CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

Academic Senate Agenda
Tuesday, January 30, 1990
UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

I. Minutes: Approval of the January 9, 1990 Academic Senate minutes (pp. 2-5).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
A. Academic Senate Reading List (p. 6).
B. Resolution(s) approved by President Baker:
   AS-327-89/RC Resolution on CAM 543...(ARDFA Facilities)
C. Academic Senate vacancies for 1990-92 (pp. 7-8).

III. Reports:
A. President's Office
B. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
C. Statewide Senators
D. Douglas Gerard, Executive Dean of Facilities Administration

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Enrollment Growth–Hagen, Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, Second Reading (p. 9).
B. Resolution on Prerequisites for Upper Division Courses–Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, Second Reading (p. 10).
C. Curriculum Proposal for Liberal Studies Program–Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, Second Reading (pp. 11-14).
D. Curriculum Proposal for SPC 360–Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, Second Reading (p. 15).
E. Curriculum Proposal for M.S. in Structural Engineering–Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, Second Reading (pp. 16-17).
F. Resolution on Department Name Change (Computer Science Department)–Camp, Chair of the Computer Science Department, First Reading (pp. 18-23).
G. Resolution on Department Name Change (EL/EE Engineering Department)–Harris, Head of the EL/EE Engineering Department, First Reading (pp. 24-27).
H. Resolution on International Baccalaureate Program–Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, First Reading (pp. 28-30).
I. Resolution on Elective Credit/No Credit Grading–Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, First Reading (pp. 31-32).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS- -89/
RESOLUTION ON
ENROLLMENT GROWTH

WHEREAS, The California State University Board of Trustees has adopted a growth plan for 1990-2005 which calls for an enrollment ceiling at Cal Poly of 20,000 academic year FTE; and

WHEREAS, Present enrollment exceeds the capacity of campus facilities; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Academic Senate resolved in March, 1988, "that Cal Poly prepare a comprehensive plan, in consultation with the Academic Senate, covering demographic projections, composition of the student body, program addition and expansion, facility location and timing, and community impact to determine whether and how Cal Poly could accommodate an increase in enrollment to a range of 16,600 to 17,400 FTE over the next fifteen years" (Academic Senate Resolution AS-279-88/LRPC); and

WHEREAS, Enrollment has grown more quickly than envisioned in Academic Senate Resolution AS-279-88/LRPC; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Administration shall maintain enrollment at the authorized 15,000 FTE level until facilities, faculty, and other support resources are made available to match that enrollment; and be it further

RESOLVED: That no enrollment increase beyond 15,000 FTE shall be made until appropriate facilities are operational; and be it further

RESOLVED: That consideration of enrollment growth up to 17,400 FTE by the 2005-2006 academic year shall be referred to the appropriate consultative bodies on campus and in the community; and be it further

RESOLVED: That enrollment for the 2005-2006 academic year shall not exceed 17,400 FTE even if the enrollment ceiling is placed at 20,000 FTE; and be it further

RESOLVED: That any consideration of future enrollment growth shall also be referred to the appropriate consultative bodies on campus and in the community.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee
October 17, 1989
Amended: January 10, 1990
Academic Senate
Of
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

Background Statement: During the curriculum review for the 1990-92 catalog, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee was asked to consider the renumbering of several courses from lower to upper division as well as proposals for new courses at the upper division level. The Committee found little guidance in the catalog or in CAM as to the distinguishing features of an upper division course. The current 1988-90 catalog on page 390 shows the following:

- 300-399 Courses primarily for advanced undergraduate students, generally bearing no graduate degree credit.
- 400-499 Courses for advanced undergraduates and graduate students.

In attempting to evaluate course proposals, the Committee thought it desirable to have some objective standard for upper division status. This would help not only the Curriculum Committee but also individual departments and schools in the design of courses and course descriptions. In addition, some objective standards in the form of prerequisites to upper division courses could help students in their preparation for more advanced study.

**AS__89/CC**

RESOLUTION ON
PREREQUISITES FOR UPPER DIVISION COURSES

WHEREAS, Neither the university catalog nor the Campus Administrative Manual have objective standards for the designation of a course as upper division; and

WHEREAS, Enrollment in an upper division course presumes that undergraduates are advanced in their studies, that is, that they have demonstrated proficiency in preparatory lower division courses or possess the maturity of previous university experience; and

WHEREAS, The skills needed for enrollment in upper division courses may be quite variable; and

WHEREAS, A department and school should have the maximum flexibility in the design of their courses and curricula; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That all upper division courses have a stated prerequisite and that prerequisite may be one of units accumulated (sophomore, junior, senior level), preparation in related coursework or support courses, or General Education and Breadth preparation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That these directions for prerequisites to upper division courses be placed into the appropriate 400 section of the Campus Administrative Manual.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
date 11/2/89
(Vote 10-0-0)
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate Executive Committee

Date: November 3, 1989

File No: 

Copies: Harry Busselen, Dean, Prof Studies
         Marge Glaser, Liberal Studies Program
         William Rife, Ass. V.P. Acad Affairs
         Malcolm Wilson, V.P. Acad. Affairs

From: C.A. (Tina) Bailey, Chair
       Academic Senate Curriculum Committee

Subject: Liberal Studies Program

Please add to your next agenda our committee recommendation on the Liberal Studies program (attached). The Curriculum Committee recommends approval of the entire revised program with one exception. The question of resources is one inextricably entangled in the consideration of a two course sequence of Seminar and Senior Project. The Liberal Studies committee proposed the two courses and, in theory, everyone believes this is an ideal design especially for this major. However, the resources, both monetary and in terms of personnel, make this infeasible at this time. We agree with the recommendation of Dean Busselen that the interim solution to this curriculum and resource problem lies in having a 6-unit Senior Project which would generate the resources needed for eventually offering both Seminar and Project (3 units each).

It should be mentioned that several problems exist in the administrative structure of the Liberal Studies program and in the design of the Teacher Credentialing curriculum. The issues need to be addressed by a broad representation of the university community and administration and a more satisfactory resolution must be sought than is present in the current Liberal Studies program. The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee would like to take part in such discussions.
# 1990-92 Catalog Proposals

**VP (Vice President Academic Affairs), AS (Academic Senate), CC (Curriculum Committee)**

A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification, 
AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments), 
T = Tabled (see Committee Comments), D = Disapproved

## I. Degree Program Proposals

### A. Degree Program

1. None

### B. Minors

1. None

### C. Concentrations or Specializations

1. None

## II. New Courses

1. LS 304 Interdisc. Fieldwork (2) 2act
2. LS 460 Senior Seminar (3) 3sem C5

## III. Deleted Courses

1. None

## IV. Changes to Existing Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>C/S Number</th>
<th>Description and Prerequisite Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>LS 101 tact C13 to 1lec C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>LS 461 (3) repeatable to (6) to (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## V. General Education and Breadth Courses

1. None

## VI. Curriculum Changes

1. AD BIO 101 General Biology (3) 1st yr
2. AD BIO 102 Plant Biology (4) 1st yr
3. AD BIO 103 Animal Biology (4) 1st yr
4. AD BIO 105 General Biology Lab (1) 1st yr
5. DE BIO 127 Natural History (3) (B.1.b) 1st yr
6. DE MATH 118 Pre-calculus Algebra (4) (B.2) 1st yr
7. AD MATH elective (4) (B.2) 1st yr
8. DE HIST 101/HIST 102/HIST 103 History of Western Civilization (3) 1st yr
9. DE Courses to complete major (depending on emphasis) (5) 1st yr
10. AD PSC 102 The Physical Environment: Atoms and Molecules (B.1.a) (4) 2nd yr
11. AD PSC 103 The Physical Environment: Earth and the Universe (4) 2nd yr
12. AD Spanish electives (4) (4) 2nd yr
13. AD Foreign language electives (4) (4) 2nd yr
14. AD Computer literacy elective (F.1) (3) 2nd yr
15. AD ENGL 240 American Tradition in Literature or ENGL 330-352 (4) 2nd yr
14. DE Life or physical science elective (B.1.) (3) 2nd yr
15. AD Courses to complete major (depending on emphasis) (9) 2nd yr
16. AD MATH 327 Modern Elementary Mathematics (4) 3rd yr
17. Change ENGL 302/ENGL 392 to ENGL 390/ENGL 392/ENGL 395 3rd yr
18. AD HIST 314/HIST 339/HIST 381/HIST 415 3rd yr
19. AD PHIL 331/PHIL 335/PHIL 337 3rd yr
20. Change PE 250 to choice of BIO 220/FSN 210/HE 210/PE 250/PSY 304 3rd yr
21. DE SPC 310 Performing Literature in the Classroom (4) (Note: now a choice of 3 courses in Credential area)
22. AD SPC 316/SOC 315/SOC 316/ETHS 114/ETHS 210 (3) 3rd yr
23. DE Literature elective (300-400 level) C.3. (3) 3rd yr
24. AD PE 310 Concepts in Physical Education (3) 3rd yr
25. DE ART elective (3) 3rd yr
26. DE Fine arts elective (300-400 level) (3) 3rd yr
27. AD Restricted electives (area of emphasis) (9) 3rd yr
28. DE Social Sciences electives (6) 3rd yr
29. AD electives (3) 3rd yr
29a. AD ANT/BUS/ECON/GEOG/POLS/SOC elective (D.4.b.) 4th yr
30. DE choice of CSC 110/CSC 111/CSC 112/CSC 118/CSC 120/CSC 410/CSC 416
    (F.1) 4th yr
31. DE HIST 385 California History or GEOG 340 Geography of California (3) 4th yr
32. DE MATH/Science elective (B.1/B.2) 4th yr
33. AD Restricted electives (area of emphasis) (9) 4th yr
34. Change Courses to complete major (depending on emphasis) from 29 to 15.

Courses in Credential Emphasis (Concentration)
35. DE BIO 128, 129 Natural History (3) (3)
36. Change ED 301, ED 303, ED 401, ED 402 from required to footnote to 15 units of electives, "Students may wish to use these electives to complete the course prerequisites to student teaching: ED 301, ED 303, ED 401, ED 402."
37. DE ED 406 Teaching Language Arts and Reading in the Elementary School (4)
38. DE ED 407 Multicultural and Social Science Education in the Elem School (4)
39. Move MATH 327 Modern Elementary Applications from concentration to core curriculum
40. Change MU 301 Music for Children to MU 301/SPC 310/TH 380 (3)
41. Move PSC 102 and PSC 103 from concentration to core curriculum
42. DE PSC 303 Earth and Space Science (4)
43. AD BIO 306 Biological Applications or PSC 304 Physical Science Applications (3)
44. AD electives (15) (See item 36)

Non-Credential Emphasis (Concentration)
45. DE Fine arts/Humanities electives (6)
46. DE English/Speech electives (3)
47. DE Computer Science/Math/Science electives (15)
48. DE Social Science electives (3)
49. AD Free electives (6)
50. Change total units from (57) to (30)

VII. COMMITTEE COMMENTS-----------------------------------------------
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES IN MAJOR</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>SUPPORT COURSES</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>GEN ED/BREADTH REQ</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>ELECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation LS 101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter/Energy PSC 101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth/Universe PSC 103</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Math MATH 327</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Math MATH 328*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 390/392/395</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 240/330-352</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 331/335/337</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 314/339/361/415</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC 316/SOC 315/316</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Fund MU 100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts in PE PE 310</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early/Middle Childhood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Project LS 101</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation LS 101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter/Energy PSC 101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth/Universe PSC 103</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Math MATH 327</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Math MATH 328*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 390/392/395</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 240/330-352</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 331/335/337</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST 314/339/361/415</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC 316/SOC 315/316</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Fund MU 100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts in PE PE 310</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early/Middle Childhood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Project LS 101</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**See Advisor For Approved List   ++Refer To Catalog Pages ___  19-1/10/90 bb
To: Academic Senate Executive Committee

Date: November 16, 1989

File No:

Copies: Philip Bailey, Interim VP Acad Affairs
           Bernard Duffy, Chair, Speech Comm
           Nishan Havandjian, Head, Journalism
           Glenn Irvin, Dean, SLA
           William Rife, Assoc VP Acad Affairs

From: C.A. (Tina) Bailey, Chair
       Academic Senate Curriculum Committee

Subject: Speech 360 Course Proposal for the 1990-92 Catalog

In its meeting of Thursday, November 9, 1989, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee discussed the tabled Speech 360 course proposal and voted to recommend its inclusion in the course offerings of the Speech Communication department. Although we realize that there may be some overlap in the course content with that in Journalism 402, approved last spring, we feel that there is no duplication of purpose. Speech 360 is designed to emphasize rhetorical aspects of mass media communication whereas Journalism 402 emphasizes social responsibility and accountability. The rapidly expanding field of mass media communication surely has room for many diverse points of view and approaches. Please include this curriculum item as soon as possible in your agenda for the Academic Senate.
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate Executive Committee

Date: November 16, 1989

File No:

Copies: Philip Bailey, Interim VP Acad Affairs
Day Ding, Dean, SArch/Env Design
David Hatcher, Head, Arce
Stephen Hockaday, Head, CE/Enve
Peter Lee, Dean, SEng
William Rife, Assoc VP Acad Affairs
Mark Berrio, Arce
H. Mallareddy, CE/Enve
John Mouton, CM
Cornel Pokorny, CSc

From: C.A. (Tina) Bailey, Chair
Academic Senate Curriculum Committee

Subject: M.S. in Structural Engineering

Please place the attached curriculum for the M.S. degree in Structural Engineering on your agenda as soon as possible. As was stated in my memo of October 25, 1989 we are recommending approval of the program pending the alteration of the prefixes of Civil Engineering courses which are to be included in the program to SE. Since the October 25th note I have chaired a meeting between representatives of the Architectural Engineering and Civil Engineering departments as well as representatives from both schools involved in order to attempt to resolve the SE prefix problem. David Hatcher's memo of November 14, 1989 accurately sums up the topics of the joint meeting and his department's response to Civil Engineering's proposals. Any further discussion at this point in terms of the fine tuning required on the program should be worked out between the parties involved. It was and still is the Curriculum Committee's recommendation that the M.S. in Structural Engineering is a valid program proposal and that the compromise of each department contributing courses to the joint S.E. prefix was not unreasonable. It is our understanding that should the program begin and falter that those altered courses would be returned to their respective departments and that historical records such as past catalogs and this program proposal would substantiate the claims to return them.
STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING PROGRAM

1990-92 CATALOG PROPOSALS

VP (Vice President Academic Affairs), AS (Academic Senate), CC (Curriculum Committee)

A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification,
AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments),
T = Tabled (see Committee Comments), D = Disapproved

I. DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSALS

A. Degree Program

AR, V

1. M.S. Structural Engineering (joint effort of Architectural Engineering and Civil and Environmental Engineering Departments)

II. CURRICULUM

1. SE 405 Advanced Strength of Materials (3) 3lec (from CE 405)
2. SE 407 Dynamics of Structures (4) 3lec, 1lab (from CE 407)
3. SE 455 Matrix Analysis of Structures (3) 3lec (from ARCE 306 & CE 554)
4. SE 501 Advanced Structural Analysis (3) 3lec (new)
5. SE 558 Finite Element Analysis (3) 3lec (from ARCE 504 & CE 558)
6. SE 561, 562 Advanced Structural Design I, II (3) 3lab (new)
7. SE 563 Advanced Seismic Design (3) 3lab (new)
8. SE 587 Analysis and Design of Deep Foundations (3)
9. SE 590 Graduate Seminar (1) lsem
10. SE 599 Thesis (2) (2) (5) supv

Additional New Courses
1. Create new course prefix "SE" for Structural Engineering
2. SE 514 Plates and Shells (3) 3lec
3. SE 515 Inelastic Analysis and Design of Structures (3) 3lec
4. SE 518 Connection Engineering (3) 3lec
5. SE 580 Independent Study in Structural Engineering (1-3) supv

III. DELETED COURSES

1. None

IV. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

The courses (v) which are to be contributed by the ARCE and CE departments should have the SE prefix only.
RESOLUTION ON DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE:
COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

RESOLVED: That the "Computer Science Department" be changed to "Computer Science and Engineering Department."

Proposed By: Computer Science Department
January 31, 1989
Memorandum

To: Charles Andrews, Chair 
    Academic Senate

From: Malcolm W. Wilson 
      Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: PROPOSED DEPARTMENTAL NAME CHANGE FOR THE 
         COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

Attached is a copy of a memorandum from the Computer Science Department dated January 24, 1989 requesting that the name of their department be changed to the "Computer Science and Engineering Department." I would appreciate the Senate reviewing this request and forwarding a recommendation to me. A response prior to the end of the Winter Quarter would be appreciated.

Attachment
Memorandum

To: Malcolm Wilson, Vice President
   Academic Affairs
via
Peter Y. Lee, Dean
   School of Engineering
via
Roger C. Camp, Chair
   Computer Science Department

From: John B. Connely
   Chair
   Computer Science Dept. Curriculum Committee

Subject: REQUEST FOR DEPARTMENTAL NAME CHANGE

Pursuant to Dr. William Rife's memo of October 22, 1988, (see attachment #1), we are formally requesting that the name of the Computer Science Department be changed to the Computer Science and Engineering Department.

The desired change was initially proposed at our Fall Department Retreat. It was later discussed in some detail with Dean Lee. Finally it was unanimously approved by the Computer Science Faculty.

Dr. Lois Brady of our faculty was asked to prepare a statement encapsulating the various reasons given in support of the requested name change. Her statement is appended as attachment #2.

If this request is approved, the Department would wish to begin using the new name during the current catalog cycle.
To: John B. Connely  
Computer Science Department  

From: Interim Associate Vice President 
for Academic Programs (x2246)  

Subject: Changing the Name of the Computer Science Department  

Date: October 20, 1988  
File No.:  
Copies: R. Camp  
P. Lee  
M. W. Wilson  

You asked me what steps you needed to take to change the name of your department to Computer Science and Engineering, besides including the change in your package of catalog revisions. I asked Malcolm Wilson.  

Malcolm asks that you write a memo to him from or through Roger Camp and through Peter Lee, asking for the change; he foresees no problem in approving it. You could then use the new name before it appeared in the 1990-92 catalog.
COMPUTER SCIENCE and ENGINEERING - why?

The meaning of the terms
The American Heritage Dictionary ¹ gives the following definitions:

science- The observation, identification, description, experimental investigation and theoretical explanation of phenomena.

engineering- The application of scientific principles to practical ends as the design, construction, and operation of efficient and economical structures, equipment and systems.

Surely in this department we teach both science and engineering. Indeed it is the strong tradition of Cal Poly that we include the latter. Thus it would reflect more accurately what we do here to be named the Department of Computer Science and Engineering.

The recent history of the department
In 1984 the Computer Science Department joined the School of Engineering. Subsequently a degree program in Computer Engineering jointly coordinated by the administrative officers of the Departments of CSc and EL/EE was established. Ours is presently the only department in the School of Engineering without the designation "Engineering" in its name. Since we are in the School of Engineering, teach courses with an engineering flavor and jointly administer a program in Computer Engineering, it is fitting that this be reflected in our name.

The designation of professional societies
The IEEE Computer Society has proposed a "Model Program in Computer Science and Engineering" ² much of which is taught in this department. Thus it seems appropriate to designate our department in this way.

The most recent joint report of the ACM and IEEE Computer Society ³ on employment of Ph.D.s for the first time includes departments offering degrees in Computer Engineering as well as Computer Science. The intention to integrate the figures for both degrees in the future is stated.

Perception of others and its potential effect
Faculty report that industry perceives our students as having skills which are appropriately called "Computer Science and Engineering". The new name would alert potential employers to this before hiring our students. This could be beneficial to our graduates as well as employers.

¹The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language; Houghton Mifflin Co; Boston

²IEEE Computer Society order number 932; December 1983

³The 1986-87 Taulbee Survey; in CACM; August 1988
Students who think of themselves as more interested in applications than in science may be more inclined to apply to a department of "Computer Science and Engineering." This could help provide a larger applicant pool.

There are several institutions which have departments named "Computer Science and Engineering". Cal Poly with its strong tradition of applying knowledge and skill and the precedent of having computer science in the School of Engineering has strong reasons for joining their ranks.
ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Electronic and Electrical Engineering Department requested a name change to the "Electrical and Computer Engineering Department" as documented in its memo of May 10, 1989 from James G. Harris, Head, via Peter Y. Lee, Dean of the School of Engineering, to Malcolm Wilson, Vice President of Academic Affairs,

WHEREAS, the Computer Science Department which jointly administers with the EL/EE Department the Computer Engineering Program by its motion of May 2, 1989 voted to support the position "that the name of any particular department is primarily the business of that department", and

WHEREAS, the proposed name is particularly appropriate for the degree programs that it administers and the subject matter of its curriculum, be it

RESOLVED, that the name of the Electronic and Electrical Engineering Department be changed to the "Electrical and Computer Engineering Department" with due haste, and for incorporation into the 1990-92 University Catalog.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Malcolm Wilson  cc: Charlie Andrews, Chair  
    Vice-President of Academic  
    Affairs  

VIA: Peter Y. Lee, Dean  academic Senate  
        School of Engineering  

FROM: James G. Harris, Head  Academic Senate  
       EL/EE Department  

DATE: May 10, 1989  

SUBJECT: Request for Departmental Name Change  

The EL/EE Department in its meeting on May 9, 1989, voted to change its name from the "Electronic and Electrical Engineering Department" to the "Electrical and Computer Engineering Department". The vote was 22 in favor, 2 against, and 0 abstentions.  

On a subsequent vote, it was unanimously decided to implement the name change with due haste. The reason for this haste is the hope to include the new name in the 1990-92 catalog. The Computer Science Department, in response to consultation with the EL/EE Department on a possible EL/EE name change, in its meeting of May 2, 1989, passed the following motion: "The Computer Science Department feels that the name of any particular department is primarily the business of that department." The Dean of the School of Engineering also has indicated his support of the name change.  

This name change is more representative of the programs supported by the department, and Attachment 1 indicates a number of variations for the names of departments which support our programs. This representative list seems to indicate a consensus on the proposed name.  

The name change to Electrical and Computer Engineering is particularly appropriate since (a) the EL/EE Department administers, together with the Computer Science Department, the Computer Engineering degree program and (b) both Electronic Engineering and Electrical Engineering majors take courses in and emphasize digital computer techniques of logic design, computer processor (microprocessor) design, digital signal processing, digital communication systems, digital control systems, digital image processing, computer programming, and computer aided design.  

We appreciate your support in expediting this request. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.  

Attachment
MEMORANDUM

TO: EL/EE Faculty

FROM: D. J. Winger
EL/EE Department

DATE: April 26, 1989

SUBJECT: What's In A Name?

Prompted by the recent discussions concerning departmental names, I thought it of interest to see the names used by the other CSU and UC campuses as well as those of adjoining states. I am not attempting to draw any conclusions, but am sharing this with you as an informational item. You will note the high entropy of this information. (From March 1989 issue of Engineering Education.)

Cal Poly (Pomona)
   Electrical and Computer Engineering
   (no Computer Science listed in Engineering)

Cal State (Fullerton) - School of Engineering and Computer Science
   Electrical Engineering/Systems Engineering
   Computer Science

Cal State (Long Beach) - School of Engineering
   Electrical Engineering
   Computer Science and Engineering

Cal State (Los Angeles) - School of Engineering and Technology
   Electrical and Computer Engineering
   (no Computer Science listed in Engineering)

Cal State (Northridge) - School of Engineering and Computer Science
   Electrical and Computer Engineering
   Computer Science

Cal State (Sacramento) - School of Engineering and Computer Science
   Electrical and Electronic Engineering
   Computer Science
   (Note: Computer Engineering is listed as a division with a coordinator)

[Cal State Chico and Cal State Fresno were not listed.]
UC (Berkeley) - College of Engineering
  Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences
  (Computer Science Division is listed with an associate chair)

UC (Davis) - College of Engineering
  Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences

UC (Irvine) - School of Engineering
  Electrical Engineering
  (no Computer Science listed in Engineering)

UC (Los Angeles) - School of Engineering and Applied Science
  Electrical Engineering
  Computer Science

UC (San Diego) - Division of Engineering
  Electrical and Computer Engineering
  Computer Science and Engineering

UC (Santa Barbara) - College of Engineering
  Electrical and Computer Engineering
  Computer Science

ADJACENT STATES

Arizona (Tucson) - College of Engineering and Mines
  Electrical and Computer Engineering
  (no Computer Science listed in Engineering)

Arizona State - College of Engineering and Applied Sciences
  Electrical and Computer Engineering
  Computer Science

Nevada (Reno) - College of Engineering
  Electrical Engineering/Computer Science
  (under one department head or chair)

Nevada (Las Vegas) - College of Engineering
  Computer Science and Electrical Engineering

Oregon State - College of Engineering
  Electrical and Computer Engineering
Background Statement: The International Baccalaureate Program (IBP) is a comprehensive, demanding two-year sequence for students aged 16-19, available to qualified candidates throughout the world. The basic plan recognizes the need for a broad general education and the need for choice among subjects without sacrificing a properly balanced education.

The IBP curriculum consists of six subject groups. Examinations are administered worldwide in April and May each year at participating schools. The examination for the Diploma requires candidates to offer six subjects. At least three and not more than four must be offered at the Higher Level (HL, 240 hours teaching time required) and the others at the Subsidiary Level (SL, 150 hours teaching time required). In addition to completing the six subjects, each Diploma candidate must write an extended essay, follow a course in the theory of knowledge (occupying 100 hours teaching time) and engage in some extra-curricular (creative, aesthetic, physical, or social service) activity approved by IBP. Additional requirements regulating the breadth and quality of the program are made.

The IB Diploma is awarded to candidates whose total score reaches or exceeds 24 points and does not contain any failing condition or to candidates with only one failing condition but with a total score at or above 28 points. Additional excluding conditions have been established to ensure the quality of the Diploma.

Candidates who do not fulfill the requirements for the Diploma receive a Certificate indicating the results obtained.

WHEREAS, Over 10,000 students have earned the IB Diploma since the first examinations were administered in 1970; and

WHEREAS, The subsequent performance of students who have earned the Diploma and continued their studies elsewhere has led to acceptance of the IB in over 70 countries, including the United States of America; and
WHEREAS, The CSU Academic Senate has recognized the value of the IBP in its Resolution AS-1643-86/AA (attached); and

WHEREAS, The CSU Academic Senate has urged campus senates/councils to consider the IBP as a factor for admission, course credit, and advanced placement; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, adopt the following policy with regard to candidates for admission:

1. The IB Diploma shall meet the criteria for admission.
2. Credit will be awarded only for classes at the Higher Level.
3. For each exam score of 5 or higher, a maximum of 8 units of credit may be awarded.
4. The IB Certificate shall be considered a factor in admission.
5. A candidate possessing the IB Certificate, if admitted, may receive credit for work at the Higher Level documented by the Certificate.

Proposed By: The
Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
Date: November 8, 1989
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-1643-86/AA
March 13-14, 1986

SUPPORT OF THE
INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM

WHEREAS, The International Baccalaureate Program (IBP) is designed to give an advanced, college-oriented experience to the highly motivated, academically talented student at the 11th and 12th grade level; and

WHEREAS, IBP diploma recipients have matriculated in many colleges and universities in the United States; and

WHEREAS, Ten campuses of The California State University recognize the IBP Diploma or Certificate as a factor for admission, course credit, or advanced placement; and

WHEREAS, The CSU continues to seek ways to internationalize its curriculum, to effect greater ties to secondary schools, and to encourage rigorous preparation; and

WHEREAS, Campuses adopting the IBP become partners in an international enterprise which emphasizes high standards; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University recognize the value of the International Baccalaureate Program; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates/councils to consider the International Baccalaureate Program as a factor for admission, course credit, and advanced placement.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY March 13-14, 1986
Background Statement: Cal Poly approved the CR-NC option in 1969. This option was initiated by the Student Pass-Fail Grading System Committee, a subcommittee of the Student Affairs Council, after a two-year study of this issue. At that time, many universities were adopting a new policy which allowed students to take courses on a "pass-fail" or "credit-no credit" basis. Cal Poly followed that pattern. Files available in the Academic Vice President's Office indicate that the student committee reviewed relevant materials from many other campuses. Eventually they seem to have patterned the Cal Poly system after that of Napa College. A 1968-1969 brochure from that institution states that the purpose of the Credit-No Credit system is "to encourage students to pursue subject areas for interest and breadth."

The Student Affairs Council approved the recommendation of the Student Pass-Fail Grading System Committee on February 11, 1969. That recommendation stated that the purpose of the new system was "to encourage students...to venture into courses which they might otherwise hesitate to take because they are uncertain about their aptitude or preparation."

The Academic Council approved the proposal on May 19, 1969 and stated that the purpose was "to encourage greater educational breadth."

The Faculty Senate approved the Credit-No Credit option on June 3, 1969, and stated that its purpose was "to encourage course taking for exploration and general education purposes."

Thus, the CR-NC option went into effect in the fall of 1969 for a trial period of three years, with its impact to be reviewed yearly. At that time, students were allowed to take a maximum of 15 courses, or a total of 45 quarter units, on a CR-NC basis outside their majors. Only one such course was allowed per quarter. The 45-unit total was apparently an arbitrary figure suggested by the Student Affairs Council. Available files do not indicate that there was much discussion on the issue of total units possible, but it does seem high in light of the fact that one of the institutions serving as a pattern (CSU, Long Beach) had a 12 semester unit maximum. The higher number of 45 quarter units may reflect the state of general education requirements on the Cal Poly campus at that time, a situation that has been greatly altered in more recent years.
The current policy on elective CR-NC courses has not changed much from the initial trial period except that students may now take two such courses per quarter rather than one. There is no information in the Academic Vice President's files on the rationale for that change.

AS-90/RESOLUTION ON ELECTIVE CREDIT/NO CREDIT GRADING

WHEREAS, Much of the original intent of the CR-NC option (viz., to encourage course taking for exploration and general education purposes) is now largely satisfied by the more extensive general education requirements now in effect; and

WHEREAS, Many students do not use the CR-NC option as a means for exploration; and

WHEREAS, The CR-NC option is a major factor in the inflation of students' overall GPA's; and

WHEREAS, Forty-five units is too great a number of units to be excluded in the determination of a student's cumulative GPA; and

WHEREAS, The present system may penalize students (by way of comparison) who have not learned to use it to enhance their academic credentials; and

WHEREAS, Many students now take lower-division introductory courses on a CR-NC basis, which was not the intent of the system; and

WHEREAS, Students taking a course for a letter grade (A, B, C, D, F) are more likely to strive for a greater degree of excellence and/or mastery of the subject material; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That students be allowed to take a maximum of 18 quarter units of courses on an elective credit/no credit basis, and only at the upper division level.

Proposed By: The Academic Senate Instruction Committee Date: December 1, 1989 (Editorial revisions 1/16/90)