

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

San Luis Obispo, California 93407

ACADEMIC SENATE**FILE COPY****Executive Committee Agenda****Tuesday, March 1, 1988**

UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

<u>Member:</u>	<u>Dept:</u>	<u>Member:</u>	<u>Dept:</u>
Andrews, Charles	Acctg	Lamouria, Lloyd H.	AgEngr
Baldwin, Marylud	Educ	Lutrin, Sam	StLf&Acts
Borland, James	ConstMgt	Peck, Roxy	Stat
Burgunder, Lee	BusAdm	Sharp, Harry	SpCom
Crabb, A. Charles (CH)	CropSci	Terry, Raymond	Math
Forgeng, William	MetEngr	Weatherby, Joseph	PoliSci
Gooden, Reg	PoliSci	Wilson, Malcolm	VPAA
Hellyer, George	AgMgt	Copies: Warren J. Baker	
Kersten, Timothy	Econ	Glenn Irvin	
		Howard West	

- I. Minutes:
Approval of the February 16, 1988 Executive Committee Minutes (pp. 2-4).
- II. Communications:
Memo from Hockaday dated 2/19/88 re Interview Schedules for candidates to the position of Dean, SENG (p. 5).
- III. Reports:
A. President
B. Academic Affairs Office
C. Statewide Senators
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Course Information/Syllabi-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee (p. 6).
B. Resolution on Surveys of Graduates and Employers-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee (p. 7).
C. Resolution on Student Evaluation of Instruction and Instructors-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee (pp. 8-9).
D. Resolution on the Use of the Student Instructional Report-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee (p. 10).
E. Resolution on Common Final Examinations-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee (p. 11).
F. Resolution on Course Evaluations-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee (p. 12).
G. Resolution on Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty-Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee (pp. 13-15).
H. Selection of nominee to the Affirmative Action Faculty Development Program Proposal Review Committee (bring nominations to the meeting).
- VI. Discussion Item:
- VII. Adjournment:

2/16/88
minutes
removed

Memorandum

RECEIVED

To : Distribution List*

FEB 24 1988

Date : February 19, 1988

Academic Senate

File No.:

Copies : Consultative Cmte
Department Heads,
School of Engr
Cheri Lovejoy
CateringFrom : *SA/a*
Stephen Hockaday, Chair
Dean of Engineering Consultative Committee

Subject: Interview Schedules

The Consultative Committee wishes to announce that the first three candidates for the position of Dean of the School of Engineering are scheduled for interview Wednesday and Thursday, February 24 and 25; Monday and Tuesday, February 29 and March 1; and Thursday and Friday, March 3 and 4, 1988.

Enclosed for your information are copies of the interview schedules and abbreviated resumes for Dr. Peter Y. Lee (Interim Dean, School of Engineering, Cal Poly), Dr. Lawrence J. Wolf (Dean of the College of Technology, University of Houston) and Dr. Robert B. Grieves (Dean, College of Engineering, University of Texas at El Paso).

For your information and planning purposes, three additional candidates will be interviewed during the month of March. Schedules will be sent to you within the next two weeks. The Consultative Committee appreciates your help and support in this search. Any scheduling questions can be directed to Cheri Lovejoy of the Personnel Office (ext. 2844).

* President Baker, Malcolm Wilson, Philip Bailey, Harry Busselen, Lark Carter, Day Ding, Jon Ericson, Peter Lee, Kenneth Walters, David Walch, J. Kent Butler, Charlie Crabb, Al Amaral, Doug Gerard, Art Gloster, Lorraine Howard, Jim Landreth, Jan Pieper, Jim Strom, Mike Suess, Stan Van Vleck, Cindee Bennett-Thompson

Adopted: _____

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-____-88/____

RESOLUTION ON
COURSE INFORMATION /SYLLABI

RESOLVED, That during the first week of classes an instructor is to distribute to the class members printed information about the course *, including at least the following items:

1. The instructors's grading policy;
2. Required texts and other materials;
3. Course goals, objectives and requirements;
4. Attendance requirements;
5. Policy on due dates and make-up work;
6. Tentative schedule of examinations; and
7. Policy on retention of exams, especially final exams; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the instructor be encouraged to distribute a syllabus to the class.

* It is understood that circumstances may require a change in the course information and /or syllabus distributed during the first week of a class and this resolution does not preclude such changes, nor is it meant to abridge any principle of academic freedom.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 10, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No

Adopted: _____

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

AS-____-88/____

**RESOLUTION ON
SURVEYS OF GRADUATES AND EMPLOYERS**

- WHEREAS, Surveys of graduates one, five or ten (or more) years following graduation can be a valuable source of information about the effectiveness of the education they received and about areas they believe need improvement; and
- WHEREAS, A similar survey of major employers of Cal Poly graduates can be a valuable source of information about the effectiveness of the education received by Cal Poly graduates; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, That such surveys of Cal Poly graduates and major employers of Cal Poly graduates be carried out (in conjunction with the Alumni Office and the Placement Center) as a department function no less than once every five years; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That the resources necessary to prepare and administer both surveys be supplied by the University, but not from O&E nor instructional budgets.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 5, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-____-88/____

**RESOLUTION ON
STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTORS**

- WHEREAS, Student evaluation of instruction and instructors is presently an integral part of RPT decision making; and
- WHEREAS, The evaluation form is not standard across campus; and
- WHEREAS, Some departments may be using unsound evaluation instruments;
- WHEREAS, The student evaluations so conducted may not be helpful to those evaluated; and
- WHEREAS, Such unsound evaluation instruments may represent indefensible documents in the case of a grievance or law suit;
- WHEREAS, Student evaluation of faculty should be organized in a way that is nonthreatening to faculty and students alike; and
- WHEREAS, A focus on course objectives and the reliability and validity of course examinations should be a prominent feature of student evaluations; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, That all student evaluation instruments include:
1. a quantifiable element;
 2. a significant percentage that is common across the school or university;
 3. some means of evaluating the internal consistency and responsibility of the respondents; and
 4. some means of correlating it with the peer evaluation.

Rejected: 0 Yes, 6 No

Comments. It is not terribly important that the present evaluation forms used are not standard. Each department /school should seek to improve the form it uses, but not necessarily along standardized lines. The Committee agrees with Item #3 of the resolved clause, but believes that item #4 is impossible to achieve.

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

AS-____-88/____

**RESOLUTION ON
THE USE OF THE STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT**

- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate recognizes the importance of developing the educational quality at Cal Poly to its highest degree; and
- WHEREAS, This may be achieved with feedback which is facilitated through an objective course and faculty evaluation; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate believes that the STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT, provided by Educational Testing Services, may fulfill these objectives; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, That the Administration strongly recommend the optional use by the faculty of the STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT to be used in a complementary fashion with the current evaluation system in order to provide faculty with confidential constructive feedback of classroom performance.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 5, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No

Adopted: _____

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-____-88/____

RESOLUTION ON
COMMON FINAL EXAMINATIONS

- WHEREAS, Common final examinations may be a valuable means to measure the effectiveness of instruction; and
- WHEREAS, Common final examinations are used in some departments where multiple sections of a course are taught each quarter and /or principles covered in that course are necessary for subsequent courses;
- WHEREAS, The primary objective of such a common final examination is to determine whether course objectives are being met; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, That all departments consider the development and use of common final examinations in central /core courses; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That the ultimate decision to utilize common final examinations be left to individual departments.

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 10, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-____-88/____

RESOLUTION ON
COURSE EVALUATIONS

- WHEREAS,** Instructors examine their students for mastery of course material as stated in the course objectives in many ways; and
- WHEREAS,** Instructors spend a significant amount of time formulating questions, problems, themes, individual and class projects, and lab experiments for their students; and
- WHEREAS,** Additional time goes into the preparation and evaluation of design projects and senior projects; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED,** That in-service opportunities for the analysis and improvement of evaluation instruments be routinely provided by the University Administration in the form of (but not limited to) consultations, workshops, classess, etc..

Proposed by:
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 10, 1988

Approved: 6 Yes, 0 No

Adopted: _____

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

AS-____-88/____

RESOLUTION ON
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

- WHEREAS, The present guidelines are out-of-date; and
- WHEREAS, The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the California State University and Unit 3 faculty addresses the issue of student evaluation; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That Administrative Bulletin 74-1 be deleted from the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM); and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the new guidelines be included in CAM as Administrative Bulletin 88-____.

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
March 1, 1988

GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

1. Student evaluations will be conducted in accordance with sections 15.14, 15.15, and 15.16 of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between The California State University (CSU) and Unit 3-Faculty.
2. The primary purpose of this student evaluation program is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program at Cal Poly.
3. The results of this student evaluation program will be used for both the improvement of instruction, and in partial substantiation of recommendations in appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion decisions. They will also be considered during the post-tenure peer review process.
4. Annually, a minimum of two (2) classes of each instructor shall participate in this student evaluation program.
5. The student evaluation form and additional procedures used by any department shall be in accordance with these guidelines and shall be endorsed by the department faculty, department head/chair, and dean of the appropriate school. Student opinion regarding the form and additional procedures of any department shall be considered prior to the dean's endorsement through consultation with the student council of the school.
6. The following procedures shall be used in the administration of student evaluations:
 - (a) each department is responsible for providing its faculty with copies of these guidelines and any other procedures covering student evaluation of faculty in order to ensure that proper procedures are followed.
 - (b) 10-20 minutes of class time will be provided by the faculty member for the student evaluation process in each class in which s/he is being evaluated. During this time, the faculty member shall be absent from the classroom.
 - (c) only students officially enrolled in the class will be permitted to participate.
7. Subsequent to the issuance of the grades for the quarter in which a faculty member has been evaluated using this process, the results (as defined in department procedures) of this program shall be made available to the faculty member, his/her department head/chair and the custodian of the faculty member's personnel action file. The results shall be included in the faculty member's personnel action file.
8. If the results of a department's student evaluation form include written comments in addition to quantitative data, then any summary of the written comments must be approved by the faculty member being evaluated. If the faculty member feels that the summary is inaccurate, then all of the written comments shall be placed in the personnel action file.

GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

- I. The primary purpose of student evaluation of faculty is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.
- II. Evaluation Instruments should be developed with emphasis on those factors which students are especially capable of evaluating (e.g. course organization, quality of presentation, grading procedures, examinations, etc.).
- III. All classes (except for individual supervision courses) of every instructor shall participate in the student evaluation of faculty program at least annually.
- IV. Only students officially enrolled in an instructor's class will be permitted to participate in the evaluation. No signature or other methods by which individual students could be identified are to be requested on the evaluation form.
- V. The results of the annual evaluation will be used for both improvement of instruction and in partial substantiation of recommendations on faculty personnel actions regarding promotion, retention and tenure. There will be only one official evaluation required annually.
- VI. Subsequent to the issuance of the grades for the quarter for which the faculty member has been evaluated, the results of the program of student evaluation of faculty shall be made available to the individual faculty member, his tenured colleagues and department head for their deliberations and recommendations regarding personnel actions, and for the individual's aid in improving his performance.
- VII. To allow for obvious lack of similarity of various instructional programs, each of the seven schools shall be entitled to its own evaluation form. Additionally, it might be necessary for a department to develop its own evaluation instrument if its best interests will be served in that manner. The specific form, questions and methods of reporting results for the several types of instruction offered in any individual school or department shall be endorsed by the faculty, department head and dean of that department or school. Student school councils are charged with the responsibility of obtaining representative student opinion which shall be considered in the development of the questionnaire.
- VIII. Each department is responsible for furnishing its faculty with copies of these guidelines as well as with the necessary instructions to insure that proper procedures be followed in the administration of the evaluation. During any one quarter, faculty will provide not more than twenty-five minutes of any one class for the time necessary to complete the evaluation process. During the evaluation process, the instructor shall be absent from the classroom with the evaluation being administered in the classroom by students.

Add-on Agenda Item
for 3/1/88 Executive Committee Meeting

The EOAC is forming a subcommittee to review the Affirmative Action Facilitators program. They have asked the Senate Executive Committee to nominate one faculty member to this subcommittee.

This subcommittee will be meeting twice a month during Spring Quarter.

They will be looking into the present AAF program and how it is working, by:

- Surveying faculty serving as AAF
- Interviewing them possibly
- Asking them how successful they feel the program has been and how it can be improved upon.
- Etc.

At the end of Spring Quarter, The Senate representative will be asked to report back to the Senate with the subcommittee's findings.

Pat Engle
Chair, EOAC
2/29/88