I. Minutes: Approval of the January 28, 1992 Academic Senate minutes (pp. 2-6).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
   A. Nominations received for Academic Senate/committee vacancies (pp. 7-8).
   B. Nominations are now open for the offices of Academic Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary for the 1992-1993 term. Forms are available in the Academic Senate office.
   C. Memo Kerschner to Presidents dated 1/21/92: "Proposed Executive Order to Replace EO 338 and 342: General Education-Breadth Requirements." In response to questions asked of Senator Vilkitis regarding the changes proposed to EO 338 and 342, this memo is provided as a summary of those changes (pp. 9-10).
   D. Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2061-92/FA on Year Round Operation and Resolution AS-2064-92/AA on Support for Executive Order on CSU GE&B Requirements (...EO 338 and 342) [provided in Senate agenda of 2/4/92]: Please submit any comments regarding these resolutions to James Vilkitis at today's meeting.

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. CSEA Campus President
   G. ASI Representatives

IV. Consent Agenda:
   A. Resolution on Appointment of Temporary Academic Employee to the Academic Senate-DeMers, Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (p. 11).
   B. Resolution on Representative of Temporary Academic Employees to the Academic Senate-DeMers, Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (p. 12).
   C. Resolution on Academic Senate Meeting Schedule-DeMers, Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (p. 13).

V. Business Item(s):
   A. Proposed Academic Program Review Criteria-Pedersen, Chair of the Program Review Criteria Setting Committee, second reading (pp. 14-32). Comments received regarding this document are attached (pp. 33-35).
   B. Resolution on Visibility of the Policy on Cheating and Plagiarism-J Murphy, Chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading (pp. 36-37).
   C. Resolution on Voter Eligibility-DeMers, Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, first reading (p. 38).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
NOMINATIONS RECEIVED FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE, RESEARCH COMMITTEE, UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL LEAVE COMMITTEE, and STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE
1992 - 1994

SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE (4 vacancies)
Amspacher, William (Agribus)
Bermann, James (Ag Engr)
Hallock, Brent (Soil Sci)
Hannings, David (OH)
Seim, Edwin (Crop Sci)
Shelton, Mark (Crop Sci)

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (3 vacancies)
Botwin, Michael (Arch Engr)
Johnston, Hal (Const Mgt)
Turnquist, Carl (Const Mgt)

University Professional Leave Committee
VACANCY

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS (2 vacancies)
Andrews, Charles (Actg)

Research Committee
VACANCY

University Professional Leave Committee
VACANCY

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING (5 vacancies)
Connelly, John (Computer Sci)
Dana, Charles (Computer Sci)
Lomas, Charles (Engr Tech)
Morrobel-Sosa, Anny (Mats Engr)

VACANCY

SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS (4 vacancies)
Carter, Clay (Journalism)
Densham, Robert (Art & Design)
Fetzer, Philip (Poli Sci)
LaPorte, Mary (Art & Design)
Russell, Craig (Music)

Research Committee
Krieger, Daniel (History)

University Professional Leave Committee
Lant, Kathleen (English)
NOMINATIONS RECEIVED FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE, RESEARCH COMMITTEE, UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL LEAVE COMMITTEE, and STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE
1992 - 1994

SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES (3 vacancies)
Englund, David (Psyc/HD)
Lord, Sarah (Home Ec)
Weber, Barbara (Home Ec)

SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS (4 vacancies)
VACANCY
VACANCY
VACANCY
VACANCY

Research Committee
VACANCY

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES (1 vacancy for librarian)
Gamble, Lynne (Library)

Research Committee
VACANCY

University Professional Leave Committee
VACANCY

STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE (1 vacancy)
Timothy Kersten (Economics)
Date: January 21, 1992
To: Presidents
From: Lee R. Kerschner
Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Subject: Proposed Executive Order to Replace Executive Orders 338 and 342: General Education-Breadth Requirements

Coded memorandum AAP 91-10 sought campus comments on proposed modifications to the sections of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, governing general education in the CSU. The comments were largely favorable, and Title 5 changes were approved by the Trustees in July 1991. The existing CSU general education-breadth requirements remain one route to fulfillment of CSU general education requirements. The Title 5 changes allow implementation of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum as an alternative route for students transferring from a California community college; also permitted, but not yet ready for implementation, is a third alternative: students transferring between CSU and UC may fulfill lower-division general education requirements of the receiving institution by satisfying the lower-division general education requirements of the institution from which they transfer.

Two executive orders issued in 1981 specify policies and procedures governing CSU general education-breadth requirements. E.O. 338 concerns implementation of the current CSU general education-breadth requirements on CSU campuses (and does not, of course, acknowledge the alternative routes approved in July 1991). E.O. 342 contains provisions for certification by regionally accredited institutions of the extent to which students transferring to the CSU have fulfilled CSU general education-breadth requirements. Coded memorandum AAP 91-12 discussed three sets of proposed modifications to E.O. 342:

1. changes implementing reciprocity for lower-division general education for students transferring from one CSU campus to another,

2. changes pertaining to full and subject-area certification of transfer students' fulfillment of CSU general education-breadth requirements, and

Distribution: Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs (with attachment)
Associate Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs (with attachment)
Deans, Undergraduate Studies (with attachment)
Deans/Directors, Admissions and Records (with attachment)
Chairs, Academic Senates (with attachment)
Chancellor's Office Staff (without attachment)
changes to procedures for recognizing transferring institutions’ courses for CSU general education-breadth credit.

AAP 91-12 sought campus comments on (1) and (2). The comments were generally encouraging.

Attached is a draft executive order designed to acknowledge all three routes to fulfillment of CSU general education requirements (see Section I of the draft) and to include all systemwide policies and procedures pertaining to the route we have identified as "CSU general education-breadth requirements." This executive order would supersede E.O. 338 and E.O. 342. The new executive order would retain the substance of the existing CSU general education-breadth requirements (see Sections II through VII of the draft). It would incorporate provisions for full and subject-area certification (see Subsection C of Section VIII of the draft) and for reciprocity among CSU campuses (see Section IX of the draft); these provisions are largely as outlined in AAP 91-12 but were revised slightly to address some campus concerns. Please note that the provisions for full and subject-area certification would require a different classification scheme for courses in Areas C and D, which is reflected in Attachment A to the draft executive order.

The draft executive order also includes changes in the procedures for recognizing transferring institutions’ courses for CSU general education-breadth credit (see Subsections A and B of Section VIII of the draft). E.O. 342’s provisions for the challenge of courses certified as meeting CSU general education-breadth requirements have proven to be cumbersome and expensive to implement, and the CSU has not been able to pursue challenges in a timely manner. The proposed changes would align the procedures with those used quite satisfactorily for the initiation of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum in 1991. The new procedures would still involve maintenance of the list of transferring institutions’ courses that are acceptable for fulfilling particular requirements of the CSU general education-breadth program. All courses currently on the list and not identified for possible challenge before April 1992 would be kept on the list. Under the new procedures, however, a committee of CSU faculty would review the course outline before a newly proposed course is added to the list. A certifying institution would also be expected to review periodically its portion of the list for continued appropriateness.

The Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on General Education has approved the draft executive order, and it is under consideration by the statewide Academic Senate CSU.

Because the annual cycle for updating the aforementioned list of courses begins in April, it would be advantageous to be able to issue the new executive order by April 1. We would appreciate receiving, no later than February 26, 1992, written responses to the proposed provisions in the draft executive order for recognition of transferring institutions’ courses for CSU general education-breadth credit. Other comments on the draft executive order may be included in the campus response. Please direct the responses and any questions to Dr. Jo Service, Academic Affairs, Plans, at (310) 985-2845.

Attachment: Draft Executive Order on General Education-Breadth Requirements
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Executive Committee currently appoints one representative of the temporary academic employees to serve on a quarterly basis; and

WHEREAS, A yearly appointment would simplify this process and reduce the administrative work necessary for reappointment on a quarterly basis; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Article VI.B.9 of the Academic Senate Bylaws be changed as follows:

9. Each quarter The Executive Committee shall appoint one representative of the temporary part-time academic employees to serve during that quarter or academic year. Normally, this shall be done prior to the first Academic Senate meeting for that quarter/year.

Proposed By: The Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws Committee
February 4, 1992
Adopted:

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

AS- -92/C&BC

RESOLUTION ON
REPRESENTATIVE OF TEMPORARY PART-TIME ACADEMIC
EMPLOYEES TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

WHEREAS,
A quarterly appointment of temporary employees to the Academic Senate creates additional administrative duties; and

WHEREAS,
A quarterly appointment leads to inconsistency in representation; therefore, be it

RESOLVED:
That Article II.A.3 of the Academic Senate Bylaws be changed as follows:

3. Representative of Temporary PART-TIME Academic Employees

A nonvoting member representing temporary part-time academic employees shall be appointed quarterly each quarter or for the academic year contingent upon the representative's continuing appointment.

Proposed By: The Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws Committee
February 4, 1992
WHEREAS, Article IV.A.1 of the Academic Senate Bylaws leaves no flexibility for scheduling additional meetings of the Academic Senate; and

WHEREAS, Occasionally two Senate meetings are scheduled during some months; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Article IV.A.1 and IV.A.2 of the Bylaws be changed as follows:

A. Regular Meetings
   1. Regular meetings of the Academic Senate shall be at 3:00pm on the second Tuesdays of each month, as needed, except in the months of July, August, and September.
   2. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate may change the day and/or time of the regular meeting if the second Tuesday occurs. shall not schedule Academic Senate meetings:
      a. on an academic holiday
      b. after the last regular day of classes during the quarter; or
      c. during final examinations

The change must be announced at the previous regular meeting. The rescheduled time shall be as close as possible to the second Tuesday of that month where the change is needed.

Proposed By: The Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws Committee
February 4, 1992
Adopted:

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

AS--92/EX
RESOLUTION ON
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

WHEREAS, The current process of five-year reviews of "existing degree programs" required under AB 82-1 has not been effective in assessing the academic environment at Cal Poly, and

WHEREAS, Academic program reviews under AB 82-01 are largely internally-generated and lack the perspective and objectivity of broader peer review, and

WHEREAS, Budgetary allocations have not been linked to academic program reviews under AB 82-1, and

WHEREAS, In response to budgetary short-falls in the 1991 academic year, the academic program review process conducted by faculty to identify programs at-risk, created an environment of apprehension and tension amongst the faculty and staff, and

WHEREAS, Budgetary problems have continued and are anticipated to continue over an extended number of years, and

WHEREAS, The faculty have a responsibility to both review academic programs and provide input into the budgetary decision-making process, and

WHEREAS, The faculty are responsible for curriculum and academic programs, and

WHEREAS, The quality of the academic programs at Cal Poly needs to be a primary consideration in academic program review, and

WHEREAS, The administration is responsible for allocation of funds between and among programs, and

WHEREAS, The administration may use program review recommendations in determining the allocation of resources; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopt and recommend to the University a policy of comprehensive academic program review to be conducted by the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC); and be it further,

RESOLVED: That academic program reviews are for the purpose of improving the quality of academic programs at Cal Poly; and be it further,

RESOLVED: The processes to be used in implementing the Academic Program Review are to be in accordance with the attached "Academic Program Review Criteria Detailed Guidelines."

Proposed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
January 28, 1992
Introduction

The criteria below were developed to evaluate academic programs in order to strengthen them. These criteria are meant to allow all programs campuswide to show their strengths. In doing this, some criteria have been included which may not apply to all programs.

Each program will be evaluated separately. Graduate programs are to be evaluated in the same manner as undergraduate programs, using the same criteria as applicable. Since the criteria asks that all programs be compared to similar peer programs, graduate programs will be compared to other graduate programs for evaluation.

As a program prepares data for this evaluation, it is encouraged to comment on the data, particularly information which may be helpful to the evaluation committee. The program administrator should feel free to include any special explanations for data which might otherwise be interpreted negatively.

A more detailed explanation of each criterion is supplied in the Guidelines attached.

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
   B. Evidence that the program mission, goals, and objectives are being met
   C. Contribution to the community, state, and nation

II. PROGRAM QUALITY
   A. Curriculum
      1. Appropriate sequence, patterns of delivery, and size of class
      2. Appropriate comparison with similar peer programs
      3. Appropriate course mix related to previously stated goals and objectives
      4. Appropriate grade distribution
      5. Quality evaluation method
         a. accreditation
         b. outside evaluation
         c. other
      6. Currency
      7. Professional support
      8. Professional service
      9. Evidence of interdisciplinary activity
      10. Evidence of use of senior project as a learning tool
      11. Contribution to G,E & B program at Cal Poly
      12. Student Advising
B. Faculty (attach CV for each faculty member)

1. Demographics (gender, ethnicity)
2. Specific qualifications appropriate to discipline
3. Professional work experience
4. Diversity of faculty
   a. professional background
   b. areas of expertise
5. Professionalism
6. Evidence of teaching excellence
7. Evidence of mentoring and personal development of faculty
8. Service to the university, school and community
9. Percent of tenure-track versus non-tenured track faculty

C. Students

1. Student profile
   a. Average SAT scores of enrolled students
   b. Average GPA of transfer students
   c. Gender and ethnicity
   d. Honors, awards, scholarships
   e. Number of students transferring into and out of major
   f. Average quarterly class load enrolled in by major students

2. Evidence of successful program completion
   a. Student graduation rates
   b. Student success rates
   c. Average length of time for students to graduate
   d. Percent of graduate placement
      1) Other graduate school
      2) Graduate programs at Cal Poly
      3) Job requiring college degree
      4) Unknown
   e. Other evidence of success relevant to field

3. Alumni evaluations (5, 10, 15 year post-graduation evaluations)
   a. Strengths of program
   b. Weaknesses of program
   c. Adequacy of knowledge acquired for entry level jobs
   d. Adequacy of program to provide for the overall university experience

D. Physical Facilities

1. Adequacy of facilities
2. Adequacy of equipment inventories
3. Adequacy of access to library resources
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 faculty member)
8. How adequate is your O&E budget in terms of your programs’ needs?
9. How adequate is your new and replacement equipment budget for your programs’ needs?

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’ fund raising 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
B. Program uniqueness
C. Integral Component to State University Education
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 the attached Title 5 description (subchapter 2, Articles 1 and 2), and the mission statement of the California State University-A, B.

B. Evidence that the program mission, goals, and objectives are being met

List the program mission, goals, and objectives. Include your departmental priorities. (See attached list of examples of instructional priorities for reference-C).

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

List all courses taught by the program during the last two years and indicate for each the enrollment/section. Identify low/over enrollment courses and explain circumstances for each. Identify graduate courses with high undergraduate enrollment and explain circumstances for each one. (Over enrolled course defined as 50% above breakeven for the course classification). Indicate, by using the following code, the primary function of each course: MA for major, MI for minor, E for elective in degree program, GE for general education, S for service for other degree program(s), C for credential requirement.

Describe structure of curriculum including actual or possible course taking sequences and patterns that a student would follow to graduate from your program (demonstrate with flow chart).

Explain the feasibility of the above sequences or patterns in terms of the abilities of students, the available time and resources at Cal Poly. Does your major course sequence have an impact on other programs? 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 identical or similar programs offered in the CSU and other institutions, including enrollment and number of degrees awarded.

Provide the findings of external reviews by consultants, peer-groups, or accrediting agencies.

3. Appropriate course mix related to previously stated goals and objectives

Does 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. Appropriate grade distribution

Provide summary of grade distributions for your department for each quarter for the last five years.

Is there a pattern of successive increases/decreases in percentages? Explain any trends. Also describe how grade distributions are monitored in your department.

5. 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?

b. outside evaluation
   Indicate any other foundations, professional associations or societies, or external peer reviews that are used to evaluate your program.

c. other
   If used, indicate occurrences and formal procedures for student and alumni evaluation.

6. Currency

List all courses that have been added or deleted from your program in the last five years and explain in a broader perspective why these changes occurred. Describe the difference between the current and earlier versions of curriculum.
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.

List courses in the catalog that have not been offered for the previous two years.

7. Professional support

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

8. Professional service

What service or in-service functions does your program provide on a regular basis? List the 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?

Describe other professional services your program is providing in the form of internships, co-ops, senior projects, etc.

9. Evidence of interdisciplinary activity

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

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

Describe the inter-relationship of your program with other programs.

10. 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?

11. Contribution to G,E & B program at Cal Poly

If you teach G,E & B courses, describe your involvement in general education and breadth requirements.
12. Student Advising

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

Are advising responsibilities shared by all faculty? Describe orientation or training programs for faculty to make them more knowledgeable and effective advisors.

Describe the department's procedures to ensure that students receive accurate and timely academic advising.

B. Faculty (attach CV for each faculty member)

Many of the faculty professional activities can be summarized in a table format. See attachment D 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. Professional work experience

4. Diversity of faculty
   a. professional background
   b. areas of expertise
   c. appropriate faculty expertise related to professional background

5. Professionalism

6. Evidence of teaching excellence

7. Evidence of mentoring and personal development of faculty

8. Service to the university, school and community

9. Percent of tenure-track versus non-tenured track faculty

C. Students

1. Student profile
   a. Average SAT scores of enrolled students
   b. Average GPA of 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? Can students easily change major programs within Cal Poly? Do these students encounter any major difficulties 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?

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 success 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) Other graduate schools
      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) Job requiring college degree
      What percent of your graduates are currently employed in a field utilizing a college degree?

   4) Unknown
      Of your graduates, what percent is there status unknown?

   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. Physical Facilities

1. Adequacy of facilities
   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?

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 faculty member)

8. How adequate is your O&E budget in terms of your programs' needs?

9. How adequate is your new and replacement equipment budget for your programs' needs?

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' fund raising 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 the CSU education?
Title 5  Board of Trustees of the California State Universities

§ 40100. Authorization to Establish Curricula

A campus may be authorized by the Board of Trustees to establish and maintain curricula leading to the bachelor's degree, and the master's degree, and the doctoral degree, provided, that in the case of the doctoral degree, the requirements of Section 40050 are satisfied.


HISTORY
1. Amendment filed 12-29-70; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 71, No. 1).
2. Amendment and renumbering of Section 40001 filed 8-22-72; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 72, No. 35).
3. Amendment of NOTE filed 3-19-82; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 82, No. 12).

§ 40100.1. Cooperative Curricula.

Curricula leading to the bachelor's or master's degree may be established cooperatively by two or more campuses. The Chancellor is authorized to establish and from time to time revise such procedures as may be appropriate for the administration of this section.


HISTORY
1. New section filed 6-22-72; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 72, No. 35).
2. Amendment filed 3-19-82; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 82, No. 12).

§ 40100.2. The Consortium of the California State University and Colleges.

The Consortium of the California State University and Colleges ("The Consortium") is hereby established. Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter to the contrary, the Consortium shall conduct, academic programs utilizing combined faculty and program resources of the California State University and Colleges, and degrees authorized in Article 6, Subchapter 2 of this chapter may be awarded by the Consortium in the name of the Board of Trustees. The Chancellor is authorized to establish and from time to time revise such provisions as may be appropriate for the administration of this section. The Chancellor shall report annually to the Board on such provisions issued pursuant to this section, commencing at the first meeting of the Board following July 1, 1974.


HISTORY
1. New section filed 6-21-73; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 73, No. 25).
2. Amendment of NOTE filed 4-29-77; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 77, No. 18).
3. Amendment of NOTE filed 3-19-82; effective thirtieth day thereafter (Register 82, No. 12).

§ 40101. Authorization to Recommend for Teaching Credentials.

A campus may establish and maintain courses leading toward fulfillment of requirements for one or more public school service credentials, and when a campus is approved by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, the campus is authorized to recommend qualified applicants to the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing for the credential.

The Mission of The California State University

I. The mission of The California State University is:

To advance and extend knowledge, learning, and culture, especially throughout California.

To provide opportunities for individuals to develop intellectually, personally, and professionally.

To prepare significant numbers of educated, responsible people to contribute to California’s schools, economy, culture, and future.

To encourage and provide access to an excellent education to all who are prepared for and wish to participate in collegiate study.

To offer undergraduate and graduate instruction leading to bachelor’s and higher degrees in the liberal arts and sciences, the applied fields, and the professions, including the doctoral degree when authorized.

To prepare students for an international, multi-cultural society.

To provide public services that enrich the university and its communities.

II. To accomplish its mission over time and under changing conditions, The California State University:

Emphasizes quality in instruction.

Provides an environment in which scholarship, research, creative, artistic, and professional activity are valued and supported.

Stresses the importance of the liberal arts and sciences as the indispensable foundation of the baccalaureate degree.

Requires of its bachelor’s degree graduates breadth of understanding, depth of knowledge, and the acquisition of such skills as will allow them to be responsible citizens in a democracy.

Requires of its advanced degree and credential recipients a depth of knowledge, completeness of understanding, and appreciation of excellence that enables them to contribute continuously to the advancement of their fields and professions.

Seeks out individuals with collegiate promise who face cultural, geographical, physical, educational, financial, or personal barriers to assist them in advancing to the highest educational levels they can reach.

Works in partnership with other California educational institutions to maximize educational opportunities for students.

Serves communities as educational, public service, cultural, and artistic centers in ways appropriate to individual campus locations and emphases.

Encourages campuses to embrace the culture and heritage of their surrounding regions as sources of individuality and strength.
Examples of Instructional Priorities

Please rank in descending order of priority the following instructional priorities as your unit now performs them:

- Provide liberal arts and/or general education.
- Provide undergraduate educational preparation through majors, minors, options, concentrations, and special emphases. Please rank in descending order of priority any options, concentrations, and special emphases you offer. (An option, concentration or special emphasis requires University approval and is defined as "an aggregate of courses within a degree major designed to give a student a specialized knowledge, competence, or skill.")
- Provide core courses within school/division.
- Provide service function for other programs.
- Provide graduate study through the master's degree. Please rank in descending order of priority any options, concentrations, and special emphases you offer.
- Provide professional/pre-professional training (e.g., teacher education, pre-law).
- Provide extended education, consortium, off-campus, or external degree programs.
- Provide in-service training for those currently employed.
- Other (please identify).
SELECTION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS FOR REVIEW

The selection process for programs to be reviewed should be in accordance with the following steps:

1. Develop a MASTER FILE on all programs subject to the Program Review process, both undergraduate and graduate.

2. Identify those programs that are subject to accreditation review and the dates when such review is to next occur.

3. Project the Program Reviews over a five-year period, and insure that programs subject to accreditation have congruent times for the accreditation reviews as well as the internal Program Reviews; thus, minimizing demand upon resources.

4. In each year, by May 1, the Academic Senate office shall solicit programs for those wishing to be reviewed, either because of accreditation or other external reviews, or for other reasons.

5. If a sufficient number of programs are not identified in #4, then the Academic Senate Executive Committee shall select additional programs, from those subject to review on a current basis, using random selection.

6. A listing of programs to be reviewed in the next academic year shall be completed by the Academic Senate by June 1, with said list being submitted to the Vice-president for Academic Affairs and the affected programs. Every effort should be made to provide notice of review at least one academic year in advance.

7. Assure there is a mix of programs between those that are subject to accreditation as well as those that are not.

8. No school shall have all of its programs reviewed in the same year, irrespective of accreditation review or other external review.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

1. The Committee shall consist of 8 tenured full professors; one from each of the seven schools, one from the Academic Senate, and a non-voting ex-officio person appointed by the Vice-president for Academic Affairs. The University Center for Teacher Education shall be included with a school of their choice for the selection of the representative from that unit.

2. Each School caucus shall forward the names of three nominees to the Academic Senate Office. The Academic Senate Executive Committee members shall receive a ballot of these nominees
and shall have five days to vote and return their marked ballots to the Academic Senate office for counting of the returns by the Academic Senate Elections Committee. The name of the person receiving the highest number of votes from each school shall be the person elected to serve on the Program Review Committee.

The person receiving the second highest number of votes from his school shall be the alternate to the committee, if from a different department. If the person receiving the second highest votes is from the same department as the persons with the highest number of votes, then the third person on the ballot will be considered to be the alternate, if from a department different from the department of the highest vote receiver.

3. No member of the committee shall participate or be present when a program sponsored by that representative's department is under consideration by the committee. In such instances, the alternate, whom shall be from a department other than the one under review, will represent that school until the program review is completed and a report forwarded to the Academic Senate.

4. Committee members shall be elected for a two year term, and may be reelected for a second consecutive term.


7. Should a vacancy occur the replacement shall be elected in the same process as described in section 2, and shall complete the term of the person replaced.

8. Should a vacancy occur in the first year of the term for that position, the replacement person shall be eligible for one addition consecutive term. Should the vacancy occur after the first year of a term, the replacement will be eligible for two consecutive terms following the completion of the term as a replacement.

9. Persons excluded from eligibility for the 1991-92 election only, are those persons who served on the program review task force in 1990-91 and those who served on the 1991-92 Ad Hoc Committee for Program Review Criteria.
10. The Administration shall be expected to provide the necessary support staff to enable the Program Review Committee to carry out its responsibilities.

11. Members of the Program Review Committee should be provided with released time in which to perform this responsibility.

IMPLEMENTATION OF REVIEW AND REPORT FORMAT

1. The office of the Vice-president for Academic Affairs shall provide all program heads with a copy of the University Academic Program Review Criteria and the guidelines that are to be used to evaluate academic programs. (This document, once approved, should remain largely unchanged from year to year.)

2. The review process shall be conducted by the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC), with the composition and selection of the Committee in accordance with other parts of this document.

3. Programs selected by the Academic Senate Executive Committee will prepare information packages for evaluation by the APRC. These packages shall be formatted in conformity with the criteria and guidelines instructions. The completed packages will be submitted to the Academic Senate office for distribution to the ARPC, with a copy also being forwarded to the appropriate School Dean.

4. The evaluation process shall be a review and assessment of the materials pertaining to a program. The Committee will prepare a list of Findings based on the materials contained in the package submitted.

5. Members of the program being reviewed shall be given the opportunity to meet with the APRC and to discuss the FINDINGS, and to submit written Responses to the Findings.

7. After receiving the Responses, the APRC will prepare Recommendations. In developing the Recommendations, the APRC shall give careful consideration to the Responses received.

8. The APRC shall prepare a report to the Academic Senate Executive Committee, with a copy to the program administrator and the appropriate school.

9. The report will be structured in the following order:
   FINDINGS
   RESPONSES
   RECOMMENDATIONS
   The original package of materials provided by the program
under review will be included in the report to the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

10. Following review by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, the completed report will be submitted to the Academic Senate for review and comment.

11. After review by the Academic Senate, the report, with recommendations from the Academic Senate, will be forwarded to the Vice-president for Academic Affairs and the appropriate program administrator and school dean.

12. The responses of the Academic Senate should be limited to broad policy issues raised by the Review process, rather than focusing on recommendations concerning specific aspects of a program.

13. The Vice-president for Academic Affairs shall have the responsibility for responding to the recommendations made concerning specific programs.

14. Any action taken by the administration, which is based upon the recommendations of the APRC shall be communicated to the parties involved and to the Academic Senate.
COMMENTS MADE REGARDING THE
PROPOSED ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW CRITERIA DOCUMENT

Comments made at the 1/21/92 Executive Committee meeting
1. Add a statement from the VPAA stating what the document will be used for (i.e., budgetary evaluations).
2. Define "programs." (Per Dr. Koob, all courses with the same prefix are a program. This functionally works; however, one department can have more than one prefix. Interdisciplinary programs like the Women's Studies minor will not have just one prefix for its courses.)
3. Define low enrollment or make reference to "mode & level" as defined by university standards.

Comments made at the 1/28/92 Academic Senate meeting
1. Program demand should be a required piece of data. It is available data that brings consistency and uniformity in the review of all programs.
2. On page 23 of the agenda, write "EXAMPLE" across the matrix.
3. On page 25 of the agenda, SPS is listed twice and SSM is not listed.
4. Not all programs have the same barriers. This isn't recognized in the document.
5. We should look at accrediting bodies' standards and what they use before we do another internal review.
6. After the information is accumulated, the department should conduct a self-assessment. (This would speed up the process in helping the department/program to do a lot of the work the committee would be doing.)
7. The data required should illustrate the constraints of a program by connecting data instead of presenting individual pieces of data.
8. I would like to see the review committee set out its ideal. I would like to know what the standard is for acceptability.
9. On page 25 under the Constitution of Members of the Committee, item 3, I'm concerned that if someone from the outside is going to be sitting on the committee just for the one evaluation, they may not be aware of what the whole procedure is. Having tenure on this committee gives experience, and bringing in someone from the outside may not be fair to that department. Maybe the person from the department under review should be a nonvoting member at that point but still be there to explain things. I would be concerned about bringing someone in who was not aware of the criteria used in the past.
10. Is there going to be recommendations on how this data is to be used and weighted for some sort of recommendation? How do you take each one of these components to come up with the assessment?
11. I suggest a review clause to streamline the procedure once it has been tried.
12. Retitling the document to include the words "Academic Program Quality Review and Improvement" would state what it is we are reviewing and for what reason. It gives a purpose
to the data collection.

13. A tremendous amount of data will be generated by these reviews. How will the Senate review this much paper? How much quality information will be provided to this quality-control body?

School of Architecture and Environmental Design
1. On page 11 of the agenda, C.1.a., add "Average SAT scores of enrolled FTF students."
2. On page 11 and 12 of the agenda, the following entries should be asterisked and the following information provided: "Data to be provided by the Institutional Studies Office." This statement should apply to entries C.1.a.,b.,c.,f.; C.2.a.,b.,c.; and III.A.1.,2.,3.,4.,5.,6.,7.,B., and 9.

School of Engineering
1. The following criteria should be deleted:
   II.C.
   2.c. "average length of time for student to graduate"
   1.f. "average quarterly class load enrolled in by major students during the last five years"

Rationale: (1) it is the FTES count, not the body count, that directly effects costs at Cal Poly; (2) It will have the effect of discriminating against certain students (those who work to support themselves, targeted students who generally need more time to graduate, students who strengthen their education through CO-OP, etc.)

2. The following criteria should be deleted:
   II.C.
   7. "Five, ten, fifteen year alumni evaluation of program"

Rationale: This cannot be done in a meaningful way in a time frame for use in any budget allocations for '92-93. (Should be deleted until we've spent at least one year gathering meaningful data.)

3. Faculty comment: I have strong problems with a POLYTECHNIC university that places graduate school placement ahead of job market demand in the criteria. That (job demand) should be a primary evaluation criterion for any professional program. Unless we want to become CUS-SLO, we need to emphasize our market-driven curricula.

4. Faculty comment: I have the same problem. Also, why not recognize that some programs result in much higher starting salaries than others and therefore return more to the taxpayers of California who foot most of the bill. Therefore, starting salary and/or salary of graduates 5-10 years down the road should be looked at.

The criteria should definitely recognize that some programs are more costly per FTES in the major than others, and should take this into account when determining "return on investment" to the taxpayers. For example, many of the Ag programs are very costly but students do not command high
salaries, but most Engineering programs yield a much higher return.

5. Regarding II.C.4.c Academic Program Review: Gender and ethnicity are not related to program quality (perhaps to I.C).

6. Regarding II.c.2.d, I would prefer to see this portion rewritten as follows:
   d. Percent of graduate placement over past five years
      1. Jobs requiring your or a similar college degree
      2. Jobs requiring any other college degree
      3. Graduate programs at Cal Poly
      4. Graduate programs at other universities
      5. Unknown
   e. Average starting salaries for category #1 above over the past 5 years
   f. Other evidence of success relevant to field

School of Professional Studies
I would like to recommend inclusion of applicant pool data (size and quality as measured by GPA/SAT) as well as accommodation data in the list of program review criteria. These data are useful in determining external demand for programs, which is not necessarily reflected in the overall quality of the enrolled student pool. For instance, we have some programs on campus who are allocated more major slots than they have applications, resulting in 100% accommodation. Other programs are able to accommodate a much smaller, more selective group of students. Clearly, this provides very relevant information about a program and how it is perceived by prospective students.

School of Science and Mathematics
On page 25 of the 1/28/92 agenda, items 5 and 6 list the procedures and timing for elections to the Program Review Committee. The School of Science and Mathematics is absent from the list. Please rectify this omission.
Background Statement: Campus Administrative Manual (CAM) articles 684, et al, state in part: "The University will not condone academic cheating or plagiarism in any form..." These articles further define cheating and plagiarism and what procedures shall be followed when cheating or plagiarism is noted.

While it must be accepted that all students are aware, prima facie, what cheating and plagiarism are, and as such that to cheat or plagiarize is unacceptable behavior, reference to these factors is not well publicized in documents readily available to students. Specifically, the current University Catalog references the California Administrative Code in its appendix on page 739, a few pages short of the end of the catalog. The University Winter 1992 Schedule of Classes likewise offers a single line (in small print) near the back of the schedule under the major topic of Campus Rules. This latter reference is found under Article IX. PETS ON CAMPUS.

AS-92/ RESOLUTION ON VISIBILITY OF THE POLICY ON CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM

WHEREAS, California Polytechnic State University is governed by certain regulations as published, specifically Title V of the California Administrative Code and the Campus Administrative Manual; and

WHEREAS, Section 41301 of the California Administrative Code identifies cheating or plagiarism as one of many actions which justifies expulsion, suspension or probation of students; and

WHEREAS, Campus Administrative Manual (CAM), section 684, "Academic Dishonesty: Cheating and Plagiarism" further establishes university policy and defines cheating and plagiarism; and

WHEREAS, The University Catalog and the Schedule of Classes publications do not adequately address the issues of cheating and plagiarism, and as reference to these are neither identified in tables of contents or indexes; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the statement below be printed in both the University Catalog and the Schedule of Classes immediately following the Table of Contents of each document, and that this statement be given a single page and be in bold print:
CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM

CAL POLY WILL NOT CONDONE TOLERATE
ACADEMIC CHEATING OR PLAGIARISM IN ANY FORM

Cheating or plagiarism in any form is considered a serious violation of student behavior and will result in disciplinary action.

The formal policy on cheating and plagiarism (including definitions, sanctions, and appeal procedures) can be found in the Campus Administrative Manual. Learning to think and work independently is part of the educational process. Accordingly, the policy can be summarized simply:

As a student, you are responsible for your own work and you are responsible for your actions.

Cheating and plagiarism are defined in the Campus Administrative Manual, section 684. In addition, the Rules and Regulations, as stated in the Appendix of the University Catalog and the quarterly Schedule of Classes, further clarify appropriate disciplinary action when a student cheats or plagiarizes. All faculty and students are encouraged to review these documents to ensure such activities do not occur.

Learning to think and work independently is part of the educational process.

Cheating or plagiarism in any form is considered a serious violation of expected student behavior and may result in disciplinary action. All faculty and students are encouraged to review the formal policy on cheating and plagiarism (including definitions, sanctions, and appeal procedures) found in the Campus Administrative Manual, Section 684.

University policy can be summarized simply:

As a student, you are responsible for your own work and you are responsible for your actions.

Proposed By: Academic Senate Instruction Committee
January 14, 1992
Revised: January 28, 1992
Adopted:

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

AS-92/C&BC

RESOLUTION ON VOTER ELIGIBILITY

WHEREAS, Information relating to voter eligibility within the Academic Senate Bylaws is not completely accurate and is misleading; and

WHEREAS, Only tenured and tenure-track faculty can vote for University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) members, and only librarians can vote for a librarian to the UPLC; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Article I.B.8 of the Academic Senate Bylaws be changed as follows:

8. Voter Eligibility
   Voting members of the General Faculty as specified in Article I of the Constitution are eligible to vote for:
   a. senators from schools or Professional Consultative Services;
   b. CSU Academic Senate members;
   c. members of the Research Committee; and
   d. members of the University Professional Leave Committee (voting restricted to tenured and tenure-track faculty/librarians); and
   e. consultative committees as needed.

Proposed By: The Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws Committee February 4, 1992
State of California

Memorandum

To: Charlie Andrews, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Glenn Irvin
   Associate VPAA

Subject: ELM Recommendations

Charlie,

Attached is the latest draft of the procedures for the ELM. As you know, the Student Progress Committee, working with Art DeKleine and Paul Murphy, has been tightening up the current procedures to bring them in line with new Chancellor’s Office directives and to ensure we test, diagnose, and place students in mathematics classes quickly and accurately.

Although the recommendations need some further refinement with regard to score and placement levels and staffing for classes, I’m hoping to include these in the 1992-94 catalog, which is going to press very soon, and would appreciate your having the Senate review the recommendations so I can move ahead with them as quickly as possible.

Call if you have any questions.

Re: ELM Recommendations

This will be a Discussion Item at the February 18, 1992 Academic Senate meeting. Please bring this document to the meeting. Thank you.
## Recommendations Regarding the ELM

**Intent:** to identify each student's mathematical competency level and place the student in the appropriate class.

1. A demonstrated proficiency in prerequisite skills should be required for enrolling in any entry level mathematics or statistics course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For entry into:</th>
<th>Requirement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH x100 Beginning Algebra</td>
<td>ELM score below 480.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT/ACT score below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 104 Intermediate Algebra</td>
<td>ELM score 480 to ---.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT/ACT score --- to ---.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 116 Precalculus Algebra</td>
<td>ELM score -------.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>SAT/ACT score -------.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 118</td>
<td>ELM score -------.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT/ACT score -------.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 119</td>
<td>ELM score -------.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>SAT/ACT score -------.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exceptions:** Transfer students with a grade of C or better in a college-level mathematics or statistics course which satisfies General Education requirements.

Individual exceptions to be determined by ELM program coordinator or chair of the Mathematics Department.

2. All students not exempted must take the ELM exam prior to enrolling in a Cal Poly mathematics or statistics class. Placement in these classes will be determined by diagnostic scores.

Students who are admitted without taking the ELM exam, if not exempt, must take the exam during the orientation week during Fall, Winter, and Summer quarters.

All students, if not exempt, who do not take the ELM exam within two quarters of initial enrollment at Cal Poly will be disqualified.

3. Information regarding mathematics diagnostic test scores and other preparation for study in mathematics and statistics is
to be placed on the data base in a timely manner so it can be used to advise and register students in appropriate classes.

ELM, SAT, ACT, and MAPE scores for entering freshmen are to be placed on the data base.

Transfer students are to be checked for math coursework and requirements.

4. The CAPTURE System should be coded to block registration in inappropriate mathematics or statistics classes based on diagnostic scores.

5. Enough sections of entry level mathematics courses should be offered to provide spaces for students required to take them. Sufficient sections should be offered during quarters when demand is highest.

6. Admission selection criteria should be adjusted to place more emphasis on mathematics competency.

Entering freshmen should be prepared for the first mathematics and statistics courses required by their major, or for the courses to meet the General Education and Breadth requirement.

Transfer students should have satisfied mathematics and statistics requirements for General Education and Breadth, and be prepared for mathematics or statistics courses required by their major.

7. Adequate time and resources should be provided for the program and coordinators to carry out their responsibilities.

8. Time to satisfy the ELM:

Freshmen must satisfy the ELM exam or pass a mathematics or statistics class at the level of intermediate algebra within 1 year of initial enrollment at Cal Poly.

Transfer students should have the GE&B mathematics and statistics requirement completed and ELM satisfied. If not, they should have ---- to satisfy both requirements.

At Cal Poly, ELM scores are valid for two years.
Supporting Information:

3.  (Schedules for each quarter--information vs. registration)

5.  Current estimates indicate the following number of spaces are required to meet demand:

   MATH x100  420 seats per academic year
   MATH 104   630 seats per academic year

ILE $ for math?  Where are you?
Memorandum

To: Glenn Irvin, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Date: January 17, 1992

File: recomend.eim.jkb.sg

Copies: P. Lee
        R. Koob
        H. Scott
        W. Mark
        S. Breitenbach
        P. Ringer
        J. Murphy
        G. Punches
        C. Andrews
        B. Hensel
        J. Maraviglia

From: J. Kent Butler, Associate Dean
School of Engineering

Subject: UPDATED "DRAFT" FOR RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE ELM

For the record, be advised that the input from the School of Engineering does not concur with recommendation 5.

"5. Enough sections of entry level mathematics courses should be offered to provide spaces for students required to take them. Sufficient sections should be offered during quarters when demand is highest.

Current estimates indicate the following number of spaces are required to meet demand:
MATH x100  420 seats per academic year
MATH 104  630 seats per academic year"

1. These courses are not entry level but remedial.

2. Staffing of same would limit offering of entry level and above courses by Math Dept.
Memorandum

To: Glenn Irvin
Assoc Vice President for Academic Affairs

Date: January 21, 1992

File No.:
Copies: T. Hale
P. Bailey
Test Office

From: H. Arthur DeKleine, ELM Coordinator
Mathematics Department

Subject: Two recommendations.

1. I would like to recommend that we add to the Student Progress Committee Recommendations Regarding the ELM, under item 8. Time to satisfy the ELM, a third paragraph,

   At Cal Poly, ELM scores are valid for a period of two years. This period is longer than ideal, but easier to administer.

2. I think we need a meeting with Kerry Yamada, George Stanton, Stefanie Shuman, Dorothy Tomilson, and anyone else interested in the testing schedule, to set the ELM test schedule for next year. The Test Office may need as much lead time as possible to make plans.
Date: January 6, 1992  
To: Presidents  
From: Herbert L. Carter  
Executive Vice Chancellor  

Subject: Determination of Competence in Entry Level Mathematics, Executive Order No. 582

I am transmitting to you five copies of Executive Order 582 which establishes revised procedures for the development and implementation of entry level mathematics competency programs. The Executive Order, which is effective beginning May 9, 1992, provides significant changes in the procedures leading to certification of entry level competence in mathematics.

The Executive Order is effective on the same day as the first systemwide administration of the revised CSU Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) examination (May 9, 1992). Because the revised examination tests the full three years of required college preparatory mathematics, new scoring guidelines have been established.

The score denoting competence in entry level mathematics sufficient to undertake the first baccalaureate mathematics course has been identified by the ELM Development Committee as a raw score of 39. This score will be under continuous review by the committee to ensure that it remains an appropriate measure of competence. The official "scaled" competency score will be calculated after the first test administration.

Scores on other tests determined to be equivalent to ELM competence and providing ELM exemption are listed on Addendum A to the Executive Order.

The President has the responsibility for implementing this Executive Order and for maintaining the campus repository and index of all Executive Orders.

Please address any questions regarding this Executive Order to the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Educational Support.

HLC/pb  
Attachment

Distribution:
- Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
- Vice Presidents/Deans, Student Affairs
- Chairs, Campus Senates/Councils
- Deans/Directors, Admissions and Records
- Deans, Undergraduate Studies
- Test Officers
- Chairs, Departments of Mathematics
- Directors of Counseling
- ELM Liasions Officers
- Presidents, Associated Students
- Chancellor's Office Staff
Executive Order No.: 582

Title: Determination of Competence in Entry Level Mathematics

Effective Date: May 9, 1992

Supersedes: Executive Order No. 498

This Executive Order is issued pursuant to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Sections 40405.1-40405.4, specifically Sections 40405.1 and 40405.4, and Sections 1 and 2 of Chapter III of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees of The California State University.

This Executive Order supersedes Executive Order 498, pertaining to mathematics competence to be demonstrated by entering college students. This Executive Order is effective for undergraduate students entering under the 1983-84 or later campus catalog or bulletin.

I. Policy Development

The Advisory Committee on Entry Level Mathematics, appointed by the chancellor from among the CSU faculty and administration, shall have primary responsibility for policy development and recommendation regarding entry level mathematics skills testing and instruction.

II. Entry Level Competence

A. Each entering CSU undergraduate student shall be required to take the CSU Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) examination for placement in appropriate coursework, except those who qualify for the following exemptions:

—First-time freshmen can qualify for an exemption on the basis of satisfactory performance on examinations determined to be appropriate by the Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Development Committee. These examinations and the required minimum scores are described in Addendum A.

—Transfer students can qualify for an exemption either on the basis of satisfactory performance on an examination listed in Addendum A or by completion and transfer to CSU of a college course that satisfies the General Education-Breadth quantitative reasoning requirement, provided such course was completed with a grade of "C" or better.

B. The CSU Entry Level Mathematics Development Committee shall review the ELM examination at least annually and revise it as necessary. The committee shall determine the "passing" score denoting entry level mathematics competency on the ELM examination which shall be applicable systemwide. The committee shall be appointed by the chancellor.
C. Satisfying the ELM requirement shall be defined as any one of the following:

1. Receiving exemption from the ELM examination,

2. Passing the ELM examination, or

3. Taking the ELM examination and, in the event of not passing it, demonstrating competence in intermediate algebra by passing campus-approved mathematics courses and/or by retaking and passing the ELM examination.

A non-exempt student shall be required to take the ELM examination before enrollment in any quantitative reasoning course, including remedial courses. Each student subject to the ELM requirement shall be encouraged to satisfy it as soon as possible after being admitted. Campuses shall require students who must take the ELM examination to do so before the end of the first semester or the first two quarters of enrollment. Campuses may grant one-term extensions of the deadline for taking the ELM examination, when students can demonstrate that circumstances beyond their control necessitate such extension.

Each campus may require at local option that a student pass the ELM examination through earning the competency score set by the ELM Development Committee prior to entry into a course which satisfies the General Education-Breadth requirement in quantitative reasoning. Campuses may also establish time limits for the applicability of ELM scores and mathematics course grades to eligibility for enrollment in specified coursework as determined locally.

D. Satisfaction of the ELM requirement shall be prerequisite to enrollment in a course which satisfies the General Education-Breadth requirement in quantitative reasoning. Campuses shall ensure that students who do not demonstrate the requisite competence take appropriate steps to correct deficiencies. Campuses may permit students to retake the ELM examination at local option, particularly after self-study and/or enrollment in self-contained classes, study, or tutoring.

E. Campuses are free to designate other courses for which satisfaction of the Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) requirement is prerequisite.

Date: January 6, 1992
Students will be exempted from the ELM examination for having performed at or above the level specified below on the following examinations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>College Board Advanced Placement Mathematics Examination (AB or BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)-Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>American College Testing (ACT) Mathematics Test (Taken Prior to October 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Enhanced ACT Mathematics Test (Taken October 1989 and later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>College Board Mathematics Achievement Test, Level 1 or Level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project FOCUS Information

What is Project FOCUS?

Cal Poly has been awarded a grant through the United States Department of Education, FIPSE Program, or Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education. This grant allows for the development and implementation of an education/prevention/intervention program that addresses lifestyle issues surrounding alcohol and other drug use and abuse. We have chosen to name this project FOCUS!

How Will Project FOCUS Work at Cal Poly?

This is a project to benefit the students of Cal Poly so they will be asked to play key roles in the planning and implementation of all project activities. Students who have an interest in promoting healthy lifestyle choices are invited to join the FOCUS team to help plan the project implementation. As a team, we will meet each week to coordinate committee activities. If you are a student and would like to join the team or simply get more information, please call Susan or Katy at 756-2890. If you are an interested staff or faculty member, we want you too--call the same number.

Will This Be Another Boring Lecture Program?

No! The Project FOCUS mandate is to get students involved in activities that highlight responsible choices regarding alcohol and other drug use/abuse. The FOCUS team will be planning and creating events, activities, forums and other types of experiential happenings. The goals of these happenings are to 1) highlight the option of healthier lifestyle choices, and 2) have fun doing it! Some possible examples are Friday Night Live programs, mocktail parties, creating videos for showing, radio show, improv night, etc. We are only limited by our imaginations!

Is There Anything Else?

Yes! Project FOCUS offers student support and referral for any student who has questions, concerns, or needs relating to alcohol and other drug use and how it affects your life or the lives of your friends. Trained and caring student FOCUS team members are available to listen and let you know of all campus and county resources that might be of help. If we don't know, we'll find out! Some examples of how we can help are if you drink too much, spend too much money on drugs, want to give a responsible party, are worried about HIV disease, are afraid of being date raped, or just want to know ways of coping with stress.

Project FOCUS is located downstairs in the Health Center on campus. Call 756-2857 for office assistance, 756-2890 for Program Coordinator, or 756-2891 for student assistants.

Project FOCUS is funded through a grant from the United States Department of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education.

January 1992
Introduction

The process below was developed to evaluate academic programs in order to strengthen them. This process is meant to allow all programs campuswide to show their strengths. In doing this, some steps have been included which may not apply to all programs.

Each program will be evaluated separately. Graduate programs are to be evaluated in the same manner as undergraduate programs, using the same process as applicable. Since the process asks that all programs be compared to similar peer programs, graduate programs will be compared to other graduate programs for evaluation.

As a program prepares data for this evaluation, it is encouraged to comment on the data, particularly information which may be helpful to the evaluation committee. The program administrator should feel free to include any special explanations for data which might otherwise be interpreted negatively.

Academic programs can be defined as a structured grouping of course work designed to meet an educational objective; i.e., degree, certification, credential, or group of courses for a specific purpose (Ethnic Studies, Women Studies, Extended Education, etc.).

A more detailed explanation of each step is supplied in the Guidelines attached. (* 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
B. Evidence that the program mission, goals, and objectives are being met
C. Contribution to the community, state, and nation

II. PROGRAM QUALITY

A. Curriculum
   1. Appropriate sequence, patterns of delivery, and size of class
   2. Appropriate comparison with similar peer programs
   3. Appropriate course mix related to previously stated goals and objectives
   4. Appropriate grade distribution
   5. Quality evaluation method
      a. accreditation
      b. outside evaluation
      c. other
   6. Currency
7. Professional support
8. Professional service
9. Evidence of interdisciplinary activity
10. Evidence of use of senior project as a learning tool
11. Contribution to G, E & B program at Cal Poly
12. Student Advising

B. Faculty (attach CV for each faculty member)
1. Demographics (gender, ethnicity)
2. Specific qualifications appropriate to discipline
3. Professional work experience
4. Diversity of faculty
   a. professional background
   b. areas of expertise
5. Professionalism
6. Evidence of teaching excellence
7. Evidence of mentoring and personal development of faculty
8. Service to the university, school and community
9. Percent of tenure-track versus non-tenured track faculty

C. Students
1. Student profile
   a. Average SAT scores of enrolled FTE students
   b. Average GPA of transfer students
   c. Gender and ethnicity
   d. Honors, awards, scholarships
   e. Number of students transferring into and out of major
   f. Average quarterly class load enrolled in by major students

2. Evidence of successful program completion
   a. Student graduation rates
   b. Student success rates
   c. Average length of time for students to graduate
   d. Percent of graduate placement over past five years
      1) Jobs requiring your or a similar college degree
      2) Jobs requiring any other college degree
      3) Graduate programs at Cal Poly
      4) Graduate programs at other universities
      5) Unknown
   e. Other evidence of success relevant to field

3. Alumni evaluations (5, 10, 15 year post-graduation evaluations)
   a. Strengths of program
   b. Weaknesses of program
   c. Adequacy of knowledge acquired for entry level jobs
   d. Adequacy of program to provide for the overall university experience
D. Academic Support Resources

1. Adequacy of facilities/services
2. Adequacy of equipment inventories
3. Adequacy of access to library resources
   a. Quality and quantity of library collection
   b. Relationship to program
   c. Acquisitions budget
   d. Faculty participation in collection development
4. Other

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 faculty member)
8. How adequate is your O&E budget in terms of your programs' needs?
9. How adequate is your new and replacement equipment budget for your programs' needs?

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' fund raising 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
B. Program uniqueness
C. Integral Component to State University Education
D. Student Demand

V. SELF-ASSESSMENT
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 the attached Title 5 description (subchapter 2, Articles 1 and 2), and the mission statement of the California State University-A, B.

B. Evidence that the program mission, goals, and objectives are being met

List the program mission, goals, and objectives. Include your departmental priorities. (See attached list of examples of instructional priorities for reference-C).

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

List all courses taught by the program during the last two years and indicate for each the enrollment/section. Identify low/over enrollment courses and explain circumstances for each. (Low enrollment defined by Administrative bulletin 82-1. Low enrollment courses defined as less than 13 students for lower division, less than 10 students for upper division, and less than 5 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. (Over enrolled course defined as 50% above breakeven for the course classification). Indicate, by using the following code, the primary function of each course: MA for major, MI for minor, E for elective in degree program, GE for general education, S for service for other degree program(s), C for credential requirement.

Describe structure of curriculum including actual or possible course taking sequences and patterns that a student would follow to graduate from your program (demonstrate with flow chart).
Explain the feasibility of the above sequences or patterns in terms of the abilities of students, the available time and resources at Cal Poly. Does your major course sequence have an impact on other programs? 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 identical or similar programs offered in the CSU and other institutions, including enrollment and number of degrees awarded.

Provide the findings of external reviews by consultants, peer-groups, or accrediting agencies.

3. Appropriate course mix related to previously stated goals and objectives

Does 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. Appropriate grade distribution

Provide summary of grade distributions for your department for each quarter for the last five years.

Is there a pattern of successive increases/decreases in percentages? Explain any trends. Also describe how grade distributions are monitored in your department.

5. 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?

b. outside evaluation
   Indicate any other foundations, professional associations or societies, or external peer reviews that are used to evaluate your program.

c. other
   If used, indicate occurrences and formal procedures for student and alumni evaluation.
6. Currency

List all courses that have been added or deleted from your program in the last five years and explain in a broader perspective why these changes occurred. Describe the difference between the current and earlier versions of curriculum.

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.

List courses in the catalog that have not been offered for the previous two years.

7. Professional support

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

8. Professional service

What service or in-service functions does your program provide on a regular basis? List the 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?

Describe other professional services your program is providing in the form of internships, co-ops, senior projects, etc.

9. Evidence of interdisciplinary activity

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

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

Describe the inter-relationship of your program with other programs.

10. 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?
11. Contribution to G,E & B program at Cal Poly

If you teach G,E & B courses, describe your involvement in general education and breadth requirements?

12. Student Advising

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

Are advising responsibilities shared by all faculty? Describe orientation or training programs for faculty to make them more knowledgeable and effective advisors.

Describe the department’s procedures to ensure that students receive accurate and timely academic advising.

B. Faculty (attach CV for each faculty member)

Many of the faculty professional activities can be summarized in a table format. See attachment D 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. Professional work experience
4. Diversity of faculty
   a. professional background
   b. areas of expertise
   c. appropriate faculty expertise related to professional background
5. Professionalism
6. Evidence of teaching excellence
7. Evidence of mentoring and personal development of faculty
8. Service to the university, school and community
9. Percent of tenure-track versus non-tenured track faculty

C. Students

1. Student profile
   a. Average SAT scores of enrolled students
   b. Average GPA of 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? Can students easily change major programs within Cal Poly? Do these students encounter any major difficulties 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?

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 success 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) Other 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?
2) Jobs requiring any other college degree

What percent of your graduates are currently employed in a field utilizing any other college degree?

5) /\ Y Unknown

Of your graduates, what percent is there status unknown?

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. PHYSICAL/FACILITIES 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?

c. Acquisitions budget
Does the library's acquisitions budget accommodate faculty request for monographs and serials within appropriate limits?

d. Faculty participation in collection development
Does the faculty participate in the selection and evaluation of library resources?

4. Other
Provide information on other resources or support services which might impact on your program.

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 faculty member)
8. How adequate is your O&E budget in terms of your programs' needs?
9. How adequate is your new and replacement equipment budget for your programs' needs?
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 fund raising 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 the 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.
### Core Alcohol and Drug Survey
**For use by two- and four-year institutions**

**FIPSE Core Analysis Grantee Group**

Please use a number 2 pencil.

1. **Classification:**
   - Freshman ............ 0
   - Sophomore .......... 0
   - Junior ............... 0
   - Senior ................ 0
   - Grad/professional .... 0
   - Not seeking a degree ............. 0
   - Other ............... 0

2. **Age:**
   - [ ]

3. **Ethnic origin:**
   - American Indian/Alaskan Native ...........
   - Hispanic ...........
   - Asian/Pacific Islander ..
   - White (non-Hispanic).. 
   - Black (non-Hispanic)...
   - Other ........

4. **Gender:**
   - Male ... .... ...... 
   - Female .............. 

5. **Marital status:**
   - Single ............ 
   - Married ..... 
   - Separated ..... ...
   - Divorced ..... 
   - Widowed ..... 

6. **Is your current residence as a student:**
   - On-campus ......... 
   - Off-campus ........

7. **Are you working?**
   - Yes, full-time ...... 
   - Yes, part-time ...... 
   - No ................... 

8. **Living arrangements**
   - Where: (mark best answer)
     - House/apartment/etc...
     - Residence hall ....... 
     - Approved housing ....
     - Fraternity or sorority...
     - Other ................
   - With whom: (mark all that apply)
     - With roommate(s) ..... 
     - Alone ............... 
     - With parent(s) ........ 
     - With spouse .... 
     - With children ....... 
     - Other ............. 

9. **Approximate cumulative grade average:** (choose one)
   - A+ A A- B+ B B- C+ C C- D+ D D- F

10. **Some students have indicated that alcohol or drug use at parties they attend in and around campus reduces their enjoyment, often leads to negative situations, and therefore, they would rather not have alcohol and drugs available and used. Other students have indicated that alcohol and drug use at parties increases their enjoyment, often leads to positive situations, and therefore, they would rather have alcohol and drugs available and used. Which of these is closest to your own view?**
   - Have available 
   - Not have available

11. **Student status:**
   - Full-time (12+ credits)...
   - Part-time (1-11 credits)...

12. **Campus situation on alcohol and drugs:**
   - a. Does your campus have drug and alcohol policies? ....
   - b. If so, are they enforced? ....
   - c. Does your campus have a drug and alcohol prevention program? ....
   - d. Do you believe your campus is concerned about the prevention of drug and alcohol use? ....
   - e. Are you actively involved in efforts to prevent drug and alcohol use problems on your campus? ....

13. **Place of permanent residence:**
   - In-state ............
   - USA, but out of state ....
   - Country other than USA ...

14. **Think back over the last two weeks. How many times have you had five or more drinks* at a sitting?**
   - None ........ 
   - Once ........ 
   - Twice ........ 
   - 3 to 5 times .... 
   - 6 to 9 times .... 
   - 10 or more times ....

15. **Average # of drinks* you consume a week**
   - (If less than 10, code answer as 01,02, etc.)
   - [ ]

16. **At what age did you first use... (mark one for each line)**
   - a. Tobacco (smoke, chew, snuff)
   - b. Alcohol (beer, wine, liquor)*
   - c. Marijuana (pot, hash, hash oil)
   - d. Cocaine (crack, rock, freebase)
   - e. Amphetamines (diet pills, speed)
   - f. Sedatives (downers, ludes)
   - g. Hallucinogens (LSD, PCP)
   - h. Opiates (heroin, smack, horse)
   - i. Inhalants (glue, solvents, gas)
   - j. Designer drugs (ecstasy, MDMA)
   - k. Steroids
   - l. Other illegal drugs

*Other than a few sips

---

Processed by: UCS/Office of Measurement Services
University of Minnesota
2520 Broadway Drive - Room 130
St. Paul, MN 55113
17. Within the last year about how often have you used...
(mark one for each line)
a. Tobacco (smoke, chew, snuff)
b. Alcohol (beer, wine, liquor)
c. Marijuana (pot, hash, hash oil)
d. Cocaine (crack, rock, freebase)
e. Amphetamines (diet pills, speed)
f. Sedatives (downers, ludes)
g. Hallucinogens (LSD, PCP)
h. Opiates (heroin, smack, horse)
i. Inhalants (glue, solvents, gas)
j. Designer drugs (ecstasy, MDMA)
k. Steroids
l. Other illegal drugs

18. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you have:
(mark one for each line)
a. Tobacco (smoke, chew, snuff)
b. Alcohol (beer, wine, liquor)
c. Marijuana (pot, hash, hash oil)
d. Cocaine (crack, rock, freebase)
e. Amphetamines (diet pills, speed)
f. Sedatives (downers, ludes)
g. Hallucinogens (LSD, PCP)
h. Opiates (heroin, smack, horse)
i. Inhalants (glue, solvents, gas)
j. Designer drugs (ecstasy, MDMA)
k. Steroids
l. Other illegal drugs

19. How often do you think the average student on your campus uses...
(mark one for each line)
a. Tobacco (smoke, chew, snuff)
b. Alcohol (beer, wine, liquor)
c. Marijuana (pot, hash, hash oil)
d. Cocaine (crack, rock, freebase)
e. Amphetamines (diet pills, speed)
f. Sedatives (downers, ludes)
g. Hallucinogens (LSD, PCP)
h. Opiates (heroin, smack, horse)
i. Inhalants (glue, solvents, gas)
j. Designer drugs (ecstasy, MDMA)
k. Steroids
l. Other illegal drugs

20. Where have you used...
(mark all that apply)
a. Tobacco (smoke, chew, snuff)
b. Alcohol (beer, wine, liquor)
c. Marijuana (pot, hash, hash oil)
d. Cocaine (crack, rock, freebase)
e. Amphetamines (diet pills, speed)
f. Sedatives (downers, ludes)
g. Hallucinogens (LSD, PCP)
h. Opiates (heroin, smack, horse)
i. Inhalants (glue, solvents, gas)
j. Designer drugs (ecstasy, MDMA)
k. Steroids
l. Other illegal drugs

21. Please indicate how often you have experienced the following due to your drinking or drug use during the last year...
(mark one for each line)
a. Had a hangover...
b. Performed poorly on a test or important project...
c. Been in trouble with police, residence hall, or other college authorities...
d. Damaged property, pulled fire alarm, etc...
e. Got into an argument or a fight...
f. Got nauseated or vomited...
g. Driven a car while under the influence...
h. Missed a class...
i. Been criticized by someone I know...
j. Thought I might have a drinking or other drug problem...
k. Had a memory loss...
l. Done something I later regretted...
m. Been arrested for DWI/DUI...
n. Have been taken advantage of sexually...
o. Have taken advantage of another sexually...
p. Tried unsuccessfully to stop using...
q. Seriously thought about suicide...
r. Seriously tried to commit suicide...
s. Been hurt or injured...

22. Have any of your family had alcohol or other drug problems: (mark all that apply)
- Mother
- Father
- Stepmother
- Stepfather
- Brothers/sisters
- Father's parents
- Mother's parents
- Children
- Spouse
- Aunts/uncles

23. If you volunteer any of your time on or off campus to help others, please indicate the approximate number of hours per month and principal activity:
- Don't volunteer, or
- 1-4 hours
- 5-9 hours
- 10-15 hours
- 16 or more hours
- Principal volunteer activity is: