

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California  
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Tuesday, March 1, 1988  
UU 220 3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

I Preparatory:

- A. It was announced that Charlie Andrews would be chairing the meeting.
- B. The minutes of the February 16, 1988 meeting were approved as submitted.

II. Communications:

- A. The memo from Hockaday regarding the interview schedule for candidates for SENG Dean was noted.
- B. Charlie Andrews announced that the members of the Foundation Board had approved the Senate resolution regarding appointment of the faculty representative to the board.

III. Reports:

- A. President: none.
- B. Academic Affairs: none.
- C. Statewide Senators: none.

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

V. Business Items:

- A. Resolution on Course Information/Syllabi  
Ray Terry indicated that this resolution is modeled on a similar resolution passed at Dominguez Hills. The basic idea is that certain items should be spelled out early in the quarter and that they are of sufficient importance that they should be in print.

Members of the Executive Committee suggested that the Instruction Committee check to see whether this represents a change to a policy in CAM and that they be prepared to provide a definition of the term syllabus at the full Senate meeting.

M/S/P (Sharp, Forgeng) to place this item on the agenda of the next Senate meeting as a first reading item.

- B. Resolution on Surveys of Graduates and Employers  
Ray Terry indicated that this resolution responds to part 3 of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment. The Instruction Committee has made some changes to the recommendations in the report.

Some comments from members of the Executive Committee were:

Wilson: Malcolm suggested that the committee may want to consider deleting the last phrase about not using funds from O&E or instructional budgets.

Sharp: Harry suggested that although we may want departments to survey graduates, we may want the survey of employers to be done on a university-wide basis.

Burgunder: Lee suggested that the first resolved could be made more specific as to what the goals are. Other members of the Executive Committee concurred.

M/S/P (Terry, Burgunder) to refer this resolution back to committee.

C. Resolution on Student Evaluation of Instruction and Instructors

Ray Terry stated that this was taken directly from the section on student evaluation in the Ad Hoc Committee's report. The Senate Instruction Committee rejected this resolution. They did not feel that uniform evaluation would be beneficial.

M/S/P (Terry, Borland) to not place this item on the Senate agenda.

D. Resolution on the Use of the Student Instructional Report

Ray Terry indicated that this resolution is a response to a resolution from the Student Senate (ASI 88-11). It calls for the SRI form to be used optionally in quarters when the RPT evaluation process is not being used. It would be completely confidential with results sent to the instructor only. The information could not be used against an instructor in a formal evaluation.

Harry Sharp suggested that the wording of the resolved be changed to state that the Senate (rather than the Administration) is the recommending body.

M/S/P to place this item on the agenda of the next Senate meeting as a first reading item.

E. Resolution on Common Final Examinations

Ray Terry indicated that he thinks this will be a controversial item. The resolution says that departments should think about common finals, but leaves the ultimate decision up to the individual departments.

Several Executive Committee members indicated that they were opposed to the idea of common finals. Burgunder felt that scores on common finals might be used to rate instructors. Glenn Irvin felt that there can be some benefits to common exams.

M/S/P (Borland, Sharp) to place this item on the agenda of the next Senate meeting as a first reading item.

F. Resolution on Course Evaluations

Ray Terry pointed out that the term course evaluation refers to all ways in which professors evaluate students. It calls for in-service training to facilitate ways of improving evaluation methods. Sharp and Irvin suggested that this is something that might be able to be funded by lottery money.

Charlie Andrews suggested that the resolution be retitled to Resolution on Student Performance Evaluation.

M/S/P (Sharp, Borland) to place the renamed resolution on the agenda of the next Senate meeting as a first reading item.

G. Resolution on Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty

Paul Murphy indicated that the present guidelines are in an administrative bulletin in CAM and were written in 1974. The Personnel Policies Committee wanted to acknowledge that the contract addresses the issue of student evaluation of faculty and to bring CAM in line with what is actually done in terms of student evaluation. The resolution would modify CAM to bring it in line with the M.O.U.

M/S/P (Sharp, Burgunder) to place this item on the agenda of the next Senate meeting as a first reading item.

H. Selection on nominee to the Affirmative Action Faculty Development Program Proposal Review Committee

No nominations have been received. Executive Committee members were encouraged to submit nominations in writing to Marjorie in the Senate office.

I. Nomination of representative on EOAC subcommittee to evaluate the affirmative action facilitator program. The Senate needs to recommend one or two representatives. Work would span a 3 to 4 month period. Executive Committee members were asked to think about possible nominations for these positions. Names should be submitted to the Senate office.

VI. Discussion Items: none.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.