Today's meeting will start promptly at 3:10pm and end at 4:30pm

I. Minutes: none.

II. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair: [time certain 3:10-3:15]
   (Rachel Fernflores) General Education Task Force Recommendations (pp. 2-12).

B. President's Office: [time certain 3:15-4:00]
   (President Armstrong) Strategic Planning (pp. 13-18).

C. Provost:

VI. Business Item(s):

A. Resolution on Academic Advising: Harris, chair of Instruction Committee, second reading
   (pp. 19-21).

B. Resolution on Proposed New CAFES Department: Natural Resources Management and
   Environmental Sciences (NRES) Department: Moody, Department Head for NRM/Piirto,
   Department Head for ERSS, second reading (pp. 22-39).

VII. Adjournment: 4:30pm
Opening Statement:
The GE Task Force appreciates the continued support from Cal Poly administrative leadership and faculty to view GE not as separate and distinct from education in the major, but instead as integral to the development of the "whole system" thinkers we want our students to become. The GE Task Force recognizes the commitment from Cal Poly administrative leadership and faculty to continually improving our whole curriculum in part by relying on GE as a crucial resource for students to learn and develop foundational skills.

Section 1: Recommendation regarding General Education (GE) for Cal Poly Leadership:

1. GE and Advising

Background:
GE, as a program, ought to have an interactive relationship with advising in order to keep abreast of student advising issues, solve problems, and create opportunities for student success. From 1999 to 2010, GE staff voluntarily attended Advising Council meetings without an official appointment. This resulted in many informational exchanges and problem solving opportunities, as well as development of many collaborative outreach projects. Due to a change in leadership on the Advising Council, along with the unofficial status of the GE appointment to the Advising Council, the GE staff member was removed from the council.

At the President's discretion, he or she could appoint either the GE staff member to the Advising Council, or someone from the GE Governance Board. Alternatively, the President could delegate this responsibility to the GE Governance Board.

The GE Task Force respectfully requests that the President establish an official GE appointment on the Advising Council.

Section 2: Recommendations regarding GE for the GE Governance Board:

2. Writing and GE

Background:
GE 2001 was designed to introduce and develop students' writing skills through a writing requirement of 10% in all GE courses, and a writing-intensive component (3,000 words of writing, with faculty
providing steady and meaningful feedback to students, and 50% of grade) spread out through six lower and upper division GE courses. Faculty teaching writing intensive courses were to be supported through resources and training through Writing in Generally Every Discipline (WINGED; see Appendix One and http://ge.calpoly.edu/facultyandstaff/winged/workshops.html).

The GE Task Force consulted with the Chair of the English Department, the director of the writing program in English (Area A course series; she also happens to be the University Learning Objective Writing Consultant), the coordinator of the Writing and Rhetoric Center, and the WINGED coordinator about GE and writing intensive courses.

The GE Task Force considered data regarding the frequency over the past four years of large section offerings of writing intensive classes. Some departments have been offering some large sections of writing intensive classes due to budget conditions. It is challenging for faculty to provide steady and meaningful feedback of student writing in large section classes. The data shows an increase in large section writing intensive courses in the following areas:

- GE Area C1 and C2 classes have enrollment in some sections from 120 to 137.
- Most C4 (Arts and Humanities - upper-division writing intensive-elective) have class sections with enrollments of 35 students or less; however there are large sections with enrollment from 80 to 218 in HUM 320, MU 324, and PHIL 339.
- D5 courses (Society and the Individual - upper-division writing-intensive elective) have section enrollments from 30 to 230. (ECON 303 runs as large as 230, POLS 325 runs as large as 135-210).

Recommendations for the GE Governance Board regarding writing and GE:

A. Develop an annual plan to encourage freshmen students to take the GE Area A: Communication course series (A1, A2, and A3) by the end of their first year. The plan should include interaction with faculty, advisors and students. The GE Area A1, A2, and A3 learning outcomes should be shared with faculty in all disciplines, so that faculty will understand what communication/writing skills students are expected to learn in these introductory courses, skills that should prepare students for their major courses.

B. Develop an annual plan to encourage junior students to fulfill or at least attempt the Graduation Writing Requirement (GWR) by the end of their junior year. This would allow students to see the assessment of their skills sufficiently early in their university experience, to afford them more time to improve their skills if they need to retake the test.

C. Work with major programs to develop flow charts that integrate lower-division GE writing-intensive courses into the freshmen/sophomore curriculum, and integrate upper-division GE writing intensive courses into the junior/senior curriculum.

D. Develop a plan for an annual series of workshops, as well as a communication plan to reach faculty who teach writing-intensive courses. The plan would be coordinated with the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), WINGED, and the Writing and Rhetoric Center. The workshops would provide opportunities for joint discussions and provide an assortment of tools to assist faculty with teaching.
and grading writing.

E. The GE Program staff should recreate a new WINGED web site linked to the GE web site, offering online web site resources, sample writing assignments, rubrics, and workshop dates.


G. As long as Cal Poly remains committed to the value of GE writing intensive courses, it needs to ensure that enrollment in writing intensive courses does not exceed manageable class sizes relative to the responsibility faculty have to give regular and meaningful feedback to students about their writing in these courses (see Appendix Two, regarding three university wide learning objectives faculty across the campus identified as priorities for their programs, one of which was written communication). The GE Task Force recommends that the GE staff member monitor the frequency and range of large section offerings of GE writing intensive classes. When appropriate, based on accurate data, the GE Governance Board should encourage the administration to provide adequate support and resources to ensure that writing intensive requirements are met. Alternatively, it may also be appropriate to explore whether Cal Poly wants to build an infrastructure that allows for large section writing intensive alternative courses. If Cal Poly cannot or will not provide adequate resources to support current GE writing intensive offerings for large sections, the GE Governance Board should consider whether those courses should continue to be certified “writing intensive” courses.

3. GE Assessment

The GE Task Force refrains from making recommendations about assessment until the Academic Senate Assessment Task Force completes its assessment report.

Summary GE Assessment since 2006 GE Program Review:

GE utilized a collaborative strategy in GE assessment, one that would integrate with academic program reviews and align its goals with the university learning objectives. A summary of progress is listed below:

A. Mapping of the GE Learning Objectives in the GE curriculum has become a key point of integration in academic program review.

B. A full scale integrated program review pilot was successfully implemented with the College of Business in 2007.

C. GE utilized “ULO consultants” from 2008 through 2011 to assess specific GE/ULO learning objectives. The consultants led committees in assessing GE courses in writing proficiency, lifelong learning/information literacy, oral communication, diversity, and ethics. Results are available on ulo.calpoly.edu
4. GE Credit for Courses in Intermediate Level Courses in a Foreign Language

Background:

In article 4 of EO 1033: Subject Area Distribution, it states the following in reference to Area C Arts and Humanities courses in “Languages Other than English”:

“Students may take courses in languages other than English in partial fulfillment of this [Area C] requirement if the courses do not focus solely on skills acquisition but also contain a substantial cultural component. This may include literature, among other content.”

Currently at Cal Poly, students can receive Area C1 course credit by taking one of Spanish 233, German 233, or French 233. Courses in C1 must cultivate “language skills that are advanced rather than basic” (see Area C Educational Objectives and Criteria, CR1, at: http://www.ge.calpoly.edu/facultyandstaff/ge_objectivesandcriteria.html#C).

The GE Task Force Chair consulted with Professor Keesey (GE Director), CLA Dean Halisky, CLA Associate Dean Valencia-Laver, Professor Thompson (Modern Languages and Literature Department Chair), and Ms. Tool (GE assistant in Academic Programs and Planning).

All parties consulted agreed that it is important to cultivate students’ language skills that go beyond skill acquisition by determining a way that Cal Poly students could receive credit toward the degree for courses at the intermediate level. GE Area C may provide that possibility if students could earn GE credit in courses in languages other than English that are at the intermediate level, not just at the advanced-intermediate level.

Increasing opportunities: Students who participate in the CEA Study Abroad Program and the University Studies Abroad Consortium (USAC) receive GE Area C credit for taking intermediate level (not just advanced-intermediate) courses in languages other than English that have a substantial cultural component, providing they take those courses as part of their study abroad program. By contrast, students who participate in a Cal Poly led and developed study abroad program, such as the Cal Poly Spain and Cal Poly Peru programs, do not receive GE Area C1 credit for taking intermediate level (not advanced-intermediate) courses in languages other than English that have a substantial cultural component.

Cal Poly does have some approved courses in languages other than English in the 121/122 MLL courses that are at the intermediate level courses and have a substantial cultural component. However, Cal Poly students who take courses in the 121/122 series do not receive GE credit for those courses.

The Cal Poly GE template specifies that all courses in C1 should be literature-based, and the GE Task Force does not believe at this time that Area C1 needs revising. However, the GE Task Force maintains that it is important to increase opportunities for students to develop intermediate level language skills within the parameters of EO 1033 and the Cal Poly GE template, such that no student sees an overall increase in his or her total unit count for degree. One possible route is to create a new area in Area C, such as Area C5 as an option for students required to take the “C Elective.”

1 Article 4: Subject Area Distribution: CSU EO 1033 (http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-1033.pdf)

Students may take courses in languages other than English in partial fulfillment of this requirement if the courses do not focus solely on skills acquisition but also contain a substantial cultural component. This may include literature, among other content. Coursework taken in fulfillment of this requirement must include a reasonable distribution among the subareas specified, as opposed to restricting the entire number of units required to a single subarea.
Additional Background regarding the Area C Elective for CAFES, CAED, CSM, and OCOB Students:

Within the required 72 unit template of General Education, students in the colleges of CAFES, CAED, CSM, and OCOB are required to take 4 extra units in any GE Area C area. Similarly, students in CLA, LS, and LAES are required to take 4 extra units in any Area B area. In GE Area B, students in CLA, LS, and LAES can satisfy the extra 4 units in Area B by taking any course in the B1-B4 series or, by taking a course in the specific B5 designation for CLA, LS, and LAES students only. B5 provides for an additional selection of Area B non-foundational course offerings for CLA, LS, and LAES students.

The GE Task Force believes it would be beneficial to pursue developing a comparable area, called C5, which could serve to provide additional course options for students in CAFES, CAED, CSM, and OCOB (who are already required to take 4 extra units in any GE Area C). These students could satisfy the extra GE Area C requirement either by taking any course in the C1-C4 offerings as they currently do, or by taking a course in the proposed C5 offerings (see Appendix Three, Current GE Template and Possible Revision to GE Template).

Proposed Benefits of a C5 area include:

A. Cal Poly faculty who lead Cal Poly Study Abroad courses would have an opportunity to propose new "intermediate level" language courses in consultation with faculty from Modern Languages and Literature that could be used to satisfy the extra Area C elective course for CAFES, CAED, CSM, and OCOB students. Additionally, Cal Poly faculty who lead Cal Poly Study Abroad programs would have an opportunity to develop new GE language courses in consultation with faculty from Modern Languages and Literature.

B. Cal Poly students could receive GE Area C elective credit by taking courses in the 121/122 MLL series.

The GE Task Force recommends that the GE Governing Board leave C1 as it is, unless it uncovers issues the GE Task Force did not consider that suggest revision of this area is advisable. The GE Task Force does recommend that the GE Governance Board consider options for maximizing opportunities regarding GE credit for intermediate level courses in languages other than English that have a substantial cultural component. One option might be to create a "C5 elective" designation within the existing GE Area C elective option for CAFES, CAED, CSM, and OCOB students only. This C5 GE area would provide for an additional selection of Area C non-foundational course offerings. The criteria and objectives for an additional selection of Area C5 non-foundational course offerings would be subject to the CSU EO 1033 Area C Arts and Humanities guidelines, and would be expanded within the current parameters of Cal Poly's GE Area C objectives and criteria by the GE Governing Board. Other possibilities could also apply. The GE Governing Board is charged with pursuing possible options and bringing what it believes is the best option to the Academic Senate for discussion and/or approval.
Because of the interdisciplinary nature of these courses, all colleges have courses in Area F. Prior to AS 713-10: Resolution on the Establishment of an Academic Senate General Education Governance Board, the Area B/F Chair would monitor the supply and demand of Area F courses. The monitoring of supply and demand of Area F courses was especially helpful in advance of quarters for which it appeared there might not be enough courses to meet demand.

The GE Task Force recommends that the GE Governing Board work with the GE staff member to monitor the supply and demand of Area F courses.

6. Ad hoc committees: Area Experts to Assist with GE Curriculum Review During Catalog Cycle Review

According to the “Resolution on the Establishment of an Academic Senate Governance Board” (AS-713-10), the General Education Governance Chair may “Establish ad hoc committees if the GEGB Chair determines that ad hoc committees are needed, for instance for periodic GE assessment purposes of for program review.”

The GE Task Force maintains the importance of ensuring that experts in specific GE areas are involved in the process of GE Curriculum Review. During heavy review periods, such as a catalog cycle, it would be prudent if the GEGB Chair were to establish an ad hoc committee comprised of an area expert from each GE area whose sole task is to attest to the appropriateness of course proposals for the areas in which faculty desired them to be certified.

The GE Task Force recommends that during heavy GE curriculum review periods, the GEGB Chair establish a GE Area ad hoc committee to attest to GE area appropriateness of courses proposed for GE.

Section 3: Recommendations for Academic Senate

7. Sustainability requirement

Background:

The GE Task Force supports a “Sustainability” requirement, similar to the USCP requirement, for all Cal Poly Students. In 2009 the Academic Senate adopted the “Sustainability Learning Objectives” for the university (AS-688-09). The GE Task Force maintains that is it possible and, in light of the Sustainability Learning Objectives, desirable, to add a Sustainability requirement for all Cal Poly students in such a way that no student sees an increase in his or her overall degree unit count. Just as USCP spans the curriculum, GE and non-GE, so too could a Sustainability requirement. Just as USCP is a “tag” on USCP certified courses from across the curriculum, so too would Sustainability be a “tag” on Sustainability certified courses from across the curriculum. Cal Poly faculty already have numerous approved courses in the major and GE curriculum in which important issues pertaining to sustainability are addressed. Consequently, students could satisfy the Sustainability requirement by taking courses they are already taking. Furthermore, faculty members would have new opportunities to develop courses in which they explore sustainability issues while they help students to meet GE or major requirements.

The GE Task Force recommends that the Academic Senate Chair work with the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the GE Governance Board to explore writing a resolution requiring that all
Cal Poly students satisfy a Sustainability requirement by taking one Sustainability certified course. In consultation with the chair of the Academic Senate Sustainability Committee, the resolution should provide criteria courses need to satisfy to be certified as "Sustainability" courses. The Sustainability requirement would become an official requirement for Cal Poly students starting with the 2013 Cal Poly Catalog.

The GE Task Force further recommends that the Academic Senate establish a Sustainability Task Force in spring, 2012, whose sole charge is to certify existing and new courses for the Sustainability requirement, well in advance of the 2013 catalog.

8. USCP Review

Background:

Over the past three years, Cal Poly has been conducting a pilot assessment project, the "ULO Project." Among the assessment activities, the pilot project involved assessing for diversity learning. As a result of the diversity learning assessment activities, the Diversity Learning Assessment teams recommends that the university do a review of all USCP courses to ensure that they are aligned with the USCP criteria the Academic Senate adopted in 2009 (Resolution on United States Cultural Pluralism Requirement: AS-676-09; see Appendix Four, from the Diversity Learning Assessment Report).

Some USCP courses are not GE courses, however, many USCP courses are also GE courses, so the GE Task Force spent some time discussing the recommendation from the Diversity Learning Assessment team.

Many courses certified as USCP were so certified before the adoption of the 2009 criteria. It is important that future courses certified as USCP courses receive adequate review to ensure they meet USCP criteria, too.

The GE Task Force recommends that the Academic Senate establish a USCP Task Force in spring, 2012, whose charge is to review existing USCP certified courses to ensure that they meet the criteria described in AS-676-09. The USCP Task Force is also charged with giving faculty members meaningful feedback regarding any USCP courses in need of updating to meet USCP criteria. It is important that this review take place well in advance of the 2013 catalog.

For subsequent years, the GE Task Force recommends that the Academic Senate keep active the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee USCP sub-committee for on-going review of USCP proposed courses.
APPENDIX ONE

WINGED - Writing In Generally Every Discipline

The GE Program is committed to support both the GE required writing component and the writing-intensive coursework. This writing support is coordinated through the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) workshops. (756-7002)

WINGED Coordinator: Deborah Wilhelm - English Department (756-7032)

Workshop Goals and Content

The goal of the WINGED workshops is to promote better learning and receive better work from one's students and to join colleagues from across disciplines. Participants have the opportunity to discuss ideas and strategies that are all designed to make classes more effective and the instructor's life simpler. Topics include:

- How to get students to complete and understand assigned readings
- How to encourage students to think critically about course content
- How to design lectures, assignments, rubrics, and exams that meet program goals and produce high-quality student work

At the conclusion of WINGED, participants have access to a variety of ready-to-go strategies to try in their classes and an arsenal of practical ideas and skills, including at least one fully developed and "workshopped" assignment.

WINGED - Sample Schedule of Annual Workshops

Fall Series 2011: Three day workshop series from 9 to 12 noon, generally the weekend following Labor Day.

Winter Series 2011: Four two-hour workshop series (format sometimes varies)

Spring Series 2011: No workshops, but Deborah Wilhelm available for consultation
QUESTION
What are the top three university learning objectives the faculty in your program think a university wide assessment program should assess for?

ULO Components
1. Think critically
2. Think creatively
3. Communicate effectively: written
4. Communicate effectively: oral
5. Demonstrate expertise in a scholarly discipline
6. Understand that discipline in relation to the larger world of the arts, sciences, and technology
7. Work productively as individuals
8. Work productively in groups
9. Use their knowledge and skills to make a positive contribution to society
10. Make reasoned decisions based on an understanding of ethics
11. Make reasoned decisions based on a respect for diversity
12. Make reasoned decisions based on an awareness of issues related to sustainability
13. Engage in lifelong learning: independent research

Number of respondents: 54 programs
**APPENDIX THREE**

**GE Requirements (existing template)**


Some programs indicate specific GE courses to fulfill major and support course requirements. Courses from student’s Major department may not be used to fulfill Areas C4 or D5. All GE courses are 4 units unless otherwise indicated. ✓ non-unit requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most Majors</th>
<th>CLA, LS &amp; LAES</th>
<th>ENGR only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GE Units Taken in Residence</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Upper Division Units Required</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA A COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Expository Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Oral Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Reasoning, Argumentation, and Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA B SCIENCE &amp; MATH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Mathematics/Statistics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Life Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Physical Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 One lab taken with B2 or B3 course</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 elective (for CLA, LS &amp; LAES students only)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 Upper-division (Engineering)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering: Additional Area B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA C ARTS AND HUMANITIES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Literature</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Philosophy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Fine and Performing Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Upper-division elective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C Elective (One from C1-C4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA D/E SOCIETY/INDIVIDUAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 The American Experience (4040)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Political Economy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Comparative Social Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Self Development (CSU Area E)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Upper-division elective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA F TECHNOLOGY (upper-div)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GE UNITS</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GE Requirements (with C5 proposed change)**


Some programs indicate specific GE courses to fulfill major and support course requirements. Courses from student’s Major department may not be used to fulfill Areas C4 or D5. All GE courses are 4 units unless otherwise indicated. ✓ non-unit requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most Majors</th>
<th>CLA, LS &amp; LAES</th>
<th>ENGR only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GE Units Taken in Residence</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Upper Division Units Required</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA A COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Expository Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Oral Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Reasoning, Argumentation, and Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA B SCIENCE &amp; MATH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Mathematics/Statistics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Life Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Physical Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 One lab taken with B2 or B3 course</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 elective (for CLA, LS &amp; LAES students only)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 Upper-division (Engineering)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering: Additional Area B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA C ARTS AND HUMANITIES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Literature</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Philosophy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Fine and Performing Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Upper-division elective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 elective (for Most majors only: CAFES, CAED, CSM, &amp; OCOB – These students may take C5, or any course from C1-C4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA D/E SOCIETY/INDIVIDUAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 The American Experience (4040)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Political Economy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Comparative Social Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Self Development (CSU Area E)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Upper-division elective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA F TECHNOLOGY (upper-div)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GE UNITS</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX FOUR

USCP: Excerpts from the Diversity Learning Report (DLO) - March 2011
Chaired by Dan Villegas, ULO Consultant

- The 2009-2011 Cal Poly catalog lists seventy-one courses that fulfill the USCP requirement. These courses address many different dimensions of diversity and employ many different discipline-specific principles and perspectives for advancing the particular learning objectives designated for each course. The focus of the Diversity Learning Objective (DLO) assessment project is to evaluate the overall contribution of the USCP program to student attainment of the Cal Poly diversity learning objectives.

- The overall assessment results did not reveal a large positive contribution to the diversity learning objectives from the USCP program. The analysis provides a very general assessment of the USCP program, and is not a reflection of the quality of diversity learning that takes place in individual USCP courses. Although diversity learning should be infused throughout the Cal Poly curriculum and in co-curricular activities, the reality is that the USCP program plays a critical and prominent role in the diversity learning of Cal Poly students. The overall assessment results related to the USCP program support the need for strengthening the connection between USCP courses and the Cal Poly diversity learning objectives.

- Diversity should be infused throughout the student's curriculum, including the GE program, the USCP program and major courses.

- A program review of the U.S. Cultural Pluralism (USCP) program should take place “to discern if courses are meeting the USCP criteria and objectives, as well as reflect the intent of the diversity learning objectives.”

- In addition, the USCP program review should determine if each of the seventy-one USCP courses are effectively aligned with the Cal Poly diversity learning objectives. All USCP course instructors should be encouraged to address the four Cal Poly diversity learning objectives in their course content.

- The diversity learning objectives should be included in a review of the Cal Poly general education program and infused throughout the GE program (DCTF)
Colleagues:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in a discussion about our strategic plan. Rest assured we are not starting over with strategic planning.

The plan developed by the campus in 2008-09 has served us very well, and the fundamental framework it represents has recently been adopted by the Academic Senate.

The next step is to prepare a succinct document that communicates an engaging, emotionally appealing vision of the future built on the strategic plan. A number of stakeholders – faculty, staff, alumni alike – have expressed a desire for a document that “bluntly, is more inspiring,” as one faculty member candidly put it. We also know we need a document that summarizes the strategic plan in an engaging way and could serve as the cornerstone of a fundraising communications plan for the upcoming capital campaign. To prepare for the conversation that you’ve agreed to participate in with President Armstrong, I’d ask that you read the attached document.

The pages of this document are an attempt to begin that conversation, hence the label first draft. These pages represent a summary of several hours of discussion held by the Deans Council. In addition to your review, this first draft is being exposed to several stakeholder groups between now and the end of the spring quarter. Representatives of the President’s Cabinet, Foundation Board, faculty, staff and students are all being asked to react to this draft. After this consultation is complete, a second draft will be constructed.

Since this draft reflects the views of a small, albeit important, group, there certainly are gaps to be discovered when viewed from other perspectives. This consultative process is an attempt to identify those gaps.
The following document follows the pattern of:

- What is Cal Poly trying to do?
- What does Cal Poly need to accomplish its objectives?
- What are examples of initiatives under way, or should be undertaken, to accomplish our goals?
- How are we building on the Strategic Plan?

For the last question, examples of key performance indicators are presented along with example targets for each.

Please read this relatively short document, constructively criticize it and come prepared to discuss these ideas – and your own – with your colleagues.

And thank you again for agreeing to participate.
Graduates of Cal Poly will need to...

- serve society as resourceful professionals and innovative leaders;
- in cooperation with others, solve complex problems;
- be able to continue to learn both broadly and deeply;
- be culturally competent in a plural American society and in the global community;
- behave ethically and responsibly in pursuit of their goals.

To educate such graduates, Cal Poly will need...

- the highest available quality of faculty and staff;
- the support of its alumni and all other stakeholders;
- interaction with off campus communities, public and private, near and far;
- continued investment in proven productive practices; and
- new resources to support collaborative project based learning.

Opportunities for educational context are nearly boundless, but some examples include...

- The interaction between people and their tools...
  - medical tools, implants or prosthetics that improve the human condition;
  - security systems that improve human safety;
  - expressive technologies that nourish human interaction and exchange;
  - the enormous array of tools enhancing economic productivity.

- The interaction between people and their natural and built environment...
  - public policy and its impact on both;
  - renewable energy and efficient energy use;
waste management and reduction;
land, air, and water management and use;
The interaction between people and the systems that nourish them
food safety, security, production, processing, packaging and distribution;
communication; educational and personal growth opportunities.

Cal Poly will take specific, measurable steps to assure its continued service to the people of California.

I. **Cal Poly will continue to develop its unique identity as a comprehensive polytechnic university.**

A. Maintain and enhance its core learn by doing pedagogy.

   KPI: number of project based learning experiences for each student.

   Target: portfolio of increasingly demanding projects (may be curricular or co-curricular) culminating in a final project consistent with the best practices of the discipline.

B. Undergraduate programs continue to reflect a commitment to STEM and professional education.

   KPI: number of graduates in STEM disciplines and professional programs (by Carnegie classification)

   Target: 80-85%

C. Cal Poly claims the intersection/integration between technology and the liberal arts as its operating space.

   KPI: Number of students with calculus based technology course work and liberal arts course work.

   Target: 100%
II. Cal Poly will change to reflect a changing world.

A. Cal Poly students are culturally competent in a plural American society.

KPIs: 1) Number of students that take a course introducing them to the vocabulary of cultural competency.

2) Number of students that engage in at least six hours of cross cultural dialog

3) Number of students that participate in at least one multicultural team project.

Target: 100%

B. Cal Poly students are culturally competent in the global community.

KPIs: 1) Number of students that take a course introducing them to examples of different cultures around the world.

2) Number of students that can communicate effectively in a language other than their native tongue.

3) Number of students that participate in at least one international experience.

Target: 100%

C. Cal Poly students and faculty participate in interdisciplinary educational opportunities.

KPIs: 1) Number of faculty involved in cross disciplinary projects, centers or institutes. Target: 25%

2) Number of cross, inter or multidisciplinary experiences available to students. Target: 100%

D. Number of graduate programs and enrollment in them grows to reflect increasing complexity of a professional world.

KPI: 1) Number of graduate students at Cal Poly in professional programs

Target: 5% of total enrollment of continuing Cal Poly students, 10% of enrollment of students new to Cal Poly for a graduate enrollment of 15% of all FTES.
E. Cal Poly serves both domestic and international students while maintaining a predominance of California residents.

Targets: CA residents: 80%; domestic non-residents 10%; international nonresidents 10%.

F. Cal Poly's undergraduate enrollment reflects the demographic composition of California high school graduates eligible to attend the UC.

Target: The goal states the target.

III. Cal Poly will operate sustainably while continuously improving its quality of service.

A. Cal Poly will attempt to match revenue to needs against mutually agreed upon indicators.

KPIs: 1) Student/faculty ratio (FTES/FTEF). Target: 18
2) T-TT/lecturer faculty ratio (FTEF). Target: 3 (75/25)
3) HR to operational resources, in dollars. Target: 4 (80/20)
4) College budgets match program costs. Target: mode and level.

B. Cal Poly will test itself against the satisfaction of its stakeholders.

KPIs: 1) Student satisfaction survey response.
2) Alumni satisfaction survey response.
3) Employer satisfaction survey response
4) Graduate school advisor survey response

Target: >= four on a five point scale.

C. Cal Poly will not be the obstacle for any enrolled student to reach graduation.

KPIs: 1) Availability to each student of information about their progress to stated degree goal. Target: 100%
2) Retention from first to second year. Target: 95%.
3) Freshmen grad. rate. Targets: 6 yr, 85%, 5 yr, 75%, 4 yr, 45%.
4) Match between computed classes (from 1, above) required and class availability. Target: 100%

D. All Cal Poly academic programs and business processes will be reviewed on a five year cycle.

KPI: % programs and processes reviewed each year, Target 20%.
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
Academic Advising Syllabus

Contact Information for College Advising Centers

Agriculture, Food, & Environmental Sciences ................................. Contact Departmental Offices 805-756-1325
Architecture & Environmental Design .............................................. 805-756-2601
Business ...................................................................................... 805-756-1461
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.
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-___-11

RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED NEW COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES DEPARTMENT: NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES (NRES) DEPARTMENT

WHEREAS, The College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences (CAFES) has identified several benefits for combining two current departments—Natural Resources Management (NRM) and Earth and Soil Sciences (ERSS)—into one new department called Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences Department; and

WHEREAS, These benefits, as well as the structure of the new department, are outlined in the attached Reorganization NRM-ERSS Cooperative Agreement to form Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES) Department;

WHEREAS, Approval for combining these two departments into a single new department has been approved by the Dean of CAFES, both NRM and ERSS department heads, and all, except one, NRM and ERSS faculty members; therefore be it

RESOLVED That the proposal for a new CAFES department, Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences Department, be approved.

Proposed by: College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences
Date: March 20 2011
Reorganization NRM-ERSS Cooperative Agreement to form Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES) Department

Reorganization Committee: Tom Rice, Chip Appel, Samantha Gill and Brian Dietterick
Department Heads: Lynn Moody and Doug Piirto

March 7, 2011

Representatives from the Natural Resources Management Department and the Earth and Soil Sciences Department, in open communication with all faculty and staff from these departments and the Dean of the CAFES, propose a reorganization to form a new department housing all existing programs. The new department name will be Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES). Numerous committee and department meetings have identified benefits, challenges, and resolutions to reorganizing. This document summarizes important items that have been discussed and agreed upon by faculty and staff from both departments.

Reorganization will:

1. Address the worldwide societal need to teach and train individuals equipped to manage natural resources and understand important environmental issues including climate change, ecosystem degradation at every scale due to pollution and contamination, water quantity and quality, scarcity or depletion of resources, with a focus on sustainability.

2. Combine faculty with complimentary and collaborative expertise. New faculty hires will be shared among programs, improve faculty research opportunities, provide more effective course offerings, and enhance employment opportunities for our graduates.

3. Provide a single department capable of addressing the increasing demand prospective students have to pursue meaningful natural resources and environmental science and management careers.

4. Maximize efficiency of staff to serve a broader-based student population.

The existing departmental resources along with several discussion items are outlined below.

A. Faculty and Administrative positions

Department Head

The current makeup of faculty will be reorganized in the new department under one Department Head. That Department Head will be Dr. Douglas Piirto. The commitment
of Dr. Piirto satisfies the desire of the Dean to have a Department Head that is committed full time to the start-up of NRES. The present Department Head of the Earth & Soil Sciences Department will return to an academic year faculty appointment at Professor rank (1.0 FTEF). A national search to fill the department head position will commence in a time frame commensurate with Dr. Piirto’s retirement to successfully recruit an individual that best represents the new department. The search will take place during the final year of Dr. Piirto’s appointment as Department Head, assuming he is able to anticipate that decision one-year in advance. Having Dr. Piirto become the Head of the new department, allows ample time for the new department to be better established and improve the likelihood that highly-qualified candidates will be recruited. Further there is the recommendation that “at least one degree in forestry is preferred” be in the list of desired qualifications to best maintain industry advancement opportunities and meet accreditation standards to maintain eight forestry-related faculty. If the Department Head were not to have a forestry background, it is understood that an additional forestry faculty position will be needed to preserve the accreditation standard.

**Faculty**

The current faculty and staff personnel composition is as follows:

**Earth and Soil Sciences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
<th>Appointments other than teaching within ERSS</th>
<th>ERSS FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lynn Moody</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Soil Physics, Pedology, Mineralogy, Geology</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Chip Appel</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof</td>
<td>Soil and Water Chemistry, Tropical Soils</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Thomas Rice</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Soil Science, Pedology</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Terry Smith</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Soil Fertility</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil/landscape ecologist</td>
<td>Asst. Prof</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brent Hallock</td>
<td>FERP</td>
<td>Soil and Water Conservation, Erosion Control</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Natural Resources Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
<th>Appointments other than teaching within NRM</th>
<th>NRM FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Douglas Piirto</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Silviculture, Forest Operations and Utilization</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Chris Dicus</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brian Dietterick</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Forest Hydrology, Watershed Management</td>
<td>0.67*</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Samantha Gill</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Forest Biometrics</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John Harris</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Outdoor Recreation/Conflict Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Scott Sink</td>
<td>Asst. Prof</td>
<td>Forest Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Rich Thompson</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Resource Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. James Vilkitis</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Environmental Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Norm Pillsbury</td>
<td>FERP</td>
<td>Watershed Management/Forest Mensuration</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Wally Mark</td>
<td>FERP</td>
<td>Forest Heath/ Forest Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Administrative FTEFs from service as Director of Swanton Pacific Ranch

### Administrative and Technical Staff

#### Earth and Soil Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
<th>Admin FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Wallravin</td>
<td>ASC I</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Stubler</td>
<td>Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Natural Resources Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
<th>Admin FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Calcagno</td>
<td>ASC II</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Reimer</td>
<td>Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Curriculum

Majors

All four majors (Forestry and Natural Resources, Environmental Management and Protection, Earth Sciences, and Soil Science) as well as the five minors (Disaster Management and Homeland Security, Geographic Information Systems for Agriculture, Water Science, Soil Science, and Land Rehabilitation) have been solely or jointly administered by NRM and ERSS. Under NRES these programs will be administered by curriculum groups who make recommendations to tenure-track faculty and the Department Head. Decisions will be made about the best program strategies (which may include combining majors) that are achievable by NRES and provide the greatest benefit to our students.

Graduate programs
The MS in Forest Science and the MS in Agriculture with specializations in Soil Science will continue to be administered as they presently exist.

C. Voting rights

Each tenure-track faculty member within NRES will have the same vote on all future departmental matters.

D. Department funding model

There will be one centralized departmental budget. This budget will consist of state, corporation, and CBF accounts. Allocation of CBF funds will be determined by committee recommendation to the Department Head. Particular emphasis will be on assessing individual program needs and student representation in those programs.

Budgets from the existing two departments will be combined into one operational budget for NRES and will be the responsibility of the Department Head.

E. Personnel

Personnel evaluation committees will consist of committee members from the Cal Poly tenured faculty with consultation of the person being evaluated. The guiding principles for all department personnel policies will be based on a combination of the currently existing personnel policies of each department.

No faculty or staff positions will be lost by the formation of NRES.

Staff responsibilities will be determined by the Department Head upon consultation with all staff members.
F. Physical Resources

No physical resources will be lost by the formation of NRES. Department office is proposed to be in the new Science and Math Building (to be completed in 2014). Until that building is completed, Building 11 and Building 26 will be staffed under the direction of the Department Head with consultation of faculty and staff.

Equipment and storage rooms will be maintained as they currently exist.

All existing and planned classroom space currently within the NRM or ERSS departments will be maintained and scheduled by representatives of NRES.

The Earth & Soil Sciences Department currently maintains a cooperative arrangement with Geology faculty in the Physics Department regarding use of the ERSS Department vans for field trips for GEOL and ERSC courses required of, or restricted electives for, Earth Sciences and Soil Science majors, and students pursuing the Geology Minor. This cooperative arrangement will continue.

G. Swanton Pacific Ranch Participation

The Directorship of the Ranch has been connected to the Natural Resources Management Department since 1996. It is desired this association be maintained and continue to include a 0.67 responsibility to the Dean of the CAFES and a 0.33 Department responsibility. Additionally, faculty and staff participation will continue in various advisory and professional capacities including the position of forest coordinator, participation in forest management committees, educational planning, computer and GIS support, field trip coordination, and teaching assignments.

H. Class Scheduling

For an initial two-year period, staffing plans and scheduling will be done by a committee of the current schedulers under the purview of the Department Head. After this two year period, the faculty and staff will discuss designating one scheduler for NRES.

I. Accreditation and Certifications

Maintaining accreditation by the Society of American Foresters (SAF) is crucial to the FNR major and will continue to be a priority.

Maintaining the curricula of the new department in order to ensure graduates meet U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) standards (GS 457 – Soil Conservation, GS 460
Forestry, GS 470 – Soil Science, GS 1315 – Hydrology, etc.) for various avenues of
government employment as well as professional certifications such as CPSS – Certified
Professional Soil Scientist, CPESC – Certified Professional in Erosion and Sediment
Control and others mutually agreed to by the faculty will continue to be a priority.

J. Committee Assignments

All faculty members are expected to participate in Departmental, CAFES, and University
committees as is appropriate for their expertise and experience. CAFES committees will
each have one representative from NRES.

K. Department Visioning and Strategic Planning

Visioning and strategic planning for the new department formation will commence
immediately with participation from the full faculty and staff from both departments.
The expectation is that a new visioning and strategic plan would be well underway by the
time NRES is formed.

L. Advisory Council

There will be one advisory council for NRES. This advisory council will initially be
composed of the members from the current ERSS and NRM advisory councils, with the
understanding that the make-up of the advisory council shall change over time.

M. Department Name

The name of the department, Natural Resources Management and Environmental
Sciences (NRES) was selected after open discussions among faculty, staff, advisory
councils, and other constituencies beginning in November 2010. Numerous surveys
were taken and a decision was reached by faculty vote on February 15, 2011.

N. Discussion and Agreement

Significant discussion on forming a new department in CAFES has been occurring for a
long time but in earnest since August 2010. Numerous meetings have been held that
have involved faculty, staff and to some extent our students. A signature page is attached
to this document that indicates two situations:

1. Confirmation that fair and open discussions on the creation of a new CAFES
department have occurred.
2. Consensus in terms of moving ahead with the creation of a NRES Dept. per the
discussion items that are described in this document.
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Memorandum

To: Dr. Rachel Fernflores, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Dr. Douglas D. Piirto, Head
       Natural Resources Management Department

Subject: NRM/ERSS Department Reorganization.

A proposal is being considered by the Cal Poly Academic Senate focused on forming a new department called Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES) in the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences (CAFES). I have organized my comments here to discuss the following:

1. Benefits of Reorganization
2. Vetting process
3. Key Points of the Reorganization Cooperative Agreement
4. Ecosystem Management and Collaboration
5. Need for a Timely Decision
6. Concluding Comment

Benefits of Reorganization

The following benefits have been identified with the NRES Reorganization Proposal:

1. Enhancement of educational programs will be a strategic goal.
2. One major CAFES home will be created for students interested in natural resources and environmental programs with a career focus. A stronger identity to meet these needs will result with creation of one CAFES department.
3. The new NRES Department will be better equipped to address worldwide society needs involving management of natural resources and environmental issues
4. Faculty will be combined with complimentary and collaborative expertise allowing for curriculum flexibility for students. Faculty resources will be shared between programs where possible.
5. A bigger organization will be created which will hopefully be less affected by budget reductions and retirements
6. Increased administrative support will result over the long-term in enhanced efficiency.

Vetting Process

A committee was formed by Dr. Dave Wehner, CAFES Dean, to discuss the idea of forming a new department. The committee is comprised of Dr. Tom Rice, Dr. Chip Appel, Dr. Samantha Gill and Dr. Brian Dietterick. The committee in consultation with ERSS and NRM faculty, staff and CAFES Administrators developed a Reorganization Cooperative Agreement (RCA) which was signed by all but one of the ERSS and NRM faculty and staff. Significant vetting of the proposal has occurred by faculty, staff and respective advisory councils for each department (please refer to attached letter from the NRM Advisory Council). This vetting process started last August 2010 and continues to the present. All faculty including FERPs were kept informed via e-mail and with meetings that were conducted both at the department level and jointly. Dean Wehner facilitated some of these meetings to insure that he was fully informed of all concerns. Additionally, the proposal has been reviewed by the College Deans and Provost.

Key Points of the NRM-ERSS Reorganization Cooperative Agreement

1. Title: Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences. A large number of titles were evaluated by both internal and external audiences. A vote was taken at our joint meet of ERSS and NRM departments to arrive at this decision.
2. Department Head, Faculty and Staff positions are identified. Future faculty/staff planning and evaluation processes are discussed. Upcoming strategic planning involving faculty, staff and university administrators will more fully address a hiring plan that will accommodate the needs of the new department.
3. Undergraduate and graduate programs (i.e., majors, minors, concentration) comprising the new department are listed. We have discussed the needed to undertake a curriculum review process and that will be further elaborated in our upcoming strategic planning process.
4. Voting rights and expected faculty participation on committees are described.
5. Department Funding Model is discussed.
6. Physical Resources are listed.
7. Past, present and future involvement with Swanton Pacific Ranch is described.
8. Short- vs. long-term concerns regarding class scheduling are addressed.
9. Accreditation and certification of existing programs will be maintained.
10. Strategic planning will be initiated immediately upon Academic Senate review and approval.
11. One new Advisory Council will be created comprised of existing NRM and ERSS members with new additions already occurring.

The NRM-ERSS Cooperative Agreement was formally reviewed and finalized at our February 15, 2011 joint meeting. Signature by NRM-ERSS faculty and staff on the March 7, 2011 RCA document indicates two things:

1. Confirmation that fair and open discussions on the creation of a new CAFES department have occurred.
2. Consensus in terms of moving ahead with creation of a new Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences Department.

**Ecosystem Management and Collaboration**

Ecosystem management is a central theme for both the FNR and ENVM majors. The model assumes that graduates will be working in a collaborative, interdisciplinary context. As such, FNR and ENVM students are asked to collaborate in an interdisciplinary setting. Some historical context is provided below:

1. Dr. Baker some 30+ years ago stated that the NRM Dept. would include Environmental Resources embedded into the Forestry and Natural Resources program. That initial direction then led to a broad based (i.e., ecosystem management) FNR degree that was formalized in the early 1990s and accredited by the Society of American Foresters in 1994 and re-accredited in 2004. The same nine NRM faculty members that created the FNR major then went to work to create an Environmental Management and Protection major which was approved about 7 years ago.

2. All nine NRM Faculty are involved in the delivery of the ENVM and the FNR degrees. For example, ENVM majors take NR 215 taught by either Dr. Gill or Dr. Pillsbury. ENVM majors take NR 326 and NR 465 taught by Dr. Thompson. Both FNR and ENVM majors take NR 416 taught by faculty and lecturers. Both ENVM and FNR students take NR 140 from me. NR 320, Watershed Management, is taught by Dr. Pillsbury and both ENVM and FNR majors take that course. NR 306, Natural Resources Ecology, is a main line course for both majors that is taught by faculty and lecturers. NRM Faculty and lecturers teach: NR 404 Environmental Law and NR 408 Water classes taken by both ENVM students. The NR 142 Introduction to Environmental Management is taken by ENVM students only and is taught by a local environmental manager who works for the County Environmental Coordinators Office.

3. A NREM position which will focus on the ENVM major is currently being advertised.
4. NRM has close ties to Swanton Pacific Ranch. Many forestry and environmental management learn-by-doing opportunities exist there. Most recently, we are finding that ENVM and FNR students are attracted to our 5-week summer NR 475 course that is taught at Swanton.

The Need for a Timely Decision

A timely decision to proceed this spring would enable the transition process to occur within the context of:

1. Fiscal year/academic year concerns
2. Dr. Moody’s plans to return to teaching in September, 2011
3. Needs to initiate strategic planning this Spring and Fall quarters
4. Using summer to begin restructuring administrative services, fiscal/budget management, office allocation, staff planning, RPT/personnel management, and a whole host of other details associated with forming a new department
5. Ongoing and near future faculty hiring plans. Currently two positions are being advertised to support the new department with close collaboration occurring.

Concluding Comments

The vast majority of faculty and staff associated with the NRM and ERSS departments see a number of good things that can develop with formation of a new NRES department as I have tried to outline here. We look forward to discussing this further with the Academic Senate. Thank you for your consideration.
Dear Dr. Wehner:

The Advisory Council for the Natural Resources Management (NRM) Department at Cal Poly appreciates your time at our recent meeting on November 18, 2010, notably your informative presentation regarding your new graduation initiative and the creation of a new department within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences (CAFES) that will encompass the Natural Resources Management Department, the Soil Science Department, and the Earth Sciences Department. The Advisory Council greatly appreciates your continued support of the NRM Department, one which continues to produce outstanding graduates for a critical natural resource management workforce in the State of California, and beyond. The NRM Department has come a long way during its 40 year history, especially since it sought and received accreditation from the Society of American Foresters (SAF) in 1994. Your continued support of the Department has been a vital component to its success.

Following your presentation, the Advisory Council continued to discuss the creation of a new department within the CAFES and wanted to share our thoughts and recommendations with you. We feel that the integration of these three departments would be invaluable, given the overlap in disciplines and academic focus and the limited enrollment facing the Soil Science Department. As professionals in the natural resources management and environmental protection fields, we recognize the importance of each of these disciplines in analyzing and managing natural and environmental resources, but also feel that the creation of a new department within the CAFES should proceed without compromising the forestry education at Cal Poly. With this in mind, we offer the following recommendations as you move forward in the creation of the new department:

- Maintain faculty expertise to cover education in the basic and advanced areas of forestry, specifically those areas covered on the California Professional Foresters Examination. While some cross-discipline teaching is possible within the major, it is simply not feasible for forestry faculty to provide expertise in all subject areas of forestry. The Advisory Council feels it is critical to maintain a minimum level of forestry expertise to adequately teach and prepare forestry students.

- Retain SAF accreditation for the Department. The Advisory Council feels strongly that all efforts should be made to retain this distinction and status. It was a significant effort to acquire this accreditation, and, although we realize that it may place staffing constraints on the Department, its value in producing competent, skilled graduates in the forestry and natural resources field is
Dr. David J. Wehner  
Subject: New Department within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences

immeasurable. Additionally, this accreditation has benefits for those graduates seeking to take the California Professional Foresters Examination. Specifically, a Cal Poly graduate with a Bachelor of Science degree in Forestry and Natural Resources can apply this educational experience toward four of the seven years of experience necessary to take the exam.

- Retain a focus on the Environmental Management and Protection discipline within the department. This major and study area has proven to be successful for the Department and the need for graduates with this training continues to grow.

- Once the new department is established, begin to search for new faculty to best fill the needs of the new department. With pending and upcoming faculty retirements, it will be important to identify discipline gaps and fill these positions accordingly. This process should also seek to maintain staff resources and technical support staff critical for maintaining a hands-on, learn-by-doing approach that is critical for producing highly-qualified and industry-ready graduates.

- The future new department head should be an appropriate fit with the range of disciplines included in the department. Consideration of candidates should also factor in the effect it may have on SAF accreditation. The Advisory Council concurs with your decision to retain Dr. Piirto in the interim and we all look forward to supporting him and the CAFES through this process.

- Decisions regarding the creation of the new department should occur by June 2011 so that teacher/classroom scheduling can be adequately planned and implemented.

The Advisory Council also supports the intent of the new initiative intended to decrease the time necessary to graduate from the CAFES. However, the unique nature of the Natural Resources Management curriculum has some inherent challenges that may make graduation in a four-year timeframe infeasible. For example: the department has no control over the availability of required classes outside of the department or the college; many students have work commitments, some with summer jobs in the fire suppression field that can delay returning in time for fall courses; and the many courses in the Forestry and Natural Resources/Environmental Management and Protection programs with lab components require additional time commitments. Each of these factors can contribute to slowing a student's movement through the degree program. The Advisory Council hopes that decisions in respect to this initiative are made thoughtfully and that adequate resources (classroom space, faculty, staff) are made available to the new department to successfully graduate students without losing the learn-by-doing approach that makes Cal Poly so unique.

In closing, the Advisory Council appreciates the opportunity to contribute to Cal Poly and trust you will proceed thoughtfully as you develop the new department. We look forward to supporting you, the NRM Department, and the CAFES during this transition.

Sincerely,

Scott W. Eckardt  
RPF #2835  
Chair, NRM Advisory Council (2008-2010)

cc: Dr. Doug Piirto, NRM Department
Summary statement from James Vilkitis

Resolution on New CAFES Department: Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES)

(prepared for May 3 2011 Academic Senate meeting)

When contacted in late March 2011, I expressed strong concerns regarding the proposed Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES) Department that, if approved, would result from the reorganization and merger of the existing Natural Resources Management Department and the Earth and Soil Sciences Department. The major concerns I've identified are directed at the inadequacy of the vetting process, the lack of core faculty and resource allocations in support of the ENVM major, and the absence of a strategic plan that adequately addresses an implementation and resource allocation plan.

Over the past 30 years, I have developed and implemented the ENVM curriculum and major. I am the lead and only dedicated faculty member for the major, which currently has over 200 students. I have also integrated the program with industry and maintained industry and professional ties. When the vetting process took place during fall quarter 2010, I was off-campus on sabbatical leave and not contacted for direct input regarding the proposed merger. The vetting committee consisted of two faculty members from the Forestry major and two faculty members from the Soil Science major; there was no representation of the ENVM major on that committee.

In the two departments, the majority of the faculty members are either foresters or soil scientists. In reviewing the faculty-to-student ratios for each major, the following is provided: a core of five faculty members has been established by the dean for Soil Science majors (130 students; 5:130 ratio); eight faculty members for the Forestry major as required by its accreditation body (200 students; 8:200 ratio), and one faculty member for the ENVM major (200 students; 1:200 ratio).

Additionally, there is little or no overlap of ENVM with the other two majors. ENVM is directed at the management of resource users and the assessment of their activities on the human environment as prescribed by law, whereas Forestry and Soil Science are intricately involved with only the science and management of/within each discipline.

The “proposal” for a merger of the NRM and ESS departments as presented is merely a concept of what may occur. It is not a “strategic plan” for implementing a transition nor does it identify how the department will function as a cohesive unit. It addresses very broad issues in very vague terms. Relevant current concerns need to be adequately addressed and a format developed for the transition phase in order to integrate the goals and learning outcomes for each major. Resource allocations need to be established equitably for each major, including assigned time for supervision of lectures, faculty allocations, office support, etc.
Association of Environmental Professionals
Channel Counties Chapter

April 27, 2011

President Jeffrey D. Armstrong
President's Office
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

RE: Proposed Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES) Department: Program Equity Concerns

Dear President Armstrong:

On behalf of the Channel Counties Chapter Board of Directors of the California Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP), please accept this letter of concern regarding the proposed merger of the Natural Resources Management Department with Soil Science Department at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. While recognizing the serious budgetary challenges faced by the university, we firmly believe that extreme caution should be taken in any reorganizational efforts to ensure that the individual integrity of each existing major within this invaluable multidisciplinary department is preserved.

As you may be aware, AEP is a non-profit volunteer organization of professionals working to improve our skills as environmental and resource managers dedicated to the enhancement, maintenance and protection of the natural and human environment. To this end, AEP supports environmental professionals by offering educational seminars, establishing environmental standards for its membership, and encouraging and supporting student involvement. We commend, in general, the university on its provision of an exceptional educational experience for future members of our collective professions, and are especially appreciative of the dedicated efforts in fostering leadership opportunities for Cal Poly students in the on-campus environmental programs. It is particularly noteworthy that the Cal Poly Chapter is the first and oldest student chapter in AEP.

Throughout my ten year affiliation with AEP, I have personally observed and interacted with many of these students, through their provision of support services for local seminars and the annual AEP state conference, as well as internships (through both public and private organizations to help prepare students for careers in environmental sciences professions) and scholarships we have awarded. These student interactions have been among the most gratifying experiences in my 20 year career as a land use planner for the County of Santa Barbara, based on the optimism, enthusiasm and intelligence of these young people.
While these students enter Cal Poly with many of these qualities, there is no doubt in my mind that the associated faculty and curriculum are instrumental in the development of the Environmental Management and Protection (ENVM) majors in the NRM department. In particular, I have gotten to know Dr. Vilkitis through his long association in and with AEP, and Dr. Thompson through recent sporadic participation with the local board. Historically, Dr. Vilkitis has worked with the State AEP Board of Directors, providing mentoring and guidance over a 30 year period during which the environmental management concentration with less than 100 students expanded to a major with approximately 200 students, while the core faculty decreased from two professors to one.

The ENVM major, as an integrated program, contains the majority of students we have so enjoyed working with over the years. We strongly believe that this carefully designed major is instrumental in promoting and preparing undergraduate students for entry into the environmental professional workforce.

Having served as the de facto advisory board for the student chapter of AEP and its curriculum, the AEP Channel Counties Chapter recognizes that, due to high enrollment numbers, many different outside lecturers are teaching core ENVM courses, resulting in less than adequate program supervision which severely inhibits the integration of student program learning outcomes. There is no doubt that the preparatory training of these future environmental professionals, consisting of the knowledge and skills they obtain through the pursuit of their academic degrees, is critical to their development and ultimate success in their fields.

With this in mind, the Channel Counties Chapter of AEP respectfully requests that the university retain at least one full time senior faculty member for the ENVM major in order to ensure: 1) effective integration with public and private professionals, and associated university faculty; 2) establishment of a “core” faculty of at least three members to implement the desired learning outcomes of the integrated major’s coursework; 3) the development of a strategic plan that adequately addresses the integration of the various programs and; 4) that equitable resource allocations, based on demand and current enrollment by major are achieved.
Thank you for your consideration. Please don’t hesitate to contact me at (805) 934-6255 if you have any questions or comments regarding this letter.

Respectfully,

JOHN KARAMITSOS, President
Channel Counties Chapter Board of Directors
California Association of Environmental Professionals

Cc: Dr. Robert D. Koob, Provost, Office of the Provost, Administration Building
    Dr. D.J. Wehner, Dean, College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences
    Rachel Fernflores, Chair, Academic Senate
    Dr. D. Piirto, Dept Head, Natural Resources Management
    Dr. James Vilkitis, Professor, Environmental Management and Protection
    California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
    Gene Talmadge, President, State Board of Directors, AEP (electronic)