I. Minutes: (to be distributed on June 1).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
A. Nominations will be received for the 1999-2000 positions of Academic Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary until Monday, May 24. If you are interested in serving as an Academic Senate officer, please complete the nomination form on page 3 and return to the Academic Senate office by May 24.
B. On June 1 new senators for the 1999-2000 AY will be introduced.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost’s Office:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. ASI Representative:
G. Other: On May 25 William Martinez will give a brief report on International Programs.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
A. On May 25 the first item of business will be the election of Academic Senate officers for the 1999-2000 year.
B. Resolution of Commendation of President Warren J. Baker: first reading, Academic Senate Executive Committee (p. 4). WITHDRAWN
C. Resolution to Establish a Graphic Communication Institute: first reading, Levenson, Department Head for the Graphic Communication Department (please bring the handout of this item distributed at the 4.27.99 Academic Senate meeting).
D. Resolution on Dependent Care: first reading, Harris, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (p. 5).
E. Resolution Principles to Govern Enrollment Growth at Cal Poly: first reading, Kaminaka, chair of the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (p. 6).

Continued on page 2
F. (1) Background Statement on Grading Policy Resolutions (2) Resolution on Standard Grading Policy (3) Resolution on C- Prerequisites: first reading, Keesey, chair of the Curriculum Committee (pp. 7-10).

G. Resolution on Credit by Examination Policy: second reading, Freberg, chair of the Instruction Committee (p. 11).

H. Resolution on Development of a Research Infrastructure at Cal Poly: second reading, Clay, chair of the Research and Professional Development Committee (pp. 12-16).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
I hereby nominate (please print)

for the following Academic Senate position:

Chair ______ Vice Chair ______ Secretary ______

signatures of three tenured faculty members:
(nominators must also be current senators)

CONSENT TO SERVE

If elected, I will serve as an Academic Senate officer for the 1999-2000 term.

(Signature of nominee)

PLEASE CALL THE ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE (61258)
TO ENSURE YOUR NOMINATION WAS RECEIVED

NOMINATION FORM MUST BE RECEIVED IN THE ACADEMIC SENATE
OFFICE BY MONDAY, MAY 24, 1999, 5PM.
WHEREAS, Countless organizations have recognized the importance of provision of dependent care in the lives of their employees; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly currently provides childcare services via the Children’s Center. However, the Children’s Center currently has a waiting list of more than 200 children from parents who are either students, staff, or faculty, and an additional 116 children on the waiting list from members of the community; and

WHEREAS, The influx of older students and younger faculty and staff due to retirements in the next 10 years will only exacerbate the current waiting list situation; and

WHEREAS, A number of Cal Poly faculty and staff currently have had the difficult task of placing their parents in a care institution and the number is likely to increase greatly;

WHEREAS, The provision of dependent care on campus may be a significant factor in the successful recruitment of students, staff, and faculty; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That a task force be established by the President to examine the feasibility of the construction and management of dependent care facilities for (1) children of faculty, staff, and students, and (2) the parents of faculty or their spouses and the parents of staff or their spouses; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the membership of the task force has adequate representation (a minimum of two faculty, staff, and student representatives).

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: March 30, 1999
Background: In concert with the current Cal Poly Master Plan Update, the Budget & Long Range Planning Committee of the Academic Senate was asked to review two documents from the past and to update them as needed to reflect today’s concerns. The two documents that were reviewed were:
1. Academic Senate resolution AS-279-88/LRPC, Resolution on Enrollment Growth to 15,000 FTE and Beyond, adopted: March 8, 1988; and
2. Demographic Factors Affecting Cal Poly Enrollment, dated February 8, 1988. The Committee felt that most of the text of the original documents was still relevant and elected to re-emphasize what it felt to be some important basic principles that should be considered whenever enrollment growth is discussed.

WHEREAS Cal Poly is engaged in a major update of its Campus Master Plan; and

WHEREAS Enrollment growth will have significant impacts upon academic quality, facilities utilization, and resource allocations; therefore be it

RESOLVED 1. That Enrollment growth at Cal Poly should not adversely affect Academic Quality.
2. That Enrollment growth at Cal Poly should not adversely affect the academic progress of those students who were enrolled at the time of growth.
3. That Enrollment growth at Cal Poly should be fully funded for any additional students admitted (either on this campus, at satellite facilities, or at programs taught through distance learning or other technological means).
4. That Enrollment growth at Cal Poly should not occur until the facilities needed to support the additional students are in place.
5. That Enrollment growth at Cal Poly should occur in planned phases to allow for analysis of the effect of this growth on the campus.
6. That Enrollment growth at Cal Poly should acknowledge Cal Poly’s role as a polytechnic university and the adopted mission statement of the University.
7. That Enrollment growth at Cal Poly must be sensitive to Cal Poly’s impact on its surrounding communities and environment.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Budget & Long Range Planning Committee
Date: April 21, 1999
BACKGROUND STATEMENT
ON GRADING POLICY RESOLUTIONS

THE PROBLEM: The handful of courses in the catalog which designate C- as a minimum grade required for advancement in a sequence are in violation of the catalog’s standard university grading policy, leading to self-contradiction.

THE SOLUTION: Either stick with the Standard Grading Policy (the resolution supported by the Curriculum Committee), or footnote the policy in a way that allows an exception for C- Prerequisites for advancement (opposed by the Curriculum Committee).

While it may seem odd that the Senate Curriculum Committee is bringing you two diametrically opposed resolutions, we are doing so because some definitive solution to the grading policy problem must be found. The reasons behind each resolution are outlined in the Whereas clauses. In the case of the resolution in favor of C- Prerequisites, we have tried to present the other side’s strongest arguments, even though we oppose this resolution. With regard to the resolution we support—the one upholding the Standard Grading Policy—here is some additional background information and reasoning.

Despite the fact that faculty’s first instinct may well be to allow individual departments complete autonomy in deciding how to handle grading in their major courses and that to do anything else may seem counterintuitive, the Curriculum Committee encourages the Senate to consider carefully the rationale (Whereas clauses) for upholding the Standard Grading Policy.

GRADE INFLATION: We suspect that one reason some faculty are in favor of C- prerequisites is that these may seem like a way to enforce standards without having to assign tough grades. With C- prerequisites, faculty can avoid giving Fs, but at the same time they can stop students from advancing to the next course in a sequence. But C- prerequisites seem to us like the wrong approach to the problem of grade inflation which has led to lower standards. We believe that faculty should give students the grades they earn instead of giving them higher grades and then telling them they didn’t really pass and they cannot advance to the next course. Students who perform failing work in a class should be assigned an F (officially defined as “Non-Attainment of Course Objectives”). It is unjustified and inconsistent for faculty to assign students a D (which officially gives them credit for the course), then tell students they cannot advance to the next course.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL STRIFE: The C- prerequisite is likely to create problems and conflicts between departments. Consider: students from department 1 are taking support classes in a sequence from department 2. Department 2 institutes a prerequisite whereby students cannot advance in the sequence unless they earn a C-. Department 1 may disagree with this policy, but department 2 is enforcing its prerequisite on department 1’s students—a prerequisite that departs from the standard university grading policy—and slowing these students’ progress toward the degree.
CREDIT/NO CREDIT: It has been noted that, if a C- is necessary for credit in a class taken Credit/No Credit, then it is inconsistent to grant credit for a D received by a student in a graded class. However, part of the trade-off that students make when they take a class Credit/No Credit is that, in return for the protection that doing so gives to their GPA, they must actually earn a higher grade (at least a C-) in order to pass the course than would be necessary if they were taking the class for a grade. Thus, the discrepancy between these letter-grade and Credit/No Credit minimums is built into the concept of Credit/No Credit. Furthermore, even if one grants the argument that there should not be an inconsistency between letter-grade and Credit/No Credit minimums, the way to fix this structural problem would hardly seem to be to institute C- prerequisites on an ad hoc, course-by-course basis, which would provide a piecemeal and confusing solution to the problem.

ADVISING: A footnote under the standard university grading policy in the current catalog states that students who receive below a C- in a class that is a prerequisite for another course are encouraged to repeat the prerequisite class before attempting the next course in the sequence. Nothing precludes departmental advisors from stressing this point. We believe that this is a matter for internal advising and not something that should be institutionalized through ad hoc, course-by-course exceptions to the catalog’s standard grading policy.
RESOLUTION ON
STANDARD GRADING POLICY
(supported by the Senate Curriculum Committee)

WHEREAS, The handful of courses in the catalog which designate C- as a minimum grade required for advancement in a sequence are in violation of the catalog's standard university grading policy, leading to self-contradiction; and

WHEREAS, The C- prerequisite may hold up a student's progress toward the degree by at least two quarters and as much as one full year, because a student required to repeat a class must wait until the next time that course is offered; and

WHEREAS, Students who perform failing work in a class should be assigned an F (officially defined as "Non-Attainment of Course Objectives"). It is unjustified and inconsistent for faculty to assign students a D (which officially gives them credit for the course), then tell students they cannot advance to the next course; and

WHEREAS, The C- prerequisite is likely to create problems and conflicts between departments, with one department enforcing its C- prerequisite on students in another department whose faculty disagree with this departure from standard university grading policy; and

WHEREAS, Students should retain the right (which they have under the current grading policy) to decide how to make up deficiencies in a class. Students who receive a D should have the option of studying independently or working with a tutor to prepare to do better in the next course; and

WHEREAS, Students receive low grades in courses for many reasons, including conflicts in learning/teaching styles with particular instructors. A student required to repeat a course may not be able to avoid retaking the class with the same instructor, where the same conflicts may recur; and

WHEREAS, Enforcing a C- prerequisite violates the spirit of CSU grade-for-graduation policy. In order to graduate, a student needs a 2.0 grade point AVERAGE in higher education units, in Cal Poly units, and in the major column. This is an average that could include some Ds and Bs which would average out to a C; it is not a 2.0 (or 1.7) minimum per individual course; and

WHEREAS, Attaching a C- prerequisite to certain courses on an ad hoc, course-by-course basis is likely to confuse and frustrate advisors and students, creating a complex and chaotic situation of different grading standards for different courses; therefore let it be

RESOLVED, That departments will follow the standard university grading policy specified in the catalog, which states that (1) a D- or above is a passing grade and that (2) students who receive below a C- in a class that is a prerequisite for another course are encouraged to repeat the prerequisite class before attempting the next course in the sequence.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Curriculum Committee
April 30, 1999
RESOLUTION ON
C- PREREQUISITES
(not supported by the Senate Curriculum Committee)

WHEREAS, The handful of courses in the catalog which designate C- as a minimum grade required for advancement in a sequence are in violation of the catalog's standard university grading policy, leading to self-contradiction; and

WHEREAS, It can be legitimately argued that the level of competence required of students for a course in a sequence may be set higher than that required for a terminal course; and

WHEREAS, Students may have performed poorly in a class, demonstrating insufficient knowledge to advance to the next course, but still have done well enough to receive a passing grade of D. A C- prerequisite would stop advancement, but still grant credit; and

WHEREAS, Departments should have the right to stop students from advancing to the next course in a major sequence if students are unprepared to do the work, particularly since such students take up classroom space and instruction time that ought to be devoted to more prepared students; and

WHEREAS, Two kinds of students might take a major class: students in the major, and students from outside the major who are taking the class as support in their own major or for other reasons. The instructor may need a way to grant the non-major students credit for the course by assigning a D, while also stopping the major students from advancing to the next course by enforcing the C- prerequisite; therefore let it be

RESOLVED, That departments may designate a C- as the minimum grade required for students to advance to the next course in a sequence if the C- minimum is clearly indicated under the catalog description for the class; and

RESOLVED, That "or consent of instructor" be included along with the C- prerequisite in sequenced courses to allow individual students the opportunity to make a case for exceptions; and

RESOLVED, That a footnote under the university grading policy in the catalog be added to alert students to the possibility that certain sequenced courses may have a C- prerequisite for advancement; and

REVOLVED, That C- prerequisites be enforced by departmental faculty or advisors (not the Records Office) during the Add/Drop period.

Proposed (but not supported) by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
April 30, 1999
WHEREAS, Current Cal Poly policy allows a regularly enrolled student to petition for credit by examination in courses in which he or she is qualified through previous education or experience and for which credit has not otherwise been given; and

WHEREAS, Under current Cal Poly policy, it is possible for a student to complete entire minors through credit by examination; and

WHEREAS, Letter grades for credit by examination appear to be somewhat inflated in comparison to regularly administered courses; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the number of units a student may take through credit by examination be limited to 16 units; and be it further

RESOLVED: That grading of credit by examination units be on a CR/NC basis only.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
February 22, 1999
RESOLUTION ON DEVELOPMENT OF A RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE AT CAL POLY

Background Statement: In 1996, the Academic Senate reconfigured its subcommittees. From this process, the Research and Professional Development Committee was formed and given the charge to assist in the development of research policies for the campus. Faculty on this committee, over the past two years, began identifying barriers to research on campus through a campus wide survey, and have prepared recommendations for creating an environment which supports faculty efforts in their scholarly work.

WHEREAS, Cal Poly is an institution known for its high quality of undergraduate education, where graduate programs have traditionally played a small role and faculty teaching of undergraduates has been the highest priority; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Strategic Plan outlines a greater emphasis on research and other scholarly activities by faculty in the future; and

WHEREAS, The Research and Professional Development Committee was formed by the Academic Senate and given the charge to assist in the development of research and professional development policies for the campus; and

WHEREAS, The success of research on campus requires an investment of time by faculty and students, allocation of space, and commitment of fiscal resources by the university administration; and

WHEREAS, The processes of teaching, discovery, integration, and application through research and creative activities is crucial for the continued growth and development of a community of faculty and student scholars; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That research and other scholarly activities be a factor in assigning faculty work loads; and be it further

RESOLVED, That research and other scholarly activities be a factor in assigning faculty work space, facilities, and equipment; and be it further

RESOLVED, That campus resource allocations include considerations of research and other scholarly activities; and be it further
RESOLVED, That research programs and proposed development efforts be encouraged and supported; and be it further

RESOLVED, That scholarly activities be given consistent recognition in retention, tenure, and promotional decisions at all levels of review; and be it further

RESOLVED, That graduate curricula be encouraged and developed, including funding for recruitment of graduate students and for graduate assistants; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate approve the attached recommendations for research and professional development at Cal Poly, and that these recommendations be forwarded to the President and Provost of Cal Poly.

Proposed by: Research and Professional Development Committee
Date February 22, 1999

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AT CAL POLY

Cal Poly Mission Statement

As a predominantly undergraduate, comprehensive, polytechnic university serving California, the mission of Cal Poly is to discover, integrate, articulate, and apply knowledge. This it does by emphasizing teaching; engaging in research; participating in the various communities, local, state, national, and international, with which it pursues common interests; and where appropriate, providing students with the unique experience of direct involvement with the actual challenges of their disciplines, in the United States and abroad.

Importance of Faculty Scholarship

In Scholarship Reconsidered (citation), Ernest Boyer emphasized that teaching and research are both important scholarly activities of the professorate. In its strategic plan, Cal Poly has encouraged the four scholarships as defined by Boyer;

"Cal Poly endorses the broad definitions of the four types of scholarship set forth in the Carnegie report. The following thoughts extracted from the Carnegie report summarize the mission of teaching and scholarship at Cal Poly."

The scholarship of Teaching: As a scholarly enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows. Those who teach must be well-informed and steeped in the knowledge of their fields. Teaching is also a dynamic endeavor which must bring students actively into the educational process. Further, teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, by transforming and extending it as well. In the end, inspiring teaching keeps scholarship alive and inspired scholarship keeps teaching alive. Without the teaching function, the continuity of knowledge will be broken and the store of human knowledge diminished.
The scholarship of Discovery: comes closest to what is meant when academics speak of "research". This scholarship contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge, but also to the intellectual climate of the University. Not just the outcomes, but the process, and especially the passion, giving meaning to the effort. The probing mind of the researcher is a vital asset to Cal Poly, the state, and the world. Scholarly investigations and/or creative activity, in all the disciplines, is at the very heart of academic life, and the pursuit of knowledge must be assiduously cultivated and defended. Disciplined, investigative efforts within the University should be strengthened, not diminished. Those engaged in the Scholarship of Discovery shall ask: What is known and what is yet to be discovered?

The scholarship of Integration: involves the serious, disciplined work of interpreting, drawing together, and bringing new insight to bear on original research. This scholarship can involve doing research at the boundaries where fields of study converge, or it can involve the interpretation and fitting of one's own research -- or the research of others -- into larger intellectual patterns. Integration means making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating non-specialists, too. Those engaged in The scholarship of Integration shall ask: What do the research findings mean and is it possible to interpret what has been discovered in ways that provide a larger, more comprehensive understanding?

The scholarship of application: involves using knowledge to solve problems. This scholarship is a dynamic process where new research discoveries are applied and where the applications themselves give rise to new intellectual understandings. This scholarly activity, which both applies and contributes to human knowledge, is particularly needed in a world in which huge, almost intractable problems call for the skills and insights of university faculties. Those engaged in the scholarship of application shall ask: How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems, and how can social, economic, and other problems define an agenda for scholarly investigation?

Cal Poly continually seeks ways to integrate the four types of scholarship, for the purpose of maintaining high quality academic programs. The benefits of faculty scholarship are many. Some examples are:

- Scholarship enables faculty to maintain currency in their disciplines
- Scholarship keeps teaching relevant and lively
- Scholarship can be revenue generating
- Scholarship provides opportunities for undergraduates to engage in sustained work on demanding, multifaceted problems in which they learn to define and communicate their own solutions, and to develop critical thinking and analytical skills.
- Scholarship provides opportunities for students to acquire core competencies that are valued by employers.
- Scholarship enhances the reputation of the individual and the University
- Scholarship provides an avenue for creativity and self expression
- Scholarship provides a means for faculty to reflect on the learning process
- Scholarship provides opportunities for interaction with working professionals and with scholars at other Universities
- Scholarship provides for extended individual interaction between faculty and students

The National Science Foundation recently undertook an extensive review of science, mathematics, engineering and technology education. Its report; Shaping the Future: New Expectations for
Undergraduate Education in Science, Mathematics, Engineering and Technology, stated that; “all students have access to supportive, excellent undergraduate education in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology, and all students learn these subjects by direct experience with the method and process of inquiry. Every student should be presented an opportunity to understand what science is and is not, and to be involved in some way in scientific inquiry, not just a ‘hands-on’ experience.”

Need for Policy

To operationalize this commitment to scholarship, Cal Poly needs to develop new policies and revise existing policies to support scholarly activities. A recent survey conducted by this committee of the Cal Poly faculty revealed that although there is some level of support for the research activities of its faculty, Cal Poly does not provide the necessary support to meet the professional development needs of faculty and students in the area of research. The following barriers to professional development were identified by the faculty survey:

1. Unavailability of funds to maintain a professional development program;
2. Lack of policy for research/creative activity space allocation;
3. Inequitable teaching loads;
4. Inadequacy of “seed” funds to develop or expand creative/investigative activities;
5. Insufficient support for graduate courses and programs;
6. Lack of standardized RPT criteria and acknowledgment of research as a valued activity;
7. Unavailability of functional, “supportive” intellectual environment;
8. Ambiguous policy regarding intellectual property of inventors.

Recommendations of the Research and Professional Development Committee

1.0 Make funds available to maintain a professional development program:

It should be the responsibility of each college to allocate and administer resources to maintain a professional development program. It is recommended that such resources be allocated to faculty based on professional progress and productivity.

2.0 Provide space for creative/investigative activities:

It is recommended that each college ensure that adequate space is provided to support creative and scholarly activities, and develop criteria for allocating such space to its faculty and students.

3.0 Equitable teaching loads:

Use flexibility in assigning faculty work loads to support scholarship. Scholarship and creative activities represent significant and valuable contributions to the University, and should be recognized in assigning faculty work loads. Efforts should be made in the assignment of work loads (e.g.; numbers of courses requiring preparation, contact hours, class size, committee assignments) to ensure that all faculty, and particularly junior faculty, have quality time to devote to the pursuit of their scholarship. In addition, junior faculty should be offered a reduced teaching load in their first year of employment.

4.0 Make available creative/investigative “seed” funds:

Cal Poly should establish a campus wide research fund to support the initiation of research programs by faculty, and in particular, junior faculty. These funds would supplement funds
Currently available through programs such as the State Faculty Support Grants Program. In addition, start up funds should be made available for new or junior faculty, and should be offered as part of the recruitment package.

5.0 Promote graduate curricula:

Graduate programs are an important complement to faculty scholarship. Resources should be dedicated to strengthening, expanding and initiating new graduate programs, particularly in disciplines relevant to the polytechnic emphasis of the campus. Since graduate level courses require a greater in-depth coverage of the subject matter and a greater student-teacher interaction, they should be given an additional weight factor when calculating WTU's.