CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

ACADEMIC SENATE
Academic Senate Agenda
February 15, 1994
UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

I. Minutes: Approval of the Academic Senate minutes for January 18, 1994 (p. 2).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Nominations are being received for the positions of Academic Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary for the 1994-1995 term. Please contact the Academic Senate office if you would like a nomination form.

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):
   President Baker will be in attendance for discussion of today's business items.
   A. Curriculum proposals—Morrobel-Sosa, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading (to be distributed).
   B. Curriculum proposals (Linguistics Minor, Social Sciences Department, Values-Technology-Society Minor)—Morrobel-Sosa, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading (pp. 3-5).
   C. Resolution on Calendar—Academic Senate Executive Committee, second reading (p. 6).
   D. Resolution on Calendar—A. Brown, Chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading (pp. 7-10).
   E. Resolution on Definitions of Professional Programs, Technical Programs, and Significant Majority—Nulman, Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, second reading (p. 11).
   G. Resolution on Department Name Change for Ornamental Horticulture—Hannings for the O.H. Department, first reading (pp. 15-19).
   H. Resolution on Campus Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects—Gish, Director for Ethnic Studies, first reading (pp. 20-28).
   I. Resolution on The Review of Telecommunications Course Offerings as New Courses—Dana/Nulman/Vilkitis, first reading (p. 29).
   J. Resolution on Department Designation Change for the Architecture Department—Cooper/Bagnall, Directors for the Architecture Department, first reading (pp. 30-33).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
### 1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS

**LINGUISTICS MINOR**
English Department

<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. CURRICULUM CHANGES

1. Change total required units from 26 to 26 or 27.
   
   **Required courses**
   
   2. Increase units for required courses from 7 to 11.
   3. ADD ENGL 391 Topics in Applied Linguistics (4).
   4. DE Requirement of specific language structuring courses (12)
   5. ADD: Select four of the following courses (15 or 16)
      - SPC 316 Intercultural Communication (4).
      - PHIL 325 Philosophy of Language (3).
      - ENGL 390 Modern English Grammar (4).
      - ENGL 395 History of the English Language (4).
      - FORL 401 Translation (4).
   6. ENGL 497 Theories of Language Learning and Teaching (4).

## II. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

1. PHIL 325 and FORL 401 were not approved as new courses.
I. NEW COURSES

D

1. GEOG 360 Europe (3) 3 lec C2

II. DELETED COURSES

AR

1. GEOG 320 Geography of Hunger (3) 3 lec C2.

III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

A

1. None

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES

Major:

A

1. Reduce Major courses total from 94 to 85 units:
A
2. Reduce anthropology electives (300--400 level) from 9 to 6 units.
A
3. Reduce geography electives (300--400 level) from 9 to 6 units.
A
4. Reduce sociology electives (300--400 level) from 9 to 6 units.

Support:

A
5. Reduce History electives (300-400 level) from 6 to 3
A
6. DE POLS 105 Introduction to International Relations (4)
A
7. DE LIB 101 Library Instruction (1)

Teaching Concentration:

A*
8. Delete SOCS 424 (3) and add electives (3).

Free Electives:

A
9. Increase free electives from 14 to 19 units.

Total Units

A
10. Reduce total units from 198 to 186

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

1. GEOG 360 - offer as "experimental" course. ASCC agrees with CLACC comments.
2. GEOG 320 - fills unique need.
3. SOCS 424 - awaiting confirmation from Credentials office.
VALUES, TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIETY MINOR
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

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 PROGRAM

**Required Courses:** (15 units)

- CSC 302 Computers and Society (3) (GEB F.2)
- ENGR 301 Technology in the 20th Century (3) (GEB F.2)
- HUM 402 Values and Technology (3) (GEB C.3)
- POLS 404 Science, Technology and Public Policy (3)
- PSY 494 Psychology of Technological Change (3)

**Elective Courses:** (9-11 units)

Students are required to take 3 elective courses, one from each category.

1. **Technology:**
   - CE 221 Fundamentals of Transportation Engineering (3) (GEB F.2)
   - ENVE 330 Environmental Quality Control (3) (GEB F.2)
   - IE 319 Human Factors Engineering (3)
   - IT 301 Current Technological Issues (3) (GEB F.2)
   - PSC 110 Energy for the Present and Future (3) (GEB B.1.a)
   - PSC 171 Nuclear Arms Race (3) (GEB B.1.a)

2. **Society:**
   - ANT 325 Material Culture (3)
   - ANT 360 Human Cultural Adaptations (3) (GEB D.4.b)
   - CRP 211 Introduction to Urbanization (3) (GEB F.2)
   - FNR 101 Natural Resources Management and Society (3) (GEB F.2)
   - POLS 304 Politics of Global Survival (4)
   - SPC 380 Media Effects (4)

3. **Philosophy and Values:**
   - HIST 306 History of American Technology (3)
   - HUM 302 Human Values in Agriculture (3) (GEB C.3)
   - PHIL 339 Biomedical Ethics (3) (GEB C.3)
   - SPC 331 Political Advocacy and Contemporary Rhetoric (4)
   - SPC/ENGL/JOUR 385 Mass Media Criticism (4)

Total units: 25-27

### II. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Page 1 01/25/94
WHEREAS, The survey of the faculty by the Calendar Committee in Spring 1993 did not yield a consensus choice for an academic calendar; and

WHEREAS, A primary reason for making a change in the academic calendar is to force a review of the entire curriculum; and

WHEREAS, A Task Force on Curriculum and Calendar has just been formed to review and make recommendations to the Academic Senate on, among other things, the guiding principles that should be considered in making curricular decisions; and

WHEREAS, The results of an extensive review by the task force of the curriculum and the principles that should drive the curriculum could lead to significant suggested changes in the curriculum—some of which could have implications on the choice of academic calendar; and

WHEREAS, Any calendar change will have far-reaching implications on the curriculum; and

WHEREAS, The burden of making the changes in the curriculum that would be necessary to implement a calendar change would properly and necessarily fall to the faculty; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That any calendar change proposal be made only after the Task Force on Curriculum and Calendar completes its work and submits a report and recommendations to the Academic Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That any proposed change in the academic calendar be approved by the Academic Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That any proposed change in the academic calendar, once approved by the Academic Senate, then be submitted to a referendum of the General Faculty with approval being required before it is formally adopted as the academic calendar of the university.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
December 7, 1993
Adopted:

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

AS- -94/
RESOLUTION ON
CALENDARING SYSTEM

WHEREAS, Cal Poly is one of four CSU universities funded on a year-round calendar thus an academic calendar needs to be designed for 12-month periods; and

WHEREAS, The proposed academic calendar consisting of three equal 15-week terms including final examinations meets all five criteria defined by interested parties; and

WHEREAS, *Carnegie unit time can be met by having 14 weeks of instruction with class times increased to 55-minutes each; and

WHEREAS, The results of a survey reported in April 1993, indicated that 60 percent of faculty wanted some changes in the calendaring system; and

WHEREAS, There are significant curriculum-related features:

1. A more flexible learning environment can be developed allowing for a higher level of evaluation and appreciation of knowledge;
2. The increased teaching periods and length of trimester will provide time for more continuity in teaching concepts and ideas, thus there will be less fragmentation of topics;
3. The increased teaching periods and length of trimester will provide more time for senior project which is especially valuable for empirical research and experimentation;
4. Fewer and longer courses will be taken by students which should provide for synthesis and application of subject matter which is beneficial to the learning process;
5. The proposal could facilitate curricular revisions which could address such problems as (a) general education and breadth content, structure, and scheduling [according to a recent survey, this is the most significant problem in the slow throughput at Cal Poly], (b) programs with low numbers of elective classes, (c) excessive overloading of required support and core classes, and (d) lack of adequate staffing; and

WHEREAS, There are significant features beneficial to students:

1. The proposal could facilitate easier articulation for transfer;
2. There will be fewer final examinations, registration, etc.;
3. The proposal will provide a longer period of time for new/transfer students to adjust to Cal Poly;
4. The proposal could facilitate easier coordination with school districts for student-teacher assignments;
5. There will be a greater period of time for students to regain studies in a class after an illness or personal problem;
6. There will be more time to form and develop student-teacher mentor relationships;
7. There will be more time to form and develop study and cooperative learning groups;
8. Finishing the first trimester of the year will provide for easier entrance into summer employment;
9. More meaningful midterm grades will be given;
10. There will be more time for participation in student/cultural affairs;
11. The extra time in class will allow for analysis and synthesis, not just knowledge gathering;
12. There will be more time to review class material;
13. There will be less pressure to choose research topic/term paper subjects in a hurried uninformed way;
14. There will be more time for substantive library and laboratory investigation;
15. In terms of proportion there will be less time spent in taking exams and more in learning;
16. There will be significant reduction in "red tape" concerning add, drop, schedules, grades, etc.;
17. Class content is the same in all three trimesters;
18. The summer trimester will be more efficient in as much as students will be able to earn a semester's worth of credit as opposed to the current practice where they earn a quarter's worth of credit;
19. This proposal provides for year-round operations allowing students to complete a full academic year of instruction in 33 weeks or less;
20. The proposal still allows students to qualify for full financial aid; and

WHEREAS, there are significant features beneficial to faculty:
1. The extended term length over quarters will provide faculty with more preparation time;
2. More preparation time may facilitate a greater variety of instructional methods and strategies;
3. The condensed teaching time may allow for more time for professional development activities;
4. The proposal would give faculty additional time to pursue research and/or other professional development activities;
5. The trimester calendar is more aligned to other colleges and universities thus more opportunities may be available for sabbaticals and collaborative research, etc.;
6. The increased length of the trimester will automatically increase the length of the most commonly used one-quarter sabbatical by four to six weeks;
7. There may be a reduction in stress brought on by the intensity and demands of the current quarter system;
8. All instructional terms are equal thus course outlines remain constant;
9. There will be more time available to get to know and mentor students;
10. There will be more time proportionately spent on teaching and less time on testing;
11. There will be more time to develop ideas in class and allow students to analyze and synthesize information;
12. This proposal provides for year-round operations allowing faculty to complete a full academic year of instruction in 33 weeks or less;
13. Faculty would teach two of the three trimesters;
14. Extra compensation will be paid to faculty who teach a third trimester;
15. Terms of equal duration will permit faculty to revise curriculum into a single new format;
16. Impact on labs will be minimal; and
WHEREAS, There are significant features beneficial to administration:
1. The proposal provides for three equal and well-defined instructional periods;
2. Experience at other universities indicates that there will be lower fixed overheads regarding registration, scheduling, academic records, etc.;
3. Unit values will be compatible with other institutions thus easing articulation and speed of throughput for transfers;
4. There will be more lead time which can provide for more current/updated schedules;
5. The proposal acknowledges the need of facilities management to maintain a two-week break period between terms in order to perform necessary maintenance on campus; and

WHEREAS, There are significant features which need to be assured prior to the beginning of the change process:
1. Adjustments will be made so that progress of current students will be maintained;
2. Monies will be available/obtained by the President to finance and support administrative and faculty time and hire external contractors to address the multitude of factors inherent in a change of calendar;
3. All significant parties will be involved in the planning of these changes (the committee has contacted many parties for their ideas and opinions);
4. Adequate time will be given to plan for and implement the myriad of changes (institutions who have changed their calendaring system indicate that at least three years are required to plan for the change); therefore,

RESOLVED: That appropriate actions be initiated immediately to facilitate implementation of a tri-term calendar no later than Fall Quarter, 1997.

[Carnegie unit: A quantification of student academic learning. 1 semester unit represents how much time a typical student is expected to devote to learning in 1 week of full-time undergraduate study (at least 40-45 hours including class time and preparation). Thus, a 6-week summer session might, if full-time, equate to 6 units. An alternative norm is 1 unit for 3 hours of student work per week (e.g., 1 hour of lecture and 2 hours of study or 3 hours of laboratory) for 10 weeks a quarter or 15 weeks a semester. A full-time undergraduate student program should normally be 14-16 units and, if full-time, no less than 12 units. (Western Association of Higher Education)]

Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
January 18, 1994
Amendment to insert the following immediately after the last WHEREAS,

"Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee"
"January 18, 1994"

DELETE: "RESOLVED, That appropriate actions be initiated immediately to facilitate implementation of a tri-term calendar no later than Fall Quarter, 1997."

AND INSERT:

WHEREAS, The present status of the State’s financial support of a Summer Quarter is less than adequate, and is not expected to change, even with the change to a Summer Term (Tri-mester) or whatever you want to call it, be it

RESOLVED: That the present structure of three regular quarters, and one summer quarter be continued. This, until a carefully structured plan of change be explored which has a timetable, a financial and a reasonable justification that, in fact, a calendar change justifies the proposed expenditure of a great deal of faculty and staff time.
WHEREAS, Cal Poly is a comprehensive polytechnic university; and
WHEREAS, The "Academic Senate Response to the Cal Poly Strategic Plan" has been approved by the faculty; and
WHEREAS, The "Academic Senate Response to the Cal Poly Strategic Plan" states that, "Cal Poly shall ensure that a significant majority of Cal Poly students are enrolled in professional or technical programs"; and
WHEREAS, The character of the university, the distribution of human and fiscal resources and support services are dependent on the students enrolled in academic programs; and
WHEREAS, The university's long-range planning is influenced by the balance among students enrolled as majors in academic programs; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the definition for "professional programs" shall be: Inclusion in Title 5, Section 40051 and either recognition of the program by a specialized accreditation agency or a program leading to a registration, credentialling or certification process requiring a baccalaureate degree, or both; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the definition for "technical programs" shall be: Programs pursuing the application of knowledge derived from theoretical models of life science, physical sciences, and mathematics to create, develop, and utilize solutions to practical problems; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the phrase "significant majority" be interpreted so that the balance between the number of student majors in technical/professional and nontechnical/professional programs at Cal Poly shall remain as it was during the period AY1988-AY1992, allowing for a similar range of variation as occurred during those five years.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee
November 2, 1993
WHEREAS, On November 3, 1992, Resolution AS-394-92/BC, "Resolution on Modification of Resolution AS-268-88/BC Entitled 'Resolution on Budget Information Reporting...'' was adopted by the Academic Senate and subsequently approved by President Baker for implementation; and

WHEREAS, The guidelines of this resolution set forth the type of information to be distributed to the university community; and

WHEREAS, Due to the recent changes in budget allocation, the nature of these reports needs to be changed; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Budget Committee has recommended a less extensive budget reporting format; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached sample format for budget reporting (Attachment A) replace Report I (Attachment B) required by Resolution AS-394-92/BC.
### Academic Affairs FY 94 Base Budget Calculations - FINAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Base Budget from FY 93</th>
<th>Revised FY 94 Admin. Adj. Budget (1+2)</th>
<th>Revised FY 94 Base Budget (1+2)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Permanent Budget Reduction</th>
<th>Reduction as a % of Base</th>
<th>Final FY 94 Base Budget (3+5)</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAGR</td>
<td>10,673,000</td>
<td>153,800</td>
<td>11,026,800</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>10,786,800</td>
<td>(172,080)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>6,916,000</td>
<td>32,700</td>
<td>6,948,700</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>6,877,200</td>
<td>(108,435)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBUS</td>
<td>6,355,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>6,425,000</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>6,323,900</td>
<td>(103,256)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>13,676,000</td>
<td>(25,600)</td>
<td>13,650,400</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>12,750,500</td>
<td>(203,525)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>15,321,000</td>
<td>152,900</td>
<td>15,473,900</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>15,451,700</td>
<td>(241,468)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>13,265,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,265,000</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>13,265,000</td>
<td>(249,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCTE</td>
<td>1,924,000</td>
<td>(92,500)</td>
<td>1,831,500</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>1,831,500</td>
<td>(37,471)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>67,730,000</td>
<td>291,300</td>
<td>68,021,300</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.0218</td>
<td>66,538,800</td>
<td>(1,061,482)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>1,232,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,232,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.0438</td>
<td>1,187,600</td>
<td>(18,792)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>4,038,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,038,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,038,000</td>
<td>(177,171)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILE/SWS</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.0214</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>(2,185)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Admin.</td>
<td>1,249,000</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>1,271,500</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.0220</td>
<td>1,243,500</td>
<td>(19,837)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Other</td>
<td>1,819,000</td>
<td>479,400</td>
<td>2,298,400</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.0222</td>
<td>2,246,400</td>
<td>(35,852)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>9,210,000</td>
<td>569,900</td>
<td>9,779,900</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.0220</td>
<td>9,643,900</td>
<td>(193,839)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AA Total</strong></td>
<td>76,940,000</td>
<td>881,200</td>
<td>77,821,200</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>(1,618,500)</td>
<td>75,182,700</td>
<td>(1,255,321)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Initial budget based on actions taken during FY 93.
2. Required or negotiated changes to base budgets.
3. Sum of column 1 and column 2.
4. The percent of the total that each line represents.
5. Permanent budget reduction assessed to each unit.
6. Budget reduction as a percentage of the total in column 3.
7. Final FY 94 budget after permanent reduction (Column 3 minus column 5).
8. Salary savings obligation for each unit (based on approximately 1.6% of column 7).
9. Campus contingency obligation for each unit (based on approximately 1.2% of column 7).
10. Remaining annuity obligation each unit is responsible for FY 94.
11. Supplemental allocations include telephone, postage, faculty promotion costs, and department head/chair stipends.
12. Budget available for expenditure based on the final FY 94 budget minus the various obligations plus supplemental allocations.
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Background statement: During the first program review process it was suggested to the Ornamental Horticulture Department that the department name was possibly out-of-date and no longer representative of the true nature of the industry or curriculum. Since that time the department has been discussing a name change in consultation with its industry advisory council, the Dean for the College of Agriculture, and other programs in the college. As a result of these discussions, the following recommendation is submitted.

WHEREAS, The term "environmental horticulture" has become the identifiable name of the industry that the Ornamental Horticulture Department serves; and

WHEREAS, What was once the Ornamental Horticulture industry in California has developed and matured into a 12 billion dollar environmental service industry which is a necessary part of the everyday life of many people; and

WHEREAS, Other Ornamental Horticulture departments in the country have adopted the term "environmental horticulture" to better identify the current direction of what is called the "Green Industry"; and

WHEREAS, The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language defines horticulture as "the science or art of cultivating plants"; and

WHEREAS, The professional society for horticulturists is the American Society for Horticultural Science (which is also a professional society for faculty in the Fruit Science, Crop Science, and Vegetable Science programs at Cal Poly); and

WHEREAS, The Ornamental Horticulture Department, with the enthusiastic concurrence of the industry it serves, feels that the name Environmental Horticultural Science more accurately reflects the nature of its program; and

WHEREAS, The request for this name change has been approved by the College of Agriculture Council and the Dean for the College of Agriculture; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the name of the Ornamental Horticulture Department be changed to the ENVIRONMENTAL HORTICULTURAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT.

Proposed by: The Ornamental Horticulture Department
December 7, 1993
EMORANDUM

NOV 23 1993

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Robert D. Koob
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: DEPARTMENTAL NAME CHANGE REQUEST—ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE

Date: November 18, 1993
File No.:
Copies: Glenn Irvin
Joseph Jen
Steve Angley

Attached is a request from the Ornamental Horticulture Department to change their department name to "Environmental Horticultural Science". I would appreciate your having the Academic Senate review this matter and make a recommendation as soon as possible.

Thanks for your assistance in this matter.

Attachment
State of California
MEMORANDUM

Cal Poly State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Date: November 10, 1993

TO: Dr. Robert D. Koob, Vice President
for Academic Affairs

FROM: Dr. Joseph J. Jen, Dean
College of Agriculture

cc: Mr. Steve Angley
Dr. Walter R. Mark

SUBJECT: ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE

The Ornamental Horticulture Department has requested that its name be changed from "Ornamental Horticulture" to "Environmental Horticultural Science." The rationale supporting this request is expressed in Steve Angley's memorandum dated November 3, 1993 (see attached).

The College of Agriculture Department Heads' Council is in full support of this department name change. We now submit this request to you for approval.

Attachment

Approved: __________________________
Robert D. Koob
November 3, 1993

TO: Joseph J. Jen, Dean
   College of Agriculture

FROM: Stephen F. Angley, Interim Department Head
       Ornamental Horticulture

SUBJECT: Department Name Change

At the request of and with the support of our Advisory Council and all faculty in the Ornamental Horticulture Department, we request that the Ornamental Horticulture Department name be changed to Environmental Horticultural Science. We would like this to occur as soon as possible.

We request the name change for the following reasons:

1. To clarify and reflect the department's association with industry, which has moved to the name environmental horticulture.

2. To promote our program better to students and constituents.

3. To promote the fact that our program is based strongly in the sciences, we feel it should be reflected in our name.

Attached is a copy of the name change proposal submitted by our department with our curriculum packet for 1994-96, which has been approved by the CAGR Curriculum Committee.

We are excited about the name change and feel it will make us more recognizable and feel strongly that it will greatly enhance our recruiting efforts.

Attachment
Department Name Change Proposal

ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE
To
ENVIRONMENTAL HORTICULTURAL SCIENCE

The department name change is planned in order to more correctly identify our department's emphasis. The term environmental horticulture has become the identifiable name of the industry our department serves. What was once the Ornamental Horticulture industry has developed and matured into a major environmental service industry. It has become a necessary part of our everyday life and environment.

Our program is based strongly in the sciences, which should also be reflected in our name. We also feel it is appropriate, since many other department names contain the word science.

In addition, our Departmental Advisory Council strongly recommends our name change to Environmental Horticultural Science. They feel, as do we, that the new name will keep us current with the industry as it is today and will have an even greater impact in the future.

We would like this change to be effective as soon as possible.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the attached Draft Campus Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects.
Earlier this year, the Chancellor's Office requested that each campus have in place a policy on the repatriation of Native American objects. With that directive, I asked Dr. Robert Gish, Director of Ethnic Studies, to investigate whether or not Cal Poly had an inventory of Native American skeletal materials and associated funerary objects, and to take the lead in developing a draft policy statement on this subject for the campus.

Enclosed is the draft policy developed by Dr. Gish, along with the background material from the Chancellor's Office. I would appreciate your having the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate review this document this quarter. Questions can be answered by Dr. Gish. Thanks for your assistance in this matter.

Enclosures
August 21, 1993

TO: Robert Koob
FROM: Bob Gish
REF: Native American Burial Remains, Associated and Unassociated Funerary Objects, Sacred Objects and Cultural Patrimony. Cal Poly Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects

COPY: Bonnie Tuohy, Robert L. Hoover

In compliance with the request from Chancellor Munitz, here is the draft policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects here at Cal Poly, SLO. This policy is proposed in conjunction with the recommendations of Professor Robert L. Hoover, Social Science Department.

Since the request for me to investigate the status of such objects on our campus originated from you, and since this proposed policy would seem to need some formal institutional adoption or approval, I submit the attached policy proposal to you.

Please feel free to discuss this proposed policy with me and with Professor Hoover.

CHRONOLOGY: (November 1993 established as deadline by Chancellor’s office)

Feb. 1993 request to CSU presidents from Chancellor
March, 1993 request to Gish received to oversee Cal Poly policy
April 8, 1993 letter from Gish to Dean Helen Roberts stating no such objects held by Cal Poly
May 7, 1993 status report to VP Academic Affairs from Interim Senior Vice Chancellor
Aug. 20, 1993 Gish sends Cal Poly draft policy report to VP Koob
Policy on Native American Skeletal Materials and Associated Funerary Objects

It is the policy of the California State University system to make a sincere effort to be responsive to the concerns of Federally recognized Native American communities and at the same time exercise responsible stewardship of archaeological collections under their supervision. It is also CSU policy that each campus develop its own procedures in dealing with requests for the repatriation of human skeletal materials and associated funerary artifacts.

As a public university in the CSU system which receives Federal funds, it is important that Cal Poly adhere to all applicable Federal laws, such as the Native American Graves Protection Act of 1990. All applicable state and local laws should also be followed, insofar as they do not conflict with Federal laws.

As an academic institution, Cal Poly is committed to procedures for repatriation that require due process and protect the rights of all parties regarding this issue.

It is NOT the policy of Cal Poly to possess or maintain Native American human skeletal material from archaeological sources. Cal Poly does not possess, nor has it ever possessed any such material. Cal Poly does not anticipate obtaining or holding any such material in the future.

Cal Poly does not possess or has it ever possessed funerary artifacts from archaeological sources. Cal Poly does not have the storage facilities to house such collections in accordance with the standards set by the Secretary of the Interior.

Cal Poly maintains a small teaching collection of artifacts, most of them collected from the surface of the ground. This collection does not include any human skeletal material or funerary artifacts and, therefore, is not subject to consideration for repatriation. Should such an eventuality occur, the following procedure shall be followed in accordance with Public Resources code:

A. Cal Poly will conduct an inventory of all its anthropological resources (archaeological, ethnographic, and physical). The anthropology faculty shall be responsible for keeping this inventory current.

B. Requests for repatriation by Federally recognized Native American groups shall be submitted directly to the University Academic Vice President and Provost in documentary form. Such requests should include evidence of cultural affinity to the materials being claimed.
1. Requests will be considered first to determine whether the claim is being made for Native American skeletal materials and funerary artifacts. If the inventory indicates that they are not in this category, they will not be subject to repatriation.

2. If the items claimed do consist of Native American skeletal materials and associated funerary artifacts, a three-person faculty/administrative committee shall be convened, consisting of an archaeologist, a Native American, and a biologist or a physical anthropologist with knowledge of human anatomy. The committee will review the request.

   a. The committee shall make a determination for or against repatriation based solely on whether the claimant has provided reasonable documentary evidence of cultural affinity to the material requested, using the principle of legal rules of evidence. If such a case has been reasonably established, repatriation will occur as soon as possible at the convenience of the claimant.

   b. If there are conflicting claims, the campus committee shall determine which group has best established closest cultural affinity to the material claimed, based on the documentation and rules of evidence.
Memorandum

Date: February 10, 1993

To: Presidents

Reply Requested By: April 1, 1993

From: Barry Munitz

Code: AARD-93-05

Chancellor

Subject: Native American Burial Remains, Associated and Unassociated Funerary Objects, Sacred Objects and Cultural Patrimony

In March of 1990, the CSU provided the California Native Heritage Commission with a preliminary report on the status of campus policy and inventories regarding Native American burial remains. Since then, Federal and State laws have been enacted that require all universities to 1) prepare an inventory of these items, 2) notify the most likely descendant groups, and 3) return the remains, funerary objects, and other sacred objects, if requested to do so. According to the Federal law, institutions must complete an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects by November of 1995, and must complete a summary of unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, and cultural patrimony by November of 1993. Definitions and requirements are contained in the attached copy of Public Law 101-601. Proposed Federal regulations are slated to appear in the Federal Register within the next few months.

Following enactment of the Federal law, the Chancellor delegated to the campus presidents the responsibility for developing and implementing campus policy regarding collections of Native American burial remains and grave artifacts, and for negotiation of agreements with Native American communities on repatriation of these remains and artifacts.

We are now in the process of bringing our 1990 report up to date to reflect current policy statements and the status of inventory and repatriation for each of the campuses. Without this information, it is difficult to evaluate our position in meeting the requirements of the Federal and State laws.

We therefore ask that you provide the following information for your campus:

1. Does your campus have any Native American burial remains or associated funerary objects? Does your campus have any unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, or cultural patrimony?
Memo to Presidents
February 10, 1993
Page 2

2. Please submit a copy of your current campus policy regarding Native American burial remains and objects. If you have not yet developed a policy, please submit the timeline and expected date of completion for the policy.

   Note: A campus having no such items need not develop a policy, but should ensure that campus personnel comply fully with all relevant federal and state laws, including Public Resources Code 5097.98, in any new excavations or acquisitions.

3. What is the status of your campus inventory of these items? Please provide a brief description of the remains, artifacts, or collections that are included in your inventory. If the inventory is not complete, what is the timeline and expected completion date for the inventory?

4. Has your campus returned any human remains or objects to Native American communities? Please provide a brief description of the items, the name of the Native American community, and the date returned.

Send your response to the attention of Dr. Helen Roberts, State University Dean, Academic Affairs/Research and Development, CSU Office of the Chancellor, 400 Golden Shore, Suite 132, Long Beach, California 90802-4275, by April 1, 1993. Questions may be directed to Dr. Roberts at (310) 985-2607. For questions about the Federal law or to receive a copy of the proposed regulations, contact Dr. Tim McKeown, Archaeological Assistance Division, National Park Service, at (202) 343-1142. For questions about the California law or identification of California Indian descendant groups, contact Mr. Larry Myers, Executive Secretary of the California Native Heritage Commission at (916) 653-4082.


Distribution:

Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
Members, Native American Advisory Committee
Date: November 16, 1990

To: Presidents

From: Ellis E. McCune
Acting Chancellor

Subject: Native American Burial Remains and Associated Grave Artifacts

In September of 1989, the executive secretary of the California Native American Heritage Commission wrote to this office requesting information regarding CSU collections of Native American remains and associated grave artifacts and the status of our policy on this matter. We asked the vice presidents for academic affairs to provide this information for the campuses, and in March of 1990, we sent the attached status report to the Native American Heritage Commission.

There is existing federal legislation which requires the Smithsonian Institution to return Indian skeletal remains and burial artifacts to the most likely descendant group, and a second federal law has been introduced that would require all museums to return Indian remains, sacred and ceremonial objects, and religious objects to their groups of origin.

We have also been following Assembly Bill 2577 which passed the California Legislature this year but was vetoed by the Governor. AB 2577, introduced by Assembly Member Katz, would require public and private agencies and persons who possess Native American remains or associated grave artifacts to compile and forward to the Native American Heritage Commission a copy of their archaeological record or other specific information concerning the remains, and to return the remains to the most likely descendants if requested. The probability is that Assembly Member Katz will reintroduce this bill in the next session.

The California Native Heritage Commission is the legislatively established state agency responsible for identifying and inventorying sacred lands, burial sites, and sacred objects in order to preserve the cultural and religious heritage of California. The Native Heritage Commission's responsibilities and authority are described in Health and Safety Code 7050.5 and Public Resources Code 5097.94.
The President of each CSU campus is delegated the responsibility for developing and implementing campus policy regarding collections of Native American skeletal remains and associated grave artifacts. The campus president is also delegated the authority and responsibility for negotiation of agreements with Native American communities and the California Native American Heritage Commission regarding repatriation of campus collections of Native American skeletal remains and associated grave artifacts.

Many universities and museums across the country are developing policy and procedures for the repatriation of Native American remains. Stanford University has established a policy which has been provided as an example by the Native American Heritage Commission. CSU, Chico has just completed development of their university policy, and the University of California convened a committee which has studied the issues and made a series of recommendations to the President's Office. Although the Smithsonian Institution has not yet finalized its internal policy and procedures, the requirements of the federal legislation (attached) are very explicit.

We recommend that you take the following steps to ensure that your campus is in full compliance with state and federal law on this matter:

1. Consult with appropriate Native American communities and constituencies.
2. Develop and/or review campus policy regarding collections of Native American skeletal remains and associated grave artifacts.
3. Develop and/or review written procedures to guide campus and community groups in handling requests for repatriation of collections.
4. Communicate campus policy and procedures to the faculty, the community, and the California Native American Heritage Commission.
5. Continue inventory and analysis of Native American burial remains and associated grave artifacts as policy deliberations proceed.

A campus having no Native American burial remains or associated grave artifacts need not develop a policy or procedures, but should ensure that campus personnel comply fully with Public Resources Code 5097.98 in any new excavations or acquisitions.

Attached for your information are copies of: 1) the federal legislation requiring the Smithsonian Institution to repatriate Native American remains, 2) AB 2577, the Katz bill (as amended) which passed the California legislature before being vetoed by the Governor, 3) Stanford University's policy regarding repatriation, 4) CSU, Chico's policy regarding repatriation, 5) recommendations of the University of California committee, 6) status report submitted by CSU to the Native American Heritage Commission, 7) Health and Safety Code 7050 and 8) Public Resources Code 5097.

enclosures
WHEREAS, The future of California is directly tied to meeting the educational needs of the next generation; and

WHEREAS, The demand for higher education is increasing beyond the present limits of the CSU to accommodate; and

WHEREAS, A principal objective of telecommunications is to provide instructional experiences to students, to accommodate explosive-enrollment growth, and to meet the educational and manpower needs of the next generation; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate supports advancements in teaching technologies and encourages new and innovative models and methods of teaching; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate is the formal policy-recommending body in matters of curriculum and academic standards; and

WHEREAS, The curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty; and

WHEREAS, The use of emerging information technologies will require development of appropriate pedagogies; and

WHEREAS, The employment of emerging information technologies has significant implications for curriculum and academic standards; and

WHEREAS, The technology has not been proven as an effective educational tool; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That courses offered for academic credit through telecommunications media be treated as new courses and appropriate course proposal be submitted to the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate for customary review and approval; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate instruct its Chair to remind the administration of the Academic Senate's responsibility in matters affecting curriculum, and academic standards.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
January 11, 1994
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 Department Head’s Council; the Dean of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design; the Dean’s Council; and the Vice President for Academic Affairs; therefore, be it

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

Proposed by: The Architecture Department
July 15, 1993
DESIGNATION CHANGE:
A CHARTER FOR THE SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

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 the 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 special study options 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 special study options (with others 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.” (It should be noted that this is a designation change only. It is not the intention to reorganize the Architecture Department into a School of Architecture within which reside individual Departments.)

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 Objective which reads 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.

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 integrated 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. 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 (i.e., 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, professional development, and management policy.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

The Department of Architecture proposes approval of this Charter in time for the Spring 1994 NAAB accreditation visit.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

RESOLUTION ON
THE CURRICULUM PROPOSAL TO CHANGE
AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY TO:
AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT

WHEREAS, The Agricultural Engineering Department has tried to work with
the University Curriculum Committee in justifying a change in
curriculum and major name; and

WHEREAS, Universities of prestige, such as Texas A & M, The University of
Idaho, and Texas Tech have changed their program names to
Agricultural Systems Management; and

WHEREAS, The proposed program in Ag Systems Management has the support
of the AgriBusiness Department; and

WHEREAS, The proposed program fosters an interdisciplinary approach to
education; and

WHEREAS, This program change will allow Agricultural Engineering to
separate service courses from the professional program; and

WHEREAS, This program change will “open up” the curriculum to foster a
more efficient process of program completion, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the name of the Agricultural Engineering Technology major
be changed to Agricultural Systems Management, with the
resultant coursework redirection as proposed.
# Agricultural Systems Management

**Agricultural Engineering Department**

186 Units

### GE & B - 53 Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area A -(14)</th>
<th>Area B -(0)</th>
<th>Area C -(18)</th>
<th>Area D -(18)</th>
<th>Area E -(3)</th>
<th>Area F -(0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Support Courses (Major) - 42/43 Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE 128 (3) Intro/Ag Tech</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 133 (3) Drafting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 321 (3) Safety in Ag.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG 250 (3) Computers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal or Plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Course (3/4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 121 (4) Soils</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio 220 (4) Biology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem 121 (4) Chemistry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem 122 (4) Chemistry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 118 (4) Pre-Calc Alg</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 119 (3) Pre-Calc Trig</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys 104 (4) Intro/Phys</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Support Courses (Mgt.) - 27/28 Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus 201 (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 301 (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 310 (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 312 (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 401 (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTG 211 (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 321 (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 322 (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 413/415/416 (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major, Technology (34) & Career Elect. (28) = 62 Units

#### Technology - 34 Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASM 141 (3) Mach. Safety</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM 142 (3) Machinery</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM 203 (3) Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM 325 (4) Energy Sys.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM 324 (4) Electricity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 340 (4) Irrigation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM 402 (4) Mat'l Sci</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM 425 (4) Computers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM 432 (4) Struc/Envir</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM 463 (1) Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Career Elective Areas - 27/28 units

Select one of the following:

1. Plant Production
2. Livestock Prod.
3. Food Processing
4. Env. Info. Mgmt.
5. Water/Irrigation
6. Processing & Manufacturing

*Senior Project to be taken in emphasis areas*

Select one of the following:

XXX 461*

XXX 462*
MEMORANDUM

To: Members, Academic Senate     Date: January 25, 1994

From: Harold Goldwhite, Chair     Academic Senate CSU

Subject: ITL Faculty Director

Attached is a reminder announcement regarding the search for the 1994-95 Faculty Director for the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning. The ITL Faculty Director brings a campus and a faculty perspective to the work of the Institute. This is a key systemwide position that supports research, development, and dissemination related to the instructional mission of the CSU. I encourage you to bring any prospective candidates to the attention of the Search Committee, chaired by Senator Jacquelyn Kegley of CSU Bakersfield.

HG:mp

Attachment
MEMORANDUM

TO: Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs

FROM: Peter Hoff
Senior Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Search for the 1994-95 ITL Faculty Director

This is a reminder that nominations and applications are being sought for the 1994-95 Faculty Director of the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning. The search committee, chaired by Professor Jacquelyn Kegley of CSU Bakersfield, will begin reviewing applications on February 18, 1994.

The ITL Faculty Director brings a campus and faculty perspective to the work of the Institute, and is responsible for overseeing the full range of research, development, and dissemination programs of the ITL. This position is a two- or three-year rotating assignment in the Office of the Chancellor in Long Beach.

A position announcement and job description are attached. Applications and nominations should be addressed to:

Dr. Jacquelyn Kegley, Chair
Search Committee for the ITL Director
CSU Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

I encourage you to bring any prospective candidates to our attention. Questions about the Institute for Teaching and Learning may be referred to Dr. Jacquelyn Kegley at (805) 664-2249; Dr. Kathleen Faith Mikitka at (310) 985-2607; or Dr. Helen Roberts at (310) 985-2607.

cc: Presidents
Campus Senate Chairs
Members, Academic Senate of the CSU
ITL Advisory Board and Discipline Coordinators
Directors, Campus Centers for Instructional/Faculty Development
Chancellor's Office Staff
Position Announcement

FACULTY DIRECTOR
CSU INSTITUTE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING
(2-3 year temporary assignment)

Background Information

The Institute for Teaching and Learning is a systemwide office of the California State University devoted to the enhancement of college teaching and learning. The Institute was established in 1988 as a joint initiative of the CSU statewide Academic Senate and the Office of the Chancellor. Its primary mission is to provide assistance and resources in support of the highest standards of university teaching excellence and to provide support for faculty members to grow professionally. Under the guidance of a systemwide advisory board, the ITL works with CSU campuses to promote involvement of the faculty in active scholarship on college teaching. The Institute maintains a small central staff at the CSU Office of the Chancellor in Long Beach.

Duties of the Director

The Director of the Institute for Teaching and Learning is responsible for overseeing the planning, implementation, administration, and evaluation of all initiatives conducted through the Institute. Under general supervision of the Director, Academic Programs and Support, the Faculty Director is in charge of the full range of research, development, and dissemination programs of the ITL. The Faculty Director is supported by an Assistant Director, a Clerical Assistant, and two Student Assistants.

Duties of the ITL Director include:

- in conjunction with the ITL Advisory Board, establish priorities for initiatives to enhance teaching and learning as well as priorities for faculty development and research on teaching and learning;
- maintain effective liaison with the CSU campuses in cooperation with the campus faculty/instructional development centers, the academic senates, and the vice presidents for academic affairs;
- link with and provide support to faculty groups engaged in faculty development and instructional enhancement efforts;
- oversee the publication of materials that contribute to the scholarship of teaching, including the ITL newsletter Exchanges;
- oversee ITL sponsorship of meetings, conferences, and workshops on topics related to faculty development and instructional enhancement, such as the National College Teaching and Learning Exchange and the Summer Teacher/Scholar Conference;
- prepare budgetary and program proposals for the ITL and related innovative academic programs;
- provide for effective liaison with the ITL Advisory Board and related internal and external organizations, including state and federal government, national organizations, and foundations.
Terms and Conditions of the Position

The Director of the Institute for Teaching and Learning is a tenured member of the faculty of the California State University. The position is a two- or three-year temporary assignment. Through an agreement with the home campus, the ITL Faculty Director is released from all local campus duties in order to work full time at the Office of the Chancellor. The Director's position is a year-round assignment, and the incumbent is compensated at his or her regular monthly rate during the summer months. A travel subsidy is provided under State travel guidelines if the Faculty Director does not live within commuting distance of the Office of the Chancellor. When the term of the assignment is over, the Faculty Director returns to the home campus and his or her regular teaching duties.

Application Procedures

Nominations are welcomed and may be submitted by letter, telephone, email, or fax at the address below.

Prospective candidates should submit:
1) a cover letter describing interest in the position, with specific reference to organizational skills and ability to work with all levels of the campus community;
2) résumé;
3) names and current telephone numbers of four references familiar with the candidate’s contributions in the area of teaching and learning;
4) evidence that the department chair, dean, and campus academic vice president support the candidate’s availability for this assignment.

Address applications and nominations to:

Dr. Jacquelyn Kegley, Chair
Search Committee for the ITL Director
CSU Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore, Suite 132
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

PHONE: (310) 985-2607
FAX: (310) 985-2504
EMAIL: helen_roberts@qm.calstate.edu

Review of resumes will begin on February 18, 1994, and will continue until the position is filled. The position is available beginning in June of 1994.
# AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

## 1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS

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

1. **AE 438 Drip Irrigation** (4) 3 lec 1 lab C4/16 MCF.

## II. DELETED COURSES

1. **AE 131 Agricultural Surveying** (2) 1 lec 1 lab C2/16.

## III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

1. Create new course prefix (rubric) **ASM** (Agricultural Systems Management).
2. **AE 134 Agricultural Electrification** (3) 2 lec 1 lab C2/16 to **ASM 325 Agricultural Energy Systems** (3) 2 lec 1 lab C4/16, Descr change.
3. **AE 323 Agricultural Products Handling** (3) 2 lec 1 lab C4/16 to **ASM 402 Agricultural Materials Science**, Descr change.
4. **AE 463 Undergraduate Seminar** (2) 2 sem C5 to **ASM 463 (1) 1 sem.**
5. **AE 581 Graduate Seminar in Agricultural Engineering** (3) 3 sem C5. Total credit limited to 9 units. Descr and prereq change.
6. **AE 141 Agricultural Machinery Safety** (3) 2 lec 1 lab C2/16 to **ASM 141.**
7. **AE 142 Agricultural Power and Machinery Management** (4) 3 lec 1 lab C4/16 to **ASM 142.**
8. **AE 203 Agricultural Systems Analysis** (3) 2 lec 1 lab C4/16 to **ASM 203.**
9. **AE 324 Principles of Agricultural Electrification** (4) 3 lec 1 lab C4/16 to **ASM 324.**
10. **AE 432 Agricultural Building** (4) 3 lec 1 lab C4/16 to **ASM 432.**

Change the following courses from **AE** to **AG** rubric (and some level changes):

11. **AE 124 Small Engines** (2) 1 lec 1 lab C2/13 to **AG 124.**
12. **AE 231 Agricultural Building Construction** (3) 1 lec 2 lab C2/16 to **AG 231.**
13. **AE 234 Agricultural Power Transmission and Mechanics** (3) 2 lec 1 lab C4/16 to **AG 234.**
14. **AE 301 Closed Circuit Hydraulics** (3) 2 lec 1 lab C4/16 to **AG 201.**
15. **AE 325 Agricultural Power** (3) 1 lec 2 lab C2/16 to **AG 235.**
16. **AE 341 Gasoline Engine Diagnosis** (3) 2 lec 1 lab C2/16 to **AG 241.**
17. **AE 342 Diesel Fuel Systems** (3) 2 lec 1 lab C2/16 to **AG 242.**
IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES

B.S. AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

Support courses:

1. ADD to CSC 251 (F.1) as options: CSC 118 Fundamentals of Computer Science I (4) or CSC 204 C and UNIX (3).
2. DE ETME 143 Engineering Drawing II (1).
3. ADD AE 151 CAD for Agricultural Engineering (1).
4. Change name from B.S. Agricultural Engineering Technology to B.S. Agricultural Systems Management.

Major courses:

5. Increase total units from 73 to 91.
6. Move AE 128 (3) to Support area.
7. Move AE 133 (3) to Support area.
8. ADD ASM 203 Agricultural Systems Analysis (3).
9. DE AE 231 Agricultural Building Construction (3).
11. DE AE 237 Engineering Surveying I (2).
12. DE 301 Closed Circuit Hydraulics (3).
13. DE AE 335 Agricultural Power (3).
14. DE AE 341 Gasoline Engine Diagnosis (3).
15. DE AE 342 Diesel Fuel Systems (3).
16. DE AE 343 Project Analysis (5).
17. DE AE 344 Agricultural Equipment Projects (3).
19. ADD AGB 212 Agricultural Economics (3).
20. ADD AGB 301 Agricultural Marketing (3).
21. ADD AGB 310 Agricultural Credit and Finance (3).
22. ADD AGB 401 Agribusiness Labor Relations and Personnel Management (4).
23. Move ACTG 211 (4) to Major from Support area.
24. ADD Advisor approved electives (21):

Support courses:

25. Reduce total units from 64 to 42.
26. DE CSC 110/CSC 120 as choices for GEB F.1.
27. DE AGB 312 Agricultural Policy (3).
28. DE BUS 201 Business Law Survey (3).
29. DE ETMP 144 and ETMP 145 Manufacturing Processes: Machining I, II (2,1).
30. DE ETWT 144 Manufacturing Processes: Welding I (2).
31. DE ETWT 155 Industrial Welding Technology (1).
32. DE MATH 116 Pre-Calculus Algebra I (3).
33. DE MATH 117 Pre-Calculus Algebra II (B.2.) (3).
34. ADD MATH 118 Pre-Calculus Algebra (B.2.) (4).
35. ADD PHYS 104 Introduction to Physics (B.1.a.) (4).
36. DE PHYS 121, 122, 123 College Physics (B.1.a.) (4, 4, 4).
37. Change Animal production elective (4) and Plant production elective (4) to Animal or plant production elective (3).

Electives:
38. Reduce free elective units from 8 to 6.

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Note: Shaded areas reflect items no longer under discussion.

1. AE 348 should be offered as an experimental course first.
2. The change from BS in Agricultural Engineering Technology to BS in Agricultural Systems Management reflects a change in both name and content of the program. It appears to be a different major. The ASCC has not completed deliberation on the program.
3. The Committee found that the proposed changes from BS in Agricultural Engineering Technology to BS in Agricultural Systems Management were significant in both name and curricular content. Given that a central core of these courses are offered by another program in the College, the Committee did not find the proposed program to be fundamentally different from those currently available to students in the College, with added concentration/minor in technology. Therefore, the Committee suggests that although the subject matter is important, its content may best be delivered as a minor or concentration in another program.
# Agricultural Systems Management

**Agricultural Engineering Department**

186 Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE &amp; E - 53 Units</th>
<th>Area D-(18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area A-(14)</td>
<td>Area E-(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B-(0)</td>
<td>Area F-(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support Courses - 42/43 Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AE 128 (3) Intro/Ag Tech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE 133 (3) Drafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 321 (3) Safety in Ag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG 250 (3) Computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal or Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Course (3/4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SS 121 (4) Soils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bio 220 (4) Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem 121 (4) Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem 122 (4) Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 118 (4) Pre-Calc Alg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 119 (3) Pre-Cal Trig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys 104 (4) Intro/Phys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Mgmt - 27/28 Units

- Bus 201 (3)
- AGB 301 (3)
- AGB 310 (3)
- AGB 312 (3)
- AGB 401 (4)
- ACTG 211 (4)

Select one of the following:

### Ag Business Production

- AGB 321 (4)
- AGB 322 (4)
- AGB 413/415/416 (3)

### Ag Market

- AGB 201 (3)
- AGB 304 (3)
- AGB 323 (4)

## Technology - 34 Units

- ASM 141 (3) Mach. Safety
- ASM 142 (3) Machinery
- ASM 203 (3) Systems
- ASM 325 (4) Energy Sys.
- ASM 324 (4) Electricity
- AE 340 (4) Irrigation
- ASM 402 (4) Mat'l Sci
- ASM 425 (4) Computers
- ASM 432 (4) Struct/ Envir
- ASM 463 (1) Seminar

## Career Elective Areas - 27/28 units

Select one of the following:

1. Plant Production
2. Livestock Prod.
3. Food Processing
4. Env. Info. Mgmt.
5. Water/Irrigation
6. Processing & Manufacturing

XXX 461*(2)
XXX 462*(3)

*Senior Project to be taken in emphasis areas