I. Minutes:
Approval of Academic Senate minutes for March 1 and March 8 2011 (pp. 2-4).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Regular Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost:
D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
E. Statewide Senate:
F. CFA Campus President:
G. ASI Representative:

IV. Special Reports:

V. Consent Agenda:
www.ess.calpoly.edu/_records/curric-handbook/docs/Continuous_Course_Summary/Continuous-Course-Summary.doc
BUS 304 Establishing International Supply Chains – China (4) 3 sem, 1 act (p. 5).

VI. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on a Working Definition of Learn by Doing: Neill/Olsen for the Learn by Doing Task Force, second reading (pp. 6-11).
B. Resolution on the Strategic Plan: Mehiel, chair of Strategic Plan Task Force, first reading [the Cal Poly Strategic Plan – V7 is attached to the resolution as background material. It does not need to be printed for the Senate meeting. It can also be viewed at http://www.academicaffairs.calpoly.edu/StrategicPlan/pdfs/sp_web.pdf] (pp. 12-37).
C. Resolution on Academic Advising: Harris, chair of Instruction Committee, first reading (pp. 38-40).
D. Resolution on Proposed New Degree Program: Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Communication: Flores/Gearhart for Agricultural Education and Communication Department, first reading (pp. 41-46).

VII. Adjournment:
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
Tuesday, March 1, 2011
UU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: The minutes of February 1 and February 8 were approved as presented.

II. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: Femf10res announced that the following have been selected to serve on the Consultative Committee for the Selection of Provost: CAED – Allen Estes, CAFES – Bob Delmore, OCOB – Lynn Metcalfe, CENG – Peter Schuster, CLA – John Hampsey, COSAM – Matt Moelter, PCS – Shannon Stephens.

B. President’s Office: Roberts reported that President Armstrong attended his first meeting with the Executive Cabinet where many issues were discussed, including the strategic plan and a new vision for our students in 2020.

C. Provost: Koob reported that the CSU has assigned enrollment targets to each campus. Cal Poly has been given a target of 16,000 FTES for the 2011-12 academic year. Cal Poly has decided to set the beginning admissions target at 15,683 FTEs which breaks down to 3,367 freshmen and 823 transfer student for California residents and an additional 389 freshmen and 90 transfer out of state students.

D. Vice Provost for Student Affairs: none.

E. Statewide Senate: none.

F. CFA Campus President: Thorncroft announced that bargaining updates are available at <http://www.calfac.org/>. A campus event is being planned for April 13 in support of higher education in California. More details will be available at a later date.

G. ASI Representative: Walicki announced that the Rec Center will be closed from the beginning of summer until the end of fall quarter for construction. In May, Cal Poly will be hosting the California State Student Association; this is an open meeting for the entire CSU.

III. Special Reports: Kimi Ikeda, Assoc Vice Prov Sys & Res reported on Expected Academic Progress. PowerPoint presentation is available at:
<www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen/minutes/10-11_minutes/Open%20Forum%20Update%20EAP%20101510-1.ppt>

IV. Consent Agenda: The following were approved: AERO 557, MU 168, MU 368, MU 178, MU 378, UNIV 491, and Kinesiology.
V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on the Establishment of a Subcommittee of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to Review Graduate Curricula (Executive Committee): Fernfiores presented this resolution, which establishes a standing subcommittee of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to review graduate course and program proposals. M/S/P to approve resolution.

B. Resolution on Guidelines for Academic Graduate Certificate Programs (Curriculum Committee): Schaffner presented this resolution, which requests that the Academic Senate endorse the proposed University Guidelines for Academic Graduate Certificate Programs. Resolution will return as second reading item.

C. Resolution on Defining and Adopting the Teacher-Scholar Model (Teacher-Scholar Model (TSM) Task Force: Steinmaus presented this resolution, which request that Cal Poly adopt the definition of Teacher-Scholar Model as presented. A copy of the statement presented by CFA is available upon request from the Academic Senate Office. Resolution will return as second reading item.

V. Adjournment: 5:00 pm
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
Tuesday, March 8, 2011
UU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: none.

II. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: Fernflores, in response to a previous question, indicated that she does not have a preference in regards to an internal or external provost since she has not seen the pool of candidates.
   B. President’s Office: none.
   C. Provost: Koob reported that recommendations for a new Vice President for University Advancement and Athletics Director will be presented to President Armstrong soon.
   D. Vice Provost for Student Affairs: none.
   E. Statewide Senate: none.
   F. CFA Campus President: none.
   G. ASI Representative: none.

III. Special Reports:
   A. Tim Kearns, Vice Provost for IT/Chief Information Officer – Blackboard vs. Moodle and new security standards. Information is available at: <http://www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen/minutes/10-11_minutes/lms_update.pdf>
   B. Andrew Schaffner, chair of the Curriculum Committee – online education. PowerPoint presentation is available at: <http://www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen/meetings_schedule.html> scroll down to Minutes – 03.08.11

IV. Consent Agenda: All curriculum proposals presented were approved.

V. Business Item(s):
   A. Election of Academic Senate officers for 2011-2012: The following were approved by acclamation:
      Academic Senate Chair – Rachel Fernflores, Philosophy
      Academic Senate Vice Chair – Steve Rein, Statistics
   B. Resolution on Guidelines for Academic Graduate Certificate Programs (Curriculum Committee): Fernflores presented this resolution, which requests that the Academic Senate endorse the proposed University Guidelines for Academic Graduate Certificate Programs. M/S/P to approve the resolution.
   C. Resolution on Defining and Adopting the Teacher-Scholar Model (Teacher-Scholar Model (TSM) Task Force: Fernflores presented this resolution, which request that Cal Poly adopt the definition of Teacher-Scholar Model as presented. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

VI. Adjournment: 4:55 pm

Submitted by

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
Continuous Course/Curriculum Summary
For Academic Senate Consent Agenda

Note: The following courses/programs have been summarized by staff in the Registrar’s Office for review by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC) and Academic Senate (AS)

Date: March 11, 2011

Winter 2011 Review

ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED BY ACADEMIC SENATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/ Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate (AS)</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS Agricultural Communication: new degree program</td>
<td>Recommended for approval 10/21/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Construction Management: further curricular revisions for 2011-13 catalog</td>
<td>Recommended for approval 2/10/11</td>
<td>Agendized for 3/8/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2011 – pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 D-stopper: A3 course prerequisite to be modified to read “Completion of Area A1 with a C- or better, or consent of instructor.” This affects A3 courses: COMS 126, COMS 145, ENGL 145, ENGL 148, ENGL 149, HNRS 145, HNRS 148, HNRS 149, PHIL 126</td>
<td>Recommended for approval 2/10/11</td>
<td>Agendized for 3/8/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2011 – pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 304 Establishing International Supply Chains – China (4) 3 sem, 1 act</td>
<td>Reviewed 2/17/11; approval recommended</td>
<td>Agendized for 4/12/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEMS PENDING RECOMMENDATION BY ACADEMIC SENATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/ Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate (AS)</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS 205 Personal Finance (4) 4 lec</td>
<td>Reviewed on 3/10/11; returned to college for more information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEW PROGRAM APPROVED BY PROVOST AND CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/ Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate (AS)</th>
<th>Provost/ Pres</th>
<th>C.O./ WASC</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS Fire Protection Engineering (ME Dept), a pilot program</td>
<td>Approved 12/1/09</td>
<td>Approved 3/2/10</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>C.O. approved; WASC approved 5/25/10</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://records.calpoly.edu/curric-handbook/docs/Continuous_Course_Summary/Continuous-Course-Summary.doc 3/21/11
RESOLUTION ON A WORKING DEFINITION OF LEARN BY DOING

Background: Pages 11-16 of the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Report describe a two-year effort to develop a definition of "Learn by Doing" based on: the analysis of pedagogical theories and current practices by the WASC Learn By Doing Working Group; campus surveys and focus groups conducted for all campus constituencies; and student research. Additional efforts to refine the definition through committee efforts and faculty solicitation have occurred since the December 2009 submittal of the Preparatory Review Report.

In Fall 2007, the Academic Senate discussed the Institutional Report, in which Cal Poly identified "Learn by Doing" as one of the four major themes to be examined in the University's self study for WASC. As part of the WASC reaccreditation process, a task force made up of faculty, staff, and students was formed in 2008 to help guide the self-assessment of Cal Poly's Learn by Doing approach. Pages 11-16 of the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Report describe this two-year process, which included an effort to develop a measurable definition of Learn by Doing based on: an analysis of pedagogical theories and current Learn by Doing practices at Cal Poly; campus surveys and focus groups conducted for all campus constituencies; and student research. All campus constituencies were invited in October-November 2009 to comment on the draft WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Report before the submission to WASC of the final draft the following December.

During the February 2010 visit by the WASC Visiting Team, open forums were held for all campus constituencies to discuss the report with the reviewers. Following their visit to Cal Poly in early 2010, the WASC Visiting Team members urged Cal Poly "to develop measurable ways of demonstrating the educational effectiveness of this practice" (Report of the WASC Visiting Team, p. 30). Thus, in fall 2010, the WASC Working Groups and the Academic Senate formed WASC/Senate task forces to begin to address the WASC Visiting Team's recommendations. Foremost on the group's agenda was a single, inclusive, and most importantly, measurable definition of Learn by Doing that could be used to assess the effectiveness of Learn by Doing across disciplines. Having a good working definition of Learn by Doing is critical to the overall assessment process at Cal Poly. In early February 2011, the task force proposed a definition of Learn by Doing to the Academic Senate as a first reading. The Senate debated the definition and provided feedback to the task force.

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly community has never adopted a working definition of "Learn by Doing"; and
WHEREAS, Learn by Doing was one of the four major themes of Cal Poly's WASC Self Study Committee approved by WASC; and

WHEREAS, The WASC Review Team encouraged Cal Poly to provide an evaluative operational definition of our Learn by Doing educational philosophy following its initial review in early 2010; and

WHEREAS, Programs The WASC Learn by Doing Task Force may use this definition of Learn by Doing to assess the provide evidence of the many, diverse ways in which Cal Poly's signature pedagogy contributes to student learning at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, Learn by Doing is an educational model that represents all disciplines at Cal Poly and thus is in need of a definition that reflects this diversity; therefore it be

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly recommend for approval the attached adopt the following definition of Learn by Doing:

At Cal Poly, Learn by Doing is a deliberate process whereby students, from day one, acquire knowledge and skills through active engagement and self-reflection inside the classroom and beyond it.

Proposed by: WASC/Academic Senate Learn by Doing Task Force
Date: November 15 2010
Revised: January 24 2011
Revised: March 9 2011
Attachment to Resolution on a Working Definition of Learn by Doing

Learn-by-Doing is a deliberate intellectual process whereby students acquire and apply essential knowledge and skills through self-reflective, active engagement in their education inside the classroom and beyond it.
Appendix A

Mission and vision inclusion:

Learn by Doing is an integral part of the mission and vision of most academic units at Cal Poly. Following are some examples from each college:

1. **College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences: [http://cafes.calpoly.edu/](http://cafes.calpoly.edu/)**

   At the heart of a Cal Poly education is our renowned learn-by-doing tradition. Our students have access to state-of-the-art laboratories as well as the university's 10,000 acres of ranchland, orchards, vineyards and forests - Cal Poly's 'living laboratories.

   Together, they provide the hands-on opportunities that are the essence of the Cal Poly experience.


   All of our majors are built around educational experiences that are heavily focused on the use of rigorous, time-intensive design studios and project labs as a central arena for the development and integration of multiple skills. The studios and labs are bolstered by a core component of course knowledge in the materials, technology and contemporary challenges of the built environment professions.

   All our majors place a strong emphasis on the rich tradition of an innovative approach to learn-by-doing within a comprehensive university context. We foster connections with the arts and sciences, humanities and the polytechnic professions.

3. **College of Business: [http://www.cob.calpoly.edu/](http://www.cob.calpoly.edu/)**

   We are an engaged learning community that contributes to business and society through discovery and application.

   **Industrial Technology: [http://www.cob.calpoly.edu/academic/industrial-technology/](http://www.cob.calpoly.edu/academic/industrial-technology/)**

   To offer a continually improved “learn by doing” educational experience for our students that will provide them with practical technical knowledge and skills, organizational intelligence and the confidence to lead.

4. **College of Engineering: [http://ceng.calpoly.edu/about/](http://ceng.calpoly.edu/about/)**

   **Learn by Doing:**

   A leader in engineering education, the College of Engineering promotes ‘project-based learning’ to link theory with hands-on practice. Graduates are well prepared to enter graduate school or the engineering profession. In fact, Cal Poly engineers are highly sought by industry because they are known to ‘have two feet on the ground and two hands on the problem.’
5. **College of Liberal Arts**: [http://cla.calpoly.edu/cla_deansoffice_stratplan.html](http://cla.calpoly.edu/cla_deansoffice_stratplan.html)

**Mission**

The College of Liberal Arts promotes excellence through teaching, scholarship and service in the arts, humanities, communications, and social sciences. The CLA encourages intellectual discovery and individual growth by promoting diversity, social responsibility and life-long learning-by-doing in both the local and the global communities. CLA occupies a pivotal position in the comprehensive university, providing Cal Poly students with a broad and substantive understanding of the individual, developing their capacity for critical inquiry and discourse, fostering intellectual curiosity and the pursuit of knowledge, promoting creative thought and aesthetic appreciation, and integrating technology into a broader, human context.

**Values**

The College of Liberal Arts upholds open and critical disciplinary and interdisciplinary inquiry, effective communication, creative thinking, aesthetic endeavor, and their application to contemporary issues. We advocate cultural and intellectual diversity, sustainability, professional ethics, self-awareness, and responsible citizenship. We espouse the integration of humane and aesthetic values with technological proficiency in support of the University’s mission. As essential and engaged members of our comprehensive polytechnic university, we embrace the university’s commitment to the learn-by-doing philosophy through our research, theory, and practice.

6. **College of Science and Mathematics**:

**School of Education**: [http://www.soe.calpoly.edu/](http://www.soe.calpoly.edu/)

Since its inception in 1933, professional education at Cal Poly has expanded from a single undergraduate program in agricultural education to multiple undergraduate and post-baccalaureate credential programs, and a range of master degree options. As a professional school on a polytechnic campus, the School values and emphasizes an on-going experiential process of theory and research integrated with active, applied, and reflective learning. In addition, the School has a special focus on mathematics, science, and technology education to help meet the critical need for a highly qualified, technologically prepared workforce for California.
Appendix B

Operational components (defined at the program level):

Operational Definition:

At Cal Poly, Learn by Doing is a deliberate process whereby students, from day one, acquire knowledge and skills through active engagement and self-reflection inside the classroom and beyond it.

1. "deliberate process"
   a. What is the process in your program?
   b. Is it deliberate?

2. "from day one"
   When does the process start for the student relative to entering Cal Poly?

3. "acquire knowledge and skills through active engagement and self-reflection"
   a. What is active engagement in your program?
   b. How are knowledge and skills acquired through active engagement?
   c. What is self-reflection in your program?
   d. How is self-reflection incorporated in the process?

4. "inside the classroom and beyond it."
   a. How is LBD done in the classroom?
   b. How is LBD done beyond the classroom?
WHEREAS, A strategic plan can be summarized as a roadmap to achieving the institution's long-term goals and objectives; and

WHEREAS, The key components of an strategic plan should be composed of a vision statement, a mission statement, a set of goals to achieve the mission and vision, and a set of key performance indicators; and

WHEREAS, The vision of the institution describes the overarching long-term goal of the institution; and

WHEREAS, The mission of the institution describes why it exists; and

WHEREAS, The goals in the strategic plan should be specific, measurable, and should lead to the achievement of the institution's vision and support its mission; and

WHEREAS, Key performance indicators should be specific, measurable, and should be informative as to whether the institution is making progress towards its identified goals; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate believes that a strategic plan is a necessary component to moving the University towards its long-term goals, and a strategic plan acquires operational utility when it provides a framework for collaborative decision making and institutional alignment; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate strongly supports strategic planning as an essential component of institutional success and recognizes a necessary condition for a successful strategic plan is collaboration and acceptance among a broad assortment of the Cal Poly community, including the General Faculty, administration, staff and students; and

WHEREAS, The vision in the current draft of the strategic plan revolves around Cal Poly becoming the premier comprehensive polytechnic university; and

WHEREAS, The WASC report states that there is a need to "continue to refine their [Cal Poly's] definition of a comprehensive polytechnic university in ways that can be embraced by all members of the University," and
WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Strategic Plan – V7 provides a framework for continuing discussion and a summary of where Cal Poly stands as an institution; and

WHEREAS, Identifying peer and aspirational institutions and key performance indicators are activities central to measuring Cal Poly’s progress toward achieving our strategic goals; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Strategic Plan – V7 proposes several decisions which are consistent with maintaining and enhancing the core competencies of Cal Poly including preparing whole system thinkers, increasing integration of faculty, staff and students, Learn-By-Doing as a core pedagogy, and restoring economic vitality; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate endorse The Cal Poly Strategic Plan – V7 as a framework for providing guidance on operational decisions and planning across Cal Poly; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate develop a committee whose sole charge is to work with the administration on further developing and implementing the Cal Poly strategic plan; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate continue to work collaboratively with the Cal Poly community to further develop and enhance the notion of a comprehensive polytechnic university; and be it further

RESOLVED: That based on the strategic planning activity undertaken at the 2010 Academic Senate Fall Retreat, the Academic Senate endorse the following key performance indicators as central to the successful execution of the strategic plan:

• Full Time Equivalent Student to Full Time Equivalent Faculty and Tenure/Tenure-Track to Lecturer headcount ratio,

• retention, progress toward degree and graduation rates of students, and,

• the ability of Cal Poly graduates to gain employment in meaningful economic sectors in California and the Global context and be successful in those careers.

Proposed by: Strategic Plan Task Force
Date: February 22 2011
CAL POLY STRATEGIC PLAN – V7

STRATEGIC PLAN PURPOSE
The primary purpose of this Cal Poly strategic plan is to provide the direction and core framework for institution-wide continuous strategic planning and future initiatives. This plan together with divisional and unit, and college and department strategic planning, shall align with WASC reaccreditation and also will form the foundation for the Cal Poly capital campaign planning.

The plan articulates the Vision for Cal Poly and outlines the system for tracking progress relative to that Vision. This will include the perspectives of key stakeholder groups and be benchmarked relative to comparison institutions groups. The plan expresses the core values for the institution, individual and community, and summarizes the immediate specific strategic decisions. The process to develop action plans and strategic initiatives is outlined.

Note that in addition to the annual review of progress, the plan itself will be reviewed and updated each year as needed.

VERSION HISTORY
The original Version 1 of the plan was developed during fall quarter 2008 and disseminated for comment January 15, 2009. It had been built on several existing strategic planning documents including the Access To Excellence CSU plan, college strategic plans, and the reports of the 2008 strategic planning Five Working Groups discussed at the August 21, 2008 strategic planning workshop.

After extensive feedback on Version 1 during spring quarter 2009 from the campus community and external partners, Version 2 of the plan was developed. That version was presented and discussed with the President’s Cabinet and university leadership, May 2009. Based on their feedback, successive Versions 3-6 were circulated among the Cal Poly leadership, central administration and college leaders. This current working draft Version 7 has been developed based on that combined feedback.

It should be noted that while the structure, form, style and expression in Version 7 differ significantly from the original Version 1, most of the core elements of the original version remain. Feedback on this current working draft Version 7 is invited.

Erling A. Smith
Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives and Planning
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SUMMARY

VISION
- Nation’s premier comprehensive polytechnic university
- Nationally recognized innovative institution
- Helping California meet future challenges in a global context

TRACKING PROGRESS
- We will track progress toward achieving the vision using key performance indicators
- The key performance indicators will be directly linked to the vision and connected to the different perspectives of the primary stakeholder groups
- We will measure ourselves against a comparison institutions group
- Each year we will review our status, looking for opportunities for improvement and realignment throughout the institution
- Each year, we will review proposals for action, realigning, opportunities, initiatives and investment

VALUES
- Institutional
  - excellence, continuous improvement and renewal
  - transparency, open communications and collaboration
  - accountability, fiscal and environmental responsibility
- Individual
  - professionalism, personal responsibility, and ethical
  - lifelong learner and seeking personal excellence
  - campus citizen and team member
- Community
  - multicultural, intellectual diversity and free inquiry
  - inclusivity and excellence, mutual respect and trust
  - civic engagement, social and environmental responsibility

DECISIONS
- Enhancing differentiation
  - Continue to develop unique comprehensive polytechnic identity
  - Shift definition to all majors as "polytechnic" preparing whole-system thinker graduates
  - Increase integration and interlinking of disciplines, faculty, staff and students
  - Build on core Learn-By-Doing pedagogy to ensure all students have a comprehensive polytechnic multi-mode education
- Restoring economic viability
  - Strategically manage revenue, costs, allocation or resources, improve effectiveness and efficiency
  - Shift mix of students to increase proportion of graduate students and international students
  - Implement institution-wide vision-driven and evidence-based decision-making and continuous improvement
  - Adopt and implement comprehensive enrollment management

ACTION
- All divisions and colleges will develop plans linked to this institutional plan and its strategic decisions.
- Plans will be tied to the institutional Mission and Vision identifying the contributions and roles, and highlight opportunities for collaboration and partnering.
- The plans will encompass the stakeholder perspectives, incorporate Cal Poly values and use the institutional key performance indicators along with other appropriate metrics.

APPENDIX
VISION
Premier polytechnic, innovative institution, helping California
Cal Poly will be the nation’s premier comprehensive polytechnic university, a nationally recognized innovative institution, focused to help California meet future challenges in a global context.

Questions and Answers
The Vision statement raises several strategic questions: Is this vision consistent with the Cal Poly mission? Is the vision achievable from our current position? What are the gaps between our vision, mission and our current position? Does the vision align with our preparation for WASC? Are we committed to being the best at our defined mission? Do we agree that Cal Poly is defined as a comprehensive polytechnic university with the mix of professional, STEM, humanities and social science programs that implies? Do we wish to define ourselves in terms of polytechnic colleges, polytechnic programs and/or polytechnic students? Do we accept the recommendation to expand our expectations of students to emerge from Cal Poly as whole-system thinkers? Do we continue to commit ourselves to project based learning – the emerging definition of “learn by doing”? Are we committed to transparency of process, sustainability of operations as an element of whole-system thinking, and innovation as a necessary element of continuous improvement? Do we accept that the arc of history for Cal Poly implies a continuing growth of our graduate student proportion? Do we accept the premise that resources determine size? (Does not necessarily limit growth, but focuses on how growth might be achieved rather than just hoping for state money.) Do we endorse a definition for productivity of the University as the best possible graduate per unit of resources expended?

Is this vision consistent with the Cal Poly mission?
Yes. Each of the three primary aspects of the vision statement – premier polytechnic, innovative institution and helping California – aligns and crosslinks to each of the three core aspects of the mission – teaching and learning, scholarship and research, and outreach and service – as expressed in our mission statement:
“Cal Poly fosters teaching, scholarship, and service in a learn-by-doing environment where students and faculty are partners in discovery. As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly promotes the application of theory to practice. As a comprehensive institution, Cal Poly provides a balanced education in the arts, sciences, and technology, while encouraging cross-disciplinary and co-curricular experiences. As an academic community, Cal Poly values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility.”
However, while the mission statement describes our historic, enduring and continuing institutional purpose, the vision statement is an elevation, pointing to where we wish to go from our current position.

Is the vision achievable from our current position?
Our current position is that Cal Poly is a well-established, recognized and highly ranked institution; a comprehensive polytechnic state university, with baccalaureate and
graduate level programs in science-, technology- and mathematics-based professions, and academic and professional programs in the arts and sciences. Cal Poly is known for its learn-by-doing environment and comprehensive multi-mode educational experience that prepares graduates for successful lives and careers as long-term performers and leaders in agriculture, architecture, the arts, business, education, engineering and the sciences. Cal Poly and many of our programs enjoy very high ranking. Competition for our unique Cal Poly education is extremely strong as is the demand for Cal Poly graduates because of their ready-on-day-one capabilities and long-term performance and leadership. Cal Poly contributes significantly to the economy and well-being of California. Clearly, our current position is on the trajectory towards achieving the vision.

What are the gaps between our vision, mission and our current position?

The vision calls us to be the premier comprehensive polytechnic university. Cal Poly graduates must be second to none. The total educational environment and experience we provide must enable the growth and learning of our students so they emerge as premier graduates with the skills they need for sustained future success in the challenges ahead. We must commit to ensuring our curricula and programs are the best and are continuously improving. We must ensure that the student learning we intend—as expressed in our University Learning Objectives, and program and course outcomes—is being achieved and demonstrated by robust assessment methods. In addition, we must make sure that all aspects of our support operations are focused on ensuring the progress and success of our students.

In parallel, we must commit to continuing development and expansion of our individual skills and excellence—faculty continuing their development as teachers, scholars and campus citizens, and staff and administrators continuously improving as skilled professionals and lifelong learners. Every new hire must be better than the last and even better than any one of us! Regardless of position, each of us must be dedicated to the progress and success of our students.

Meanwhile, we must continue to work hard on improving the Cal Poly learning and support infrastructure. In spite of excellent progress on the Master plan at providing many new academic buildings and residence halls during the past decade, continued progress will be far more challenging in the years immediately ahead. Many classrooms are in urgent need of renovation and upgrade. The increasing scholarly expectations on faculty have increased demand for more research laboratories, better computing facilities and an upgraded and expanded library and similar vital “common goods” of a successful university. However, we will need to be more creative and innovative, and where appropriate use technology as part of the solution to these challenges.

Does the vision align with our preparation for WASC?

Definitely. The principal theme of our WASC self-study has been “Our Polytechnic Identity” examined from different points of view including integrated student learning, the teacher-scholar model and learn-by-doing. These align and crosslink to the three principal aspects of the vision—premier polytechnic, innovative institution, and helping California. The work of all the WASC groups has contributed to the development of the strategic plan and expression of our vision.
Are we committed to being the best at our defined mission? – creates a commitment to continuous reflection, self examination and improvement.

Yes. We have a long history of leadership in undergraduate higher education and because of the reputation we have earned we attract the highest quality student and have built a faculty and staff of the highest standing. Our unique Cal Poly mission remains relevant and central; and our graduates because of their inherent quality, abilities and skill sets they possess are ever more critical to help California meet its current and future challenges.

To continue to be the best, every year we must seek to be better than the year before, with intentional continuous reflection, examination and improvement of all we do, at both the individual and institutional levels. Indeed, the primary purpose of the strategic plan is to provide the common direction and shared core framework for continuous strategic planning and future initiatives as we seek to be even better.

Thus, we need to review all aspects of the mission and prioritize. Then, we will need to track our progress continually and benchmark ourselves against a comparison institutions group to make sure our trajectory and position is right. No single measure and no single point of view will be sufficient so we will need to monitor several – though a limited set of – quantitative progress, quality and resources indicators, balancing the different aspects and perspectives of the Cal Poly mission. Each year, we will report and score our progress, balancing the different aspects, and examine opportunities for improvements, strategic initiatives and investments.

For example, we need to pay more attention to improving the graduation rate and student progress to degree; we need to systematically listen to alumni and employers to ensure the quality of our education and graduates is always relevant and moving forward; we also need to develop ways to demonstrate and highlight faculty scholarship in its fullest sense and showcase these important contributions; and we need to continually upgrade our facilities and infrastructure.

Do we agree that Cal Poly is defined as a comprehensive polytechnic university with the mix of professional, STEM, humanities and social science programs that implies?

Yes. We are both a comprehensive university and a polytechnic university and these two overlapping aspects of the Cal Poly identity reinforce each other. The range of our programs provides us intellectual breadth, balance and institutional strength and is an important reason for our continued success and durability. An important arm of our strategy is to continue to enhance this competitive advantage of our institutional differentiation.

Cal Poly is a polytechnic university, one of only 12 four-year universities/cAMPuses nationwide with “polytechnic” in their name. A feature common to most “polytechnic” institutions is a focus on programs in math-, science- and technology-based professions. Certainly this is true for Cal Poly with over 1/3 of the degrees being in the STEM fields, 3/4 of the degrees in the Professions, and 84% of our degrees in the Professions and STEM combined.

In addition, the Professions and STEM is a common unifying component of our Cal Poly identity. For example, all Cal Poly colleges have at least one program that is in the Professions, and almost all our colleges have programs that are in STEM. Further, CLA and CSM, in addition to their majors in the Professions, STEM, and other academic
disciplines, play a critical role in the foundational general education core of all our graduates.

Cal Poly is also a comprehensive university. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classifies institutions by their graduate programs using four field groupings: Humanities, Social Sciences, STEM and the Professions. Carnegie identifies an institution as “comprehensive” only if it has graduate-level programs and graduates in all four Carnegie field groupings. Perhaps surprisingly only 21% of the 1213 institutions overall and only 13% of the 804 master’s level institutions are in this category. Of the 12 “polytechnic” and 24 “institute of technology” four-year institutions combined only 5 are classified as comprehensive: three doctoral level research universities and two master’s level universities; and only three are designated as polytechnic. We are one of only very few “comprehensive polytechnic” universities. [See the Appendix for more information on Carnegie classifications and Cal Poly and also http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp]

Do we wish to define ourselves in terms of polytechnic colleges, polytechnic programs and/or polytechnic students?

For many years, we have used the total enrollment in CAFES, CAED and CENG as our surrogate measure of how “polytechnic” we are, but that is a limiting construct and not fully representative of the broader scope of the polytechnic identity of Cal Poly today. Polytechnic universities have a significant focus on undergraduate and graduate programs – typically technology, science, or math-based – that prepare individuals for professional careers. This is certainly true of Cal Poly but we now have programs in the Professions in every college, i.e. extending well beyond our historic “polytechnic” colleges.

Regardless of their major, all Cal Poly graduates will need much more of their education to tackle the challenges of the future. Of course, they will continue to need the depth of knowledge of their discipline that we have always provided. But this depth must also be integrated with breadth, balance and literacy in technology, the arts and sciences – a comprehensive polytechnic general education. Therefore, we will need to develop our programs further to prepare all our students regardless of the major to become “comprehensive polytechnic” graduates.

Do we accept the recommendation to expand our expectations of students to emerge from Cal Poly as whole-system thinkers – implies an expansion of project based learning to highly interdisciplinary teams?

It is clear that the problems of today and the challenges of tomorrow for California and in a global context will need graduates who have depth and breadth in an integrated education and are whole-system thinkers. The challenges are many and most are complex requiring a multi-disciplinary and integrated interdisciplinary team rather than a solo individual approach.

Cal Poly graduates are valued for being “ready day one” and also being long-term high performers and typically have the characteristics needed. However, we need to ensure this is an intentional outcome and added value of the educational experience we provide. We should look at all our programs both individually and collectively to ensure that the full set of learning experiences do indeed prepare our students for the challenges of their future.
Future Cal Poly graduates should have integrated breadth, balance and literacy in technology, the arts and sciences and depth of their total education to be whole-system thinkers and leaders. These will be important differentiators of Cal Poly graduates. They should demonstrate expertise, work effectively and productively as individuals and in multidisciplinary teams, communicate effectively, think critically, understand context, research, think creatively, make reasoned decisions, use their knowledge and skills, and engage in lifelong learning. This will be true for all our graduates regardless of major, preparing them for full and enriching lives, ready for entry into their chosen careers or advanced study and to contribute to society.

Meanwhile, each of us should model the expectations we have of our graduates, i.e. from working effectively and productively as individuals and as part of a multidisciplinary team, to being life-long learners and whole-institution thinkers, and campus citizens, sharing a common purpose – the success of our students.

Do we continue to commit ourselves to project based learning – the emerging definition of “learn by doing”?  

We must ensure that we remain leaders and innovators in higher education pedagogy, this must be part of Cal Poly being the best. Learn-By-Doing is a core part of a Cal Poly education and a well-known part of our identity differentiating us from other institutions. LBD provides our students hands-on active learning beyond and complementing their work in the classroom and their co-curricular activities.

Like all aspects of our pedagogy, we must continue to improve and enhance LBD to intentionally mobilize higher levels of learning. Project-based learning (PBL) can be classified as a mode of LBD; and capstone projects are an example of PBL. But LBD, PBL, and capstone experiences are opportunities for a deeper, richer education to develop the whole-system thinker, comprehensive polytechnic graduate for the future. We should explore introducing these integrative experiences early in a student’s time with us, perhaps as a foundational part of all our curricula.

Are we committed to transparency of process, sustainability of operations as an element of whole-system thinking, and innovation as a necessary element of continuous improvement?  

Transparency must be a fundamental Cal Poly value together with open communication, accountability, evidence-based decision-making, and continuous improvement. All of these will assist us in our strategy of restoring economic viability. This past year we have been working hard to improve access and sharing of institutional data and in easy-to-understand formats; we have also been working on improving internal communications particularly in these difficult times of budget uncertainty.

Meanwhile, Cal Poly is a leader in sustainability of operations with a well-developed process and a record of progress to continuously improve our performance. We also have expertise in sustainability as an academic and research field. Indeed, fully-developed, sustainability can embody whole-system thinking.

We need to be innovative and creative as we seek continuous improvement and renewal in our programs and in our operations. Cal Poly also has opportunity to contribute to the field of innovation, another potentially integrative theme we have expertise in and should develop further.
Do we accept that the arc of history for Cal Poly implies a continuing growth of our graduate student proportion?

Yes. Although approximately 10% of Cal Poly degrees are at the master’s level, overall both graduate enrollment and its proportion have been declining slightly during the past decade; currently it is at about 5% of the total enrollment. Increasing our graduate proportion would yield many benefits.

For many of our majors, a baccalaureate degree is considered only an “entry-level” degree and increasingly a graduate degree is considered the first “professional” degree. Indeed, several employers have moved to hiring only at the advanced degree level.

A greater proportion of graduate students would increase the heterogeneity of the campus population, increasing the presence of national and international students and enhancing the education of all. Graduate students also serve as academic role models for our undergraduates. A deeper graduate education presence would help us further develop our research and would certainly enhance our national and international reputation. It would also support faculty in becoming teacher-scholars.

We would have to identify strategic opportunities for growth in areas where we have strength and reputation, and can build on our existing infrastructure. Note that we do have some competitive advantage of having made only a limited investment in graduate programs so far and thus we have the opportunity to be selective, creative and agile.

Do we accept the premise that resources determine size? (Does not necessarily limit growth, but focuses on how growth might be achieved rather than just hoping for state money.)

As part of our strategy to restore economic viability, we need to decouple our institutional size from the state allocation as much as is feasible. For example, the Cal Poly Plan and the College-Based Fee recognize our unique and different mission and higher cost and quality of the education we provide. We need to carefully steward and manage all our resources, continually look for ways to streamline our activities without sacrificing Cal Poly quality.

We also need to explore expanding non-state revenue sources, again without sacrificing quality. Examples include out-of-state and international students as an increasing proportion of our students, licensing intellectual property; increased grants income and continuously growing philanthropy.

We should build on our core strengths and competitive advantages wherever possible, have a sound business plan and monitor returns on such investments.

Do we endorse a definition for productivity of the University as the best possible graduate per unit of resources expended?

This expresses the value that Cal Poly has always provided. We know our graduates are among the best – we must maintain and continue to improve their quality. We must look toward ensuring more of our students reach graduation, by facilitating progress to degree, improving year-by-year retention, as always without compromising our standards. This provides value to each individual and all students while also improving our performance and efficiency.
Cal Poly has a long history of being the best; we must never take that position for granted, we must earn it every year, and every year we must do better, even in these the most difficult economic times.

TR racking Progress

Key performance indicators, stakeholder perspectives, and comparison institutions

We will track progress toward achieving the vision using key performance indicators. The key performance indicators will be directly linked to the Vision and connected to the different perspectives of the primary stakeholder groups. We will measure ourselves against comparison institutions groups using target benchmark levels for the key performance indicators. Each year, we will review our status, looking for opportunities for improvement and realignment throughout the institution. Each year, proposals for action, realigning, opportunities, initiatives and investments will be reviewed. As needed, colleges, departments and administrative units will develop action plans and pursue strategic initiatives.

Use Key Performance Indicators

We will track progress toward achieving the vision using key performance indicators, measures of progress (quantitative outcomes), quality (level of service), and resources (financial, personnel and facilities.) Note that every year we will review each key performance indicators and assess continued relevancy and value. Sample key performance indicators are listed below:

PROGRESS indicators include: student success measures: graduation rates e.g. 6-year, 5-year, and 4-year, year-by-year retention rates, progress-to-degree rates, disaggregated; institutional and program rankings; demographic heterogeneity: proportion of students and employees by ethnic, gender, socio-economic, international categories; numbers of graduates, graduates in the Professions and STEM fields, and advanced degree graduates; student learning: attainment of University Learning Objectives and program and course objectives; faculty excellence: annual institutional total scholarly contributions, teacher-scholar indicator (to be developed), research grants, patents, etc.; staff excellence: % in-range progressions and awards; revenue: value and basis of endowment, annual operating revenue from all sources; and sustainability of operations: BTU/sq.ft.

QUALITY indicators include: surveys, annually of students and employees, multi-year of alumni and employers, quarterly of departing students and employees; retention rates of continuing and non-continuing students and employees; satisfaction surveys of employers with graduates’ depth of knowledge and breadth of skills; and student-to-faculty ratio.

RESOURCES indicators include: expenditures per student: faculty-to-student ratio, student support staff to student ratio, enrollment capacity to student ratio, cost of instruction per graduate, expenditures per faculty: faculty support staff to faculty ratio, and development expenditures per annual gift income.
KPIs Aligned to Vision

- Premier comprehensive polytechnic university
  - Ranking and Program recognition
  - Comprehensive range of programs
  - Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills
  - Quality of faculty and facilities
  - Student-to-faculty ratio
  - Retention, progress-to-degree, and graduation rates
  - Diversity and heterogeneity
  - Cost-of-attendance
  - Strategic allocation of resources
  - Annual gift and endowment growth
  - Communication of successes, achievements, awards, and economic impact

- Nationally recognized innovative institution
  - Ranking and Program recognition
  - National awards
  - Innovative academic and co-curricular programs
  - Development of Comprehensive Polytechnic Graduate
  - Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills
  - Faculty scholarly output
  - Continuous quality improvement
  - Use of appropriate technology
  - Sustainable practices
  - Communication of successes, achievements, awards, and economic impact

- Helping California meet future challenges in a global context
  - Number and quality of graduates in areas of CA human resources need
  - Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills
  - Retention, progress-to-degree, and graduation rates
  - Number and availability of jobs and employment rate of graduates
  - Number of graduates going on to graduate school
  - Entering student quality
  - Diversity and heterogeneity
  - CA intellectual property and innovation
  - CA competitiveness and economic impact
  - Institutional financial needs
  - Communication of successes, achievements, awards, and economic impact

Include stakeholder perspectives

The KPIs will be linked to the three aspects of the vision statement: “the nation’s premier comprehensive polytechnic university,” “a nationally recognized innovative institution,” and “focused to help meet the challenges of California in the global context.”
The four perspective groups include those of: external accountability groups such as governing bodies and accreditation agencies; our external beneficiaries such as potential, continuing and completing students, parents, employers of our graduates and research funding agencies; internal individuals such as employee professional growth and development to maintain the intellectual capital and intrinsic institutional value embodied in individual faculty, staff, management and executive personnel; and internal institutional perspectives such as those quality aspects in which we must excel namely our programs, support activities, operations, resources, and advancement.

Note that every year we will review the relevancy of each key performance indicators relative to the vision and the perspectives of stakeholder groups.

**KPIs Aligned to Stakeholder Perspectives**

- **External accountability**
  - **Governing Bodies**
    - Ranking and program recognition
    - Comprehensive range of programs
    - Diversity and heterogeneity
    - Retention and graduation rates
    - Graduate attainment of learning objectives and outcomes
    - National awards
    - Continuous quality improvement
    - Number and quality of graduates in areas of CA human resources need
    - Diversity and heterogeneity
    - CA intellectual property and innovation
    - CA competitiveness and economic impact
  - **Accreditation Agencies**
    - Skills and abilities of graduates
    - Robust assessment of learning
    - Programs
    - Resources - faculty, facilities and finances
    - Professional development and currency of faculty, staff, management and executive
    - Continuous quality improvement
    - Entering student quality

- **External beneficiaries**
  - **Students**
    - Program choice, ease of migration
    - Student life and satisfaction
    - Access to faculty
    - Rankings
    - Innovative academic and co-curricular programs
    - Number and availability of jobs and employment rate of graduates
    - Number of graduates going on to graduate school
  - **Parents**
    - Student-to-faculty ratio
    - Graduation rate (4-yr)
Cost-of-attendance
Mentoring and support, safety
Ranking and Program recognition
National awards
Number and availability of jobs and employment rate of graduates
Number of graduates going on to graduate school

- *Alumni*
  - Ranking and Program recognition
  - National awards
  - Economic impact
  - Institutional financial needs

- *Employers*
  - Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills
  - Quantity of graduates in area of need

- *Research Funding Agencies*
  - Quality of faculty and facilities
  - Faculty track record
  - Institutional support infrastructure

- *San Luis Obispo*
  - Economic impact
  - Environmental impact
  - Community impact

- Internal individual
  - *Faculty*
    - Support expenditures per faculty
    - Satisfaction with instructional and scholarship support infrastructure
    - Publication and other scholarly output
    - Teacher-Scholar metric
    - Student progress-to-degree
    - Number of graduates going on to graduate school

- *Staff*
  - In-rank progressions and professional development opportunities
  - Opportunities for innovation
  - Student progress-to-degree

- *Management*
  - Resources
  - Opportunities for innovation
  - Student progress-to-degree

- *Executive*
  - Ranking
  - Faculty, student and program national awards
  - Patents, licenses, and intellectual property
  - Number and quality of graduates in areas of CA human resources need

- Internal institutional
  - *Academic Affairs*
Retention, progress-to-degree, and graduation rates
Student-to-faculty ratio
Strategic allocation of resources
Faculty scholarly output
Development of intellectual resources
Use of appropriate technology
Development of Comprehensive Polytechnic Graduate
Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills

- Administration & Finance
  Expanded number and amount of revenue sources
  Continuous quality improvement
  Strategic allocation of resources
  Use of technology as appropriate
  Sustainable practices

- Student Affairs
  Residential facilities and student life
  Innovative co-curricular programs
  Well-rounded, balanced graduates

- University Advancement
  Annual gift and endowment growth
  Communication of successes and achievements, awards, economic impact

Measure against comparison institutions

We will measure ourselves against a comparison institutions group of 4-year institutions. It should be emphasized that this group is not presented as a “peer” group or an “aspirant” group to which we aspire. While some institutions in the group may be considered peers and some may be those we aspire to emulate in some aspects, included are also institutions that could be classified as sub-peers in some or many categories and in that they may look to Cal Poly as a model to aspire to.

The comparison group was developed from three subgroups: National sample subgroup, Polytechnic and Institute of Technology subgroup, and Other Regional Competition subgroup. The National sample subgroup includes institutions from each of the six regional accreditation regions, California Postsecondary Education Commission four-region comparison institutions, and University of California and California State University systems. Criteria for inclusion in the National sample are: Carnegie categories, institutional mission and program mix, student quality and institutional selectivity, ranking, and financial aspects. Carnegie categories considered are Basic, Size and Setting, and Enrollment Profile. Institutional mission and program mix includes the proportion of the Professions to the Arts and Sciences, presence of programs in agriculture, architecture and engineering, polytechnic or institute of technology, comprehensive or STEM-focused graduate instructional program. Student quality and institutional selectivity includes mean SAT or ACT scores and acceptance rates. Ranking includes scores and percentile rank in US News and World Report category. Financial aspects include instruction budget per student and endowment yield per student.

The comparison group includes some polytechnics and institutes of technology, a coop-based university, and some regional competitors. It also includes a few institutions
recognized to be "on the move to the next level" with strategic plans successfully implemented and measured progress. Almost all institutions have graduate level programs, and most are public though some are private institutions. No single institution is like Cal Poly but the group taken as a composite contains important aspects of Cal Poly.

The preliminary 2009 comparison institutions group are shown in the table following. During fall 2009 quarter, the office of Institutional Planning and Analysis will conduct a detailed analysis of each of the candidate institutions with respect to the KPIs and stakeholder perspectives. IP&A will report on possible changes to the group that would include significantly reducing the number of institutions that we will track in future years. In addition, colleges and other units are encouraged to review the institutions from their perspective and relevancy. Similarly, note that during each and every year of the plan, and consistent with the principle of continuous improvement, we will critically review each of the institutions at a detailed level for their continued candidacy in the group.

**Comparison Institutions 2009**
[By Carnegie category, then by sample subgroup: national, polytechnics and institutes of technology, and other regional competition]

- **Research University/Very High Activity**
  - Cornell University
  - University of California, Davis
  - University of California, San Diego
  - University of Colorado – Boulder
  - University of Connecticut
  - Georgia Institute of Technology
  - Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
  - Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
  - University of California, Irvine
  - University of California, Santa Barbara
  - University of California, Santa Cruz
  - Washington State University

- **Research University/High Activity**
  - Clemson University
  - Drexel University
  - University of Maryland – Baltimore County
  - Missouri University of Science and Technology
  - Polytechnic Institute of New York University

- **Doctoral Research Universities**
  - Worcester Polytechnic Institute

- **Master’s Level**
  - Boise State University
  - Northern Kentucky University
  - University of North Carolina, Wilmington
  - University of Northern Iowa
  - Arizona State University Polytechnic
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology
Rochester Institute of Technology
Southern Polytechnic State University
University of South Florida Polytechnic Campus Lakeland
University of Wisconsin – Stout
California State Polytechnic University – Pomona
Santa Clara University

- Bachelor’s Level
  Bucknell University
  Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology

Target benchmark levels for the key performance indicators will be developed for Cal Poly relative to the comparison institutions group. For key performance indicators where external data is available, the target levels for Cal Poly will be in the upper half of the comparison institution group for all, in the upper ranks for most, and leading in several key performance indicators. Note that each year we will review the benchmark levels for continuing currency and update as needed.

**Review our Status**

Each year, we will review our status, looking for opportunities for improvement and realignment throughout the institution. Key performance indicators will be continuously monitored and reported annually for Cal Poly as a whole institution, and by college and program, division or unit. Annual action plans will be reviewed and amended as needed. Each year, proposals for action, realigning, opportunities, initiatives and investments will be reviewed. As needed, colleges, departments and administrative units will develop action plans and pursue strategic initiatives. Strategic initiatives to take advantage of new opportunities or to improve progress will be reviewed. In addition, the key performance indicators themselves along with the comparison institutions groups will be reviewed for continued appropriateness and relevancy and updated as needed.

**VALUES**

*Institutional, individual, and community*

Cal Poly is committed to the learning, progress and success of our students

- **Institutional**
  - *excellence, continuous improvement and renewal*
  - *transparency, open communications and collaboration*
  - *accountability, fiscal and environmental responsibility*

- **Individual**
  - *professionalism, personal responsibility, and ethical*
  - *lifelong learner and seeking personal excellence*
  - *campus citizen and team member*

- **Community**
multicultural, intellectual diversity and free inquiry
• inclusivity and excellence, mutual respect and trust
• civic engagement, social and environmental responsibility

STRATEGIC DECISIONS

Enhancing differentiation and restoring economic viability

The key strategies to achieving the vision are those that maintain Cal Poly differentiation, leverage core competencies, and sustain competitive advantages, together with those that restore financial viability by strategically managing revenues, costs and allocation of resources. Detailed institutional action plans for proceeding with the following strategic decisions are in development. However, part of this strategic plan is that every campus unit should examine their role and contribution with respect to these initiatives.

- Cal Poly will continue to develop its unique comprehensive polytechnic university identity by emphasizing programs in the professions that are science-, technology- and mathematics-based, and academic and professional programs in the arts and sciences.
  • Maintains our institutional differentiation
  • Leverages our existing core competencies
  • Sustains our competitive advantage

- Cal Poly will define all majors as “polytechnic” having depth of expertise in the professional or academic discipline, and breadth, balance and literacy in technology, the arts and sciences, integrated seamlessly to prepare whole-system-thinker graduates.
  • Increases our institutional differentiation
  • Leverages our existing core competencies
  • Sustains our competitive advantage
  • Expands our inclusivity and strengthens sense of community and commonality
  • We will need curricula development activity

- Cal Poly programs will be more integrated to connect and interlink our disciplines, faculty, staff and students, all as partners in teaching, learning, scholarship and service, to provide a comprehensive polytechnic educational experience and common polytechnic identity.
  • Increases our institutional differentiation
  • Leverages our existing core competencies
  • Sustains our competitive advantage
  • Expands our inclusivity and strengthens sense of community, partnership and commonality
  • We will need curricula development activity
Cal Poly will build on its core learn-by-doing pedagogy to ensure all students have a comprehensive polytechnic multi-mode education that could include project-based, cross-disciplinary, co-curricular, multi-mode, experiential and international opportunities.

- Increases our institutional differentiation
- Leverages our existing core competencies
- Sustains our competitive advantage
- We will need curricula development activity
- We may need review of all programs and course offerings

Cal Poly will shift the mix of students to increase the proportion of graduate students and international students while maintaining the quality and polytechnic identity of our graduates.

- Increases our cultural diversity, increases heterogeneity
- Elevates our academic scholarly climate
- Improves our economic viability
- We will need expansion of recruitment strategies and support services
- We may need curricula development activity
- We will need review of all programs and course offerings
- Offsets anticipated declining in-state K12 pool that is STEM-ready
- Enhances global perspectives

Cal Poly will restore institutional economic viability by strategically managing revenue, costs and allocation of resources, improving effectiveness and efficiency, while maintaining quality.

- Improves our economic viability
- Sustains our competitive advantage
- We will need comprehensive management of enrollment, retention, progress and graduation, costs, and review of curricula to optimize course offerings
- Expand the number and amount of revenue streams such as more effective use of summer quarter, on-line STEM curricula for P12 teachers, etc.
- We will need strengthened relationships with our external partners and stakeholders

Cal Poly will adopt and implement comprehensive enrollment management.

- Will improve alignment and match of student to appropriate program choices
- Will remove all institutional barriers to timely graduation
- Will improve retention, progress-to-degree, and graduation rates, and providing value to each student by reducing their total cost
- Will improve ability to plan course offerings, optimize schedules, and use of faculty time
- Will need comprehensive review of curricula
o Cal Poly will adopt and implement institution-wide vision-driven and evidence-based decision making and continuous improvement processes.
- Improves our economic viability by identifying opportunities to reduce costs, improve effectiveness and efficiencies
- Continually reallocate resources to the most effective methods of increasing enrollment, retention, progress and graduation
- Can increase agility by decreasing elapsed time for decision-making and implementation
- Align budgets and other resources to desired achievement of mission and vision

**ACTION PLANS AND INITIATIVES**

All divisions and colleges will develop plans linked to this institutional plan and its strategic decisions. Those plans will be tied to the institutional Mission and Vision statements identifying the contributions and roles, and highlight opportunities for collaboration and partnering. The plans will encompass the stakeholder perspectives, incorporate Cal Poly values and use the institutional key performance indicators along with other metrics that are specifically appropriate. Plans, progress, initiatives and opportunities would be reviewed annually. Note that all the plans combined together with this institutional plan will form the foundation for planning the next Cal Poly capital campaign.

Cal Poly is developing its second comprehensive campaign. Extensive planning for the campaign has positioned the university advancement team to begin fundraising for the campaign in July 2010. The priorities of the campaign are in alignment with the Cal Poly Strategic Plan and include:
- Sustainable and Healthy Communities
- Learn by Doing and the 21st Century Polytechnic Experience
- Innovation/Leadership/Entrepreneurship

Core campus-wide fundraising priorities include:

*Faculty Support:* Endowed faculty positions and other faculty support mechanisms will allow Cal Poly to attract and retain the highest quality faculty in their fields and to grow existing and new centers of excellence on campus.

*Academic Programmatic Support:* Cal Poly’s evolving curriculum demonstrates the university’s emerging commitment to cross-disciplinary learning opportunities and newly emerging fields of study. Innovative curriculum and academic centers require investments in program development to maximize the intellectual capital generated throughout the academic community. Private support will augment state funding to develop leading-edge programming and ensure access to challenging learning opportunities.

*Student Support:* The ability to attract and retain quality students and to provide an enriched academic learning environment will help strengthen the student experience and enhance the prestige of a Cal Poly degree. This support takes the form of scholarships,
project-based learning support, student/faculty research projects, graduate fellowships, and service learning opportunities.

*Facilities/Capital Investment/Technology Support:* Private support, whether solely funded or augmented with state funds, will provide critical space for students and faculty to enjoy an innovative learning and teaching environment through new construction, renovation, laboratory modernization, and information infrastructure enhancements designed to enhance student life.

*Common Goods:* Some activities and facilities on campus are designed to serve the whole university – all colleges, students, faculty, and staff. Without acknowledgement, they tend to be “orphans” with no direct constituency. The campaign will specifically identify them and build a fund-raising strategy around them.
## APPENDIX

### Table 1: CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATIONS

Shown for Four-year institutions only. Carnegie used 2003-2004 degree and enrollment data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION TYPES</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION CATEGORIES AND SUBCATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASIC</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1713 institutions)</td>
<td>Doctoral&lt;br&gt;Doctoral degrees&lt;br&gt;&gt;20/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research University - High Research Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Research University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master's&lt;br&gt;(663 institutions)&lt;br&gt;Doctoral degrees&lt;br&gt;&lt;20/yr &amp; Masters degrees&lt;br&gt;&gt;50/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium&lt;br&gt;Masters degrees&lt;br&gt;100-199/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smaller&lt;br&gt;Masters degrees&lt;br&gt;50-99/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's&lt;br&gt;(767 institutions)&lt;br&gt;Doctoral degrees&lt;br&gt;&lt;20/yr &amp; Masters degrees&lt;br&gt;&lt;50/yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SIZE & SETTING<br>(1752 institutions) | Size<br>Enrollment | Large<br>10,000+ | 246 CP |
| | | Medium<br>3,000-9,999 | 434 CP |
| | | Small<br>1,000-2,999 | 645 CP |
| | | Very Small<br>0-999 | 427 CP |
| | Setting<br>% On-campus Residential (R) & % Part-time (PT) | Highly Residential<br>R&gt;50% & FT&gt;80% | 609 CP |
| | | Primarily Residential<br>R=25-49% | 599 CP |
| | | Primarily Non-Residential<br>R&lt;25% or PT&lt;50% | 544 CP |

| ENROLLMENT PROFILE<br>(1586 institutions) | % Graduate & Professional program students (G&P) | Shown for institutions with student body of baccalaureate and graduate students only. | Very High UG<br>G&P=0-9% | 592 CP |
| | | | High UG<br>10-24% | 326 CP |
| | | | Majority UG<br>25-49% | 301 CP |
| | | | Majority G&P<br>50-100% | 167 CP |

| UNDERGRADUATE PROFILE<br>(11719 institutions) | % Part-time | PT&gt;40% | 176 CP |
| | | 20-39% | 376 CP |
| | | 0-19% | 1167 CP |
| | Selectivity<br>Freshmen scores.<br>[Includes only 1543 institutions with PT&lt;40%] | More Selective<br>Top fifth | 360 CP |
| | | Selective<br>Middle two-fifths | 760 CP |
| | | Inclusive | 423 CP |
| | % Transfer in<br>[Includes only the 1116 Selective and] | Low<br>0-20% | 566 CP |
### UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Instruction Program</th>
<th>Relative proportion of A&amp;S and P</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences (A&amp;S), and Professions (P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Program Coexistence</td>
<td>% graduate degrees awarded in fields corresponding to UG majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>0-49%</td>
<td>823 CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50%+</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRADUATE INSTRUCTION PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Instruction Program</th>
<th>Single Program</th>
<th>Dominant - plurality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Doctoral Program and degree awarded (409 institutions)</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Hum &amp; SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Doctoral Program or degree awarded (804 institutions)</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Med/Vet</td>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>Without Med/Vet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive - degrees in each of Hum, Soc Sci, STEM, &amp; Professional fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Med/Vet</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Med/Vet</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>All Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### More Selective Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Selective Institutions</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S-Focus</td>
<td>P=0-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S+P</td>
<td>P=20-39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>P=40-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+A&amp;S</td>
<td>P=60-79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Focus</td>
<td>P=80-100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### With Doctoral Program and degree awarded (409 institutions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With Med/Vet</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>A&amp;S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without Med/Vet</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>All Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Without Doctoral Program or degree awarded (804 institutions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without Med/Vet</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>A&amp;S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Med/Vet</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>All Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comprehensive - degrees in each of Hum, Soc Sci, STEM, & Professional fields

| Comprehensive - degrees in each of Hum, Soc Sci, STEM, & Professional fields | 104 CP |

---
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Table 2: DEGREES, MAJORS, PROGRAMS & EFFORT by CARNEGIE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Field Groupings</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences</th>
<th>Professions</th>
<th>H+SS</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>Other Professions</th>
<th>H+SS</th>
<th>Professions + STEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Social Sciences (and Liberal Studies &amp; Economics)</td>
<td>26% Degrees</td>
<td>74% Degrees</td>
<td>16% Degrees</td>
<td>35% Degrees</td>
<td>49% Degrees</td>
<td>16% Degrees</td>
<td>84% Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences &amp; Mathematics (and Earth Sciences)</td>
<td>25% Majors</td>
<td>75% Majors</td>
<td>14% Majors</td>
<td>42% Majors</td>
<td>44% Majors</td>
<td>14% Majors</td>
<td>86% Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sciences</td>
<td>35% Programs</td>
<td>65% Programs</td>
<td>19% Programs</td>
<td>43% Programs</td>
<td>38% Programs</td>
<td>19% Programs</td>
<td>81% Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Business Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development, Early Childhood Education, Family Studies, Human Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: COLLEGES by CARNEGIE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>College of Architecture and Environmental Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities &amp; Social Sciences (incl. Liberal Studies &amp; Economics)</th>
<th>Sciences &amp; Mathematics (incl. Earth Sciences)</th>
<th>Computer Sciences</th>
<th>Engineering &amp; Technology</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Accounting, Business Admin</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child Care, Early Childhood, Family and Consumer Sciences</th>
<th>Kinesiology</th>
<th><strong>ACADEMIC FIELDS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>H+SS</strong></th>
<th><strong>STEM</strong></th>
<th><strong>OTHER PROFESSIONS</strong></th>
<th><strong>PROFESSIONS + STEM</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>CAFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Key</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENG</th>
<th>College of Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>College of Science and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>Orfalea College of Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA
AS-—_—11

RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC ADVISING

WHEREAS, Advising is an integral part of the student's learning experience and academic success at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, In order to guide our students toward timely graduation, the University will provide them with consistent and accurate advising; and

WHEREAS, Student advising can be conceptualized as having two essential components: 1) discipline-based advising such as course contents, course electives, career opportunities, and preparation for graduate schools, and 2) advising on general curricular and university requirements including academic policies and procedures, academic probation, and referral to support services; and

WHEREAS, The students need to understand the different roles that faculty and professional advisors play to help the students succeed in their academic career and the types of assistance the faculty and professional advisors can provide; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate accept and endorse the Academic Advising Council’s Advising Syllabus concerning the different roles and responsibilities of faculty and professional advisors and students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Advising Syllabus be distributed and made available online at http://advising.calpoly.edu to all students and faculty members for their information and use.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: February 22 2011
Revised: March 29 2011
Contact Information for College Advising Centers

Agriculture, Food, & Environmental Sciences ......................................................... Contact Departmental Offices
Architecture & Environmental Design ................................................................. 805-756-1325
Business .................................................................................................................. 805-756-2601
Engineering ............................................................................................................ 805-756-1461
Liberal Arts, by major:
   ART, COMS, ENGL, JOUR, MU, PHIL, TH ............................................................. 805-756-6200
   CD, PSY, SOC, ANT/GEOG, SOCS .................................................................. 805-756-2808
   ES, GRC, HIST, MLL, POLS ........................................................................... 805-756-7452
Science & Mathematics ......................................................................................... 805-756-2615

Our Vision and Mission

Cal Poly strives to provide effective academic advising in an encouraging and welcoming atmosphere to support students as they navigate their undergraduate academic experience and learn to value their education, in order to foster individual academic success.

Academic Advising at Cal Poly is an ongoing, intentional, educational partnership dedicated to student success. Cal Poly is committed to building collaborative relationships and a structure that guides students to discover and pursue life goals, support diverse and equitable educational experiences, advance students’ intellectual and cultural development, and teach students to become engaged, self-directed learners and competent decision-makers.

Which Academic Advisor You Should See

Faculty Advisor
- Advising for major and support courses
- Concentration and elective selection
- Interpretation of courses
- Senior project
- Mentorship
- Internships
- Career/graduate school selection
- Referral to appropriate support services

College Professional Advisor
- Academic policy and procedure
- Overall degree requirements
- Students on academic probation and other specific student populations with specific needs
- Referral to appropriate support services

How to Maximize Your Advising Experience

- Think through what questions you have and contact the appropriate advisor.
- Take the initiative to meet with your academic advisor regularly and follow through with recommendations.
- When you email faculty or staff members, use your Cal Poly email account (@calpoly.edu) and be sure to sign your name. Be professional. Be sure to clearly explain questions or requests.
- Check your Cal Poly email daily, and reply in a timely manner to all correspondence methods (both email and phone calls).
- Silence your cell phone prior to advising appointments.
What We Expect of You, the Student

You are responsible for fulfilling all the requirements of the curriculum in which you are enrolled. Be an active learner by fully engaging in the advising process. Students share responsibility for a successful university experience and are expected to contribute to effective advising experiences by doing the following:

• Be on time for your scheduled appointments and cancel or reschedule if necessary.
• Be prepared to discuss your goals and educational plans during meetings with advisors.
• Keep and organize personal copies of all important documents relevant to your academic career and progress to degree.
• Become knowledgeable of the university catalog, campus-/college-/major-specific academic policies and procedures, academic calendar deadlines and degree or program requirements.
• Review your Degree Progress Report (DPR) each quarter and seek assistance to resolve any errors or questions in a timely manner.
• Inform an advisor of any concerns, special needs, deficiencies, or barriers that might affect academic success.
• Attend advising appointments and programs.
• Be open and willing to consider advice from advisors, faculty, and other mentors.
• Accept responsibility for your decisions and your actions (or inactions) that affect your educational progress and goals.

What You Can Expect of Your Advisors

Advisors share responsibility for a successful university experience and are expected to contribute to effective advising experiences by doing the following:

• Provide a respectful and confidential environment where you can comfortably discuss academic, career, and personal goals and freely express your concerns.
• Understand and effectively communicate the curriculum, degree/college requirements, graduation requirements, and university policies and procedures.
• Assist you in defining your academic, career, and personal goals, and empower you to create an educational plan that is consistent with those goals.
• Actively listen to your concerns, respect your individual values and choices, and empower you to make informed decisions.
• Serve as an advocate and mentor to promote your success.
• Encourage and support you as you gain the skills and knowledge necessary for success.
• Respond to your questions through meetings, phone calls, or email in a timely manner during regular business hours.
• Collaborate with and refer you to campus resources to enhance your success.
• Maintain confidentiality of your student records and interactions.
• Keep regular office hours and be available to meet with you.
• Participate in evaluating and assessing advising programs and services to better serve you.

For more information, answers to frequently-asked advising questions, and a list of advising resources, go to http://advising.calpoly.edu.
RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED NEW DEGREE PROGRAM:
BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATION

1. RESOLVED That the proposed new degree program, Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Communication, be approved.

Proposed by: Agricultural Education and Communication Department
Date: February 16 2011
Summary of Statement of Proposed New Degree Program

February 16, 2011

1. Title of proposed program:

Bachelor of Science degree in Agricultural Communication

2. Reason for proposing the program:

The Bachelor of Science degree in Agricultural Communication was developed to address a specific need within the agriculture industry and fill the void created by not having a degree in Agricultural Communication in existence within the CSU system and California. Industry professionals, including the members of the Industry Advisory Council of the Agricultural Education and Communication Department, note a need for professional communicators with a specific knowledge of the complex agronomic, environmental and economic conditions within the agriculture industry. As a major California industry, agriculture plays a pivotal role in our state’s economic future. This degree is being developed to assist the industry in the daunting task of communicating the importance of the food and fiber system to its more than 37 million citizens of the State.

In a college-wide strategic visioning activity, the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences’ faculty and staff identified the increasing need for social, people and communication skills. Additionally, participants recognized the need for industry and academic partnerships. The declining public image of agriculture was identified as a social trend.

The Agricultural Communication major will help the college address its strategic plan by enhancing the students’ ability to communicate effectively. The students will be provided instruction within the classroom, as well as being provided experiential opportunities both on- and off-campus to further develop their communication skills. Experiential opportunities include such things as internships, work experience, and collaborative assignments in the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication.

3. Expected student learning outcomes and methods for assessing outcomes:

Learning Outcomes – Upon successful completion of the program, students will be able to:

A. Demonstrate and apply excellent written, verbal, listening and visual communication skills.

B. Demonstrate knowledge of current communications practices, including effective writing, layout and design, photography, computer skills, and oral communication.

C. Demonstrate the ability to work in a professional communication setting through experiential-learning (i.e. internships, work experience, student organizations).

D. Analyze and communicate effectively about major issues in agriculture, including the acquisition of information from credible sources and distilling it into proper form for distribution.

E. Understand the importance of effective communication in the agriculture industry.

F. Use and evaluate technologies that enhance the communication process.
G. Apply ethical practices in daily work and recognize media and corporate roles and responsibilities in the industry and society.

H. Demonstrate awareness and sensitivity to cultural demographics of an increasingly global agriculture industry.

I. Develop a high degree of agricultural literacy and an adequate reservoir of skills and knowledge in agricultural subjects to meet the need of the agricultural communication profession and the industry.

   a. **Agricultural Business and Economics** – Demonstrate an understanding of a range of topics in agricultural business including marketing, agricultural economics and government policies that affect agricultural business.

   b. **Agricultural Systems Technology** – Demonstrate an understanding of a range of topics in agricultural systems including safety principles and practices, and operation of power equipment.

   c. **Animal Science** – Demonstrate an understanding of animal production practices and animal facilities management.

   d. **Environment and Natural Resources** – Demonstrate an understanding of the principles of sustainability and the relationship between agriculture, the environment and society.

   e. **Food Science** – Demonstrate an understanding of food processing and food safety.

   f. **Plant Science** – Demonstrate an understanding of topics in plant science, including plant nutrition, crop production practices and emerging technologies.

   g. **Agricultural Issues** – Demonstrate an understanding of the current issues affecting agriculture.

**Assessment Methods**

Scoring Rubrics: Scoring rubrics were developed for each embedded signature assignment in each course offered with the AGC prefix.

Constituent assessments – Assessments of learning outcome achievements by important constituency groups such as members of agricultural and related industries, alumni, and graduating seniors help determine our success in achieving the desired learning outcomes and guide program improvement. Feedback from the industry advisory council and surveys will be employed.

**Feedback Mechanisms**

Curriculum improvement – A departmental curriculum committee evaluates the data collected and implements curricular adjustments (may include revisions of course content, development of new courses, or revisions of requirements or sequencing) to increase learning outcome achievement levels.

Student evaluations – Faculty will utilize the feedback from student evaluations to guide improvements in teaching techniques, learning activities, equipment, and alterations in course content or emphasis to improve each course's ability to foster the desired outcomes.

Direct student involvement in funding decisions – The student fee committee in the department will make recommendations regarding the expenditures of funds to improve the program and enhance student learning experiences.
Industry Advisory Council – The program will be annually reviewed by a group of industry professionals/experts.

4. Anticipated student demand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Majors</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate briefly what these projections are based upon:

Given the history of the Agricultural Communication minor, it is anticipated the students at the initiation of this major will come primarily from the Agricultural Science major. A few students currently pursuing a minor in Agricultural Communications may also decide to pursue the major instead.

5. If additional resources (faculty, student allocations, support staff, facilities, equipment, etc.) will be required, please identify the resources needed and from where you expect them to come:

There is no anticipated need for any additional resources. In fact, the students currently pursuing their interest in Agricultural Communication through the Agricultural Sciences major must complete 192 units to graduate. This major requires only 180 units. The program is more likely to initially decrease resource needs rather than increase the resources required.

6. If the program is occupational or professional, briefly summarize evidence of need for graduates with this specific education background:

The students who have earned the minor in agricultural communications have enjoyed a favorable job market. Anecdotally, some of the top students are in positions of influence in the agricultural policy arena. The last three California Secretaries of Agriculture and a former Governor have employed our graduates as a part of their communication team. Other alumni with the agricultural communication minors own public relations agencies or communication firms.

7. If the new program is currently a concentration or specialization, include a brief rationale for conversion:

Cal Poly currently offers a minor in Agricultural Communication with approximately 40 students enrolled. The conversion primarily affects students enrolled in the Agricultural Science major with a Career Area Path of Agricultural Communication. Such students would experience a change in degree requirements from 192 units to 180 units to graduation.
8. If the new program is not commonly offered as a bachelor’s or master’s degree, provide a brief, compelling rationale explaining how the proposed subject area constitutes a coherent, integrated degree major which has potential value for students:

No campus in the California State University System offers a degree in Agricultural Communication. No other CSU campus offers a minor in agricultural communication; however, CSU Chico and CSU Fresno allow students to focus their studies in agricultural communication within the agricultural education major.

In Land Grant Universities across the United States, agricultural communication has emerged as a separate and distinct discipline. Some of the notable universities with agricultural communication majors include The Ohio State University, Texas A&M University, Kansas State University, Oklahoma State University, University of Florida, University of Missouri-Columbia, and others.

There are twenty chapters of Agricultural Communicators of Tomorrow (ACT) with close to 400 student members. The ACT is a widely recognized student professional organization within the agricultural communication profession. Cal Poly has had a highly successful ACT chapter for many years. Three former Cal Poly students have served as national officers of the ACT association.

9. Briefly describe how the new program fits with the mission and/or strategic plan for the department, college, and university:

Campus Mission
Cal Poly fosters teaching, scholarship, and service in a learn-by-doing environment where students and faculty are partners in discovery. As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly promotes the application of theory to practice. As a comprehensive institution, Cal Poly provides a balanced education in the arts, sciences, and technology, while encouraging cross-disciplinary and co-curricular experiences. As an academic community, Cal Poly values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility.

The agricultural communication major fits with the campus mission by fulfilling the following specific provisions:
- By applying communication theory to practical projects in agricultural communication;
- By offering a broad-based curriculum; and
- By emphasizing ethics in mass media.

CAFES Strategic Plan
In a college-wide strategic visioning activity, the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences' faculty and staff identified the increasing need for social, people and communication skills. Additionally, participants recognized the need for industry and academic partnerships. The declining public image of agriculture was identified as a social trend.

Following this activity, core values for the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences emerged. Leadership development was highlighted as one of the core values. The statement in the document reads, "we emphasize student leadership and the development of management skills, particularly as they relate to communication, cooperation and teamwork”.

The Agricultural Communication major will help the college address its strategic plan by enhancing the students' ability to communicate effectively. The students will be provided instruction within the classroom, as well as being provided experiential opportunities both on- and off-campus to further develop their communication skills. Experiential opportunities include such things as internships, work experience, and collaborative assignments in the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication.
## BS AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATION

### MAJOR COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGC 102</td>
<td>Orientation to Agricultural Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGC 339</td>
<td>Internship in Agricultural Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGC 407</td>
<td>Agricultural Publications</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGC 426</td>
<td>Presentation Methods in Agricultural Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGED 404</td>
<td>Agricultural Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGED 460 Research Methodology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGC 461 Senior Project I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGC 462 Senior Project II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 111 General Biology or BIO 161 Introduction to Cell &amp; Molecular Biology (B2/B4)*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 110 World of Chemistry (B3/B4)*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMS 301 Business &amp; Professional Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMS 416 Intercultural Communication (USCP)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 222 Macroeconomics (D2)*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 310 Corporate Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC 377 Web and Print Publishing or JOUR 390 Visual Communication for the Mass Media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 203 News Reporting and Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 205 Agricultural Communications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 312 Intro to Public Relations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 118 Pre-Calculus Algebra or MATH 116/117 (B1)*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 217 Introduction to Statistical Concepts and Methods or STAT 218 Applied Statistics for the Life Sciences (B1)*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agribusiness &amp; Economics</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 212 Agricultural Economics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 301 Food and Fiber Marketing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 312 Agricultural Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural Systems Technology</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAE 121 Agricultural Mechanics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAE 141 Agricultural Machinery Safety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animal Science</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCI 112 Principles of Animal Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose 1 additional:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCI 221 Intro to Beef Production</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCI 222 Systems of Swine Production</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCI 223 Systems of Sheep Mgmt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCI 224 Equine Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSCI 230 General Dairy Husbandry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 225 Intro to Poultry Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity in Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 401 Managing Cultural Diversity in Ag. Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Natural Resources</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 121 Intro to Soil Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG 360 Holistic Management (F)*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAE 340 Irrigation Water Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose 1 additional: (D5)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 308 Fire and Society</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 323 Human Dimensions in Natural Resources Mgmt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Science</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSN 275 Principles of Food Safety and Hazard Analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plant Science</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCS 120 Principles of Horticulture and Crop Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural Issues</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose 1 course:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG 452 Issues Affecting California Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCI 476 Issues in Animal Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOT 329/HCS 329 Plants, Food and Biotechnology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives – 7 units selected to enhance expertise in any area of study. Limited to maximum of 3 units of special problems and enterprise projects.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Major Units</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL EDUCATION

72 required; 28 units in major
Min of 12 units required at 300-400 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area A Communication</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 ENGL 133/134</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 COMS 101/102</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Reasoning, Argumentation and Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area B Science and Math</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Math/Stats (in major)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Life Science (in major)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Physical Science (in major)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Lab taken with either B2 or B3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area C Arts and Humanities</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Literature</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Philosophy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Fine/Performing Art</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Upper Division Elective</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C Elective (any class from C1-C4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area D/E Society and the Individual</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 American Experience</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Political Economy (in major)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Comparative Social Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Self Development (CSU Area E)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Upper Division Elective (in major)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area F Technology Elective</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area F (in major)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total GE** 44

**Total Units** 180