I. Minutes: Approval of the Academic Senate minutes for May 3, 1994 (p. 2).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
   A. Resolutions approved by President Baker:
      AS-419-94/PPC  Evaluation of College Deans or Equivalent Administrators
      AS-422-94/OH  Department Name Change for the Ornamental Horticulture Department

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:
   G. Freberg/Murphy/Vix: report from the faculty representatives to the Athletics Governing Board

IV. Consent Agenda:
   A. Election of Academic Senate officers for the 1994-1995 academic year.
   B. Curriculum proposal POLS 209X submitted for Cultural Pluralism requirement-
      Morrobel-Sosa, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading (p. 3).
   C. GE&B proposals for SPAN 340 and GRC 277-Vilkitis, Co-Chair of the GE&B Committee, second reading (pp. 4-5).
   D. Resolution on Diversity Proposal for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure-Terry, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, second reading (p. 16-24).
   E. Resolution on Indirect Cost Sharing for ARDFA-Krieger, Chair of the Research Committee, second reading (pp. 25-27).
   F. Resolution on Five-year Academic Program Review Schedule-Heidersbach, Chair of the Program Review and Improvement Committee, second reading (pp. 28-33).
   G. Resolution on Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines Change-
      Heidersbach, Chair of the Program Review and Improvement Committee, second reading (pp. 34-35).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
## U. S. CULTURAL PLURALISM REQUIREMENT

### I. CURRENT LIST OF COURSES

| TA | 18. | POLS X209 American and California Ethnic Politics (GEB D1) |

---

### II. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

The ASCC strongly recommends that all USCP courses be reviewed for consideration in GEB.
# General Education and Breadth Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>2. PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Velasquez</td>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X New Course (approved by committee, 4.3.2 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Change to an Existing GEB Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPAN 340 Chicano/a Authors (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To introduce students to Chicano/a literary accomplishments in order to facilitate their appreciation of Chicano/a literary aesthetics and to increase their understanding of Chicano/a cultural values and lifestyles. Lecture in Spanish. 4 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee approval recommended (12/3/93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This course should have been evaluated by our committee last year; it fell through the cracks in the review process. This course fully meets the criteria for inclusion on the C.3 GEB list of courses. Approval recommended (3/3/94).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Academic Programs: 7/18/90
I. PROPOSER'S NAME

Mike Blum

2. PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT

Graphic Communication

3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)

F.1

4. THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR:

- New Course
- Change to an Existing GEB Course
- Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB

5. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format)

GrC 277 Computer Applications in Desktop Publishing (3)

Computer applications, their relationship to print media and publishing. How desktop publishing is influencing and is influenced by society. Use and selection of personal computers, desktop publishing software, and output devices. Terminology, typography, creating, editing, transferring, merging text and graphics. Credit not allowed for GrC majors. Miscellaneous course fee requires—See Class Schedule. 2 lectures, 1 laboratory.

6. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS

Approval recommended February 18, 1994; reservations expressed about resources needed to meet student demand and how often this course will be offered.

7. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS

The GEB Committee recommends approval of this course (3/3/94). We note the concerns of the Area F Subcommittee. These need to be addressed. However, the content of this course meets the criteria for inclusion on the F.1 list.

8. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION

Academic Programs: 7/18/90
Adopted:

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

AS- 94/PPC
RESOLUTION ON
DIVERSITY PROPOSAL FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Background Statement: By a memo dated September 21, 1993, the Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force referred to the Personnel Policies Committee a Diversity Proposal for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure. In that proposal two statements were made: (1) "The purpose of this proposal is not to be punitive, but to facilitate faculty awareness and involvement in this important issue"; (2) "It is proposed that within each area, diversity-related activities be specifically noted. It is not intended that faculty must fulfill diversity requirements in all three categories. However, diversity-related activities should appear in at least one category."

The Personnel Policies Committee believes that these two statements are contradictory. We agree with the first statement above and, hence, propose that Form 109 be revised so as to permit specific mention of diversity-related activities.

The Committee is opposed to any diversity-requirement in Retention, Promotion, and Tenure.

For ease of reading, please note: Attachment 1 is one way to revise Form 109 to include specific mention of diversity-related activities; Attachment 2 is a second way to accomplish the same result; and Attachment 3 is the Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force’s Diversity Proposal for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure and the accompanying letter of transmittal.

WHEREAS, The University is committed to diversity; and
WHEREAS, Faculty members are encouraged to become more involved in promoting diversity; and
WHEREAS, Diversity is broadly defined in terms of "differences in age, country of origin, creed, economic background, ethnicity, gender, physical disability, race, and sexual orientation" (Education Equity Commission, 1992); and
WHEREAS, Diversity-related activities permeate the existing areas of teaching, scholarship and University/community service in which tenure-track faculty are required to show competence; and
WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Equal Opportunity Advisory Council has proposed that diversity considerations become an integral part of the retention, promotion and tenure (RPT) process; and
WHEREAS, Form 109 does not preclude mention of diversity-related activities; and
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force has endorsed the Equal Opportunity Advisory Council’s proposal; therefore, be it
RESOLUTION ON DIVERSITY PROPOSAL
FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
AS-94/PPC

RESOLVED: That Form 109 be revised so as to include diversity-related activities as a specific factor of consideration; and

RESOLVED: That faculty members be recognized for the pursuit of diversity-related activities.

Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
February 16, 1994
FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

NAME_________________________ FACULTY RANK/STEP ________________________
DEPARTMENT____________________ SCHOOL_________________ DATE__________

This is an evaluation for (check applicable blank or blanks):

- Retention to a ____1st, ____2nd, ____3rd, ____4th, ____5th, ____6th probationary year.
- ____ Tenure
- ____ Merit Salary Increase
- ____ Promotion
- ____ Other
- ____ Periodic Review

FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION

Justification for Recommendations (CAM 341.1, D)
Evaluative statements should be accompanied by supporting evidence. If the evidence does not appear to support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the reviewing levels for amplification.

The evaluator should review effectiveness of the faculty member primarily during this evaluation period. The evaluation should reflect both (1) evidence of merit and (2) suggested areas for improvement. Reference any resources used for evaluation; such as class visitation, conferences, and materials provided by the faculty member. If more space is needed, use an additional page.

1. Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance: Consider such factors as the faculty member's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of course, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student consultations, and other factors relating to performance as a teacher, including diversity-related activities. (Include results of Student Evaluation Program.)

Evidence of Merit:

*Nonteaching academic personnel are to be evaluated on their professional performance.

(Over)

Form FA109
Rev. 1/26/94
II. **Professional Growth and Achievement**: Consider such factors as the faculty member's original preparation and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies and publications, professional registration, certification and licensing, and diversity related activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:
III. Service to University and Community: Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement, placement follow-up, cocurricular activities, department, school and university committee and individual assignments, systemwide assignments, and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities, including diversity-related activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

IV. Other Factors of Consideration: Consider such factors as the faculty member's ability to relate with colleagues, initiative, cooperativeness, dependability, and health, etc.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:
This is an evaluation for (check applicable blank or blanks):

Retention to a __1st, __2nd, __3rd, __4th, __5th, __6th probationary year.

____ Tenure
____ Merit Salary Increase
____ Promotion
____ Other
____ Periodic Review

**FACTORs Of CONsiderATION**

*Justification for Recommendations (CAM 341.1, D)*

Evaluative statements should be accompanied by supporting evidence. If the evidence does not appear to
support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the reviewing levels for amplification.

The evaluator should review effectiveness of the faculty member primarily during this evaluation period. The
evaluation should reflect both (1) evidence of merit and (2) suggested areas for improvement. Reference any
resources used for evaluation; such as class visitation, conferences, and materials provided by the faculty
member. If more space is needed, use an additional page.

*I. Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance:* Consider such factors as the faculty
member's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching
techniques, organization of course, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student
achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student consultations, and other factors relating to
performance as a teacher. (Include results of Student Evaluation Program.)

Evidence of Merit:

*Non-teaching academic personnel are to be evaluated on their professional performance.*

Over
II. Professional Growth and Achievement: Consider such factors as the faculty member's original preparation and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies and publications, professional registration, certification, and licensing.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:
III. **Service to University and Community:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement, placement follow-up, cocurricular activities, department, school, and university committee and individual assignments, systemwide assignments, and service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

IV. **Other Factors of Consideration:** Consider such factors as the faculty member's ability to relate with colleagues and students (including diversity-related activities), initiative, cooperativeness, dependability, and health, etc.

Evidence of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:
MEMORANDUM

Date: September 21, 1993

To: Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee

From: Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force
(Mary Beth Armstrong, Kecia Brown, Lawson Bush, David Dubbins, Philip Fetzer, Victor Fonseca, Monet Parham, Refugio Rodriguez)

Subject: Diversity Proposal for RPT

During this past summer, the Academic Senate Diversity Summer Task Force met to draft various resolutions that would further the achievement of diversity goals at Cal Poly. After reviewing the Equal Opportunity Advisory Committee's Diversity Proposal for RPT, we wanted to acknowledge our support for its recommendations and add the following:

1. We ask that the Diversity Proposal for RPT be addressed as soon as possible;

2. We recommend that some wording be added to indicate that, without changing the Strategic Plan definition of Diversity, we would like to see special emphasis placed on African-Americans, Latino-Americans, and Native-Americans.

Thank you for your consideration of these items. If you have any questions regarding our committee or the comments given above, please contact Margaret (1258) at the Academic Senate office.
Diversity Proposal for RPT

To enhance the University's commitment to diversity and to encourage faculty to become more involved, the EOAC proposes that diversity considerations become an integral part of the retention, promotion and tenure (RPT) process. Currently, faculty are asked to show competence in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and University or community service. It is proposed that within each area, diversity-related activities be specifically noted. It is not intended that faculty must fulfill diversity requirements in all three categories. However, diversity-related activities should appear in at least one category.

Diversity, in this context is defined in terms of "differences in age, country of origin, creed, economic background, ethnicity, gender, physical disability, race, and sexual orientation" (Educational Equity Commission, 1992). Diversity-related activities encompass any activities (broadly defined) included within the three areas of RPT consideration (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and University or community service). For example, if one adds materials related to diversity into lectures or teaches a course dealing with diversity, this would be a diversity-related, teaching activity. Scholarship would include research on diversity topics, attending diversity-related conferences/workshops, making presentations at such conferences/workshops, and similar activities. University or community service would include serving on committees associated with diversity, volunteering for organizations that are diversity related, etc. In essence, the definition of what types of activities fit within each of the three categories of evaluation is to be broadly defined.

The purpose of this proposal is not to be punitive, but to facilitate faculty awareness and involvement in this important issue. Because the omission of information dealing with diversity is an omission of knowledge itself, such activity should lead to better teaching, better scholarship and, in the greater humanity for both faculty and students alike.
Whereas, Administrative Bulletin 90-2 created a trial policy for distribution of indirect costs sharing for Applied Research and Development Facility and Activities (ARDFA) in order to develop ARDFA's infrastructure for research; and

Whereas, Procedures for implementing this trial policy were to be in place for five years beginning with academic year 1989-90; and

Whereas, The five-year trial period concludes with 1994-95; therefore, be it

Resolved: That the trial policy for distribution of indirect costs sharing for Applied Research and Development Facility and Activities (ARDFA) established by Administrative Bulletin 90-2 be discontinued; and, be it further

Resolved: That the attached report and recommendations prepared by the Academic Senate Research Committee regarding indirect costs for research be approved.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Research Committee
April 21, 1994
To: Jack Wilson, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Dan Krieger, Chair, ASRC

CC: Susan Opava

Date: April 21, 1994

Subject: Sunsetting of "Experimental Agreement for Indirect Cost Sharing for ARDFA Sponsored Projects"

Attachments: ADMINISTRATIVE BULLETIN 90-2

THE PROBLEM:

ADMINISTRATIVE BULLETIN 90-2 created an experimental model for stimulating the development of infrastructure for research at CAL POLY. It sets procedures for five years, beginning with Academic Year 1989-90.

The ASRC is charged with annually reviewing the ARDFA facility created by the bulletin. The five year period has drawn to a close. The question of continuance or sunsetting the arrangement is at hand. Herewith is the ASRC evaluation of the ARDFA experiment:

A BRIEF HISTORY OF ARDFA's ORIGINS:

Robert Lucas, then Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research and Faculty Development, had begun the task of remodeling a World War II era aircraft hangar now designated as Building 04.

Prof. Steve Hockaday (College of Engineering) became interested in converting the hangar into a facility for his CALTRANS funded transportation engineering projects.

The problem of paying for this development of infrastructure for research became critical.
Lucas and Hockaday perceived the rate of recovery of indirect costs as a source of generating the needed funds.

**ADMINISTRATIVE BULLETIN 90-2** "describes the procedures for allocating indirect costs earned on selected sponsored projects" to the newly created Applied Research and Development Facility and Activities (ARDFA).

The bulletin notes that the "procedures are proposed as an experiment for applied research facilities that do not have general fund or other continuing sources of support for their basic operation."

It describes the problem of recovery of indirect costs at this University:

The Campus Administrative Manual (Section 543) describes the policy of sharing indirect costs earned on sponsored projects. Current policy does not allocate indirect costs for items such as general equipment purchase, maintenance and operating costs. Such use is appropriate in general circumstances, however, since capital costs and operating expenses comprise part of the indirect cost rate. The cost principles of the Federal Government's Department of Health and Human Services, as expressed in the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-21, allow costs of operation (lighting, heating, janitorial), furnishing, remodeling, equipment installation and maintenance, office equipment, departmental administration and management as part of the base that makes up the indirect cost rate."

The bulletin then creates an exception to campus policies:

"This administrative bulletin creates an administrative exception to CAM 543 as an experiment for Building 04. It describes a way to return part of the indirect costs to support the continued development and operation of a research facility. It will serve until a policy governing all such facilities is recommended and adopted in the Campus Administrative Manual."

The bulletin then sets the following "Policies and Procedures":

**For five years, beginning with Academic Year 1989-90, the following procedures will apply:**

Projects conducted in Building 04 that have specific need for remodeling or for the installation of equipment shall, whenever possible, recover these costs as line items in the budget of the grant or contract. When direct cost recovery is not possible, the cost of remodeling or installing equipment may be drawn from the development and operating budget of ARDFA.
Indirect costs earned on ARDFA/IC projects shall be allocated among the following program areas, following a percentage recommended by the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development and approved by the President in the Fall of each academic year:

a) ARDFA facility development, operating costs, and reserves;

b) Foundation costs, consisting of Sponsored Programs administrative costs and reserves;

c) University research development costs, including Grants Development Office costs and reserves, and

d) The CARE grant program of the Academic Senate Research Committee.

The bulletin stipulates that the percentages of recovery of indirect costs be set only after the submission of an annual report by the Associate Vice President for Research that would include a proposal for a specific level for recouping such costs.

This report was to be reviewed by “the ARDFA Director, the Academic Senate Research Committee, the Director of the Grants Development Office and the Director of Sponsored Programs before being via the Vice President for Academic Affairs to the President for approval before the end of the Fall Quarter.”

The bulletin set the maximum percentage of recovery for ARDFA indirect costs at forty-percent (40%). It notes that the recovery rates for Foundation Sponsored Programs is 44%, but for Grants Development it is a slim 11% and for CARE Grants it is 5%.

CONCLUSIONS:

The ASRC congratulates Prof. Hockaday and the ARDFA staff for their energies and very real accomplishments in promoting research during the worst fiscal crisis since the Great Depression.

Nonetheless, the ASRC believes that the procedures set forth in Administrative Bulletin 90-2 have not been followed in granting maximum rate (40%) of recovery of indirect costs to ARDFA. The ARDFA experiment has resulted in inequities for the
other institutes and centers generating indirect costs. Hence the ARDFA model does not benefit or stimulate research activities throughout the academic community.

The ASRC recommends that ARDFA be granted the same rate of recovery of indirect costs as other centers and institutes.

The ASRC also recommends that the Senate charge our committee with fulfilling the goal of Administrative Bulletin 90-2: The University desperately needs a policy for equitably funding infrastructure for research by centers and institutes at the University.
The attached procedures to implement a trial policy for indirect cost sharing for the Applied Research and Development Facility and Activities (ARDFA) was developed after recommendation by the Academic Senate. This administrative bulletin creates an administrative exception to the manner in which indirect cost funds are distributed and implements the procedures during the five year trial period beginning with Academic Year 1989-90.

NOTE: This Administrative Bulletin should be filed in the Appendix of the Campus Administrative Manual and appropriate entries made in the CAM Index and Administrative Bulletins list.
INDIRECT COSTS SHARING FOR ARDFA SPONSORED PROJECTS

This bulletin describes procedures for allocating indirect costs earned on selected sponsored projects to the Applied Research and Development Facility and Activities (ARDFA). The procedures are proposed as an experiment for applied research facilities that do not have general fund or other continuing sources of support for their basic operation.

The Campus Administrative Manual (Section 543) describes the policy of sharing indirect costs earned on sponsored projects. Current policy does not allocate indirect costs for items such as general equipment purchase, maintenance and operating costs. Such use is appropriate in general circumstances, however, since capital costs and operating expenses comprise part of the indirect cost rate. The cost principles of the Federal Government's Department of Health and Human Services, as expressed in the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-21, allow costs of operation (lighting, heating, janitorial), furnishing, remodeling, equipment installation and maintenance, office equipment, departmental administration and management as part of the base that makes up the indirect cost rate.

This administrative bulletin creates an administrative exception to CAM 543 as an experiment for Building 04. It describes a way to return a portion of the indirect costs to support the continued development and operation of a research facility. It will serve until a policy governing all such facilities is recommended and adopted in the Campus Administrative Manual.

These guidelines apply to the sharing of indirect costs recovered only on those projects conducted exclusively in Building 04 as part of ARDFA. In practice, this means that a project situated administratively in an instructional office on campus, but conducted in a laboratory in Building 04, is governed by these guidelines. Conversely, a project run in a laboratory which is not in Building 04 is not an ARDFA project even if it is administered from an office in Building 04. In the latter case, the indirect costs are treated the same as if they were earned on any other research project.

Sponsored research projects that meet the criterion for being included in this experiment will be identified as ARDFA/IC projects. This designation will be noted on the "Approval of Application for Grant or Contract" Form that is routed with any proposal before it leaves campus. The notes section of the approval form will contain a statement which reads:

This proposal is for an ARDFA/IC project, to be conducted exclusively in Building 04. Indirect costs will be shared in accordance with Administrative Bulletin 90-2.
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

For five years, beginning with Academic Year 1989-90, the following procedures will apply:

Projects conducted in Building 04 that have specific need for remodeling or for the installation of equipment shall, whenever possible, recover these costs as line items in the budget of the grant or contract. When direct cost recovery is not possible, the cost of remodeling or installing equipment may be drawn from the development and operating budget of ARDFA.

1. Indirect costs earned on ARDFA/IC projects shall be allocated among the following program areas, following a percentage recommended by the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development and approved by the President in the Fall of each academic year:

   a) ARDFA facility development, operating costs, and reserves;

   b) Foundation costs, consisting of Sponsored Programs administrative costs and reserves;

   c) University research development costs, including Grants Development Office costs and reserves, and

   d) The CARE grant program of the Academic Senate Research Committee.

2. The percentages to be recommended shall be set as follows:

   a) Following the end of each fiscal year, the ARDFA Director shall prepare a report that describes ARDFA/IC projects, provides actual income and expenses for the previous academic year and gives estimates of income and costs for building development and operation for the next academic year. The director shall develop this report in consultation with the Dean of the School of Engineering, and shall send it to the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development before the beginning of the Fall Quarter.

   b) The Associate Vice President shall prepare a report that combines the ARDFA report with data on income and costs in the previous fiscal year for Sponsored Programs administration, Grants Development administration and CARE grants. The report shall include a proposal that recommends the ARDFA percentage to be adopted for the current academic year. The maximum percentage for ARDFA/IC projects shall be 40%.
The proposal shall be incorporated into the annual report on proposed indirect costs utilization described in CAM 543 and will be reviewed by the ARDFA Director, the Academic Senate Research Committee, the Director of the Grants Development Office and the Director of Sponsored Programs before being sent via the Vice President for Academic Affairs to the President for approval before the end of the Fall Quarter.

3. The President shall set the ARDFA/IC percentage before the start of the Winter Quarter. The Foundation shall deposit funds monthly into the ARDFA Foundation account from indirect costs earned and received on ARDFA/IC projects as reimbursement is recovered from the sponsor.

4. The Academic Senate Research Committee may conduct an independent review of ARDFA each Spring Quarter and prepare a report for the President's review. Copies of the report shall be provided to the ARDFA Director, the Associate Vice President and the Director of Sponsored Programs.

Percentages for AY 1989-90, the first year of this experiment, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARDFA/IC Projects (maximum)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Sponsored Programs</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Development</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE Grants/ASRC</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current projects and proposals covered as ARDFA/IC projects under this administrative bulletin shall be identified by the ARDFA Director. A list of these projects shall be sent to each department head to acknowledge their governance under the provisions of this administrative bulletin.

APPROVED:  
Warren J. Baker, President

DATE: August 28, 1990
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee has proposed a five-year academic program review schedule for all academic programs at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, The proposed five-year academic program review schedule has been discussed within each college; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached "1994 Degree Program Summary" prepared by the Program Review and Improvement Committee be approved.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee
April 19, 1994
## 1994 Degree Program Summary

### Program Review Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS Agricultural Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Agricultural Engineering, Ag Eng Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Agricultural Science, Agricultural Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Animal Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Crop Science, Plant Protection Science, Fruit Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Dairy Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Food Science, Nutritional Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Forestry and Natural Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Recreation Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Ornamental Horticulture</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Soil Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

| BS Architectural Engineering | X |
| BARCH/MS Architecture | X |
| BS/MCRP City and Regional Planning |   X  |
| BS Construction Management | X   |
| BLA Landscape Architecture |   X  |
| MCRP/MS Transportation Planning |

### COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

| BS/ MBA Business Administration | X   |
| MBA/ MS Engineering Management | X   |
| BS Economics | X   |
| BS/ MA Industrial Technology | X   |

### COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

| BS/MS Biological Sciences, Biochemistry, Ecology and System Biology, Microbiology | X |
| BS Chemistry | X   |
| BS/MS Mathematics | X |
| BS/MS Physical Education | X   |
| BS Physics, Physical Science | X   |
| BS Statistics | X   |
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### COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS</td>
<td>Aeronautical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS</td>
<td>Civil Engineering/Environmental Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS</td>
<td>Electrical/Electronic Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engineering Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Manufacturing Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Materials Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA/MS</td>
<td>Engineering Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCRP/MS</td>
<td>Transportation Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Applied Art and Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/MA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Graphic Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/MS</td>
<td>Psychology/Human Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WHEREAS, The guidelines for the Program Review and Improvement Committee set forth broad criteria for reviewing programs; and

WHEREAS, Some of the material in the existing guidelines does not provide enough information to justify the effort required to gather and submit it; and

WHEREAS, Asking programs to submit all the material in the guidelines makes the compilation of documents, and their review, burdensome; and

WHEREAS The existing guidelines are on some subjects vague and ambiguous requiring flexibility on the part of the committee; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Program Review and Improvement Committee have the flexibility to decide what information within the existing guidelines will best serve the interests of the university community; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Program Review and Improvement Committee recommend changes in procedure, if any, as a standard component of their annual report.
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT GUIDELINES

(*Indicates data to be provided by the Institutional Studies Office)

I. MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAM

A. Relevance of the program to the special mission of Cal Poly and/or the mission of the CSU:
   See Attachment A - Title 5 description of Subchapter 2 "Educational Program", Articles 1 and 2; Attachment B - Mission Statement of the California State University; and Attachment C - Cal Poly's Mission Statement.

B. Evidence that the program mission, goals, and objectives are being met:
   List the program mission, goals, and objectives. Include your departmental priorities. See Attachment D - list of examples of instructional priorities for reference.

C. Contribution to the community, state, and nation:
   In what general ways does the program contribute to each of these? Are the graduates of particular service?

II. PROGRAM QUALITY

A. Curriculum:

   1. Appropriate sequence, patterns of delivery, and size of class:
      Using data provided by Institutional Studies, identify low/over-enrollment courses and explain circumstances for each. Low enrollment courses, as defined by Administrative Bulletin 82-1, are courses with less than 13 students for lower division, less than 10 students for upper division, less than 5 students for graduate courses, and frequency of offering of these courses for the last two years. Identify graduate courses with high undergraduate enrollment and explain circumstances for each one. Describe structure of curriculum including actual or possible course taking sequences and patterns (demonstrate with flow chart).

      What other programs on campus have an impact on the ability of your students to graduate on time?

   2. Appropriate comparison with similar peer programs:
      Summarize and compare with identical or similar programs.

   3. Appropriate course mix related to previously stated goals and objectives:
      Do your course offerings meet the stated goals and objectives of your department?

      List all major concentrations currently offered and specify the number of students enrolled in each.

   4. Quality evaluation method:
      Provide information on how your program is evaluated by the appropriate means including one or more of the following methods:
      a. accreditation:
         Indicate if accreditation agencies exist for your program evaluation. Is your program accredited? Provide summary report from last accreditation review.
      b. outside evaluation:
         Indicate any other foundations, professional associations or societies, or external peer reviews that are used to evaluate your
5. **Currency:**
Describe how your curriculum has responded to factors such as changing emphasis in the discipline, new technological development, changing character of society, current national curricular trends, demands by the profession and employers, etc.

6. **Professional support:**
What support (nonmonetary) is provided by your profession in contributing to the enhancement of your curriculum.

7. **Professional service:**
List the service or in-service activities sponsored by your program during the past five years and list the number of people accommodated in each activity. Were these activities offered for credit?

8. **Evidence of interdisciplinary activity:**
List any interdisciplinary/problem-based studies or activities emphasizing the unity of knowledge and the cooperative contributions of individual disciplines.

Briefly describe any courses developed by two or more departments for a major in your program or any cooperative arrangements that have been explored.

Briefly describe the interrelationship of your program with other programs.

9. **Evidence of use of senior project as a learning tool:**
Is senior project an essential component of your curriculum? What role does it play as a part of your major? How is senior project organized and managed in your department? How many students do not successfully complete senior project in your majors?

10. **Contribution to GE&B program at Cal Poly:**
If your program provides GE&B courses, please identify those courses.

11. **Student advising:**
Summarize the academic, professional, and career advising service that your program offers and its effectiveness.

Are advising responsibilities shared by all faculty? Briefly describe the department’s procedures to ensure that students receive accurate and timely academic advising.

B. **Faculty:**
Many of the faculty professional activities can be summarized in a table format. See Attachment E for example of a form to use.

*1. **Demographics:**
   a. affirmative action target goals
   *b. gender
   *c. ethnic diversity

2. **Specific qualifications appropriate to discipline**
3. Diversity of faculty:
   a. professional background
   b. areas of expertise
   c. appropriate faculty expertise related to professional background

4. Professionalism and professional work experience

5. Evidence of teaching excellence for past five years

6. Evidence of mentoring and personal development of faculty for past five years

7. Service to the university, college, and community for past five years

*8. Percent of tenure-track versus nontenure-track faculty

C. Students:

1. Student profile:
   a. average SAT scores of enrolled FTE students
   b. average GPA of new transfer students
   c. gender and ethnicity
   d. honors, awards, scholarships:
      Are the trends of items a - d over the last five years of any significance to the program?
   e. number of students transferring into and out of major:
      What percent of your students leave your program as internal transfers per year? What percent of your students are internal transfers? Identify any major difficulties students transferring in may have in completing the program.
   f. average quarterly class load enrolled in by major students:
      What percent of your students are primarily full-time students? Are significant numbers of students part-time because of program or institutional policy?
   g. Evidence of student involvement in program (i.e., clubs, extra projects, etc.)

2. Evidence of successful program completion:
   a. student graduation rates:
      Do the trends over the last five years of the percentages of majors graduating indicate any significant changes in the program? Over the last five years, indicate the number of majors who have filed for graduation and the number who have completed their degree.
   b. student persistence rates:
      How many students who enter eventually complete the program?
   c. average length of time for students to graduate:
      Why are students not completing their degrees according to projected time frames?
   d. percent of graduate placement (over the last five years):
      (1) graduate programs at other universities:
         What percentage of your graduates attend graduate programs at other schools?
      (2) graduate programs at Cal Poly:
         What percentage of your graduates attend graduate programs at Cal Poly?
      (3) jobs requiring your or a similar college degree:
         What percent of your graduates are currently employed in
a field utilizing your or a similar college degree?

(4) **Jobs requiring any other college degree:**
What percent of your graduates are currently employed in a field utilizing any other college degree?

(5) **unknown:**
Of your graduates, what percent is of unknown status?

e. **other evidence of success relevant to field:**
What are the pass rates for professional registration or certification, acceptance rates to graduates internships, etc.?

3. **Alumni evaluations (5-, 10-, 15-year post-graduation evaluations):**
   a. **strengths of program:**
   What input have you received from alumni regarding the strengths of your program?
   b. **weaknesses of program:**
   What input have you received from alumni regarding the weaknesses of your program?
   c. **adequacy of knowledge acquired for entry level jobs:**
   Do the students have an adequate level of knowledge acquired for entry-level jobs?
   d. **adequacy of program to provide for the overall university experience:**
   How does your program keep in contact with alumni? How do the responses from the different post-graduation ages differ?

D. **Academic Support Services**
1. **Adequacy of facilities/services:**
   How adequate are your facilities such as classrooms, offices, laboratories, etc.?

2. **Adequacy of equipment inventories:**
   How adequate is your equipment inventory including computers, lab equipment, and maintenance of this equipment?

3. **Adequacy of access to library resources:**
   How adequate is your access to the resources available to the library:
   a. **quality and quantity of library collection:**
   Is the library’s collection sufficient in quality, depth, diversity, and currentness to meet the needs of the academic program?
   b. **Relationship to program:**
   Is the library’s collection structured in direct relationship to the nature and level of the academic program’s curricular offerings, including graduate courses?

III. **PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY**
   **A. Efficient use of state resources:**
   1. Faculty positions used and faculty positions generated by your program for each of the last five years.
   2. Staff positions used and staff positions generated by your program for each of the last five years.
   3. Administrative time used and administrative time generated by your program for each of the last five years.
   4. Average total cost (salary, O&E, equipment, travel, telephone, etc.) per annual SCU taught for your program for each of the last five years.
   5. Average total cost per FTE major student for your program for each of the last five years.
   6. Average annual WTU taught per FTEF for your program for each of the last five years (for each faculty member).
   7. Average quarterly faculty contact-hour load for your program (for each
B. **Generation and use of non-state resources:**
   (It should be acknowledged that there is not equality of opportunity for all programs in this regard.)
   1. Provide a list of all grants and contracts submitted and funded by your faculty for each of the last five years (give title and dollar amount).
   2. For each of the last five years, list the amount of money generated via your programs fundraising efforts. Also indicate how this money was spent.
   3. For each of the last five years, list the gifts of equipment, supplies, and services received by your program.
   4. List all other non-state income generated for each of the last five years and indicate how that money was spent.

IV. **PROGRAM NEED**
   A. **Job market need:**
      Are graduates from the program in demand? If applicable, what is the ratio of requests for graduates at the Placement Center to actual graduates?
   
   *B. **Program uniqueness:**
      1. What is the need for the program at Cal Poly, in the State of California, nationwide? Compare enrollment to other programs in the state.
      2. Are there courses offered in your department that are similar to courses offered in other departments? If so, what is the specific need for these courses within your department?

C. **Integral component to state university education:**
   Is your program essential to CSU education?

*D. **Student demand:**
   Provide data on the number of applicants to your program and the number of students accommodated. Include any other relevant information on these students if appropriate.

V. **SELF-ASSESSMENT**
   Identify the strengths, weaknesses and any constraints existing for your program. Draw from the information compiled in the preceding sections of this document. Indicate strategies or plans designed to improve the areas of weakness and future areas of strengthening for your program.
Adopted:

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

AS-- 94
RESOLUTION ON
THE REVIEW OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS COURSE OFFERINGS
THE REVIEW OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED
LECTURE COURSES OFFERED THROUGH THE DISTANCE
LEARNING MODE AS NEW COURSES

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

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

WHEREAS, The CSU is taking the initiative in meeting this challenge as expressed in Leveraging the Future: The Telecommunications Plan for the CSU; and

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

WHEREAS, Distance Learning is a principal component of the plan; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate supports advancements in teaching technologies, encourages new and innovative models and teaching methods, and 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 pedagogues; 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.
RESOLUTION ON
THE REVIEW OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS COURSE OFFERINGS
THE REVIEW OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED
LECTURE COURSES OFFERED THROUGH THE DISTANCE
LEARNING MODE AS NEW COURSES
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WHEREAS, Distance Learning education is defined as courses or sections in which
instruction is delivered over physical distance and a significant portion of the
instruction is delivered through electronic technology; and

WHEREAS, The standards for course quality applied to traditional classroom courses should
also be applied to Distance Learning courses; and

WHEREAS, The faculty have the primary responsibility for making curricular decisions; and

WHEREAS, The determination and judgment regarding course standards, content, quality,
and design of Distance Learning courses should be made with the full
involvement of faculty through appropriate committees; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That new or modified courses submitted for academic credit to be taught
through the Distance Learning mode be treated as new courses and appropriate
course proposals be submitted to the Curriculum Committee of the Academic
Senate for its customary review of academic standards, content, quality, design
and approval.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
January 11, 1994
Revised May 3, 1994
MEMORANDUM

Date: May 18, 1994

To: ACADEMIC SENATORS

From: Jack D. Wilson, Chair

Subject: Academic Senate Agenda for May 24, 1994

The following items (enclosed) have been added to the Academic Senate agenda for the May 24, 1994 meeting:

1. "Resolution on Personal Computers for Students" has been added to Business Items as V.I.

2. "Student Throughput Committee...Final Report" has been added as an information item only. It will be acted upon during fall 1994.

3. "Draft Report and Recommendations of the General Education & Breadth Committee to the Academic Senate" has been added as an information item only. It will be acted upon during fall 1994.

Enclosures
WHEREAS, There is substantial interest within the administration for more rapid development of the campus network for telecommunications; and

WHEREAS, The funding required for more rapid development of the network apparently is not available in Information System's budget; and

WHEREAS, The discontinuance of funding for microcomputer labs for students is seen as a possible source of funds for upgrading the network; and

WHEREAS, Requiring students to purchase their own personal computers is an idea which has been discussed by some campus constituencies and has merit; and

WHEREAS, The requirement for students to purchase personal computers is an issue separate from whether state funds should be used to support microcomputer labs for students; and

WHEREAS, The financing of the purchase of personal computers is not an insignificant challenge for many students; and

WHEREAS, The Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing is discussing these two issues; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That before any departments or other administrative units make decisions requiring students to purchase personal computers, that the Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing and the Academic Senate Instruction Committee report their recommendations concerning this matter--including plans for student financing for said personal computers--to the Academic Senate; and

RESOLVED: That the Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing and Academic Senate Instruction Committee report their recommendations on the advisability of the state maintaining personal computer labs even if all students were required to purchase their own personal computer; and

RESOLVED: That these recommendations be subject to approval or disapproval by the Academic Senate before any action is implemented.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
May 17, 1994
Report and Recommendations of the General Education & Breadth Committee to the Academic Senate

The Cal Poly GE&B program has not undergone serious revision since it was implemented on campus a dozen years ago. Over the past several years, this committee and a "Blue Ribbon" subcommittee have discussed various suggestions for reforming the program. Although the general education program meets the intent of the Executive Order, modest changes are needed. Two criticisms have been voiced over the years. First, the number of required units can impede a student's completion of the undergraduate degree in a timely fashion. This is a particular burden to students in high unit majors. Second, and related to the first criticism, is the feeling that some departments can best meet some of the g.e. requirements via their own courses for their majors. We urge the Executive Committee approve the concepts of these recommendations so that appropriate resolutions can be brought to the Academic Senate floor for approval during the 1994-95 academic year.

There will always be debate over the structure and content of a general education program. This is to be encouraged. Rather than considering our general education program a finished product, we offer the following short and long-term recommendations as but one in a series of ongoing reforms that will continually strengthen the educational value of general education. The short term recommendations should be approved for implementation as soon as possible. These changes are designed to give students and departments more flexibility in how the requirements can be fulfilled without jeopardizing the academic integrity of the program. We suggest these recommendations become the agenda for this committee next year.
Tentative List of Recommendations by the GE&B Committee:

I. Short-term Recommendations

1. allow each College to propose one or more courses* that students would take to fulfill the Critical Thinking (A.1) requirement; double-counting allowed; [Rationale: critical thinking is not discipline or course specific; the concepts for this requirement as set forth in E.O. 595 can be met in a number of courses across the curriculum];

2. allow each department to designate one or more writing courses* within the major that students could take to fulfill the A.4 writing requirement; [Rationale: students are exposed to the basics of writing in ENGL 114; students are required to do written assignments in many of their major classes. One way to encourage more writing in the major is to allow an appropriate course with a significant writing assignment to double-count for the A.4 requirement];

3. allow departments to decide how to best meet the "computer literacy" requirement (F.1); [Rationale: E.O. 595 does not specify a "computer literacy" requirement. Most students are exposed to computers in high school and most students take courses in their majors (or cognates) where computer skills appropriate to the major are taught. It should be left to departments to establish computer proficiency levels for their majors];

4. Subcommittee D should reconsider the separate categories to more adequately integrate the courses in D; [Rationale: there are too many categories in D and they do not provide students with sufficient flexibility to choose among the courses listed. It would make sense, for example, to divide courses in D into two categories: those involving the United States and those involving other countries and other cultures];

5. Advanced Placement credit should be allowed to satisfy appropriate GE&B courses; [Rationale: students should be encouraged to participate in AP and given credit for their attained level of proficiency];
6. Area E should be set at 4-units rather than 5, as specified in E.O. 595; [Rationale: E.O. 595 specifies 3 semester units; while Cal Poly has rounded this requirement up to 5 quarter units, it can be rounded down to 4];

7. Students should be allowed to take no more than two general education courses credit/no credit; [Rationale: because g.e. is an integral part of a student's university education, students should be encouraged to regard g.e. courses more seriously. Major courses cannot be taken credit/no credit. Rather than prohibiting credit/no credit courses in g.e., this recommendation seeks to elevate the status of g.e. but still allow students to take two g.e. courses credit/no credit in order to fulfill all curriculum requirements in a timely fashion];

8. Areas C, D, and E should be revised to incorporate more courses that also fulfill the U.S. Cultural Pluralism Requirement; [Rationale: the U.S. Cultural Pluralism requirement is an exit requirement. Because there are a number of classes that can meet both this requirement and g.e., it is logical to allow double-counting. Additional courses, new and existing ones with some modification, should be encouraged for categories C, D and E to achieve this];

9. The language in B.2 should be changed to read "All students must complete a minimum of two courses in mathematics and/or statistics." [Rationale: since students currently can take two math courses to fulfill part of the B requirement, they should also be given the flexibility to take two statistics courses as well].

*Appropriate courses for double-counting would have to be approved by the GE&B Committee and the Academic Senate.
II. Long Term Recommendations:

1. Consideration should be given to integrating upper division general education courses around themes;

2. The development of innovative and interdisciplinary courses across several categories in GE should be encouraged;

3. Enrollment levels need to be reduced in general education courses, where appropriate, to encourage writing across the curriculum;

4. Students should be exposed to a variety of instructional techniques—e.g., seminars and working in small problem solving groups, not just standard lecture mode;

5. Faculty who are particularly adept at managing large classes should be rewarded with the appropriate WTU credit;

6. Incorporation of an honors program/track into GE;

7. The F.2 category should be revised to make this a meaningful requirement or eliminated.
Student Throughput Committee

An Ad Hoc Committee of the Academic Senate

Final Report

April 26, 1994

Committee Members:

Russell Cummings, Chairman (Aeronautical Engineering)
Mary Beth Armstrong (Accounting)
Tina Bailey (Chemistry)
Joel DeYoung (ASI)
Glenn Irvin (Academic Programs)
Dan Levi (Psychology and Human Development)
Ryan Sakai (ASI)
Ken Scott (Agribusiness)
George Stanton (Testing Office)
Ed Turnquist (Construction Management)
Preamble

Student throughput is an issue which affects many aspects of the university, including resources, class scheduling, student satisfaction, and our image to the citizens of California. We strongly believe that student throughput is very important, and we have found that throughput is affected by a variety of factors. In order for throughput to be effectively managed we must all take a positive approach to the various issues and problems which have caused increases in student throughput. In this light, we believe that there should be rewards to departments and colleges for making improvements in throughput quality.

We should all realize that we have a commitment to the students who have been admitted to our university—we should also have a commitment to enabling them to graduate from Cal Poly in a timely fashion. The following report outlines the committee's recommendations for achieving success in student throughput. We genuinely believe that student throughput can be positively influenced if we all take an honest look at these issues and work to improve the quality of education here at Cal Poly.

Background

The Student Throughput Committee was formed during Winter Quarter 1993 as an Ad Hoc Committee of the Academic Senate. The committee was given the tasks of investigating issues which affect the throughput of students at Cal Poly and formulating a blueprint for action for the university. The committee reviewed the results of the Student Progress Committee as a starting point, and then added new items of concern and categorized the results according to importance.

A wide variety of campus administrators were interviewed in order to gain their perspective on the throughput problem, including: Jim Maraviglia (Admissions), Euel Kennedy (ESS), Tom Zuur (Records), Paula Ringer (ESS), Stacie Breitenbach (CENG Advising Center), Bev Hensel (CBUS Advising Center), and Lucy Rodriguez (Admissions). A survey of nearly one thousand students was also conducted during Spring Quarter 1993 in order to determine what the throughput problems are from the student's perspective. A listing of the survey questions and the results are attached as an appendix.
Recommendations

The following recommendations are presented as a blueprint for achieving success in student throughput. The committee believes that presenting these recommendations in a concise format will be most efficient and valuable to the campus community. The recommendations are made within four general areas: 1) Advising and Student Support, 2) Curriculum Issues, 3) Class Availability, and 4) Senior Problems.

1) Advising and Student Support

- Community College Transfers
  - Evaluations should be available for all transfer students before they first register at Cal Poly.
  - Each department should be encouraged to re-examine their curriculum with regards to community college transfer issues (200 vs. 300 level course issues, etc.).
  - Articulation agreements between Cal Poly and the community colleges should be more flexible and "friendly" to the transfer.
  - Procedures for accepting transfer credit from community colleges should be more flexible and "friendly" to the transfer student.

- Advising
  - Every student should be given the name, office location, and phone number of their appropriate advisor (or advisors) when they enter the university.
  - Intrusive advising should occur before a student first registers at Cal Poly (START is a successful program which could be used as a model).
  - Advisors should be introduced to students during WOW Week.
  - Departments should take advantage of Admission Office mailings in order to inform new students about advising issues.
• Colleges should consider doing one of the following:
  • institute advising centers (CENG and CBUS Centers are successful models), or
  • give annual seminars to faculty who will be serving as advisors to inform them of new and changing information.

• Support Services
  • All student support services should be consolidated, both physically and logistically (that is, they should be located in one building on campus, and be part of one campus organization).
  • Services need to be made more available to the students—if budget cuts are affecting services, then student assistants should be used to fill in the work gaps where appropriate.
  • A directory should be provided to students, faculty, and staff explaining where they should go in order to get help with various academic problems.
  • Support services (tutoring, etc.) should be available for all students, while realizing that proactive support is necessary for targeted student groups.

2) Curriculum Issues

A lack of flexibility has been one of the key causes of student throughput problems, which in turn has been created by the over-structured curriculum. There has been a lack of flexibility in GE&B, advisor-approved electives, and other areas which are described below.

• Changing Majors
  • The administration should formulate a policy which prevents departments and/or colleges from taking unwarranted action against students who want to change majors.
  • Every department should reduce the barriers which students face in changing majors.
• College-Wide Undeclared Majors

• The administration and faculty should consider admitting college-wide undeclared majors.

• The undeclared majors should be required to declare a major by the end of their second year at Cal Poly.

• The undeclared majors should be asked to express a program interest and then receive advising from that program at the earliest possible time in their education.

• GE&B

It is vitally important that GE&B requirements be streamlined and be made more flexible.

• Decisions regarding GE&B cannot be made effectively if resources are directly tied to course allocations.

• Departments should provide more opportunity for students to be flexible in their GE&B choices.

• The GE&B system should have more flexibility for students—the categories should be more openly defined and double counting via multi-content courses should be made more flexible.

• The faculty should insure that GE&B addresses "what is important for our students to know."

• The GE&B system should provide departments the opportunity to be flexible in choosing paths for their students.

• Reducing Graduation Unit Requirements

• Departments should consider reducing the number of units required for graduation.

• Departments should consider reducing the number of small unit courses which are required for their students.

• Flexibility should be built into the curriculum as much as possible (electives, scheduling, etc.).
• Mis-numbered Courses

Good progress has been made with the Community College transfer issue of courses which have been mislabeled as 300 level, when in fact they contain 200 level information. A continued effort should be made to improve this type of flexibility.

3) Class Availability

• Scheduling/Classrooms

  • Scheduling should serve the best interests of the students.
  
  • Scheduling should continue to be de-centralized, with as much flexibility as possible given to the departments.
  
  • Departments should take a careful look at their scheduling to insure that student scheduling is logical and flexible.
  
  • Every effort should be made to insure that the published class schedule is followed whenever possible.
  
  • There should be expanded availability of the theater and large classroom spaces for lecture course use.

• Scheduling Conflicts

  • Departments should attempt to insure that they do not schedule conflicts for their own students.
  
  • Departments should consider off-hour scheduling of labs and other multi-hour courses in order to avoid scheduling conflicts for students.
• Viable Summer Term

It is obvious from our survey that students want a viable summer term. This is a problem which needs to be planned for and resolved.

• The university ought to make a commitment to a summer term.

• The university should address and solve the resource issues for summer term before offering the term to the students.

• The university should establish a clear and equitable policy for faculty to teach during the summer term.

• Survey Students to Identify Current Bottlenecks

Departments should be encouraged to perform regular surveys of their students in order to determine what problems are occurring with class scheduling and availability.

4) Senior Problems

• Senior Projects

The university has already made progress in giving the departments a great deal of latitude in defining Senior Projects. However, inflexible regulations within the departments and/or colleges can cause the Senior Project to be an unnecessarily burdensome task for the student. Students need to be prepared for conducting independent work, and the Senior Project should be seen as a way to accomplish this goal.

• There needs to be university-wide policies for Senior Project grading and requirements—the Academic Senate Instruction Committee should be asked to make recommendations for these policies.

• Departments should insure that support and advising for Senior Projects is consistent for all students, and that the Senior Project is a meaningful and valuable experience for their students.
• The university should consider doing away with "SP" grading for Senior Projects in order to make the "in progress" grades more meaningful to the students.

• The independent thought and study required in order to complete a Senior Project should be instilled in students earlier in the curriculum.

• The university should consider a special summer-term Extended Ed. program for encouraging students to return to the university and finish their Senior Projects.

• Senior Evaluations and "The End Game"

  • Good progress has been made in insuring that students have their Senior Evaluations in a timely fashion—improvements should continue to be made so that all students received a meaningful and timely Senior Evaluation.

  • The university should consider offering the students a chance to submit an "End Game" form which would detail how the students would fulfill their remaining graduation requirements. This could eliminate the students from having to fill out individual petitions for each exception.
STUDENT PROGRESS SURVEY

These are the results of the Student progress Survey which was conducted during Spring Quarter 1993. The survey was administered to 967 students in randomly selected classes—there were a proportionate number of classes at the lower and upper division levels so as to accurately represent the student body. These results only represent the raw data which was collected—anyone interested in obtaining more detailed information from the survey should contact Russell Cummings at X2562.

Percentage of students surveyed according to college:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCTE</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Math</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of students surveyed according to class level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. When did you first enroll at Cal Poly (quarter and year)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4 years ago</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6 years ago</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 6 years ago</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did you transfer into Cal Poly?

Yes 42%
No 57%

If yes, approximately what percentage of your transfer units were accepted by Cal Poly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Units</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90% - 100% of units</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% - 90% of units</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 70% of units</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How many quarters have you attended Cal Poly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarters</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 quarters</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 quarters</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9 quarters</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12 quarters</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 12 quarters</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How many units are you presently taking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 11 units</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 16 units</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 16 units</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How many in-class hours per week do you have this quarter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 11 hours</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 16 hours</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 21 hours</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 21 hours</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How many units did you take last quarter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 11 units</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 16 units</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 16 units</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Have you ever worked while taking classes at Cal Poly?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, please indicate:

a) how many quarters you worked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarters</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 quarters</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 quarters</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9 quarters</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 9 quarters</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) how many hours you worked per week on the average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 10 hours</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 19 hours</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29 hours</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 hours or more</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) did working ever make you reduce the number of courses/units that you otherwise would have taken?

Yes 51%  No 49%

8. Have you ever participated in or do you plan to participate in:

Co-op 30% said Yes
Internship 45% said Yes

9. Please indicate the number of quarters that you have been involved in clubs, organization and/or other extra-curricular activities while at Cal Poly.

Average = 6.2 quarters

10. How many curriculum substitutions (deviations) have you requested at Cal Poly?

Average = 2.2 substitutions.

11. How many courses have you repeated at Cal Poly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 courses</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 courses</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more courses</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Have you changed your major at Cal Poly?

Yes 30%  No 70%

13. Are you on financial aid?

Yes 37%  No 63%
14. How many courses have you taken here which were unnecessary for your degree or G.E. requirements in order to:

a) carry 12 units per quarter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) satisfy your personal needs or interests?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Have you ever dropped out of Cal Poly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, for how many quarters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarters</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 quarters</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more quarters</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the scale provided (scale of 1 to 5, 1—not important, 3—moderately important, 5—very important), please indicate how important each of the following five factors is to you in considering which elective courses to enroll in.

16. Time when class meets. Average = 3.7

17. Day when class meets. Average = 3.2

18. Reputation of instructor. Average = 3.9

19. Amount of studying required. Average = 3.4

20. Difficulty level of course. Average = 3.4
The following is a list of factors that may have affected your academic progress since you entered Cal Poly. For each factor that affected you at any time, please answer the corresponding questions. (Do not answer questions about factors that did not affect your progress.)

21. Obtaining courses required by your major.
   a) why was this a problem (check all that apply)
      
      space was unavailable 63%
schedule conflict with other courses 68%
prerequisite not met 26%
other 13%

   b) how did you deal with this problem (check all that apply)
      
      re-arranged my schedule 58%
reduced my unit load 22%
took unnecessary courses 11%
other 19%

22. Obtaining general education courses.
   a) why was this a problem (check all that apply)
      
      space was unavailable 71%
schedule conflict with other courses 52%
prerequisite not met 8%
other 5%

   b) how did you deal with this problem (check all that apply)
      
      re-arranged my schedule 68%
reduced my unit load 12%
took unnecessary courses 6%
other 13%
23. Obtaining sequential courses.

a) why was this a problem (check all that apply)

- space was unavailable: 42%
- schedule conflict with other courses: 38%
- prerequisite not met: 14%
- other: 8%

b) how did you deal with this problem (check all that apply)

- re-arranged my schedule: 38%
- reduced my unit load: 22%
- took unnecessary courses: 6%
- other: 11%

24. Obtaining support and core courses.

a) why was this a problem (check all that apply)

- space was unavailable: 51%
- schedule conflict with other courses: 44%
- prerequisite not met: 12%
- other: 5%

b) how did you deal with this problem (check all that apply)

- re-arranged my schedule: 45%
- reduced my unit load: 9%
- took unnecessary courses: 4%
- other: 10%

25. Obtaining courses offered once a year.

a) why was this a problem (check all that apply)

- space was unavailable: 39%
- schedule conflict with other courses: 35%
- prerequisite not met: 12%
- other: 6%
b) how did you deal with this problem (check all that apply)

- re-arranged my schedule 31%
- reduced my unit load 8%
- took unnecessary courses 2%
- other 15%

26. Time changes or cancellations of courses.

how did you deal with this problem (check all that apply)

- re-arranged my schedule 33%
- reduced my unit load 9%
- took unnecessary courses 2%
- other 5%

27. Have you ever reduced your academic load to keep your GPA from dropping?

- Yes 31%
- No 69%

If yes, for how many quarters?

- 1 or 2 quarters 69%
- 3 or more quarters 31%

28. Have you ever reduced your academic load to meet non-academic concerns (e.g. work, family, personal issues, etc.)?

- Yes 50%
- No 50%

If yes, for how many quarters?

- 1 or 2 quarters 59%
- 3 or more quarters 41%

29. Has inaccurate or inadequate advising delayed your progress?

- Yes 30%
- No 70%

Explain—these explanations are on the original surveys.
30. Other (please describe and indicate for how many quarters the issue delayed your progress.

20% responded—these explanations are on the original surveys.

31. How often have you taken fewer units than you could have only because of your personal preference, and not because of any of the factors mentioned in items 20 through 29 above?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Quarters</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 quarters</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 quarters</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more quarters</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Has finishing your Senior Project delayed your progress?

- Yes 12%
- No 88%

33. How important is it for your academic progress to be able to take courses at Cal Poly during summer quarter? (1 to 5 scale, 1—not important, 3—moderately important, 5—very important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - not important</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3 &amp; 4 - moderately important</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - very important</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the scale provided, please indicate the level of importance that you place on each of the following four goals (1 to 5 scale, 1—None, 2—Low, 3—Moderate, 4—High, 5—Very High):

34. Completing a degree as quickly as possible: Average = 3.8

35. Obtaining an internship or Co-op: Average = 3.3

36. Taking advantage of extra-curricular activities: Average = 3.2

37. Having fun while going to school: Average = 3.7

38. How satisfied are you with your rate of progress towards your degree at Cal Poly? (1 to 5 scale, 1—very dissatisfied to 5—very satisfied)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Friendly Amendment
to the

Resolution on Indirect Cost Sharing Agreement
for ARDFA Sponsored Projects

Proposed by members of the Centers, Institutes, and Related Units on campus.

RESOLVED: That the Vice President for Academic Affairs establish, by January 1, 1995, new policies and procedures for the retention by centers, institutes, and related units of sponsored project indirect costs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Research Committee develop, by November 1, 1994, a proposal for these new policies and procedures, following consultation with affected parties; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these new policies and procedures replace existing procedures for all sponsored projects, including those for ARDFA.
MEMORANDUM

Date: May 24, 1994

To: Academic Senate
   Warren Baker, President
   Robert Koob, Vice President of Academic Affairs

Via: Peter Lee, Dean, College of Engineering
      Joseph Jen, Dean, College of Agriculture
      Paul Neel, Dean, College of Architecture

From: Charles Burt, Director of the Irrig. Training and Res. Center
      Stephen Hockaday, Director of ARDFA
      Jens Pohl, Director of CAD Research Center
      James Vilkitis, Director of The Coastal Resources Inst.

Re: Support by Institutes and Centers of University/Foundation Sponsored Project Costs

The University has recognized the importance of strong centers, institutes, and units (CIU's) which perform instructional and research activities on and off campus.

Benefits of the CIU's, generated from outside funds, include:

- Improved facilities which are available for both instructional and research activities by students and faculty
- Professional faculty and staff development
- Financial support of students, plus support of internships and projects
- Modern equipment for teaching and research
- Funds generated from faculty assigned (buy-out) time to help support academic departments
- Enhanced University reputation
- Interdisciplinary cooperation among faculty, departments, and colleges
It is only through the activities of various CIU's that such benefits occur, without requiring significant costs from the regular University budget.

The University has an opportunity and duty to encourage and strengthen successful CIU's and the development of new CIU's. This will require the proper financial guarantees for the CIU's. Under the proper environment, faculty and CIU's will "go the extra mile" in terms of risk and time allocation to increase their level of activities.

The CIU's have significant fixed and variable costs associated with their activities. As the CIU's evolve from activities of individuals, to true center activities, these costs become quite significant. These costs are in addition to regular project funding. CIU's often cannot recover these costs directly because project sponsors specifically exclude them from contract charges. Examples include:

- Facility construction and maintenance.
- Equipment purchase and maintenance
- Contract administration, including
  - Proposal writing
  - Maintaining office staff
  - Advertising and hiring of personnel
  - Bookkeeping
  - Travel, phone, fax and other up-front expenses.
  - Purchase of general supplies

To sustain and expand the benefits which the University receives via the CIU activities, the University must assure the CIU's that they can retain a sufficient portion of the project indirect costs to remain financially sustainable, and to expand.

The CIU's recognize that the University and Foundation have some real costs associated with approval of contracts and support for the CIU's, in addition to the many benefits which the University receives.
The following is an equitable and sustainable policy that will provide the University with significant funds. We propose that:

"On Foundation Sponsored Projects, there should be a fixed maximum percentage of the Total Direct Costs which will go to the University/Foundation. The remainder of project funds will be retained by the CIU which operates the project."

We also propose:

"That the Vice President for Academic Affairs establish, by January 1, 1995, new policies and procedures for the retention by centers, institutes, and related units of sponsored project indirect costs.

That the Academic Senate Research Committee develop, by November 1, 1994, a proposal for these new policies and procedures, following consultation with affected parties.

That these new policies and procedures replace existing procedures for all sponsored projects, including those for ARDFA."
An open letter from the Graphic Communication Department to Academic Senators in support of GrC 277 Computer Applications in Desktop Publishing

SECOND READING FOR GEB F.1. APPROVAL, MAY 24, 1994

ADDITIONAL POINTS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Appropriate approvals for this course were obtained at all levels of review: Department, College, Area F Subcommittee, GEB Committee, and Academic Senate Curriculum Committee

2. Desktop publishing is not a single, narrow application. It is a group of interrelated applications that — when taught as a whole — can form a basis for computer literacy. Desktop publishing is becoming the business of every field and discipline.

3. Computers are taught in many departments at Cal Poly. Adobe Photoshop, for example, is taught in GrC, Art and Design, and Computer Science — each department brings their own unique perspective. Some GEB F.1. courses are offered by departments other than Computer Science.

4. Computer literacy is evolving — it used to be critical to teach computer programming, for example, but today one can be a literate computer user without being a programmer.

5. Graphic Communication is in a good position to teach a computer literacy course such as this. Our faculty attend and present at the major desktop and computer publishing conferences. We have published articles, books, and studies in this area, and serve as consultants to the industry. We have just opened a new state-of-the-art laboratory which will be used to teach this course.

(OVER)
May 24, 1994

Dear Colleagues on the Academic Senate:

A pressing personal matter requires that I be off campus this afternoon, and I regret not being able to attend this meeting. I am, therefore, submitting this letter as a request for your favorable consideration of GrC 277, Computer Applications in Desktop Publishing, as a G.E.B. F.1. course.

Desktop publishing is rapidly becoming everybody's business. From the home user to the classroom to the business world, desktop publishing is becoming a necessary way of communicating. Every discipline at Cal Poly does it or will be doing it in the future. Indeed, desktop publishing has made the author the producer of print media and this has become a way of life that has just begun to acquaint people in all walks of society with the power of the printed word.

Think of yourselves and how desktop publishing has changed the way you communicate. Whether your discipline is in Agriculture, Architecture, Business, Engineering, Liberal Art, or Science and Math, most of you are probably using desktop publishing to prepare and disseminate information and appreciate the need of computer literacy in this area. The subject of desktop publishing is truly interdisciplinary and an academic understanding of the subject will serve all Cal Poly students well as they prepare to enter a work force that is becoming increasingly service and communication oriented.

Additionally, Cal Poly's Graphic Communication Department is the recipient of one of the most modern desktop publishing facilities anywhere in education. Equipped with 16 Apple Quadra 800 computers, 16 Radius 20" monitors, high resolution color printers, and related software, this laboratory has promise of additional growth through continuing industry support. We are just at the beginning of developing a facility that will provide students with access to a communication system that will shape how information is prepared and disseminated in the future, and become an integral part of the "information superhighway."

I suggest that we would be amiss if we did not provide the option for Cal Poly students to participate in this exciting field of study addressing computer literacy issues that cross all disciplines.

I express my appreciation for your consideration regarding the approval of GrC 277 for the G.E.B. F.1. category.

Sincerely,

Harvey R. Levenson, Ph.D.
Department Head

(OVER)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Jack Wilson, Chair, Academic Senate
FROM: R. Heidersbach, Chair, Program Review & Improvement Committee
COPIES: M. Camuso, PR&IC, All Deans
DATE: May 19, 1994
SUBJECT: Senate resolution on procedures for changing PR&IC guidelines

The Academic Senate will review the resolution that proposes:

RESOLVED: The Program Review and Improvement Committee have the flexibility to decide what information within the existing guidelines will best serve the interests of the university community; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Program Review and Improvement Committee recommend changes in procedure, if any, as a standard component of their annual report.

Jack Wilson has asked for examples of guidelines that "need" changing. Examples that I can think of include:

Possible page limit for reports from programs --This year's committee indicated that it would not read reports longer than twenty pages. Several programs still felt compelled to provide extensive appendices, etc. that resulted in reports more than 100 pages in length.
Rationale - Page limits would minimize the amount of work required from programs being reviewed. They would also insure that all programs were given "equal" attention.

"Efficiency" - This year's committee compromised by reporting $/SCU and SCU/FTEF numbers. Committees in the future will have to decide what is fair to both laboratory-
intensive (i.e. "expensive") programs and what is in keeping with current campus policy on mode/level, etc.

Rationale - -No one can tell at the moment how "efficiency" will be determined in future years.

Metrics for "grading" programs - -At the December 1993 meeting with all programs being reviewed this year, it was suggested that a checklist of some sort be developed that could be applied to all programs. This checklist was quickly developed and is in use for the first time this year. It will need revision.

Rationale - -Use of a checklist will allow all programs to know the subjects that are being considered by the committee and how they have fared. The checklist will also serve as a means of organizing the final reports submitted by the PR&IC committee.

Report format - -Complaints about last year's reports centered around questions of whether all programs had been:

1. Asked to "jump through the same hoops"
2. Judged by the same criteria.

Last year's reports followed the format contained in the existing guidelines to the PR&IC committee.

Rationale - -As deficiencies in existing report formats are identified, the committee needs to alter report formats and make recommendations to successor committees on how to avoid problems that they have encountered.

Please review the above ideas and come up with any other ideas that you think would be helpful. We'll discuss this list at this afternoon's meeting.
FROM: Curriculum Committee of the Department of Computer Science
TO: The Academic Senate
RE: Proposed Course GrC 277
DATE: 24 May 1994

The Computer Science Department Curriculum Committee (CSCC) has recently examined the expanded course outline for GrC 277 that is being proposed for GEB category F.1. A copy of the course outline is attached. From this outline, GrC 277 appears to be an interesting course that presents a good curriculum for desktop publishing. However, we feel the course does not provide a minimum core of computer literacy. Therefore, we strongly recommend that GrC 277 not be approved as a course that satisfies the F.1 GEB requirement.

As proposed, GrC 277 focuses primarily on a single area of computer application, viz., desktop publishing. The course fails to cover significant areas of study that are a core part of computer literacy. A brief list of these core areas includes:

- Knowledge of other computer applications, such as spreadsheets and database systems, and how such applications interact
- Computer networks
- Communication with electronic mail and bulletin boards
- The general societal impacts of computer technology
- Introduction to fundamental concepts of computing, such as computer programming, operating systems, and computer architecture.

In general, the CSCC believes that home departments are best suited to offer courses on fundamental concepts in a particular discipline. Hence, we believe that the Department of Computer Science is best suited to offer courses in computer literacy. Further, the CSCC concurs with a finding of the 1992-1993 Program Review and Improvement Committee, which stated:†

"... Programs should require students to first take courses in the fundamental knowledge and skills before a program teaches the application of those fundamental skills to its majors. ..."

This means that application-oriented courses, such as GrC 277, should be taught after a fundamental course in computer literacy.

† A copy of the complete memorandum containing this quote is attached.
The Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee reviewed four graduate and nine undergraduate programs during the current academic year. The information used was gathered from each program, Institutional Studies, accreditation studies and reviews, catalog material, and other sources.

The Committee makes the following observations pertaining to the programs:

1. As stated in the 1992 report, in general, the curriculum contains too many units. However, it was noted during this cycle of reviews that programs are making efforts to reduce the number of required units for graduation. This effort is commended by the Committee.

2. Programs should require students to first take courses in the fundamental knowledge and skills before a program teaches the application of those fundamentals to its majors. Departments delivering courses in fundamental knowledge have an obligation to tailor courses specifically for departments they are servicing, if there is sufficient demand. This cooperation will avoid the problems of inefficiencies found in duplication of subject matter offerings.

3. During the Committee’s reviews, there surfaced numerous courses in which students were earning an inordinate number of high grades. The finding of courses in which there were no grades below "C" occurred in both service courses and in a student’s major courses. The Committee recommends that each dean and department identify such courses and review them for academic rigor.

4. Although little time has lapsed since the Committee recommended more integration of cultural pluralism and gender issues, we reiterate our recommendation that these topics be addressed, where appropriate, and so indicated in course descriptions.

5. In all appropriate instances, the committee has recommended the pursuit of accreditation where such accreditation is available. This is in keeping with Cal Poly and CSU policy.

6. The Committee continues to recommend more interdisciplinary efforts be made to improve course and program quality.
Expanded Course Outline

I. Catalog Description
Computer applications, their relationship to print media and publishing. How desktop publishing is influencing and is influenced by society. Use and selection of personal computers, desktop publishing software, and output devices. Terminology, typography, creating, editing, transferring, merging text and graphics. Credit not allowed for GrC majors. Miscellaneous course fee required — see Class Schedule. 2 lectures, 1 laboratory.

II. Required Prerequisite Preparation
None.

III. Expected Outcomes
The student will:
A. Identify appropriate applications for computers in print media and publishing
B. Understand the influence of desktop publishing and print media on society
C. Understand how society is influencing the development of new publishing software
D. Identify current computer hardware and software appropriate for desktop publishing
E. Learn terminology and procedures used in print media production and publishing
F. Understand methods used in creating, editing, transferring, and merging text and graphics
G. Identify different types of output devices and understand the appropriate use of each
H. Learn where to obtain more information on computer applications to print media and publishing

IV. Text and References
Guide to Desktop Publishing

Understanding and Evaluating Desktop Publishing Systems
Mike Blum, 1992. Graphic Services+Seminars, San Luis Obispo, CA.

V. Minimum Student Materials Required
Notebook, pen and pencils, and textbooks.
VI. Minimum Facilities Required
The University will provide lecture and laboratory space. The lecture room will have an overhead projector, a chalkboard and normal seating accommodations. The laboratory will contain appropriate personal computers, desktop publishing software, laser printers, high-resolution imagesetters, and film processing equipment. In addition, various other Graphic Communication Department laboratories will be used for demonstrations and tours.

VII. Expanded Description of Content and Method of Instruction
Lectures will include chalkboard and overhead presentation on the topics detailed below. Laboratories will cover projects oriented to give each student hands-on experience on the hardware and software discussed in lecture. Demonstrations and tours of the Graphic Communication Department will be conducted in order to acquaint students with the printing and publishing process.

A. Overview
   1. The printing and publishing process
   2. The impact of print media on society
   3. How society influences print media and the publishing process
   4. The role of computer applications in print media and publishing

B. The printing and publishing process
   1. Typographic and typesetting terminology
   2. Design basics, the use of templates and style sheets
   3. The major methods of print media production
   4. Typical steps in print media reproduction
   5. Printing terminology

C. Hardware used in the publishing process
   1. Personal Computers
      a. Impact and use in print media production and publishing
      b. Macintosh vs. MS-DOS/Windows
      c. Hardware options available
   2. Networks
   3. Output Devices
      a. Ink jet
      b. Laser printers
      c. High-resolution imagesetters
      d. PostScript
      e. Fonts

D. Software used in the publishing process
   1. Text creation and editing
   2. Working with graphics and images
      a. Raster vs. vector graphics
      b. Graphic file formats
      c. Popular applications
      d. Digital scanners
      e. Electronic clip art
3. Transferring data
   a. Network software
   b. The use of modems, microwave and satellite transmission in publishing
   c. Bridging PCs, workstations, and Macintosh computers

4. Electronic page assembly
   a. Significance
   b. Important features
   c. Current page makeup software

E. Printing a publication
   1. Working with a printer and publisher
   2. Steps in publishing proposals, manuals, newsletters, magazines, books, and other publications
   3. Preparing camera-ready artwork and plate-ready films
   4. Methods of including halftones and color photographs in a publication

F. Summary
   1. Where to find more information on computer applications to print media and publishing
   2. Future trends of computers in the publishing process

VIII. Methods of Evaluating Outcomes
There will be one midterm examination worth 25% of the total grade and one final examination worth 30% of the total grade. Laboratory projects will constitute 40% of the grade, and class attendance and participation during both lecture and laboratory sessions will count 5% of the total grade.