

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - AGENDA
October 26, 1976

Chair, Tom Hale
Vice Chair, Bob Sennett
Secretary, Luther Hughes

I. Minutes - Executive Committee - September 21 and 28, 1976.

II. Business Items

- A. Sponsorship of Events (Cichowski)
- B. Academic Senate Representation of Division of Social Sciences
(McCormac - Constitution and Bylaws Committee)(Att. II-B)
- C. Resolution Regarding Recall of Department Heads (Bermann/Sennett)
(Att. II-C)
- D. Resolution Regarding Implementation of AGR-70 (Riedlsperger)
- E. Resolution Regarding Final Exams (Greffenius)(Att. II-E)
- F. Approval of New Senators (Brenner, Duarte, Watson)
- G. Academic Calendar (Cirovic)

III. Discussion Items

- A. Resolution Regarding Class Scheduling (Hale)(Att. III-A)
- B. Parking Alternatives (Cirovic)
- C. School Representation on Academic Senate (Cirovic)
- D. Student Grades by OpScan (Hale)
- E. Increased FTE (Kersten)

IV. Announcements

- A. Marjorie Downing Wagner to attend February 8, 1977 Academic Senate meeting. (Att. IV-A)

Memorandum

To : Executive Committee, Chair

Date : October 7, 1976

File No.:

Copies :

ACADEMIC SENATE

OCT 8 1976

CAL POLY - SLO

From : Wes McCormac 

Subject: Constitution and Bylaws Committee

1. The subject committee, with all members present, met at 1400, 5 October, to organize and to consider current business.
2. Wes McCormac, Senator from the Business School, was eligible to chair this committee and was elected.
3. The committee considered the memorandum from Tom Hale, dated 22 September, subject, "Resolution Concerning Academic Senate Representation for the Division of Social Sciences", and the memo to Tom Hale from Hazel J. Jones, subject "Division of Social Sciences."
4. The committee recommends that the Chair, Senate, take the necessary action only on the first resolution, i.e., "that a minimum of three elected senators would be essential for our adequate representation as a Division." This will require a change in the Constitution by an election. This is specifically dealt with in Section 6, Amendments.

The committee further recommends that the wording of Section 2a be changed to read, "Each school/division (when separate) shall elect..."

The committee further recommends that necessary action for the second resolution be considered after the decision of the constituency.

Memorandum

Executive Committee,
Academic Senate

Date September 21, 1976

File No.

Copies

From Division of Social Sciences Faculty

Subject Resolution Concerning Academic Senate Representation for the
Division of Social Sciences

It is respectfully requested that the following resolution which has our unanimous support be given your earliest consideration.

We, the faculty of the Division of Social Sciences, request the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to provide for our adequate representation on the Academic Senate.

Resolved that a minimum of three elected senators would be essential for our adequate representation as a Division.

Resolved that the Division be represented on all committees of the Academic Senate.

Ex.Comm. Att. II-B
10/26/76 Agenda

RESOLUTION REGARDING RECALL OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

RESOLVED: That the following be made an addition to CAM:

315.5E The appointment of an instructional department head (as defined in AB 74-4, Section V) can be terminated by the University President. Under some circumstances, the tenured and probationary faculty of a department may become concerned with the department heads failure to provide desired professional and academic leadership. If a majority of the full time tenured and probationary faculty of a department, excluding the department head, determines that it is necessary to recommend review of the performance of a department head with a view towards termination of the appointment, such a recommendation should be made in writing to the University President with a copy to the school dean and to the concerned department head. The recommendation should provide a basis for review of the department head and contain a statement of reasons for requesting the termination of the department head's appointment together with evidence substantiating the recommended action. Upon receipt of this recommendation, the University President will consult with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the appropriate school dean, the tenured and probationary faculty of the affected department, and the department head concerned prior to taking action on the recommendation.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-14-76/PPC
May 25, 1976

RESOLUTION REGARDING [REASSIGNMENT] OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

RESOLVED: That the following be made an addition to CAM:

315.5E The appointment of an instructional department head (as defined in AB 74-4, Section V) can be terminated by the University President. Under some circumstances, the tenured and probationary faculty of a department may become concerned with the stewardship of a department head for failing to provide desired professional and academic leadership or for other reasons. If a majority of the tenured and probationary faculty of a department determines after meeting as a complete group that it is necessary to recommend review of the performance of a department head with a view towards termination of the appointment, such a recommendation should be made in writing to the University President with a copy to the school dean and to the concerned department head. The recommendation should provide a basis for review of the department head and contain a statement of reasons for requesting the termination of the department head's appointment together with evidence substantiating the recommended action. Upon receipt of a recommendation from a majority of the tenured and probationary faculty of a department to terminate the department head's appointment, the University President will consult with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the appropriate school dean, the tenured and probationary faculty of the affected department, and the department head concerned prior to taking action on the recommendation.

APPROVED

JUNE 1, 1976

Ex.Comm. Att. II-C
10/26/76 Agenda

RESOLUTION REGARDING FINAL EXAMS

Background Rationale: The Instruction Committee was requested early in 1974 to study the final exam policy - then in effect on the campus as spelled out in CAM. Concern was expressed at that time that the policy was not being followed nor enforced. Based on recommendations to and approved by the Academic Senate on 4/30/74 and on recommendations by the Academic Council, the President, after considering all recommendations, revised CAM 484.1. These changes are in effect at the present time.

Since that time questions have been raised as to the need for greater flexibility and the effect of the four-day exam period on preparation of the Academic Calendar.

The Instruction Committee was requested to further study the final exam policy and to make a recommendation to the Academic Senate.

In considering a policy change, it must be kept in mind that we have on the campus a wide variance in the type of classes offered by the different schools such as lecture classes, courses with lectures and lab, seminars, activity courses, etc. The point is that not all classes lend themselves to traditional final examinations during the four-day exam period at the end of the quarter.

To help determine faculty opinion with respect to the present final exam policy, the Instruction Committee conducted a Final Exam Survey (actually an opinionaire) in the Spring Quarter of 1976 in which 384 faculty members participated.

The survey can best be summarized as follows:

- 1) The overall results show a wide divergence of opinion among faculty.
- 2) Although this is not a conclusion, the survey indicates that the final exam policy should provide greater flexibility as to the method and timing of evaluation of student performance.

The following pages show, question by question, faculty response to the survey. It is obvious that the data do not warrant any conclusions as to specific policy changes.

The survey results do not warrant a committee recommendation at this time as to specific changes that could bring about policy change.

Committee discussion brought out two pertinent points:

- (1) The existing final exam policy is indeed quite flexible.
- (2) Proposals to change final exam policy have cropped up every few years in the past.

The Instruction Committee therefore is submitting this as its final report until such time as the Executive Committee gives us further direction, if any.

0 - Before receiving this opinionnaire, were you aware that courses could be exempted from final examination requirements? Yes 36.7% No 60.4% Missing Values 2.9%

After each of the statements following, please circle the number which best shows the intensity of your disagreement or agreement with that statement, using this code:

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Mildly Disagree	No Opinion	Mildly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree

1. POLICY OK - SCHEDULE OK

The present final examination policy and schedule with its provision for exempt courses (CAM 484.2) is completely satisfactory.

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	M.D.*
17.7	17.4	8.1	5.2	13.5	19.5	15.9	2.6

2. POLICY OK - SCHEDULE NOT OK (more exam days)

The present policy is satisfactory with additional final examination schedule days for:

2.1 More hours of examination time.

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	M.D.
35.2	10.2	7.3	18.5	9.1	6.0	6.5	7.3

2.2 More study time between each scheduled examination.

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	M.D.
23.2	8.9	5.2	21.4	11.7	12.2	10.2	7.3

3. POLICY OK - SCHEDULE NOT OK (less exam days)

The present policy is satisfactory but the final exam schedule should be eliminated and replaced with regular class schedule days in which final exams are given.

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	M.D.
42.2	11.7	5.5	10.4	3.6	5.5	14.3	6.8

4. SCHEDULE OK - POLICY NOT OK (more flexibility)

The present final examination time schedule is satisfactory, but policy should provide for more flexibility, with:

4.1 Methods and times of evaluating student learning determined by each instructor. (May include final examinations and/or other methods of evaluating student achievement of course objectives.)

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	M.D.
18.0	7.6	3.6	8.9	12.5	13.3	28.4	7.8

*Missing Data

4.2 Methods and times of evaluating student learning determined by department and subject discipline.

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	M.D.
23.4	10.4	5.7	12.5	14.1	11.7	14.6	7.6

5. SCHEDULE OK - POLICY NOT OK (less flexibility)

The present final examination schedule is satisfactory, but final examinations should be required and standardized by subject discipline.

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	M.D.
48.4	13.3	7.0	6.5	5.7	6.0	5.7	7.3

6. SCHEDULE NOT OK - POLICY NOT OK (drop final exam schedule - options)

The final examination schedule should be replaced by regular class schedule days with:

6.1 Evenly weighted exams scheduled throughout the quarter and no comprehensive final exam.

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	M.D.
44.8	13.8	8.6	8.6	6.0	3.1	7.0	8.1

6.2 Methods and times of evaluating student learning determined by each instructor. (May include final examinations and/or other methods of evaluating student achievement of course objectives.)

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	M.D.
23.4	6.8	6.3	3.6	13.0	9.9	29.4	7.6

6.3 Methods and times of evaluating student learning determined by department and subject discipline.

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	M.D.
32.0	10.7	6.8	8.3	18.5	7.8	7.3	8.6

7. To what extent do the types of examinations you now give agree with the types of evaluation of student learning you would use were there no departmental requirements? (If you have no department requirements - circle +3.)

-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	M.D.
1.8	1.6	1.3	5.7	4.2	10.4	64.6	10.4

YOUR COMMENTS: (Such as - if you disagree with statement #1, what is your most pressing problem with final examination policy? How would you rewrite CAM 481?)

Memorandum

To : Tom Hale, President
Academic Senate

Date : July 13, 1976

File No.:

Copies :

From : Stuart Goldenberg

Subject: Resolution Regarding Class Scheduling

Whereas: The enrollment at Cal Poly has continued to increase;

whereas: Cal Poly facilities have not kept pace with enrollments;

whereas: many departments are now required to offer classes at 7:00 AM or after 5:00 PM;

whereas: scheduling of classrooms has been based on possession from prior years, with little adjustments among departments or schools during prime hours. (Prime hour is defined as between 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM), therefore,

be it resolved that scheduling of classrooms both during prime hours and other hours be in approximately the same ratio for all departments, based on totals for the three quarters, Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Ex.Comm. Att.III-A
10/26/76 Agenda

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

AKERSFIELD - CHICO - DOMINGUEZ HILLS - FRESNO - FULLERTON - HAYWARD - HUMBOLDT
POMONA - SACRAMENTO - SAN BERNARDINO - SAN DIEGO - SAN FRANCISCO - SAN JOSE



LONG BEACH - LOS ANGELES - NORTHRIDGE
SAN LUIS OBISPO - SONOMA - STANISLAUS

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
(213) 590-5596

ACADEMIC SENATE

OCT 11 1976

CAL POLY - SLO October 6, 1976

Dr. Thomas E. Hale, Chair
Academic Senate
California Polytechnic State
University, San Luis Obispo
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Dear Dr. Hale:

Thank you for your note on my new assignment as well as your most welcome invitation. Unfortunately, because of prior commitments, I will not be able to be with your Senate until your scheduled meeting of February 8, 1977. Please keep me informed as to the arrangements.

I look forward to the opportunity and challenge of my new position, and I promise you I shall do my best to enhance the relationships between the central administration for Faculty and Staff Affairs and the campuses.

Sincerely yours,

Marjorie Downing Wagner
Marjorie Downing Wagner
Vice Chancellor
Faculty and Staff Affairs

MDW:mae

Ex.Comm. Att.IV-A
10/26/76 Agenda