horton, William	Pohl, Jens	Walch, David
Ericson, Jon	Jones, Hazel	Rife, Bill	Wilson, Malcolm
Gooden, Reg	Lebens, Frank	Simmons, James	

It has been mentioned numerous times that the Interim Vice President should not be a candidate for the permanent position for the following possible reasons:

1. The incumbent tends to have an advantage;
  2. Possible conflict-of-interest (feathering one's own bed);
  3. Attendant feeling of depression and rejection if not appointed to the permanent position.
- D. Research Committee - SOSAM recommended replacement for Goro Kato.
- E. Curriculum Committee - SAGR Caucus recommends Gaston Amedee to replace Kenneth Kline.
- F. Response to President Baker's Fall Address from Long Range Planning Committee (attached p. 16).

V. Discussion Items:

VI. Adjournment:

GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH PROPOSAL

1. PROPOSER'S NAME George Brown	2. PROPOSER'S DEPT. Agricultural Engr.
3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable) F.2.	
4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format) AE 121 - Agricultural Mechanics (2) Identification and use of tools and materials; tool sharpening and care; concrete mixes and materials; simple electric wiring; metal work; pipe fitting; basic woodworking; estimating quantities and costs. 1 lecture, 1 laboratory.	
5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS  Approves.	
6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS  Approves      6-0-0	
7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION	

GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH PROPOSAL

1. PROPOSER'S NAME Biological Sciences Department	2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.
3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable) F.2.	
4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format) CONS 120 - Fisheries and Wildlife Management (3) Survey of fisheries and wildlife resources and management practices. Relationships to recreational values, land management, food production, and preservation. 3 lectures.	
5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS  Approves.	
6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS  Approves 6-0	
7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION	

GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH PROPOSAL

1. PROPOSER'S NAME NRM Department	2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.
3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable) F.2.	
4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format) FOR 201 - Forest Resources (3)  Overview of forest resources including basic management, fire protection, and multiple use of forest, woodland, and chaparral lands for water production, forage, recreation, wildlife, timber, energy and urban forest values. Three lectures.	
5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS  Approves.	
6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS  Approves 8-0	
7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION	

GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH PROPOSAL

1. PROPOSER'S NAME Barbara P. Weber	2. PROPOSER'S DEPT. Home Economics
3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable) D.4.b.	
4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format) HE 203 - Consumer Role of the Family (3) Study of the individual and family as consumers in the marketplace. Sources of consumer protection and recourse. Influence of selected management concepts on consumption patterns. 3 lectures.	
5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS Against. See attached sheet.	
6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS Against 0-6-0	
7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION	



To: ✓ George Lewis, Chair  
GE&B Committee

January 13, 1985

From: Area D. 4.b. Subcommittee (Burton, Culver, Harris, Preston)

Subj: Evaluation of Home Economics 203

Our Subcommittee has reviewed the appropriateness of HE 203 (Consumer Role of the Family) for insertion into Area D.4.b in the General Education and Breadth curriculum. We recommend against this course in D.4.b based upon our evaluation of the support materials provided to you in Dr. Barbara Weber's memorandum of 21 October 1985.

Specifically, we note the following in our opposition to the course:

1. This course fails to meet the requirement of Area D as established in E.O. 338. It does not adequately address the interwoven nature of "human social, political and economic institutions and behavior" and it makes no effort to examine issues in a non-western context;
2. This course does not meet the Cal Poly GE&B Knowledge and Skills Statement requirements that concern (a) examination of the forces which shape institutions other than our own, (b) recognition of the interaction of communities and institutions, and (c) consideration of the geographical and cultural diversity of the world.

**Comment:** According to the clearly stated content and goals of Home Economics 203, the course is designed to increase the consumptive awareness of the American citizen. Essentially the course endeavors to help "...the consumer develop an individual consumer perspective, an awareness of sources of consumer protection and recourse, and a broad base of general information to apply management concepts to consumptive patterns." This effort directed at contemporary American consumers does not qualify as a candidate for inclusion in area D.4.b. Home Economics 203 does not examine problems in their contemporary as well as historical setting. It does not include both western and non-western contexts and fails to reflect the fact that human social, political and economic institutions and behavior are inextricably interwoven. Indeed if Home Economics 203 attempted to satisfy the criteria outline above it would (by its own definition) fail to achieve its stated goals and totally diminish the worthiness of the course to any contemporary American consumer. It is primarily a single issue course and must remain that way in order to fulfill its stated design. As such, Home Economics 203 simply does not qualify in Area D.4.b which is inherently broad based and represents an entirely different realm of study.

GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH PROPOSAL

<p>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</p> <p>Barbara P. Weber</p>	<p>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</p> <p>Home Economics</p>
<p>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)</p> <p>F.2.</p>	
<p>4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)</p> <p>HE 331 - Household Equipment (4)</p> <p>Principles involved in construction, operation, energy consumption, selection, safety, and space utilization of household equipment. 3 lectures, 1 two-hour laboratory. Prerequisite: Junior standing.</p>	
<p>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</p> <p>Approves, with the recommendation that Home Economics majors not be allowed to use this course to satisfy F.2.</p>	
<p>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</p> <p>Approves 5-0-3</p> <p>Some members of the committee expressed reservations about the upper division status of this course.</p>	
<p>7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</p>	



PROPOSAL FORM AND ATTACHMENTS

GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH PROPOSAL

1. PROPOSER'S NAME Biological Sciences Department	2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.
3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable) B.1.b.	
4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format) To include ENT. and CONS. in the specific prefixes cited in Area B.1.b.	
5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS  Against (unanimous)	
6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS  Against. Committee divided the question:  ENT. 1-6-1 CONS. 2-6-1	
7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION	

The Biological Sciences Department proposes that the GE&B display in the next catalog be modified to include a parenthetical <sup>-15-</sup>ent listing the specific prefixes that define the term "life science." The proposed revision would read: Any 300-level life science course (i.e., with a BACT, BIO, BOT, CONS, ENT, or ZOO prefix) having one of the above as a prerequisite may also be selected with the exception of BIO 321, 342. (The added parenthetical statement has been underlined for clarity.)

In March of 1985 the GE&B Subcommittee for Area B, chaired by Dr. Mueller, directed its attention to the vague wording of GE&B, B.1.b. in the 1984 - 1986 catalog. This

committee elected to define "life science" as those courses having "one of the prefixes: BACT, BIO, BOT or ZOO." The Bio Sci Department offers several 300-level life science courses having either an ENT or a CONS prefix. All of these courses are acceptable alternatives for Area B.1.b.

The effect of the present proposal would be to enlarge the 300-level life science courses offered by the Bio Sci Department that satisfy the GE&B Area B (B.1.b) requirements.

From : Jim Mueller, Chair *JM*  
GE & B Subcommittee for Area B

Subject: Biological Science Department: Second Proposal

A meeting of the GE & B Area B subcommittee was held on November 6, 1985 to consider a request from the Biological Science Department to revise the definition of "life science" under GE & B guidelines in the catalog. Present at the meeting were Jim Mueller, Tina Bailey, Don Morgan, and John Pohling.

The proposed revision would expand the definition of "life science" for GE & B to include 300-level courses having the prefixes CONS or ENT. The subcommittee's vote was to deny the request. Our feeling was that courses with these prefixes do not carry the spirit of general education in Area B. Documentation supporting this view can be found in GE & B notes #3, 10/19/81, from the Academic Affairs Office of the Chancellor:

Courses utilized to address understanding of science should be selected with an eye to exposing students to broad concepts and principles. Highly specialized and "how to" courses would not be expected to achieve the objectives of imparting "knowledge of the facts and principles which form the foundation of living and non-living systems" as well as exposing students to the methodologies of science and their limitations.

We reaffirm our decision of April 4, 1985 that the catalog read under GEB B.1.b.: Any 300-level life science course (i.e., with a BACT, BIO, BOT, or ZOO prefix) having one of the above as a prerequisite may also be selected with the exception of BIO 321, 342.

# Memorandum

Lloyd Lamouria, Chair  
Academic Senate

Date : 18 February 1986

File No.:

Copies :

From : Long Range Planning Committee *SPF*  
Subject : Response to President Baker's Fall Address

In response to your memo of January 22, 1986, concerning our views on President Baker's fall address on the future Cal Poly, the committee strongly endorses the goals outlined in that statement. There is nothing in the statement that is inconsistent with our thinking. The committee does, however, have some questions about the mechanisms needed to accomplish the goals laid out by the President. While the goals are ones to which we can all subscribe, the day to day operations at all levels of the university are not always consistent with the President's statement. We feel that more specifics are needed concerning the intermediate steps that can guide day to day decisions.

The committee feels that more specifics are also needed regarding how a plan will be developed to follow through on the President's initiative. For example, the organization of the university's planning process needs to be further clarified. Our resolution last spring asked that the President designate a single administrator to take charge of the strategic planning process, but we are unclear as to who this individual is. The resolution also suggested that the President or his representative should brief the Senate or the Executive Committee this winter on progress made in developing a plan to guide the university into the next decade. Such a briefing would also provide an opportunity to deal with the specifics that are needed to accomplish the goals laid out by the President. Again the committee endorses the goals laid out by the President, but feels that it is now time to focus on specific actions which will help to accomplish the goals he laid out.

In terms of actions that the Executive Committee can take, the Long Range Committee strongly recommends an opinion survey be conducted to identify the views of the faculty regarding the future development of Cal Poly. We also suggest that the Executive Committee solicit suggestions from the various standing committees regarding particular concerns they have regarding the future of the university.

draft.SPFI

# Memorandum

: Academic Senate via  
Academic Senate Executive Committee

Date : 3/17/86

File No.:

Copies : Tomlinson Fort, Jr.

From : Raymond D. Terry  
Chair: UPLC

Subject: Recommendations for Changes in the  
"Leave With Pay Guidelines"

During the period February 17, 1986 through March 14, 1986 the UPLC carried out its annual review of school, Library and UPLC procedures and criteria. The UPLC is now prepared to recommend certain changes in UPLC procedures, criteria and the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications.

Background No. 1: The University temporarily departed from school / Library quotas for sabbaticals in 1984 and 1985. In the period before this, school quotas were computed so as to result in a proportional allocation to each school, based on the ratio of eligible faculty in each school to the total eligible in the University. The UPLC, in its effort to restore the status quo recommended Senate adoption of Sect. F.4.b of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines," which was excerpted from a 1980 version of CAM. We subsequently learned that the initial distribution to each school and the Library of one sabbatical leave, as specified in the LWPG's, had not been in effect for some time. The UPLC seeks now to remedy this error by recommending Senate adoption of

\*Amendment No. 1: On Page 4 of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines" Item F.4.b. shall be changed to read:

"F.4.b. The sabbatical leave allocation shall be distributed according to the ratio of eligible faculty members in the respective schools and the Library to the total eligible in the University."

Background No. 2: The term of office for each elected UPLC member is two years. Each year half of the UPLC's elected members are subject to (re)election, resulting in a balance of continuity and change. However, due to a variety of reasons, the UPLC is faced with the election this May of six positions; four two-year terms and two one-year terms. To provide additional continuity, especially when more than half the UPLC is replaced, the UPLC proposes:

\*Amendment No. 2: On Page 3 of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines" Item A.4. shall be added.



<sup>4</sup>  
"A.2. The immediate Past Chair of the UPLC shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the UPLC."

Background No. 3: Often an unsuccessful applicant for a sabbatical later requests a change from a sabbatical leave to a difference-in-pay leave. Infrequently, a request is made to change from a difference-in-pay leave to a sabbatical leave. Such a request was made in Feb. 1985 and was denied on the grounds that the prioritized list of 44 sabbaticals had already been determined. In accord with the 1984-1985 procedures, determining the position of a new application would have necessitated redoing the entire ranking process. One suggested remedy is for each SPLC (LPLC) to submit a common priority list of both sabbatical and difference-in-pay leaves. The UPLC rejects this solution and recommends instead

\*Amendment No. 3: Requests by an applicant for a change from a difference-in-pay (sabbatical) leave to a sabbatical (difference-in-pay) leave may not be made after the professional leave applications have been forwarded to the UPLC (circa January 8).

Background No. 4: Each year one or more successful applicants for a sabbatical are led to decline the offer, sometimes to pursue activities which may benefit the University even more than completion of the intended sabbatical. In such cases, the President /Provost often postpones the sabbatical to a subsequent year, without requiring the applicant to reapply and /or be re-ranked. On the one hand, this seems acceptable and even desirable. However, the mandated postponement of a sabbatical has adverse consequences for new applicants of the school (Library) involved and is in conflict with Art. 27.8 of the MOU. The UPLC proposes the following

\*Amendment No. 4: Each SPLC (LPLC) should revise its "Procedures and Criteria for the Evaluation of Sabbatical and Difference-in-Pay Leaves" document so as to permit (or not to permit) the carry-over of postponed sabbaticals to the following year (without reapplication). Such a carry-over, if permitted, will effectively reduce the school's (Library's) quota with regard to new applications in the subsequent year. The application, if carried over, shall be forwarded to the UPLC for review and comparison in the light of new applications.

\*\*Amendment No. 4': If the President or his designee awards a sabbatical to one or more individuals, the number of such awarded sabbaticals shall be subtracted from the total sabbatical application prior to determining the quotas for each school and the Library, as specified in Section F.4.

Background No. 5: Each year the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications needs to be adjusted slightly to account for dates which fall on weekends or holidays. The UPLC proposes

\*Amendment No. 5: The Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications [LWPG, Page 6] shall contain the following statement:

"Note: Whenever one of the above dates falls on a weekend or holiday, that deadline is extended to the next regularly-scheduled workday."

Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications

- October 15 - Leave with pay eligibility lists are distributed and deadlines are announced by the Personnel Office. School deans / Library Director advise department heads and department heads notify eligible employees of eligibility and deadlines.
- November 1 - Candidates are responsible for submitting applications for leaves with pay to department heads.
- November 9 - Applications are forwarded to school deans / Library Director with department heads' recommendations following consultation with departmental faculty. The department shall provide a statement to the appropriate administrator regarding the possible effect on the curriculum and the operation of the department should the employee be granted a leave with pay. (MOU 27.6 & 28.8)
- November 15 - Applications are forwarded to the SPLC's / LPLC by the school deans / Library Director.
- Nov 15/Dec14 - SPLC's and the LPLC review applications and interview all leave with pay applicants.
- December 17 - Priority lists recommended by the SPLC's / LPLC are forwarded to the school deans / Library Director.
- January 10 - School deans / Library Director forward a copy of their recommendations and priority lists, the SPLC/ LPLC recommendations, all applications, and a report of the criteria and procedures followed in the recommendation process to the UPLC via the Provost.
- Jan 11/Feb14 - UPLC reviews school / library procedures and criteria for compliance, reviews applications, and develops a priority ranking of all applicants. Recommendations on priority are forwarded to the Provost by Feb. 14.
- February 25 - The Provost notifies applicants of action on applications; such actions are subject to fiscal appropriations which are proposed for inclusion in the budget.
- Feb 25/Mar25 - UPLC recommends changes in school / library procedures and criteria to the Provost with a copy to the appropriate school deans/ Library Director. The UPLC recommends to the Chair of the Academic Senate and to the Provost any changes in its procedures, criteria or the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications.