Please keep this agenda for next meeting's second-reading items. Attachments in this agenda will not be duplicated again. The next agenda will reference page numbers in this agenda.

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
Academic Senate

Academic Senate Agenda
October 5, 1993
UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

Open Floor Period 3:00 - 3:10 pm
The Open Floor Period provides an informal opportunity for faculty members to raise questions or make comments directed to Senate officers or to university administrators. Please arrive promptly at 3:00 pm.

I. Minutes: none

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
   A. If you are interested in serving as Academic Senate Secretary-elect, please contact the Senate office (1258) as soon as possible. Assigned time is given for this position.
   B. Applications for International Programs Resident Directors for '95/96 and '95/97 are being received. Please contact Walt Tryon (2639) for more information.
   C. The following resolutions have been approved by President Baker:
      AS-400-93/FPC Selection of a Campus Representative to the ACIP
      AS-401-93/FPC Revision of University Leave with Pay Guidelines
      AS-402-93/EX Resolution on Home Economics
      AS-403-93/PE Department Name Change for P.E.
      AS-405-93/GE&B Double Counting of GE&B Courses
      AS-406-93/EX E.T. and E.E.T. (p. 2)
      AS-407-93/EX Academic Senate Recommendations for Accommodating Budget Cuts (p. 3)
      AS-408-93/R&SC Priority Registration (p. 4)
   D. The Academic Senate Response to the Strategic Plan was approved by faculty on June 8, 1993 by a vote of 185-150.

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair
   B. President's Office
   C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
   D. Statewide Senators
   E. CFA Campus President
   F. ASI Representatives

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
   A. Curriculum proposals-Morrobello-Sosa, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading (pp. 5-33).
   B. Resolution on Programs to be Reviewed During 1993-1994-Andrews, Past Chair of the Program Review and Improvement Committee, first reading (p. 34).
   C. Resolution on Faculty Evaluations-ASI representative, first reading (p. 35).
   D. Resolution on Department Designation Change for the Architecture Department-Bagnall/Cooper, Directors of the Architecture Department, first reading (pp. 36-45).

Business Items will conclude at 4:00 pm to allow sufficient time for discussion item(s)

VI. Discussion Item(s):
   The Academic Senate's involvement in the charter campus development process.

VII. Adjournment:
To: Jack Wilson, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker  
President

Subject: AS-406-93/EX

In light of conflicting advice on this issue from the Academic Deans’ Council and the Academic Senate, the Vice President for Academic Affairs has recommended, and I have agreed, that we request supply and demand information for this program from CPEC. We have relayed this request to the Chancellor’s Office and they have agreed to forward it to CPEC and hope to have information back to us by January 1, 1994.

If the data warrants the continuation of the program, we will attempt to find innovative ways to do so. It is important to understand that even if the program is continued in some form, the College of Engineering will continue to phase out the Department as a means of coping with the serious budget reductions it has sustained.
I appreciate the extra effort the Senate put into developing budget recommendations this year. As you know, these items were considered by PACBRA as you presented them there. As a response to these recommendations, I will provide a short summary of the action taken for each.

1. Athletics. I have chosen to follow the recommendation of the Athletics Governing Board on this issue. They unanimously recommended that the Department of Athletics suffer a loss in State funds equal to twice that assessed to the Colleges. Please recall that the Board is comprised from three faculty selected from a list of six nominated by the Academic Senate, three students, and is chaired by the Academic Vice President. This Board more accurately represents the partnership with student government on Athletics and it has significantly more opportunity to study the issue than the full Senate. Nevertheless, I understand and appreciate the message sent by the vote of the Senate on this issue.

2. Transportation Services. This Department has been placed on a self-sustaining basis for its fleet vehicles. Departments have complete freedom to purchase services from this unit or commercial vendors. However, State funds are provided for the maintenance, upkeep, and replacement of the infrastructure vehicles, i.e. public safety, facility services, etc.

3. University Relations and Development. I have asked the firm of Ketchum, Inc. to review the status of this function at Cal Poly. I expect to receive their report shortly. In the interim, there has been no increase in funding for this unit.

4. Administration. The numbers of General Fund supported administrators has declined significantly since 1984 (over 25%) and that decline continues into the current fiscal year.

5. Computing Services. Each of the committees mentioned has expressed its willingness to relay to the Senate whatever information it requests. Each has continuously attempted to find the most cost effective ways to deliver services.

6. Faculty Consultation. The Senate position echoes mine and that of the Academic Vice President. How this is accomplished in each College is the responsibility of the Dean of that College.
I approve this resolution as stated.

I would like to ask the Senate to join me in an effort to organize the curricular resources at Cal Poly in such a way that resolutions on priority registration would no longer be necessary. I firmly believe we could do a better job of matching our offerings to our students' needs.
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VP = Vice President Academic Affairs, AS = Academic Senate, CC = Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T = Tabled (see Committee Comments),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D = Disapproved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. NEW COURSES
1. AGED 330 FFA and Supervised Agriculture Programs (6) 3 act, 3 supv C13/36 (replaces AGED 303, AGED 339, AGED 350/351).

II. DELETED COURSES
1. AGED 303 FFA Programs and Activities (2) 2 act C8 (replaced by AGEd 330).
2. AGED 339 Supervised Agricultural Experiences (2) 2 act C8 (replaced by AGEd 330).

III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES
1. AGED 461 Senior Project (3) 1 sem 2 supv C3/36 to (2) supv C36.

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES
Major courses:
1. left blank
4. Move AGB 201 Agribusiness Sales and Services (3) (from Support area).
5. Move FRSC 230 California Fruit Growing or VGSC 230 General Vegetable Crops (4) (from Support area).

Agricultural Mechanics Concentration
6. DE AE 131 from choice of AE 131 or AE 237.

Agricultural Supplies and Services Concentration
7. DE AGB 203 Agribusiness Organizations (3).
8. ADD AGB 101 Introduction to Agribusiness and Agricultural Economics (4).
9. Reduce AGB electives from 10 to 8 units, and delete (1 unit at 300--400 level).

Animal Production Concentration
10. DE ASCI 240 Applied Feeds and Feeding (2).
11. DE ASCI 260 Preparation of Livestock for Shows and Sales (2).
12. ADD ASCI 476 Issues in Animal Agriculture (3).
13. For electives, change from 7 to 4 units at 300-400 level.
14. Increase OH electives from 8 to 9 units.
15. For CRSC 230/FRSC 230/VGSC 230, select course not taken in major column.
Support courses:
16. ADD Life or Physical science elective (3).
17. Change from "elective areas" to "32 units of advisor approved electives"

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS
1. 
# ANIMAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

## 1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP = Vice President Academic Affairs, AS = Academic Senate, CC = Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification, AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments), T = Tabled (see Committee Comments), D = Disapproved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## I. NEW COURSES

1. ASCI 141 Market Beef Production (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaces ASCI 111 (3) and ASCI 241 (2)).
2. ASCI 142 Swine Science (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaces ASCI 112 (3) and ASCI 242 (2)).
3. ASCI 143 Systems of Sheep Production (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaces ASCI 113 (3) and ASCI 243 (2)).
4. ASCI 220 Introductory Animal Nutrition and Feeding (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaces ASCI 202 (3) and ASCI 240 (2)).
5. ASCI 231 General Animal Science (3) 3 lec C2 (replaces ASCI 230 (4)).
6. ASCI 290 Livestock Management Enterprise (2-4) supv S36 CR/NC (replaces ASCI 100 (1-4)).
7. ASCI 344 Equine/Human Communication (3) 3 lab C16 (replaces ASCI 434 (4)).
8. ASCI 345 Equine Behavior Modification (3) 3 lab C16 (replaces ASCI 435 (4)).
9. ASCI 410 Ultrasonography (1) 1 lab C16.
10. ASCI 420 Animal Nutrition (3) 3 lec C2 (replaces ASCI 402 (4)).
11. ASCI 421 Animal Nutrition for Pre-Vet/Grad Students (3) 3 lec C2 (replaces ASCI 402 (4)).
12. ASCI 476 Issues in Animal Agriculture (3) 3 sem C5.
13. ASCI 490 Advanced Livestock Management Enterprise (2-4) supv S36 CR/NC (replaces ASCI 100 (1-4)).
14. PM 230 Poultry Industry Survey (3) 3 lec C2 (replaces PL 121 (4), PL 230 (3) and PL 233 (2)).
15. PM 290 Poultry Management Enterprise (2-4) supv S36 CR/NC (replaces PL 100 (1-4)).
16. PM 310 Poultry Anatomy, Physiology and Diseases (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaces PL 231 (3) and PL 323 (4)).
17. PM 320 Poultry Production Management (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaces PL 122 (4), PL 133 (3), PL 221 (3) and PL 331 (3)).
18. PM 330 Poultry Processing (3) 2 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaces PL 222 (3)).
19. PM 340 Poultry Business Management (3) 3 lec C2 (replaces PL 322 (4)).
20. PM 350 Applied Poultry Feeding and Nutrition (3) 3 lec C2 (replaces PL 333 (4)).
21. PM 360 Poultry Industry Seminar (3) 3 sem C5 (replaces PL 422 (3) and PL 463 (2)).
22. PM 490 Advanced Poultry Management Enterprise (2-4) supv S36 CR/NC (replaces PL 100 (1-4)).
23. VS 312 Production Medicine (3) 3 lec C2 (replaces VS 302 (3)).
II. DELETED COURSES

1. ASCI 100 Enterprise Project (1-4) supv S36 (replaced by ASCI 290 and ASCI 490).
2. ASCI 111 Market Beef Production (3) 3 lec C2 (replaced by ASCI 141).
3. ASCI 112 Elements of Swine Production (3) 3 lec C2 (replaced by ASCI 142).
4. ASCI 113 Elements of Sheep Production (3) 3 lec C2 (replaced by ASCI 143).
5. ASCI 131 Beginning Western Riding (3) 3 lab C16.
6. ASCI 202 Feeds and Feeding (3) 3 lec C2 (replaced by ASCI 220).
7. ASCI 230 General Animal Science (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by ASCI 231).
8. ASCI 240 Applied Feeds and Feeding (2) 1 lec, 1 act C2/13 (replaced by ASCI 220).
9. ASCI 241 Applied Beef Cattle Practices (2) 1 lec, 1 act C2/13 (replaced by ASCI 141).
10. ASCI 242 Applied Swine Management Practices (2) 1 lec, 1 act C2/13 (replaced by ASCI 142).
11. ASCI 243 Applied Sheep Management Practices (2) 1 lec 1 act C2/13 (replaced by ASCI 143).
12. ASCI 250 Preparation of Livestock for Shows and Sales (2) 2 lab C16.
14. ASCI 323 Beef Husbandry (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16.
15. ASCI 402 Animal Nutrition (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by ASCI 420 and ASCI 421).
16. ASCI 434 Advanced Western Riding (4) 4 lab C16.
17. ASCI 435 Advanced Western Training (4) 4 lab C16.
18. ASCI 475 The Practice of Animal Science (2) 2 sem C13.
19. PI 100 Enterprise Project (1-4) supv S36 (replaced by PM 290 and PM 490).
20. PI 121 Poultry Industry Development (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by PM 230).
21. PI 122 Replacement Programs/Broilers (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by PM 320).
22. PI 133 Poultry Incubation (3) 2 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by PM 320).
23. PI 221 Poultry Selection and Egg Production (3) 2 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by PM 320).
24. PI 222 Poultry Products and Processing (3) 2 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by PM 330).
25. PI 230 General Poultry Production (3) 2 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by PM 230).
26. PI 231 Poultry Anatomy and Physiology (3) 2 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by PM 310).
27. PI 233 Poultry Plant Design (2) 1 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by PM 230).
28. PI 322 Poultry Business Organization (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by PM 340).
29. PI 323 Poultry Diseases and Hygiene (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by PM 310).
30. PI 331 Turkey Industry (3) 2 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by PM 320).
31. PI 333 Applied Poultry Feeding/Nutrition (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by PM 350).
32. PI 422 Advanced Poultry Enterprise Supervision (3) 3 lec C2 (replaced by PM 360).
33. PI 431 Applied Poultry Breeding (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16.
34. PI 461 Senior Project (2) supv S36 (replaced by ASCI 461).
35. PI 462 Senior Project (2) supv S36 (replaced by ASCI 462).
36. PI 463 Undergraduate Seminar (2) C5 (replaced by ASCI 463).
37. VS 241 Veterinary Technology (2) 2 act C13.
38. VS 302 Animal Hygiene (3) 3 lec C2.
39. VS 310 Zoonosis (2) 2 lec C2.
40. VS 341 Veterinary Technology - Advanced (2) 2 act C13.

III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

1. Change Poultry Industry (PI) rubric to Poultry Management (PM).
2. ASCI 114 Elements of Horse Production (3) 3 lec C2 to ASCI 144 Equine Science.
3. ASCI 401 Reproductive Physiology (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C2/16. Description change.
4. ASCI 461 Senior Project (3) supv S36 to (2) 2 sem C5.
5. ASCI 462 Senior Project (3) supv S36 to (2) 2 supv S36.
6. PI 200 Special Problems for Undergraduates (2-3) supv S36 to PM 200.
7. PI 400 Special Problems for Advanced Undergraduates (2-4) supv S36 to PM 400.
8. PI 581 Graduate Seminar in Poultry (3) 3 sem C5 to PM 581.

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES

B.S. Poultry Industry:
A. Discontinue BS degree program in Poultry Industry

B.S. Animal Science:
A. Reduce total units for the B.S. in Animal Science to 186 from 198.

B. Reduce Major Core from 64 to 55 units.
   1. DE ASCI 111, ASCI 112, ASCI 113, ASCI 114.
   3. DE ASCI 302, ASCI 402.
   4. AD ASCI 141, ASCI 142, ASCI 143, ASCI 144.
   5. AD ASCI 202.
   6. AD ASCI 420/421.
   7. AD ASCI 476.
   8. AD PM 230.
   9. AD: Choose 2 of the following: ASCI 311, ASCI 312, ASCI 313, ASCI 314, PM 320, PM 340.
10. Move FSN 211 to Major Core (from Support Courses).
11. Move VS 123 to Major Core (from Support Courses).

C. Reduce Support from 53 to 20 units.
   1. DE AE 121 and SS 121.
   2. DE CRSC 123.
   3. DE CHEM 328.
   4. DE BACT 221.
   5. DE VS 203 and VS 302.
6. DE AGB 321.
8. AD to CHEM 121: "or" CHEM 127 (CHEM 121/127).
9. AD to CHEM 122: "or CHEM 128" (CHEM 122/128).
10. AD to CHEM 326: "or CHEM 316" (CHEM 326/316).

D. Add 36 units of advisor approved electives.

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS
1. The CC expresses concern over the deletion of science in the support area. As we understand it, there will be a small number of students who will follow this route.

The department has agreed to monitor the choices for advisor-approved electives.
Memorandum

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
Academic Senate

From: E. J. Carnegie, Chair
Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Budget Implications from the Animal Science Proposal

The Animal Science Proposal is a well-thought-out effort to simplify and shorten the departments offerings. The proposal is to delete 47 courses, replace them with 23 new courses, and drop the Poultry Industry Major. The most important part of the package is a reduction in the units required for the B.S. degree from 198 to 186. The department estimates an annual reduction of 60 WTUs. The Budget Committee sees a large net decrease in resource needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VP = Vice President Academic Affairs, AS = Academic Senate, CC = Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T = Tabled (see Committee Comments),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D = Disapproved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. **NEW COURSES**
1. EDES 113 Graphic Analysis and Communication Skills (3) 3 lab (from ARCH 113, sections for ARCE students)
2. EDES 311 Construction Contract Documents (5) 5 lab C16.
3. EDES 408 Sustainable Architecture (3) 3 lec C2.
4. EDES 479 Urban Design for Environmental Design Professionals (1) 1 lec C2.

II. **DELETED COURSES**
1. None

III. **CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES**
1. None

IV. **CURRICULUM CHANGES**
1. None

V. **CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS**
1.
I. NEW COURSES
1. ARCE 224 Mechanics of Structural Members Laboratory (1) 1 lab C16.
2. ARCE 457 Structural Computer Aided Design (2) 1 lec 1 lab C4/16. MCF.

II. DELETED COURSES
1. None

III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES
1. None

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES
Major:
1. Increase Major Core from 67 to 71 units.
2. DE ARCH 112 Basic Graphics (3).
3. ADD ARCE 224 Mechanics of Structural Members Laboratory (1).
4. ADD ARCE 403 Advanced Steel Structures Laboratory (3) or ARCE 407 Advanced Reinforced Concrete Laboratory (3).
5. ADD ARCE 445 Prestressed Concrete Design Laboratory (3) or ARCE 446 Advanced Structural Systems Laboratory (3).
6. ADD ARCE 457 Structural Computer Aided Design (2).
7. Reduce approved technical electives from 10 to 4 units.

Support:
8. Reduce Support from 85 to 81 units.

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS
1.
I. NEW COURSES
1. ARCH 157 Basic Computing Skills in Architecture (1) 1 act CJ3, GEB F.1.
3. ARCH 221, 222 Architectural Design Fundamentals (3)(3) 3 labs (replaces ARCH 208, 209)
4. ARCH 420 Seminar in Architectural History (3) sem

II. DELETED COURSES
1. ARCH 208 and ARCH 209 Architectural Design Basics (2) (2) (replaced by ARCH 221 and ARCH 222 Architectural Design Fundamentals (3)(3)).
2. ARCH 250 (3) (replaced by ARCH 157 (1) and ARCH 257 (2)).

III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES
1. ARCH 101 Survey of Architectural Education and Practice (2) 2 lec C1 to CR/NC grading.
3. ARCH 481 Senior Architectural Design Thesis Project (6) 6 lab C16 to ARCH 521 (5) 5 lab.

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES
1. Decrease total for B.Arch degree from 248 to 247 units.
   Major:
2. Increase Major units from 85 to 87.
3. ADD ARCH 157 Basic Computing Skills in Architecture (1).
6. ADD ARCH 491 Design Project (2).
   Support:
7. Reduce Support units from 96 to 93.
8. DE ARCH 250 Computer Applications (3).
V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

1.
I. NEW COURSES
   1. CM 364 Project Administration (3) act C13.

II. DELETED COURSES
   1. CM 201 Introduction to Construction Management (3) 3 lec C2.
   2. CM 322 Concrete Technology Laboratory (1) 1 lab C16 (replaced by CM 321; see changes).
   3. CM 351 Building Support System Construction Practices (3) 3 act C13 (replaced by CM 352 and CM 353; see changes).

III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES
   1. CM 321 Concrete Technology (2) 2 lec C2 lec (3) 2 lec 1 lab C2/16. Lab unit from deleted course CM 322.
   2. CM 352 Building Support System Construction Practices (3) 3 act C13 to (5) 5 act C13. 2 additional activity units from deleted course CM 351 (3).
   3. CM 353 Building Support System Construction Practices (3) 3 act C13 to (5) 5 act C13. 2 additional activity units from deleted course CM 351 (3).

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES
    Major:
    1. DE CM 201 Introduction to Construction Management (3).
    2. DE CM 322 Concrete Technology Laboratory (1).
    4. DE ARCH 112 Basic Graphics (3).
    5. DE ARCH 231 Architectural Practice (3).
    6. ADD CM 364 Project Administration (3).
    7. ADD EDES 311 Construction Contract Documents (5).

    Support:
    8. DE ARCH 208 Architectural Design Basics (2).
    10. ADD ACTG 211 Financial Accounting for Nonbusiness Majors (4).
### 1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VP = Vice President Academic Affairs, AS = Academic Senate, CC = Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T = Tabled (see Committee Comments),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D = Disapproved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I. NEW COURSES

1. CRP 442 Housing and Planning Seminar (3) 3 sem C5.
2. CRP 518 Policy Analysis for Planners (4) 4 sem C5.

#### II. DELETED COURSES

1. None

#### III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

1. None

#### IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES

For Master of City and Regional Planning

1. Increase core units from 45 to 50/52.
2. ADD CRP 518 Policy Analysis for Planners (4) to core.
3. Move CRP 554 Regional Planning Laboratory (4) from emphasis area to core.
4. Move POLS 401 State and Local Government or POLS 403 Municipal Government (4) from core to recommended electives.
5. Decrease emphasis area units from 19 to 15.
6. Decrease urban electives in Urban Land Planning emphasis area from 8 to 4 units.
7. DE CRP 505 Principals of Regional Planning (4) from Environmental Planning emphasis area.
8. DE CRP 554 Regional Planning Laboratory (4) from Environmental Planning emphasis area.
9. ADD CRP 545 Environmental Planning, Policies and Principles (4) to Environmental Planning emphasis area.
10. Decrease adviser approved electives units from 8 to 7/5.

#### V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

1.
GEB courses:
11. Specify ARCH 318 History of Architecture (3) for Area C.3.
12. Specify ARCH 319 History of Architecture (3) for Area C (arts and humanities elective).
13. DE ECON 201 Survey of Economics (3) from D.3.

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS
1. The disapproval of GEB requests is for the restriction of a GEB choice in a program that is highly restricted to begin with.
I. NEW COURSES
1. LA 320 Design Theory for Landscape Architects (3) 3 lec C2.

II. DELETED COURSES
1. LA 112 Graphic Communication Techniques for Landscape Architects II (3) 3 lab C16.
2. LA 152 Fundamentals of Design and Planning in Landscape Architecture (4) 4 lab C16.
3. LA 247 Landscape Plant Composition (3) 3 lab C16.
4. LA 341 Landscape Architecture Construction II (3) 3 lab C16.
5. LA 342 Landscape Architecture Construction III (3) 3 lab C16.
6. LA 348 Advanced Landscape Plant Composition (3) 3 lab C16.
7. LA 463 Undergraduate Seminar (2) 2 sem C5.

III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES
1. LA 111 Three Dimensional Graphics for Landscape Architects (3) 3 lab C16 to (4) 4 lab. Descr. change/ incorporate subject matter from LA 112.
2. LA 153 Fundamentals of Design and Planning in Landscape Architecture (3) 3 lab C16 to LA 251 (4) 4 lab. Prereq change from LA 110 to LA 110, LA 111, LA 114. Descr change/ incorporate partial subject matter from LA 152. MCF.
3. LA 202 Fundamentals of Design and Planning in Landscape Architecture (3) 3 lab C16 to LA 252 (4) 4 lab. Descr change/ incorporate subject matter from LA 247. MCF.
4. LA 203 Applied Design and Planning Fundamentals (3) 3 lab C16 to LA 253 (5) 5 lab. Descr change/ incorporate subject matter from LA 341. MCF.
5. LA 353 Design for Landscape Architects (5) 5 lab C16 to (6) 6 lab. Descr change/ incorporate subject matter from LA 348. MCF.

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES
B.S. Landscape Architecture:
1. Delete the program.

Bachelor of Landscape Architecture:
2. Reduce units for major courses from 122 to 118.
3. DE LA 112 Graphic Communication Techniques for Landscape Architects II (3).
5. ADD LA 201 Survey of Landscape Architecture (2).
6. DE LA 247 Landscape Plant Composition (3).
7. ADD LA 320 Design Theory for Landscape Architects (3).
8. DE LA 341 Landscape Architecture Construction II (3).
9. DE LA 342 Landscape Architecture Construction III (3).
10. DE LA 348 Advanced Landscape Plant Composition (3).
11. DE LA 463 Undergraduate Seminar (2).
12. ADD LA 464 Senior Seminar (1)(1)(1).
13. ADD 3 LA elective units.

Support:
14. Increase Support units from 47 to 49.
15. Change OH 238 Landscape Plants I (3) to OH 231 Plant Materials (4) (OH course number change; see memo to OH).
16. Change OH 308 Landscape Plants II (3) to OH 232 Plant Materials (4) (OH course number change; see memo to OH).

Electives:
17. Increase free electives from 9 to 11 units.

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS
1. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP = Vice President Academic Affairs, AS = Academic Senate, CC = Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification, AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments), T = Tabled (see Committee Comments), D = Disapproved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. NEW COURSES
1. None

II. DELETED COURSES
1. None

III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES
1. None

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES
Joint MCRP/MS Engineering with Specialization in Transportation Planning

1. Increase Core courses units from 67 to 68.
2. Reduce Emphasis Area units from 15 to 14.
   *Urban Land Planning Emphasis*
3. Reduce Urban Land Planning electives from 4 to 3 units.
   *Environmental Planning Emphasis*
4. DE CRP 407 Environmental Law (3).
5. DE CRP 505 Principles of Regional Planning (4).
6. ADD CRP 404 Environmental Law (3).
7. ADD CRP 545 Environmental Planning Policies and Principles (4).
8. Reduce Environmental Planning electives from 4 to 3 units.

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS
1.
# AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING

## 1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VP = Vice President Academic Affairs, AS = Academic Senate, CC = Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification, AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments), T = Tabled (see Committee Comments), D = Disapproved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## I. NEW COURSES

1. AERO 501 Aircraft Gas Turbine Engines (4) 4 lec C4.
2. AERO 565 Advanced Topics in Aircraft Design (3) 3 lec C4.

## II. DELETED COURSES

1. None

## III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

1. AERO 435 Composite Structures Analysis and Design (4) 3 lec 1 lab C4/16 to AERO 532 Advanced Composite Structures Analysis and Design. Descr change, prereq change.
2. AERO 456 Aircraft Vibration and Flutter (3) 3 lec C4 to AERO 434 Structural Dynamics Analysis (4) 3 lec 1 lab C4/16. Descr change, prereq change.
3. AERO 526 Computational Fluid Dynamics I (3) 3 lec C4. Descr change, prereq change.
4. AERO 527 Computational Fluid Dynamics II (3) 3 lec C4 to 2 lec 1 lab C4/16. Descr change.
5. AERO 551 Advanced Topics in Estimation and Control (3) 3 lec C4 to 2 lec 1 lab C4/16.

## IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES

1. None

## V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

1. AERO 435 to 532. Please explain why the change to graduate level.
### I. NEW COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPE 200</td>
<td>Special Problems for Undergraduates (1-2)</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>C36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPE 400</td>
<td>Special Problems for Advanced Undergraduates (1-2)</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>C36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPE 410</td>
<td>Performance Analysis (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>C4/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPE 470</td>
<td>Selected Advanced Topics (1-3)</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. DELETED COURSES

1. None

### III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

- Change the following courses' prefixes from CSC to CPE:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Prefix Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSC 315</td>
<td>Computer Architecture II (4)</td>
<td>CPE 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 316</td>
<td>Computer Architecture III (4)</td>
<td>CPE 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 353</td>
<td>Computer Systems Programming (3)</td>
<td>CPE 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC 415</td>
<td>Advanced Computer Architecture I (4)</td>
<td>CPE 415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Change the following courses' prefixes from EE to CPE:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Prefix Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE 404</td>
<td>Microprocessor System Design Methodologies (3)</td>
<td>CPE 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 408</td>
<td>Digital Computer Systems (3)</td>
<td>CPE 408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 409</td>
<td>Computer Peripheral Interfacing (3)</td>
<td>CPE 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 427</td>
<td>Digital Computer Subsystems (3)</td>
<td>CPE 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 446</td>
<td>Microprocessor Interfacing Laboratory (1)</td>
<td>CPE 446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 448</td>
<td>Digital Computer Systems Laboratory (1)</td>
<td>CPE 448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following courses will be cross-listed with Computer Engineering and Computer Science:

11. CPE 215 Computer Architecture I (4) (Also listed as CSC 215). Descr change (content unchanged).
12. CPE 404 Computer Networks (4) (Also listed as CSC 404).
13. CPE 405 Computer Networks II (4) (Also listed as CSC 405).
The following courses will be cross-listed with Computer Engineering and Electrical Engineering:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14. CPE 219 Logic and Switching Circuits (3) (Also listed as EE 219).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>15. CPE 259 Logic and Switching Circuits Laboratory (1) (Also listed as EE 259).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>16. CPE 319 Digital System Design (3) (Also listed as EE 319).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17. CPE 359 Digital System Design Laboratory (1) (Also listed as EE 359).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES
1. None

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS
1. 
I. NEW COURSES

D
1. CSC 241 Advanced Topics in UNIX (3) 3 lec C4.
A
2. CSC 349 Theory and Analysis of Algorithms (3) 3 lec C4.
A
3. CSC 458 Computer Graphics Seminar (2) 2 sem C5.
A
4. CSC 472 Object Oriented Design (3) 2 lec 1 lab C4/16.
D
5. CSC 484 Computer Vision (3) 3 lec C4.

II. DELETED COURSES

A
1. CSC 315 Computer Architecture II (4) 3 lec 1 lab C4/16 (replaced by CPE 315).
A
2. CSC 316 Computer Architecture III (4) 3 lec 1 lab C4/16 (replaced by CPE 316).
A
3. CSC 353 Computer Systems Programming (3) 3 lec C4 (replaced by CPE 353).
A
4. CSC 410 Computer Fundamentals for Educators (3) 2 lec 1 act C4/13 (F.1.).
A
5. CSC 411 Advanced Programming for Educators (3) 3 lec C4.
A
6. CSC 413 Authoring Languages (4) 3 lec 1 lab C4/16.
A
7. CSC 415 Microcomputer Systems (4) 3 lec 1 lab C4/16.
A
8. CSC 416 Computer Applications in School Administration (3) 3 lec C4.
A
9. CSC 559 Practicum in Computer Science I (1) 1 act C13.

III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

A
1. CSC 215 Computer Architecture I (4) (Also listed as CPE 215). Descr change; content unchanged.
A*
2. CSC 414 prereq of CSC 413 deleted.

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES

B.S. COMPUTER SCIENCE

AR
1. Reduce total units required from 198 to 192.
Major:
A
2. Reduce total units from 87 to 85.
A
3. Change CSC 332 Numerical Analysis II (3) to include: or CSC 349 Theory and Analysis of Algorithms (3)
A
4. ADD EE 259 Logic and Switching Circuits Laboratory (1).
5. Reduce adviser approved technical electives from 15 to 12 units.
Electives:
6. Reduce free electives from 15 to 11 units.

**COMPUTER SCIENCE MINOR**
7. Change total units required from 24-28 to 24-30.
Tracks:

*Computer Architecture Track*
8. Reduce total units from 14 to 12.
9. ADD EE 259 Logic and Switching Circuits Laboratory (1).
10. DE Upper-division restricted electives (3).
*Computer Based Training Track (II)*
11. DE entire track.
*Graphics Track*
13. Increase Upper-division restricted electives from 3 to 8 units.

**M.S. COMPUTER SCIENCE**
14. DE CSC 559 Practicum in Computer Science I (1) as choice among thesis, project or practicum (6).

**V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS**
1. CSC 241 and 484 disapproved. Courses are elective, not required. Suggest offering as X course to establish student interest.
2. CSC 414 no longer has a prereq. Please add prereq.
3. We applaud the reduction in total units, is it possible to decrease total to 186?
### I. NEW COURSES

1. None

### II. DELETED COURSES

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. EE 423 Microwave Electronics (3) 3 lec C4. (Merged into EE 402.)
2. EE 451 Solid State and Microelectronics Laboratory (1) 1 lab C16.
3. EE 404 Microprocessor System Design Methodologies (3) 3 lec C4 (replaced by CPE 408).
4. EE 408 Digital Computer Systems (3) 3 lec C4 (replaced by CPE 408).
5. EE 409 Computer Peripheral Interfacing (3) 3 lec C4 (replaced by CPE 409).
6. EE 427 Digital Computer Subsystems (3) 3 lec C4 (replaced by CPE 407).
7. EE 446 Microprocessor Interfacing Laboratory (1) 1 lab C16 (replaced by CPE 446).
8. EE 448 Digital Computer Systems Laboratory (1) 1 lab C16 (replaced by CPE 448).

### III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

1. EE 311 Electric Circuit Theory (3) 3 lec C4 to EE 201.
2. EE 351 Electric Circuits Laboratory (1) 1 lab C16 to EE 251.
3. EE 487 Cooperative Education Experience (6) C36 to EE 485 CR/NC.
4. EE 497 Cooperative Education Experience (12) C36 to EE 495 CR/NC.
5. EE 587 Cooperative Education Experience (6) C36 to EE 585 CR/NC.
6. EE 597 Cooperative Education Experience (12) C36 to EE 595 CR/NC.

### IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES

**B.S. ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING**


**B.S. ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING**

**Major:**

1. Increase total units from 86 to 89.
2. DE EE 303 Power Transmission (3).
Approved restricted technical electives (10 units)

4. Add choice of Power or Electronic technical electives. To be approved by major adviser:
   A 5. Electronic (10 units)
   A 6. EE 313, EE 353 Signal Transmission and Laboratory (3,1)
   A 7. EE 401 Electromagnetic Fields II (3)
   A 8. EE 414 Introduction to Communication Systems (3)
   A 9. Power (10 units)
   A 10. EE 303 Power Transmission (3)
   A 11. EE 406 Power System Analysis I (4)
   A 12. ME 341 Fluid Mechanics (3)

Approved technical electives (13 units)

13. A minimum of two senior design laboratories with EE prefix and two design lecture courses in the major is required. To be approved by major adviser.

Support:

14. Reduce total units from 69 to 66.
15. DE ME 341 Fluid Mechanics (3).

M.S. ELECTRONIC AND ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

16. Change from M.S. Electronic and Electrical Engineering to M.S. Electrical Engineering.
17. DE Specialization in Computer Engineering.
18. DE Specialization in Electrical Engineering.
19. DE Specialization in Electronic Engineering.

Core courses:

20. Reduce units from 19 to 16.
21. ADD EE 563 Graduate Seminar (1)(1)(1)
22. Change EE 599 Design Project (Thesis) (2)(2)(5) or 9 units of approved technical electives and a comprehensive written examination to EE 599 Design Project (Thesis) (2)(2)(5) or 9 units of major field graduate level courses and a comprehensive written examination.
23. DE Approved courses from: MATH, STAT, CSC (6).

Approved technical electives (400-500 level):

38. Increase units from 12 to 17.
39. ADD: May be selected from the course list above and other adviser approved technical electives.

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

1.
### 1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP = Vice President Academic Affairs, AS = Academic Senate, CC = Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = Tabled (see Committee Comments),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = Disapproved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I. NEW COURSES

A* 1. ENGR 110 Engineering Science I (3) 3 lec C4 (F.2.) MCF.
A* 2. ENGR 111 Engineering Science II (3) 3 lec C4 (F.2.) MCF.
A* 3. ENGR 112 Engineering Science III (3) 3 lec C4 (F.2.) MCF.

#### II. DELETED COURSES

1. None

#### III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

1. None

#### IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES

A 1. Reduce total units required for B.S. Engineering Science from 204 to 197-198.
   **Major:**
   A 2. Reduce total units from 91 to 84-85.
   A 3. DE CE 205, CE 206 Strength of Materials and Laboratory (2,1).
   A 4. DE CSC 112 Pascal Programming (3).
   A 5. Change CSC 204 C and UNIX or CSC 251 Digital Computer Applications (F.1) (2) to CSC 204 C and UNIX or CSC 118 Fundamentals of Computer Science I (F.1) (3,4).
   A 6. DE CSC 332 Numerical Analysis I (3).
   A 7. DE EE 112 Electric Circuit Analysis I (2).
   A 8. ADD EE 201 Electric Circuit Theory (3).
   A 9. DE EE 208, EE 248 Electronic Devices and Laboratory (3,1).
   A 10. DE EE 211, EE 241 Electric Circuit Analysis and Laboratory II (3,1).
   A 11. DE ETME 141 Applied Descriptive Geometry (2).
   A 12. DE ETME 240 CAD Project Laboratory (1).
   A 13. ADD ENGR 110 Engineering Science I (3).
   A 14. ADD ENGR 111 Engineering Science II (3).
   A 15. ADD ENGR 112 Engineering Science III (3).
A 17. DE ME 318 Mechanical Vibrations (4).
A 18. Increase technical electives from 13 to 22 units.
   Support:
A 20. ADD Upper division math elective (4).

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

1. ENGR 110, 111, 112 Engineering Science I, II, III. The use of "I, II, III" is confusing and seems to imply that the courses need to be taken in sequence, while actually they are "stand-alone" courses. Pending GEB approval.

2. We applaud you for decreasing the total number of units. Have you notified the other departments that you will no longer be requiring the specific courses?
MECHANICAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VP = Vice President Academic Affairs, AS = Academic Senate, CC = Curriculum Committee
A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification,
AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments),
T = Tabled (see Committee Comments),
D = Disapproved

I. NEW COURSES
A
1. ME 405 Mechatronics (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C4/16

II. DELETED COURSES
A
1. ME 350 Thermal Environmental Engineering (4) 4 lec C4.
A
2. ME 351 Active Solar System Analysis and Design (4) 4 lec C4.
A
3. ME 420 Kinematics Analysis and Design (3) 3 lec C4.
A
4. ME 425 Design of Piping Systems II (4) 3 lec 1 lab C4/16.
A
5. ME 448 Cooling of Electronic Equipment (3) 3 lec C4.
A
A
7. ME 452 Solar Engineering Design (2) 1 lec 1 lab C4/16.
A
8. ME 455 Thermal Environmental Experimentation (2) 1 lec 1 lab C4/16.

III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES
A
1. ME 456 HVAC System Design (3) 1 lec 2 lab C4/16 to (4) 2 lec 2 lab. Prereq change.
A
2. ME 457 HVAC System Design (3) 1 lec 2 lab C4/16 to (4) 2 lec 2 lab. Prereq change.
A
3. ME 458 HVAC System Design (3) 1 lec 2 lab C4/16 to (4) 2 lec 2 lab. Prereq change.

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES
Major:
A
1. Reduce total units from 84 to 80.
A
2. ADD ME 329 Intermediate Design (4).
A
3. ADD ME 428 Design (4).
A
4. ADD ME 440 Thermal System Design (4).
A
5. ADD Approved elective courses (12).
Concentrations:
A
6. DE General Mechanical Engineering Concentration (28).
A
A
8. DE Petroleum Concentration (28).
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Support:

9. Reduce total units from 80 to 73.

10. Move BIO 220 Physiology and Biological Adaptation (B.1.b., E.2.) (4) to GEB Requirements.

11. Move ECON 201 Survey of Economics (D.3.) (3) to GEB Requirements.

12. ADD EE 325, EE 326 Energy Conversion Electromagnetics (3,1).

13. Move ENGL 218 Professional Writing: Argumentation and Reports (A.4.) (4) to GEB Requirements.

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

1.
## NEW COURSES

1. PHIL 320 Asian Philosophy (3) 3 lec C4 C.3.
2. PHIL 325 Philosophy of Language (3) 3 lec C4.
3. PHIL 340 Environmental Ethics (3) 3 lec C4 C.3.
4. PHIL 351 Traditional Theories of Aesthetics (3) 3 lec C4 C.3. (replaces PHIL 341).
5. PHIL 352 Contemporary Problems in Aesthetics (3) 3 lec C4 C.3. (replaces PHIL 341).

## DELETED COURSES

1. PHIL 341 Philosophy of Art (3) 3 lec C2 C.3. (replaced by PHIL 351 and PHIL 352).

## CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

## CURRICULUM CHANGES

## CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

WHEREAS, These departments were identified using a variety of criteria (programs for which accreditation is possible but is not being pursued, first-time freshman SAT scores, first-time freshman reported GPA, number of applications, number admitted of those that applied, SCU generated/taught, and SCU/faculty); and

WHEREAS, Indicators considered but found to be inapplicable were: gender, grading distribution, diversity, and time to graduation; and

WHEREAS, The quantitative data used was from Institutional Studies and the financial data from Academic Resources; and

WHEREAS, All parties undergoing review will have the opportunity to discuss the data with the Program Review and Improvement Committee; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Executive Committee endorses the recommendation and concurs with the departments identified therein for review; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the following programs be reviewed by the Program Review and Improvement Committee during the 1993–1994 academic year:

Agricultural Education
Agricultural Engineering/AET
Art and Design
Biological Sciences
Construction Management
Dairy Science
Industrial Engineering
Industrial Technology
Journalism
Landscape Architecture
Liberal Studies
Ornamental Horticulture
Physical Education and Kinesiology
University Center for Teacher Education

Proposed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
April 27, 1993
WHEREAS, ASI is the recognized spokesperson for the Cal Poly students; and

WHEREAS, The students at Cal Poly are the consumers of their education and have the right to educate themselves on what they are receiving for their money; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly student body has expressed a need and a desire for a student-teacher evaluation program; and

WHEREAS, ASI has conducted two pilot programs which have demonstrated the students' desire for this program; and

WHEREAS, The evaluations would be used for student purposes—as a means to "know" about their future professors; and

WHEREAS, ASI would like the help and support of the faculty in the coordinating process of the program; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That ASI and the Academic Senate create a joint task force of students and faculty to develop an evaluation instrument and method of implementation for the program; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That these so-named evaluations would not be used for tenure, promotion, or layoff of faculty members but be used solely for the benefit of educating the students about future professors and their teaching styles.

Proposed by ASI
May 20, 1993
WHEREAS, The Architecture Department requests that its department's designation be changed to the SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE; and

WHEREAS, The request for a department designation change has been approved by the College of Architecture and Environmental Design Council and the dean for the College of Architecture and Environmental Design; therefore, be it

WHEREAS, That the name of the Architecture Department be changed to THE SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE.

Proposed by: The Architecture Department
July 15, 1993
To: Paul Neel, Dean  
College of Architecture and Environmental Design  

From: Robert D. Koob  
Vice President for Academic Affairs  

Subject: REQUEST FOR "SCHOOL" DESIGNATION  

Date: June 10, 1993  

Copies: Glenn Irvin  
Michael Suess  
Elaine Doyle  

This is in response to your initial memorandum of January 26, 1993, at which time you requested that the Architecture Department be designated as the School of Architecture. Based upon the unanimous positive recommendation of the Academic Deans' Council on June 7, 1993, and the justifications noted in your and the Department's memoranda, I am hereby approving the redesignation to be effective July 1, 1993.
Memorandum

January 26, 1993

To: Robert Koob, Vice President
    Academic Affairs

From: Paul R. Neel, Dean
    College of Architecture and Environmental Design

Subject: REQUEST FOR "SCHOOL" DESIGNATION

Bob, this is the proposal to change the Architecture Department designation to the School of Architecture which we discussed last month. At that time you expressed concern over the management level of the organization. I believe the enclosed memo from Allan Cooper and Jim Bagnall explains that the new model does not create any new layers of management as the directors are at the same level as the department heads. The director designation is only interim until we decide whether these managers will have program or functional responsibilities.

The advantages of a School designation are more external than internal. This fact is pointed out in the attached memo. I fully support this request and am anxious to discuss the procedures of implementation.

Attachment

ARCH.School.Des
We are requesting that you initiate the process to change our official designation from "Department of Architecture" to "School of Architecture". We seek this change in name designation for the following reasons:

1. The Architecture Department at Cal Poly is the largest accredited undergraduate architecture program in North America and the second largest department at Cal Poly.

2. The undergraduate and graduate programs are comprised of a number of fifth year concentrations and graduate special study areas with the near-term proposed addition of new programs such as Interior Architecture, HVAC and an Environmental Design Program for undeclared majors.

3. The Department currently offers two professional degree programs (BArch & MSArch) and is in the final planning stages of a new joint BArch/MBA degree. The Graduate Program has an overall enrollment of 38 students while the Undergraduate Program has an overall enrollment of 826 students.

4. The Department has developed a unique, "professionally focused" curriculum, a highly regarded "school of thought" which has helped it to attain the stature normally associated with the "School" designation.

5. Of the fifteen largest architecture programs in North America, only two have the designation of "department".

6. Professional programs leading to registration or licensure, such as law or medicine, are normally designated "Schools".

7. "Colleges" are commonly comprised of "Schools" and "Departments" and that half of the College's resources, faculty and students are vested in the Architecture Department.

8. The only professional association of architecture programs in North America is entitled the "Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture" (ACSA) and that our program's stature within that organization will be greatly enhanced through this proposed name change.
As we move more aggressively into the area of fundraising and development, the prestige associated with the "School" designation will be recognized by potential donors.

We have met with our faculty to discuss this name change and the faculty are in full support of this recommendation.

With this name change, we are also proposing a new management model. Attached is a copy of the management model endorsed by the Architecture Department faculty on December 8, 1992. We feel that the complexity of the program and the size of the department mandates a management model unlike that of considerably smaller departments.

The current management model requires that the entire faculty (40-50 full- and part-time faculty) be assembled to advise on administrative decisions, address scheduling problems, implement budget changes, and/or other crucial areas of departmental administration. When response time does not permit assembling the entire faculty, the directors are forced to act without appropriate input from them. Implementation of a formal advisory group will enhance faculty communication and offer an avenue of representation for specialty areas within the discipline. This group will be small enough to hold regular (or emergency) meetings in order to fully represent the faculty in the decision-making process. The "School" of Architecture Advisory Board will consist of elected faculty representatives from the various academic units within the "School". These advisory representatives will be designated "Associate Directors" and will meet as a body to advise the Directors on policies, scheduling, budget allocations, priorities, etc. This model creates no new layer of supervision or personnel review, nor do the Associate Directors have any fiscal or management authority within the "School".

Please do not hesitate to ask for further clarification should you have any questions in this matter.

NOTE: Associate Directors are faculty (tenured or non-tenured) representatives from each instructional area.
I. BACKGROUND

The Architectural Engineering Department was established in 1948 within the School of Engineering. In 1952, the Architecture Program was formed, separate from the Architectural Engineering Department.

In the intervening years, conditions evolved which required that both departments move out from under the "umbrella" of the Engineering School. The School of Architecture and Environmental Design was formed to accommodate Architecture, Architectural Engineering, and City and Regional Planning and has grown to include Landscape Architecture and Construction Management. In 1992 the School became a "College" to more accurately reflect its size, enrollment and diversity of degree offerings.

The Architecture Department has developed a highly regarded and nationally recognized "school" of thought - a unique, "professionally focused" curriculum - which has helped it to attain the stature normally associated with the "school" designation.

Now, in order for the Architecture Department to better accomplish its mission - which is to:

a. better involve constituencies of degree programs and expanding concentrations within degrees in the decision-making process;

b. better support the individual needs of a diverse student, faculty and staff population; providing diverse and comprehensive educational opportunities; and

c. more accurately reflect its existing structure, a program with a director and semi-autonomous sub-units offering two degrees and five concentrations (with other concentrations currently in the planning stage);
and to operate at a par with other large, diverse architecture programs within the United States, the Cal Poly Architecture Department shall be designated "School of Architecture."

II. STATEMENT OF VALUES

The School of Architecture supports the Cal Poly Strategic Planning Document which reads in part: "By the end of Fall Quarter 1992, Cal Poly shall recommend a governance structure which involves constituencies in the decision-making process".

The School of Architecture, also supports the College of Architecture and Environmental Design Goals which read in part: "The CAED shall promote an environment that positively influences, guides, and supports the individual educational needs of a diverse student, faculty, and staff population; and emphasizes a teaching/learning/personal growth process that encourages the School’s unique close relationship between students and faculty."

The School of Architecture, retains the Architecture Department Goal and Educational Objectives which read in part: "To provide diverse and comprehensive educational opportunities for persons preparing to serve society as responsible, creative professionals involved in problem recognition, problem analysis and problem solving."

III. SUMMARY OF GOALS

The Architecture Department wishes to maintain its size and increase the diversity of its course offerings, while enhancing its ability to effectively manage itself. The Department wishes to maintain its size in order to: maintain the quality and diversity of the program, faculty and students required to support the university's goals for Educational Equity and Affirmative Action; support the College's Goal "C" pertaining to the needs of a diverse student, faculty and staff population; support the School's Goal and Educational Objectives pertaining to providing a diverse and comprehensive education; and respond to overwhelming demand by society, students, employers and the region. To increase efficiency within such a large department and to support the University's goals pertaining to governance and collegiality, a new organizational structure has been adopted. The
Director is assisted by an Advisory Board representing each of the six instructional areas in the School. (See attached organizational chart.)

IV. OPPORTUNITY SOUGHT

The "School" designation is consistent with the name commonly applied to similar diverse and large programs in the United States. The Cal Poly School of Architecture, is the largest accredited undergraduate architecture program in North America. Of the fifteen largest architecture programs in North America, only two have the designation of "department". The program's diversity is reflected in the fact that the School of Architecture currently offers two professional degree programs (BArch and MSArch) and is initiating a new joint BArch/MBA program. The undergraduate and graduate programs are comprised of a number of fifth year concentrations and graduate special study areas with the near-term proposed addition of new programs such as Interior Architecture, Environmental Systems and an Environmental Design Program for undeclared majors. The Graduate Program has an overall enrollment of 38 students, while the Undergraduate Program has an overall enrollment of 826 students.

The School of Architecture offers a professional program leading to registration and licensure. Professional programs of this type in other professions, law and medicine, are normally designated "schools."

The only professional association of architecture programs in North America is entitled the "Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture" (ACSA). Our program's stature within that organization will be greatly enhanced through this name change.

As the School of Architecture, moves more aggressively into the area of fund raising and development, the prestige associated with the "School" designation will be recognized by potential philanthropic and private donors.

Under the "School" designation, a more efficient management plan is made possible whereby more governing authority can be delegated to subunits within the School without requiring additional resources, or additional levels of personnel review.
The departmental model required that the entire faculty (40-50 full- and part-time faculty) be assembled to advise on administrative decisions, address scheduling problems, implement budget changes, and/or other crucial areas of departmental administration. When response time did not permit assembling the entire faculty, the department head was forced to act without appropriate input. The current "School" management model enhances faculty communication and offers an avenue of representation for specialty areas within the discipline. A small group of faculty representatives, or "associate directors," currently hold both regular and emergency meetings to fully represent the faculty in the decision-making process. Without creating an additional layer of supervision or personnel review and without investing the "associate directors" with fiscal or management authority, the Advisory Body is able to provide the Director with valuable input on policies related to scheduling, budget allocations, admissions, productivity, curriculum, workload, facility utilization, and professional development, and management policy.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

The Department of Architecture proposes approval of this Charter in time for the 1994 NAAB accreditation visit.
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-93/
RESOLUTION ON
CHARTER CAMPUS FOR CAL POLY

Background: Due to the continuing erosion of fiscal support for higher education and the effect this has on Cal Poly's academic and support programs, consideration for restructuring the university as a charter campus is presently being investigated. A charter campus structure would allow Cal Poly more autonomy in governing its direction and resources. In view of the growing demands being placed on the state's universities, creative approaches are needed to resist the deleterious effects posed by decreasing state support and increasing state legislation. The ability of the university to respond to the fiscal crisis is restrained by the overly centralized, highly bureaucratic system under which it strives. As a charter campus, Cal Poly would remain a state-funded institution but would be relatively free from the bureaucratic constraints in the use of these funds. In addition to helping remedy the restrictions imposed by decreasing state funds, a charter campus structure could also provide opportunities to develop new and innovative ways of delivering education.

WHEREAS, The unique nature of Cal Poly's academic programs and its reputation for distinctive teaching make it an appropriate campus to consider the special opportunities provided under a charter campus structure; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly's self-design as a charter campus could allow it to enhance its excellent reputation by gaining greater control over the quality of its programs, develop new and innovative ways to promote more learning, and create less burden for its faculty and staff; and

WHEREAS, The desire to consider the benefits of a charter campus have been impeded by faculty concern regarding the manner in which such planning and committee selections to develop this concept have taken place; and

WHEREAS, Protection of existing employee rights and benefits has not been assured in the deliberations regarding charter campus; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That there be appropriate and substantial faculty involvement in developing principles that would guide the policies of a charter university including principles that would address faculty welfare issues; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That current rights and benefits not be diminished under a charter campus design; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the charter campus model developed for Cal Poly establish its own internal governance; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the minutes of all charter campus committees and task groups be sent on a timely basis to the Academic Senate for viewing by faculty; and, be it further
RESOLVED: That Cal Poly confer with the Academic Senate CSU in defining the concept of a charter campus throughout its deliberations; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the decision to restructure Cal Poly to a charter campus be made only after a positive recommendation has been received from Cal Poly's Academic Senate; and, be it further

RESOLVED: If a positive recommendation has been received from the Academic Senate, that the final draft of the charter campus proposal for Cal Poly be submitted to a vote of the General Faculty and the vote be made on a section-by-section basis, each section requiring a majority of the votes before being sent to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees for approval.

Proposed By the Academic Senate
Executive Committee
May 27, 1993
CONCERNING: Response to Brent Keetch’s Charter Draft

First, I missed the last meeting of the Oversight Committee, because I never was notified of the time and place. I checked my voice mail several times to make sure that there was going to be a meeting or not. No message was received.

It is my understanding that responses are being sought in regard to Brent Keetch’s draft of a charter document. Here is my response.

First, it seems inappropriate to tie the charter process to a "Strategic Planning Document" that no one has seen in final form, and that the President of the University has not signed off on. That document turned out to be very general in nature, and does not include the specifics that would be required for a campus charter document.

Second, I would have to object strenuously to section V. B., which reads as follows.

"If any future changes in employment rights, compensation policies, or job security are proposed that are unique to Cal Poly, those affected by the changes will be asked to decide (1) whether to abandon the system-wide bargaining program and (2) whether they agree that the proposed changes are in their best interest."

Item one in this paragraph cannot be done. It would be a violation of HEERA and an unfair labor practice. You cannot simply vote to get rid of a statewide bargaining unit representative. There are specific procedures by which decertification of a bargaining unit exclusive representative can occur. Those procedures would have to be followed.

Third, any governance body that is created under this proposed charter must have more than simply advisory power to the President. If that is allowed to occur, then we will back where we were before
the advent of collective bargaining. The difference between the Academic Senate, the Staff Council, the ASI which all have advisory powers and the exclusive bargaining agents for the employees at Cal Poly is that the exclusive bargaining agents have more than advisory power. We can file grievances on behalf of employees, and if they are not settled at the campus or Chancellor’s Office level, they are subject to binding third party arbitration. Given the general unwillingness to settle issues at the campus level here at Cal Poly, this capability is extremely important! Employee organizations are to be treated as equals to the administration in determining terms and conditions of employment, not merely as advisory to them.

I hope to have a draft completed by the end of this week to submit to the oversight committee that will detail a reasonable process to be followed in examining the nature of a Charter Campus at Cal Poly.
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
STRATEGIC PLAN

Cal Poly's Strategic Plan was developed as a means to guide the university over the next several years. It establishes a direction for achieving the mission of the university by setting forth the goals and priorities which will direct its future planning, resource allocation, and decision making.

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 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.

Cal Poly is dedicated to complete respect for human rights and the development of the full potential of each of its individual members. Cal Poly is committed to providing an environment where all share in the common responsibility to safeguard each other's rights, encourage a mutual concern for individual growth and appreciate the benefits of a diverse campus community.

1. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The purpose of academic programs at Cal Poly is to fulfill the university mission of pursuing and transmitting skill, knowledge and truth. Cal Poly's academic programs support the university's unique comprehensive, polytechnic mission and should all be assessed periodically to ensure that they meet student and societal needs. Cal Poly should provide the necessary resources to ensure the highest quality of service to its students to facilitate their progress throughout all phases of their educational careers.

Goals:

1.1 Consistent with the provisions of Title 5, Sections 40050 and 40051 of the California Code of Regulations, Cal Poly shall affirm its polytechnic orientation emphasizing undergraduate, graduate, and post-baccalaureate professional and technical programs, while providing high-quality programs in the arts, humanities, and natural, social and behavioral sciences that characterize a comprehensive, polytechnic university. These programs shall encourage students to be imaginative and assume leadership in the future.
1.1.1.  Cal Poly shall ensure that a significant majority of Cal Poly students are enrolled in professional or technical programs.

1.1.2.  Cal Poly administration shall continue to seek necessary state resources to support a high-quality polytechnic university.

1.2  Cal Poly shall continue to admit and graduate the highest quality students possible.

1.3  Cal Poly may admit freshmen into majors, or colleges, or admit them into the university without declaring a major.

1.4  Cal Poly's general education will continue to maintain a technical component consistent with the university's character and will provide means whereby graduates:

will have achieved the ability to think clearly, logically, and creatively; to find and critically examine information; to communicate in English orally and in writing; and to perform quantitative functions;

will have acquired appreciable knowledge about their own bodies and minds, about how human society has developed and how it now functions, about the physical world in which they live,—about the other forms of life with which they share that world, and about the cultural endeavors and legacies of their civilization;

will have come to an understanding and appreciation of the principles, methodologies, value systems, and thought processes employed in human inquiries.

1.4.1  Cal Poly's general education program shall provide alternatives by which undergraduates can complete the CSU mandated requirements for general education.

1.4.2  Cal Poly shall establish policy to facilitate general education transferability.

1.4.3  Cal Poly shall ensure its graduates will have acquired knowledge regarding technology, its importance to society, and its impacts on the natural systems.

1.5  Cal Poly shall support and develop high quality postbaccalaureate programs that complement the mission of the university.
1.6 Cal Poly shall provide a campus environment where a strong commitment to teaching and learning exists, and all members of the campus community are motivated to work together in the pursuit of educational goals.

1.7 Cal Poly's instructional programs will vary in size depending on such factors as:
- relevance to mission
- quality of program, faculty, students, and staff
- support of the university’s Educational Equity and Affirmative Action plans
- projected demand by students and employers
- overlaps with programs in other institutions, including the number and size of similar programs offered elsewhere in the state
- requirements of accreditation associations
- resource requirements (variety of faculty, staff, facilities, equipment, library resources).

1.8 Cal Poly's decisions about academic programs and administrative organizations shall be based on the educational needs of students and society and the efficient, effective and appropriate use of resources within a program.

1.8.1 Cal Poly shall review these decisions regularly.

1.9 Cal Poly shall participate in self-supporting programs that offer educational opportunities for nontraditional, nonmatriculated students.

1.10 Cal Poly shall ensure that the academic curriculum is appropriately infused with issues of gender and cultural and racial pluralism.

1.10.1 Cal Poly shall require for graduation, successful completion of course work that focuses on the issues of gender and cultural and racial pluralism.

1.10.2 Cal Poly shall ensure that the content of courses across the curriculum include relevant issues of gender and cultural and racial pluralism where appropriate.

2. FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP

The faculty shall be encouraged to be proficient and current in their disciplines as well as their teaching skills. Cal Poly
shall continue to encourage faculty to belong to appropriate professional organizations. Cal Poly will provide the necessary support to ensure that faculty have the opportunity to achieve success in the scholarships identified below.

Faculty Professional Development

Excellence in teaching is the primary purpose of Cal Poly's faculty, and active participation in various types of scholarly activities is essential to meeting this goal. Cal Poly recognizes and endorses four types of scholarship as part of the expectations for faculty. A Carnegie Foundation report entitled Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate identifies these as the Scholarship of Teaching, the Scholarship of Discovery, the Scholarship of Integration, and the Scholarship of Application. Each of Cal Poly's faculty members must be active and proficient in the Scholarship of Teaching. While activity in the three remaining areas characterizes the career of a faculty member, at any given time it is likely that one area will receive greater emphasis than the others.

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, but transforming and extending it as well. In the end, inspired 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.

2.1 Cal Poly shall continue to encourage its faculty members to be proficient and current in the subjects they teach.

2.2 Cal Poly shall continue to improve opportunities for each faculty member to be skilled in classroom or comparable modes of instruction and to have the most up-to-date means of information technology available.

2.2.1 Cal Poly shall continue to place particular emphasis upon teaching methods that require
students to take an active role in their own learning.

2.3 Consistent with its expectations, Cal Poly shall continue to improve classroom space, classroom equipment, supplies, study space, communication and information technologies, books, periodicals, and other resources.

2.4 Cal Poly shall develop an on-going and effective program of conferences and workshops on teaching and use of information technology to ensure the highest possible quality of instruction across the campus.

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, give meaning to the effort. The probing mind of the researcher is a vital asset to Cal Poly, the state, and the world. Scholarly investigation 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 nonspecialists, 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?

2.5 Consistent with its expectations, Cal Poly shall continue to improve its support for the Scholarships of Discovery, Integration, and Application. Such support shall include but not be limited to assigned time, facilities, equipment, travel, and research assistance.

2.6 Cal Poly shall recognize and support professional activities to the disciplines (such as holding office, editing journals, reviewing books and participating in professional meetings) and service to the university and larger community (such as serving on committees and activity in community groups and activities).

3. STAFF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

Excellence in support of students and faculty is the primary goal of Cal Poly's staff, and participation in activities that lead to professional growth and achievement is essential to meeting this goal. Professional growth and achievement includes continuing education related to a staff member's current position as well as education and training for future careers. Professional growth and achievement may entail different activities for different staff members.

In a university, it is appropriate for all members of the campus community to have the opportunity to seek further learning.

3.1 Cal Poly's staff members shall have the opportunity to pursue additional education and training whether in pursuit of a degree, certification, or personal life-long learning.

Staff members must have available to them the tools necessary for professional growth and achievement. This shall include the opportunity to enhance skills in their current fields, to be exposed to recent developments in technology and information, and to acquire additional education.

An important part of professional growth and achievement, especially on a campus as relatively isolated as Cal Poly, is participation in professional organizations and opportunities to attend professional conferences.
3.2 Cal Poly's staff shall be encouraged to be proficient and current in their professions in order to provide the highest quality support to students, faculty, and the university at large. In support of this, Cal Poly shall continue to improve and update the work environment.

3.3 Cal Poly's staff shall be encouraged to belong to appropriate local, state, and national professional organizations.

3.4 Staff professional growth and achievement shall be recognized by the university.

3.5 Cal Poly shall institute revised performance evaluation standards that set fair and high standards for performance of staff members. These performance standards shall take into consideration the stated expectations for professional growth and achievement and recognize staff members who endeavor to meet those expectations.

3.6 Consistent with its expectations, Cal Poly shall encourage staff participation in the Scholarships of Discovery, Integration, and Application. Such staff support should include, but not be limited to, active involvement in projects and research.

4. STUDENT SATISFACTION

The experience of students on campus directly relates to their satisfaction and the prospect that they will persist with their academic programs to graduation. Student satisfaction at Cal Poly is enhanced by the ambiance of a small university setting, low student-faculty ratios, and the continuing commitment to provide a motivated, technologically current learning environment. The university must continue to support and promote student satisfaction through early affiliation with specific advising programs, respect for the rights of the individual, access to student services, and opportunities to participate in activities that develop the whole person.

4.1 Cal Poly's administrative, academic, and student services programs shall promote student retention, success, and graduation in a timely manner.

4.2 Cal Poly's administrative processes affecting students shall be efficient, effective, and oriented toward service.
4.3 Cal Poly shall provide services, such as library and information services, computing, and audio-visual services, that improve the learning environment.

4.4 Cal Poly shall administer regularly a systematic survey of student attitudes toward academic, administrative, and support services.

4.4.1 Cal Poly shall establish and implement a thorough approach to investigating the reasons why students choose to discontinue study at Cal Poly.

4.5 Cal Poly shall provide a campus environment where the rights of each member of the university community are respected.

4.5.1 The Cal Poly community shall strive to be free of all forms of harassment.

4.5.2 Campus policies for handling harassment complaints will comply with state and federal law.

4.6 Cal Poly shall provide an environment in which social, co-curricular, and multi-cultural programs motivate students, faculty, and staff to work, participate, and socialize together.

5. DIVERSITY

Diversity enhances the quality of life and education for all members of the Cal Poly community and enriches the social and professional climate both on and off campus. The concept of diversity assumes recognition and respect for differences in age, country of origin, creed, economic background, ethnicity, gender, physical ability, race, and sexual orientation. The development and maintenance of an integrated multicultural campus is the responsibility of all members of the Cal Poly community. Achieving educational equity within a diverse student body will require programs in outreach, recruitment, retention, career planning, and the promotion of timely graduation with special emphasis on reflecting the diversity among CSU eligible students within the state. Cal Poly commits to meeting the proportion of eligible underrepresented individuals by job category in appropriate recruiting areas. To achieve a truly integrated multicultural campus, members of the faculty, staff, and student body must participate in academic and cultural programs that promote the sensitivity, understanding, and appreciation necessary for the successful attainment of this ideal.

5.1 All members of the Cal Poly community shall work cooperatively to achieve an integrated multicultural, multi-racial campus in which the educational and professional
opportunities for the student body, faculty, and staff are enhanced.

5.2 The composition of the Cal Poly community shall reasonably reflect the cultural diversity of those Californians qualified for enrollment or employment at Cal Poly.

5.2.1 Cal Poly shall initiate or maintain programs to increase the number of qualified student applicants, attract and retain students of high calibre, and increase the diversity of the student population in accordance with the campus enrollment management plan.

5.2.2 Cal Poly shall establish effective outreach programs to increase the number of underrepresented students, faculty, and staff members and participate to the fullest extent possible in CSU programs for increasing faculty, staff, and student diversity. In addition, Cal Poly will have programs that promote the personal and professional success of underrepresented members of the university community.

5.3 Cal Poly shall create a campus environment that ensures equal opportunity for professional and personal success in all segments of the university community.

5.4 Cal Poly shall value diversity and promote mutual respect and interaction among all individuals. Cal Poly shall identify and support effective programs for educating Cal Poly faculty and staff members, students, and off-campus local constituencies in cultural diversity and for encouraging an integrated, diverse community within the university.

5.5 Cal Poly shall create academic and cultural programs to demonstrate to the campus and the community the contributions of culturally diverse groups.

6. GOVERNANCE AND COLLEGIALITY

Effective university governance depends on a shared sense of responsibility and commitment to the university's educational mission. Collegiality encourages the participation of all constituencies in the decision-making process and creates a work environment that builds cooperation, mutual respect and high morale, and helps achieve the university's goals.

6.1 Cal Poly shall clearly identify, evaluate, and communicate its governance structure, including its agents and their
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roles and responsibilities, and adopt a structure that includes all constituencies.

6.1.1 Cal Poly's governance structure shall implement shared decision making. This involves fostering mutual respect and a set of values that regards the members of the various university constituencies as essential for the success of the academic enterprise.

6.2 Cal Poly shall regularly evaluate and modify its governance structure and the roles and responsibilities of the structure's elements, with particular attention to collegiality and the coupling of authority and responsibility.

6.3 Cal Poly shall evaluate and enhance its roles, relationships, and responsibilities with the CSU Board of Trustees and with the Chancellor's Office.

6.4 Cal Poly shall determine the role of other authoritative structures such as the California Postsecondary Education Commission, employee organizations, the governor's office, and the state legislature in its operations, and its responsibility to those structures.

7. INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

Constant improvement in quality is essential to Cal Poly's success in achieving its goals. To accomplish this, facilities frequently need to be altered or added. However, qualitative increases cannot be sustained without money, material, and people to nourish them, and growth beyond adequate resources leads to a deterioration of quality. The university must continually balance size and resources and must develop the additional resources that excellence requires.

7.1 Cal Poly shall continue its commitment to planned changes in institutional size.

7.1.1 Cal Poly shall not undertake any growth without adequate facilities and supporting resources.

7.1.2 Campus ambiance shall be improved by ensuring that new facilities are consistent with a master plan for the physical improvement of the campus.

7.2 Cal Poly shall explore alternative educational models and technologies to enhance the quality and quantity of the services it provides to its students and other constituencies, including business and industry.
7.2.1 Cal Poly shall consider alternatives to the university's current quarter system.

7.2.2 Cal Poly shall explore new technologies that offer the potential to increase the quality and quantity of the education and services it provides.

7.3 Cal Poly's planning for institutional size shall reinforce the campus' goals for quality and diversity.

7.4 Cal Poly shall continue to develop and expand auxiliary services such as the Cal Poly Foundation enterprises to enhance the quality and quantity of support services and programs delivered to the campus community.

7.5 Cal Poly shall consult with the City and County of San Luis Obispo and participate in public forums in planning for and mitigating the impact of changes in institutional size.

7.6 Cal Poly shall actively seek all appropriate sources of financial and material support, expanding its efforts to take advantage of untapped existing opportunities and to create new ones.

7.7 Cal Poly shall consider its human resources as part of any evaluation of resources--especially when considering the adequacy of resources to support increases in enrollment.

7.8 Cal Poly's physical environment and services shall continually be improved by creative planning that emphasizes a comprehensive, humanistic environmental awareness.

8. UNIVERSITY RELATIONS AND IMAGE

Cal Poly has a multitude of relationships with many and varied groups. Its image is similarly multifaceted, depending on the quality of each relationship. While Cal Poly's reputation is enviable, it is neither perfect nor permanent. Active, open, and honest relations are the foundation of a positive image and build understanding, lasting good will, and support for the university's programs and goals. Cal Poly should continue to build and maintain relations and an image that reflect the highest integrity and help the university achieve its goals.

8.1 Cal Poly shall continue to develop a comprehensive program of active relations with the university's various constituencies and audiences to ensure effective, efficient, positive and mutually satisfying relationships.
8.1.1 Cal Poly shall treat its personnel as full partners in the university's endeavors, fully recognizing the value and importance of both faculty and staff, and shall be guided by a commitment to fostering a community spirit on the campus.

8.1.2 Cal Poly shall ensure the coordination of its various relations programs.

8.1.3 Cal Poly shall ensure that all pertinent information about the university is effectively communicated to the university community, the general public, and to appropriate news media.

8.1.4 Cal Poly shall be a good neighbor and enhance the university's positive impact by emphasizing open communication with the city and county and addressing concerns of the local community.

8.1.5 Cal Poly shall strive to increase parent and alumni participation in campus life and activities in order to build a stronger base of support as well as pride and satisfaction among both current and former students.

8.1.6 Cal Poly shall consider business, industry, and private donors to be partners with the university, and shall strive to develop mutually satisfying relationships and a climate that will maintain and increase the level of support.

8.1.7 Cal Poly shall continue to evaluate and address changes in its relationship with the state government and other levels of government as appropriate.

8.2 Cal Poly shall strive to enhance the university's image among all of its audiences and constituent groups.

8.2.1 Cal Poly shall seek a clear understanding of the university's different audiences and the different attitudes and images they have regarding the university.

8.2.2 Cal Poly shall accurately reflect in its communications the university's mission and goals, a vision of its future, the quality of its human resources and programs, the realities of campus life, and a concern for the university's long-standing reputation built on honesty and integrity.
8.3 Cal Poly shall publicize its strategic planning effort and its strategic goals immediately upon adoption of the Strategic Plan.
Task Force 1
- 16 members
- Determine whether to ask approval of Trustees to pursue Charter Campus concept (proposal)
- Asked approval - no action by trustees as of 9/8/93

Task Force 2 - Vision Committees
- 4 committees of 8 members each
- Each develops vision of Cal Poly
- Formed spring qtr. 1993
- Draft unified vision statement - issues identified
- Finish by Sept. 30, 1993

Forum to discuss process - We are at this point now.

Task Force 3 of n Ad Hoc Committees
- One committee for each issue identified by unified vision statement of Task Force 2
- Will identify obstacles and opportunities associated with each issue
- Determine how each issue to be resolved
  - By individual?
  - By department?
  - By college?
  - By university?
  - By Chancellor?
  - By Board of Trustees?
  - By State of California?
- Complete task during fall qtr.
- At least one open hearing for campus input per committee
- Report their findings to campus (beginning of Wtr. Qtr.)

Task Force 4 of m Ad Hoc Committees
- Identify metrics to measure success of issue resolution for demonstration of ACCOUNTABILITY
- Hold open hearings
- Complete tasks winter quarter
- Report findings to campus

CAMPUS OPEN FORUM WTR. QTR. 1994
- Invite Chancellor, Trustees and others
- Discuss results of process to date
- Questions and discussion
- In parallel with Task Force 4

WRITE DRAFT CHARTER
- Vision formed
- Issues identified
- Metrics to measure success of issues resolution identified - accountability demonstration

Charter Draft to
- Academic Senate
- Staff Council
- ASI
- Labor Council
For Action

VOTE ON CHARTER (DRAFT) BY CAMPUS
To:

Please peruse the enclosed information before the Academic Senate meeting on Tuesday. An hour has been set aside to discuss the charter campus process and there are three items dealing with that topic that we need to address during that time.

Thank you,

Jack Wilson
To: Academic Senate Members
From: Jack Wilson, Chair

SUBJECT: PROPOSALS OF VISIONING COMMITTEES

BACKGROUND - The charter planning process has featured 2 task forces thus far. Task Force 1 (TF1) was formed during winter quarter 92 to determine whether the campus should or should not inform the Chancellor that Cal Poly was interested in pursuing the possibility of becoming a charter campus. That task force of 16 members concluded that the campus ought to move forward in developing a charter plan. Task Force 2 was formed during the spring of 92 and was composed of 4 committees of 8 people each. Each of the Visioning Committees was asked to develop a vision for Cal Poly. They were then to determine issues, arising out of their 4 visions, that would then be the basis for Task Force 3 (TF3). The plan was a committee would be established for each of the issues defined by the Visioning Committees (TF2) and the committees would determine the obstacles and opportunities present in each of the issues. Task Force 4 would then be formed to determine the metrics for measuring the outcomes projected with the issues of TF3.

Task Force 3 has not yet been formed. Meanwhile the four Visioning Committees (TF2) came forth with the following proposal on 9/29/93.

Whereas Cal Poly has been developing a strategic plan over the past three years; and

Whereas the prospect of becoming a charter campus creates new opportunities for Cal Poly; and

Whereas both the Charter Campus Task Force Report in April 1993 and the four Vision Task Force reports from Spring 1993 essentially express a similar sense of what Cal Poly is and where it should be going as in the strategic planning document;

Therefore, we propose the following:

(1) That the strategic plan be revised to add new issues that have emerged as a result of the charter campus opportunity--namely, fiscal flexibility and financial management; and employee relationships and rights--and to revise the other topics as needed to move toward implementation for he strategic plan; and

(2) That the proposed charter be drafted as a statement defining Cal Poly's (a) proposed relationship with the California State University System and (b) its proposed internal governance structure and processes.

End of proposal

The Proposed Issues - Ten issues have been identified by TF2 as the basis for development of a charter campus plan. They are: (1) academic programs, (2) faculty scholarship, (3) staff development, (4) student satisfaction, (5) diversity, (6) facilities and institutional size, (7) university relations and image, (8) governance, (9) fiscal flexibility and (10) employee relations. The first eight emanate from the Strategic Plan.

The Oversight Committee composed of Bob Koob, Pat Harris from the Staff Council, Marquam Piros President of ASI, Wes Whitten alumni and myself met on Sept. 30, 1993 to discuss the proposal of the Visioning Committees. Craig Russell was also at the meeting and Jim Conway, who is a member of the committee, was absent. The Oversight Committee was formed to oversee, coordinate and make certain that information about the process and actions of the task forces are well publicized.

The Oversight Committee unanimously agreed that these 10 issues be brought before each of the constituent bodies (Academic Senate, ASI, Staff Council and the Unions) for discussion and action. For example are these the 10 issues that are essential to eventually developing a charter campus draft? Do we
wish to add some? Do we wish to delete some of them? After each body decides, the next step would be to have a campus open forum, tentatively scheduled for Oct. 28, 1993, to air the issues and seek campus input.

The Process - When the issues are finally agreed upon, the committees comprising TF3 would be formed based on one issue per committee. As already mentioned these committees would have the task of identifying obstacles and opportunities associated with each issue. Each committee would hold at least one open forum during its life for the purpose of informing the campus community of what they had accomplished up to that point and to seek input from the campus. When the committees are finished with their tasks, their work would be presented to the campus for discussion before moving on to Task Force 4. Also following the completion of the work of TF3, there would be a campus open forum featuring many of the players in the charter campus decision. The Chancellor and the trustees would be invited to hear the results of TF3. At that time we would hope to get some inkling about how they felt about the direction the plan was taking. This would probably occur during the middle of winter quarter.

Task Force 4 would be formed based on the issues and their associated obstacles and opportunities from TF3. Task Force 4 would determine the metrics for measuring how well the obstacles are overcome and how well the opportunities were taken advantage of. For example assume that student progress was identified as a sub-issue to one of the major issues. The obstacles to and opportunities for improved student progress would be identified by TF3. Then TF4 would determine the metrics for determining how improved student progress could be measured. One of the keys to obtaining approval from the Trustees and the Legislature is being able to demonstrate and measure improved performance.

Key Issues - The key issue for a charter campus is probably governance although employee relations is extremely important also. Governance has two aspects. First what is the relationship of the university to the CSU? Secondly what is the internal governance to be like?

There is concern that becoming a charter campus with increased freedom from the constraints imposed by the CSU might actually be a step backward. The campus would hope for example that being a charter campus doesn't mean that the CSU might see this as a way to justify reducing Cal Poly's budget even further. A draft charter would present us the opportunity to define what it is we hope to obtain from the CSU without cutting ourselves off entirely from them. Obviously there would be much negotiation needed on this.

Internal governance is the second element. A charter campus status would presumably give the university much more power than it now has. How would that power be handled? A Campus Parliament composed of faculty, staff, students and administration has been suggested by at least one of the 4 Visioning Committees of TF2. This is a concept that is certainly bound to raise the anxiety level of most faculty when they hear it for the first time. However, a Campus Parliament would not preclude the need for an Academic Senate, a Staff Council, ASI or an administration. ASI is a corporation and it's Board of Directors (composed of students) would continue to function as the decision making body for those decisions that ASI, Inc. alone can make. The faculty are not going to agree to share decisions about curriculum and programs with anyone else. The administration is not going to give up their prerogative in having the final say. And obviously the Staff Council has some issues that they and they alone must decide.

The issue of internal governance is not whether there be a Campus Parliament and no other governing bodies. But rather it is whether a Campus Parliament would be best for handling some issues. For example a Campus Parliament might have handled the issue of funding of intercollegiate athletics more intelligently than it has been handled by the ASI and the Academic Senate working independently of one another. And certainly the staff would have had some important input on this issue. It is not too far fetched to envision that perhaps some education on the issues involved might have occurred in such a setting. And it is safe to say that no one group would do all the educating. So there may well be some issues which impact students, faculty and staff which would benefit from airing in a forum like a Campus Parliament.
As it is now, the four groups do not communicate on some important issues that they ought to be talking with each other about. As a result decisions are being made without substantial input from the various constituencies. The key to all of this is of course who does what?

The issue of governance will demand our close attention. However, independently of what a Task Force dealing with governance might recommend, I believe that the faculty must study how the Academic Senate should be structured to operate more effectively in the future. As we know budget now drives programs and not the other way around. Budget drives programs and curriculum. Is this situation likely to end soon? Not according to everything I've read, seen and understand. In fact I believe the financial pressures are going to increase forcing more difficult decisions. It is questionable whether or not the Academic Senate's present structure (including its committees) enable it to respond fast enough to questions which we ought to be addressing even as you are reading this. And if we don't make them, someone else will. Time is the issue. There doesn't seem to be enough of it. Can the Academic Senate be restructured to increase its ability to participate in more of the decision making as well as its effectiveness?

There is one hour set aside at our Tuesday, Oct. 5, 1993 meeting to discuss charter campus issues. I hope we can come to an agreement on the proposal of the Visioning Committees and the accompanying issues at that time.
Resolution on Faculty Steering Committee For Charter Planning Process

WHEREAS, The charter planning process is new and untested in its operation; and

WHEREAS, There are many different issues that will be raised by the various committees involved in the charter planning process; and

WHEREAS, Many of these issues have either direct or indirect bearing on curriculum and programs; and

WHEREAS, Curriculum and programs are the responsibility of the university's faculty; and

WHEREAS, It is important for the Academic Senate to be kept abreast of these issues raised by the various committees during the charter planning process so that there are no surprises at the end of the process; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That a Faculty Oversight Committee be established to monitor the proceedings of the various charter planning committees; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That among its duties the Faculty Oversight Committee:
(1) pay particular attention to issues affecting curriculum, programs and governance.
(2) consider what should go into a charter draft and who should write it.
(3) study the issues involved with seeking exemption from various parts of Title 5.
(4) consider how a faculty vote on a charter draft might best be effected.
(5) report to the Academic Senate on a regular basis; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Oversight Committee have one member each from the 6 colleges and the UCTE.
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RESOLUTION ON
CHARTER CAMPUS FOR CAL POLY

Background: Due to the continuing erosion of fiscal support for higher education and the effect this has on Cal Poly's academic and support programs, consideration for restructuring the university as a charter campus is presently being investigated. A charter campus structure would allow Cal Poly more autonomy in governing its direction and resources. In view of the growing demands being placed on the state's universities, creative approaches are needed to resist the deleterious effects posed by decreasing state support and increasing state legislation. The ability of the university to respond to the fiscal crisis is restrained by the overly centralized, highly bureaucratic system under which it strives. As a charter campus, Cal Poly would remain a state-funded institution but would be relatively free from the bureaucratic constraints in the use of these funds. In addition to helping remedy the restrictions imposed by decreasing state funds, a charter campus structure could also provide opportunities to develop new and innovative ways of delivering education.

WHEREAS, The unique nature of Cal Poly's academic programs and its reputation for distinctive teaching make it an appropriate campus to consider the special opportunities provided under a charter campus structure; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly's self-design as a charter campus could allow it to enhance its excellent reputation by gaining greater control over the quality of its programs, develop new and innovative ways to promote more learning, and create less burden for its faculty and staff; and

WHEREAS, The desire to consider the benefits of a charter campus have been impeded by faculty concern regarding the manner in which such planning and committee selections to develop this concept have taken place; and

WHEREAS, Protection of existing employee rights and benefits has not been assured in the deliberations regarding charter campus; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That there be appropriate and substantial faculty involvement in developing principles that would guide the policies of a charter university including principles that would address faculty welfare issues; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That current rights and benefits not be diminished under a charter campus design; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the charter campus model developed for Cal Poly establish its own internal governance; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the minutes of all charter campus committees and task groups be sent on a timely basis to the Academic Senate for viewing by faculty; and, be it further
RESOLVED: That Cal Poly confer with the Academic Senate CSU in defining the concept of a charter campus throughout its deliberations; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the decision to restructure Cal Poly to a charter campus be made only after a positive recommendation has been received from Cal Poly’s Academic Senate; and, be it further

RESOLVED: If a positive recommendation has been received from the Academic Senate, that the final draft of the charter campus proposal for Cal Poly be submitted to a vote of the General Faculty and the vote be made on a section-by-section basis, each section requiring a majority of the votes before being sent to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees for approval.

Proposed By the Academic Senate
Executive Committee
May 27, 1993