

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - MINUTES
March 30, 1976

Chair, Lezlie Labhard
Vice Chair, David Saveker
Secretary, Charles Jennings

- I. The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Lezlie Labhard, in AG 241 at 3:15 PM.

All members were present except the following:

Excused absences: Barton Olsen, Hazel Jones, David Saveker.

Guests: Art Duarte, Robert McDonnell, Lloyd Beecher, Larry Moore, Keith Nielsen, Bob Negranti, John Connely.

Substitutes: Marylinda Wheeler for Louis Pippin, Shane Kramer for Hugo Hurtado.

- II. The minutes for the meeting of February 24 were approved.

III. Business Items

- A. CAM 342.2 - Academic Promotions (Beecher)(Attachment III-A) - It was M/S/P (Weatherby) to make this a business item on the agenda for the next meeting of the Academic Senate.
- B. Naming Buildings (Murphy) - It was M/S/P (Murphy) to make this a business item on the agenda of the next meeting of the Academic Senate.
- C. Faculty Input in the Budgetary Process (Nielsen) - It was M/S/P (Hughes) to make the resolution as stated in agenda attachment II-C2 (Landreth, Lebens) with accompanying background information (agenda attachment II-C1, Budget Committee) a business item on the agenda of the next meeting of the Academic Senate. (Final form of resolution - Attach. III-C.)

IV. Discussion Items

- A. Time Delay in Transmission of Tax Shelter Funds (Negranti, Nielsen) - The normal time delay is thirty days. Extended delays are usually caused within the insurance companies. Any problems should be brought to the attention to Mr. Bob Negranti to be handled on an individual basis.
- B. Task Force on Student Writing Skills (Wenzl, McDonnell)(Att. IV-B) - It was M/S/P (Dundon) to make this a business item. It was M/S/P (Dundon) that any credit for remedial courses not be counted toward graduation.

It was M/S/P (Weatherby) to endorse the recommendation of the Task Force on Student Writing Skills with the provision that any credit for remedial courses not be counted toward graduation.

- C. Campus Parking (Labhard) - The Chair reminded the Executive Committee of the Fall Quarter memo from President Kennedy. The committee made no further recommendations.
- D. Direction for Constitution and Bylaws Committee (Labhard) - There are some problems remaining from last year. Any specific problems or concerns should be directed to the Chair to be directed to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.
- E. Drinking on Campus (Labhard) - It was the consensus of the committee that it would be premature to take action on the matter until the students have formulated a recommendation.
- F. Procedures for Ranking Faculty Judged Worthy of Promotion (Dundon) - There was considerable discussion concerning the matter of lack of procedures and criteria for Ranking Faculty. It was noted that the Personnel Policies Committee's resolution to be a business item on the agenda of the April 13 Academic Senate meeting is relevant to the issue of procedures.

V. Reports

- A. Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Sponsorship of Events (Cruikshanks, Cichowski) - A brief report was given on the Ad Hoc Committee's findings and conclusions. The committee will make a recommendation at the April 27 meeting of the Executive Committee.

VI. Announcements

- A. The City of San Luis Obispo, Proposed General Plan is forthcoming to the Senate Office according to Doug Gerard.
- B. The Chair received a memo from President Kennedy requesting the appointment of a representative for the Senate on the Restructuring of Affirmative Action Committee. It is a three year term. Suggestions are welcomed by Lezlie Labhard via the Senate Office.
- C. The Chair noted the letter to Trustees and Governor Brown from President Kennedy regarding the Ritchie Amendment. It was noted that the circulation list was extensive.
- D. It was noted that the Senate Office is extremely busy and that turn-around time is at least one week.
- E. The Chair noted the attached memo on the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structure and Organization. (Att. VI-E.)
- F. The 1975 Annual Report from the Chancellor to the Board of Trustees is on file in the Senate Office.

The meeting was adjourned by the Chair, Lezlie Labhard, at 5:00 PM. The next meeting will be April 27, in AG 241 from 3:15 to 5:00 PM.

C. Ranking procedures to be utilized when the University President requests a Priority list.

1. The School-wide priority list shall contain the names of those recommended for promotion to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor and be generated in the following manner:
 - a. At the primary level of evaluation, the department or program, all tenured Associate and Full Professors, chaired by the department head or program leader (when of appropriate rank), will meet in order to rank those positively recommended by either the tenured faculty or department head for promotion to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor. This partial departmental ranking will be completed by a date as established by the individual departments or programs.
 - b. Upon receipt of the departmental ranking of those recommended to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor, all tenured Full Professors, chaired by the department head or program leader (when of appropriate rank) will meet in order to determine the position of those recommended for promotion to Full Professor by either the tenured full professors or the department head on the department's completed list. The result will be one priority list from each department or program area containing the names of those recommended to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. This completed list will retain the relative ranking of those recommended for promotion to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor and that the completed list is forwarded to the school dean by February 10.
 - c. If a department or program does not have a faculty member of appropriate rank and status, the school council, at the dean's request, shall select a committee of three appropriately ranked tenured faculty, from closely-related departments or program areas within the school, who will prepare first level recommendations to the dean. This committee shall consult with both tenured and non-tenured faculty within the affected department or program.
 - d. The school dean, acting as a voting chairperson, shall present these completed departmental lists to an ad hoc committee comprised of one Full Professor from each department elected by the department's full time (probationary and tenured) faculty. The ad hoc committee will blend the lists of the several departments into one school-wide priority list. The ad hoc committee will not make changes in the relative priority rankings established by the individual departments.
 - e. If a department or program has no Full Professor eligible to serve on the school-wide committee, the school council, at the dean's request, shall select a tenured full professor from a closely-related department or program area within the school to represent the affected

Proposed CAM 342.2 Change (cont.)

department or program on the school-wide committee. The appointed full professor shall consult with the faculty of the affected department or program.

- f. Each of the above groups will establish, adopt and make explicit its own procedures and criteria for ranking.
2. The school dean shall forward the completed school-wide priority list, along with the names of any applicants recommended negatively at all three levels of evaluation (see CAM 342.2,B,2,e & h), by March 10. Each candidate for promotion shall be informed in writing by the appropriate administrative officer of the number of promotable candidates and his or her priority on both the departmental and school-wide list as soon as the respective lists have been generated.
3. In developing criteria for ranking, schools and departments shall use only those criteria used in the original promotion procedures, and comply with the CAM 341.1,C, requirement that promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor.
4. Promotion funds allocated to the University will be distributed to the several schools according to a ratio of eligible faculty members in the individual schools to the total eligible faculty in the University. Surplus promotion funds allocated to any of the schools will be redistributed equitably amongst the other schools.

Ø/D. Effective Date of Promotions.

RESOLUTION REGARDING FACULTY INPUT IN THE BUDGETARY PROCESS

Background Rationale: Ever since the inception of the Cal Poly Academic Senate, the Budget Committee has been an integral part of the "committee system" of the Academic Senate. The Bylaws of the Academic Senate gives the Budget Committee the responsibility: "to review and made recommendations concerning the budget plans as they affect the University." However, the actual procedures of how the Budget Committee is to be directly involved in the year by year instructional budgetary process from its beginning to its finalization has never been clarified. Consequently, the Budget Committee has served in a de facto capacity, concerning itself primarily with reviewing the university instructional budget after it ~~has~~ been formulated. Only partial advantage has been taken of the past opportunities to introduce faculty input into the budgetary decision making process.

Present day economics seem to indicate that it is essential that the faculty at Cal Poly become more actively involved in the budgetary decisions which affect the instructional programs at the University. The classroom instructors should have a viable voice in how monies are allocated which impact on their job security, facilities, and instructional materials. In order to involve the instructional faculty more directly in the budgetary decision making process at Cal Poly, the following recommendation is offered for consideration by the Academic Senate.

WHEREAS, Budgetary policies of the California State University and Colleges and the State of California having direct impact on funding for the instructional programs of CPSU-SLO, and

WHEREAS, Presently the faculty at CPSU-SLO, has varying degrees of input through the departments and schools and has taken only partial advantage of opportunities through the Academic Senate's Budget Committee, and

WHEREAS, There is a need to define and make more uniform the nature of faculty input into the instructional budgetary planning and administration; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, CPSU-SLO, endorse the Academic Senate Budget Committee's recommendations on the instructional budget process to provide:

- 1) That the Academic Senate Budget Committee establish a regular meeting schedule which corresponds to the time schedule of the university budget development process. Accordingly, the Director of Business Affairs and the Vice President for Academic Affairs would confer with the Budget Committee on all fiscal matters which affect the formulation and the allocation of the instructional budget.

6

RESOLUTION REGARDING FACULTY INPUT IN THE BUDGETARY PROCESS (cont.)

- 2) That all subsequent instructional budgetary committees formed by the university administration should have two (2) faculty members from the Budget Committee appointed to it with voting rights and appropriate Academic Senate recommendation.
- 3) That the deans of the seven instructional schools, together with the Academic Senate Caucus of each instructional school, should set up procedures for more direct faculty input into instructional allocations within the respective schools. One member of the Academic Senate Budget Committee should be a member of this group in each instructional school with voting rights and appropriate Academic Senate recommendation.

TASK FORCE ON STUDENT WRITING SKILLS

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Testing

a. Lower division

A statewide writing proficiency examination should be established for all students entering The CSUC system at the lower-division level. The examination should consist of both machine-scored and essay tests designed to identify (1) students whose skills in these areas are inadequate for college level work but who nonetheless meet all legal requirements for admission, (2) students whose level of skills indicates that they can profit from college-level composition courses, and (3) students whose existing proficiency is at a level sufficient to justify the awarding of credit and/or advanced placement.

b. Upper division

After completing 56 semester units (84 quarter units) of coursework and as a prerequisite to enrolling in more than 75 semester units (112 quarter units), all students in the CSUC system should be required to take and pass a statewide writing proficiency examination. Normally, students will take this examination at the completion of 60 semester units (90 quarter units). Students will not be permitted to proceed beyond 75 semester units of coursework without having achieved a passing grade on this examination.

c. Post-baccalaureate

As a prerequisite to enrolling in more than 9 semester units (12 quarter units) of post-baccalaureate coursework, all students who have not previously passed the statewide writing proficiency examination requirement at the junior level must take the examination. Normally, students will take this examination upon entering into post-baccalaureate status.

d. Teacher certification

The Task Force recommends that the School of Education of the CSUC system, in conjunction with the Departments of English, take additional steps to insure that candidates for elementary and secondary school credentials not only read and write at an acceptable level but are also able to teach these skills effectively. For admission to credential candidacy, students should be required to achieve significantly higher than a minimum passing grade on the junior-level proficiency examination.

e. Criteria for passing this examination

As a condition for graduation, every CSUC student should be required to demonstrate the ability to read and understand a fairly complex question on an intellectually demanding subject and to respond on short notice with a logical, clear, and coherent piece of exposition. The student should be capable of formulating a thesis which can be developed within the time allotted to the assignment, of substantiating that thesis without losing focus or straying from the subject. Both the essay as a whole and individual paragraphs should be unified and coherent and represent adequate development of the central idea. The student should demonstrate knowledge of the principles of logical coordination and subordination and the ability to develop ideas at the level of the sentence rather than by mere accretion of sentences. In addition, the prose of The CSUC graduate should be reasonably free of errors in usage, spelling, and other mechanics--that is, errors of such seriousness and/or frequency as to hinder communication, seriously distract the educated, adult reader, or clearly demonstrate that the writer has not mastered the basic conventions of the language.

2. Required coursework in composition

The following should be included as a requirement in the present CSUC Basic Subjects Section: two courses (a total of six semester units or nine quarter units) above the remedial level designed to develop student abilities in written composition.

3. Remedial courses

Because it is currently unrealistic to assume that all students will enter The CSUC system with writing skills sufficient for college-level work, the Task Force recommends that remedial courses in writing skills be authorized and funded for workload credit for faculty although not necessarily for graduation credit for students.

4. Faculty development and systemwide commitment to literacy

Since the literacy problem is one that should be addressed campuswide, it is essential that faculty attain the skills not necessarily to teach writing but to perceive the problem in ways related as closely as possible to those of the composition instructor. For these reasons, the Task Force recommends funding a program for training faculty to teach writing skills. The Task Force recommends that schools, departments and individual faculty members throughout the CSUC system be held responsible for reinforcement and further development of student writing skills by (a) incorporating into existing coursework new and/or additional requirements which emphasize

standard written English in sentence and paragraph construction, vocabulary, spelling, grammar and syntax; (b) using the advisement process to direct students into specific courses including, but not limited to, writing seminars in which writing skills are emphasized; and (c) reporting on an annual basis to the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs the positive steps taken at the school and department levels to meet this objective.

This memorandum is the response of the English Department at California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo to the interim recommendations of the Task Force on Student Writing Skills. The Department regards the recommendations as an important statement containing a comprehensive and unified structure for significantly improving student writing skills in the CSUC system. If implemented, the recommended procedures will have great impact on student writing in CSUC, in education in California, and eventually in the nation. If implemented appropriately, the impact would appear to be highly beneficial.

The Department's responses to the several individual proposals are given serially here.

A. 1. Testing

It is essential that both the testing proposed and the scoring of the results be done on a system-wide basis, perhaps with the English Equivalency Examination as a model. It is essential that appropriate funding for the testing and scoring be provided. It is essential that the proficiency examination include, as proposed, an essay test.

The recommendation that teacher certification candidates pass the upper-division test with superior performance has our strongest support. All agencies involved should recognize, however, that such a requirement will have a major impact on all teacher certification programs.

2. Required coursework in composition

A requirement in the CSUC Basic Subjects Section of one year of composition above the remedial level is appropriate, especially if that is interpreted to mean 6 semester credits or 9 quarter units. We should note, however, that the recommendation is for a minimum of two courses.

The nine-credit requirement could well be almost fully met by English 114 (4 credits) and one of the following: English 115 (4 credits), English 300 (3 credits), English 304 (4 credits), English 305 (4 credits), English 310 (3 credits), English 218, (3 credits), English 219 (3 credits). The additional one or two credits necessary to meet the requirement could be one or two of the one-credits courses focusing on specific fundamental aspects of writing.

3. Remedial courses

First of all, the department would prefer some other label for courses preliminary to the collegiate writing courses. While denotatively accurate, the word "remedial" possesses in this context very strong pejorative connotation for the students involved. Some word like "fundamental" would be preferable.

The English Department is this quarter proposing on an experimental basis a series of one-credit courses for this coming Fall quarter which would focus very closely on specific fundamental problems in writing. It may be that they or some adaptation of them will serve the "remedial" function called for by this section of the recommendations.

4. Faculty development system-wide commitment to literacy

The English Department has already begun a series of efforts aimed at improving its teaching of writing. It is now conducting two experiments in the teaching of writing - one of them funded by the campus and the other by CSUC. It has formed a new Committee on Writing; that committee is now sponsoring a series of staff meetings on the teaching of writing. Dr. Ross Winterowd - nationally prominent rhetorician - will conduct a two-day seminar on rhetoric and writing for the faculty of the department on March 17 and 18, 1976. Other efforts will follow. The Department would be delighted to receive additional funding to support those efforts.

Similarly, the department would be pleased to conduct seminars for faculty in other fields on incorporating writing in their courses, if appropriate funding is available.

B. Funding

Although it is difficult to judge how much additional staff would be required to implement these recommendations, some general estimate can be made. Currently, four curricula require 3 credits in writing, five curricula require 4 credits, twenty-one curricula require 6 credits, two require 7 credits, eight require 8 credits, five require a full 9 credits, and one - English - requires 14 credits in writing. Since the median requirement is 6 credits, we may estimate that our writing program will grow by 50 per cent at the collegiate level. That would mean about 13 additional FTE faculty.

Similarly, there are uncertainties about estimating the additional costs of mounting a "remedial" program. Since the recommendations do not speak of the number of "remedial" units recommended, let us settle on 4 as a reasonable conservative estimate. In estimating how many students would be involved in this fundamental writing program, we may use the estimates given in the Summary of Campus Responses to Questions on Student Writing Proficiency. A conservative average of estimates made by departments at CPSU regarding the percentage of students with writing difficulties is reported as 60%. The system average is about 40%. Using the more conservative figure of 40% and applying that to the number of freshman writing sections scheduled for next Fall term, results in an estimate of approximately 8 FTE faculty.

These estimates of funding needs are based on the present class enrollment limits for most writing classes - 28. This level is actually dangerously high. Highly effective instruction in writing requires a maximum enrollment limit of 20. Implementing the task force recommendations at this effective level would require a total of 26 additional FTEF for the collegiate writing courses and 10.6 FTEF for the pre-collegiate courses.

Appropriate support funding and officing will be necessary for all additional FTEF.

Finally, the English Department is ready to engage in conversations with any department that wishes to carry a part of this additional load in the teaching of writing.


Memorandum

To : Instructional Department Heads
(This memo is to be shared with
all members of your department.)

Date : March 25, 1976

File No.:

Copies : Kennedy
Jones
Instructional Deans

From : Lezlie Labhard, Chair 
Academic Senate

Subject: Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structure and Organization

As a result of consideration initiated in the School of Business and Social Sciences regarding possible reorganization to meet accreditation standards, an Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structure and Organization will be formed. The Committee is being established not to initiate organizational change proposals, but to coordinate and clarify those proposals which go through the appropriate channels to the Academic Vice President or President.

It is possible that a plan will be developed that will confine reorganization to the School of Business and Social Sciences; however, it is probable that some other recommendations will be made which affect other schools and departments.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structure and Organization will be chaired by Dr. Hazel Jones. The membership will be one "linking pin" from each of the following: 1) Academic Council, 2) Staff Senate, 3) Instructional Department Heads, 4) Student Personnel Council, 5) Student Affairs Council of ASI, and 6) one faculty representative from each of the seven schools. The total membership will be twelve, with the chair non-voting.

To provide maximum faculty input, I am requesting the faculty of each department select one nominee. The nominee must be willing to serve through the remainder of this year and all of 1976-77 if necessary. It is essential that the nominee be receptive to the reorganization proposals and be willing to serve as an impartial evaluator. In addition, faculty nominated should be willing to maintain direct communication with the Senate; updating reports to the full Senate will be required periodically throughout the review process. From the total list of nominees, one representative from each school will be jointly appointed by President Kennedy and myself.

To facilitate appointment of the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structure and Organization on or about April 12, the name of each department nominee should be received in the Senate Office no later than April 9.

The committee will be convened to review proposals as they are submitted. When the committee is satisfied that it has a viable plan to propose, it will make its recommendation simultaneously to the President and Chair of the Academic Senate. Opportunity for consideration of the plan will be given to each department and/or school affected by the proposal. The President will not take any implementing action until there has been adequate consultation and review.

I look forward to receiving the name of your nominee no later than April 9. Please send the information to the Academic Senate Office, Chase Hall #218.

Thank you.

Att. VI-E, Ex.Comm.
Minutes, 3/30/76