I. Minutes:
   Approval of the April 11, 1989 Minutes of the Academic Senate (pp. 2-5)

II. Communication(s)/Announcement(s):
   A. Reading Materials (p. 6)
   B. President Baker has approved the following resolutions:
      AS-312-89/CC Resolution on Academic Minors
      AS-314-89/EX Resolution to Set Aside the School Requirement for
      Academic Senate Officers
   C. Memo from Geigle re Summer 1989 Great Teachers Seminar (p. 7).
   D. Nominations are being received by the Academic Senate for the
      offices of Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary for the 1989-1990
      term. Forms will be available at the meeting and in the
      Academic Senate office. Deadline: May 9, 1989

III. Reports:
   A. President
   B. Academic Affairs Office
   C. Statewide Senators
   D. Elections Committee Report on Results of Academic Senate Elections

IV. Consent Agenda:
   A. Resolution on Procedures for Nominating Students to the CSU Student
      Research Competition-Richards, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee (p.
      8).
   B. Resolution on Policy for the Provision of Services for Students with
      Disabilities-Richards, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, (pp. 9-22).
   C. Resolution on Accreditation Guidelines-Terry, Chair of the Instruction
      Committee (pp. 23-24).

V. Business Item(s):
   A. Resolution on Condom Availability Proposal-Richards, Chair of the Student
      Affairs Committee, Second Reading (pp. 25-27).
   B. Resolution on Foreign Language Exit Requirement-Terry, Chair of the
      Instruction Committee, First Reading (pp. 28-29).
   C. Resolution on Fall Conference Week-Terry, Chair of the Instruction
      Committee, First Reading (p. 30).
   D. Resolution on the Academic Calendar-Terry, Chair of the Instruction
      Committee, First Reading (pp. 31-34).
   E. Resolution on Bicycle and Skateboard Use, First Reading (pp. 35-39).
   F. Proposal for Joint MBA/MS Degree-Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum
      Committee, First Reading (pp. 40-46).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment: time certain 4:55pm
Materials Available for Reading in the Academic Senate Office (FOB 25H)
Spring Quarter 1988-1989

(New reading materials highlighted in bold)

1/10/89  Transfer: Key to the Master Plan (CSU Board of Trustees Committee on Educational Policy)

3/9/89   Status of Senate Resolutions (Academic Senate CSU)

March '89 The Tangled Thicket—Sham Academic Degrees in California and the Problem of State Regulation (Western College Association)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairs, Campus Academic Senates

FROM: Ray Geigle, Chair
Academic Senate CSU

DATE: March 29, 1989

SUBJECT: Summer 1989 Great Teachers Seminar

I am writing to give you advance notice of a special program that will take place this summer under joint auspices of the CSU and the California Community Colleges. You will soon receive a brochure describing an Intersegmental Faculty Seminar designed to further our ongoing efforts to improve general education teaching and to foster collaboration between CSU and CCC faculty responsible for teaching General Education courses. Campus Senate Chairs will play a key role in encouraging the campus to select a faculty participant who will contribute to that process and subsequently provide information to his or her colleagues about what was accomplished through this program.

The CSU Chancellor's Office is providing funding to defray the seminar costs for one of your faculty members to attend the Intersegmental Faculty Seminar July 9-14 at Bass Lake, near Yosemite. The CSU contribution will cover all the costs of the seminar, including food, lodging, and conference fees. A separate memo is being sent by the Chancellor's Office to the campuses asking campus support of travel costs. The Presidents have been asked to provide the names of campus nominees by May 12. The twenty CSU faculty and twenty of their Community College colleagues will, under the direction of trained discussion leaders, use the informal setting to exchange ideas about what works and what problems are experienced in teaching lower division General Education courses. There are no guest speakers; each participant shares his or her expertise and identifies areas where suggestions from others would be welcome.

This program is patterned after the National Great Teachers Seminar, which has been offered by the Community Colleges for the past eleven years. The seminar brochure indicates more about the format and the kind of preparation expected from each participant. In accord with recent Statewide Academic Senate action (AS-1854-89) I solicit your help in establishing a selection process on your campus which will bring information about this seminar program to the attention of appropriate faculty and will facilitate the prompt selection of one participant. We hope that the CSU faculty participants will come from a variety of disciplines related to General Education and will encompass the diversity of experience and viewpoint which characterizes our faculty. Please discuss this with your Academic Vice President or other appropriate administrator.

If I can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to call.

cc: Dr. Lee Kerschner
   Dr. Sally Casanova
WHEREAS, A timetable for review of student research topics, procedures, and guidelines was developed for the 1988/89 competition by the Office of the Chancellor; and

WHEREAS, The Student Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate has discussed this timetable and the December 22, 1988 memorandum from Robert Lucas, Cal Poly Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That information regarding the CSU Student Research Competition be more widely distributed during the early part of the Fall Quarter by way of information printed in the Cal Poly Report, Mustang Daily, and Pony; letters to student clubs via ASI; letters to departmental senior project coordinators, deans, and department heads; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Office of the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research and Faculty Development and the Academic Senate Research Committee be responsible for the timely distribution of information regarding the CSU Student Research Competition;

Proposed By:
Student Affairs Committee
March 15, 1989
RESOLUTION ON
POLICY FOR THE PROVISION OF SERVICES
FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

WHEREAS, A policy is required by state and federal resolution and legislation regarding the provision of services to students with disabilities in postsecondary education; and

WHEREAS, The Student Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate has discussed the policy for the provision of services for students with disabilities as outlined in the January 9, 1989 letter from Lee R. Kerschner, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support the implementation of the CSU Policy for the Provision of Services to Students with Disabilities when funding for full implementation of AB 746 is provided by the legislature.

Proposed By:
Student Affairs Committee
March 15, 1989
Date: January 9, 1989
To: Presidents
From: Lee R. Kerschner
Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs
Subject: Policy for the Provision of Services to Students with Disabilities

Attached is a copy of The California State University Policy for the Provision of Services to Students with Disabilities. The policy has undergone extensive review by the systemwide Advisory Committee on Services to Students with Disabilities, campus directors of the disabled student services program, and appropriate staff within the Chancellor's Office to ensure full compliance with AB 746 (Chapter 829, Statutes of 1987), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Report of The Trustees' Audit Staff entitled "#88-08 Handicapped Access Systemwide, July 26, 1988."

This policy, which supercedes SA 80-17(P)/BA 80-14, includes several important changes:

1. Students with learning disabilities shall be provided diagnostic assessment, including both individual and group assessment, necessary to determine the functional or educational levels or to certify specific disabilities.

2. Disability-related counseling and advising may be offered.

3. Students with disabilities may receive specialized tutoring services related to their disability that are not available to all students through learning assistance programs.

Distribution:
ATTN: VICE PRESIDENTS/DEANS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS
DIRECTORS, DISABLED STUDENT SERVICES
Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
Vice Presidents, Administration
Business Managers
Deans/Directors, Admissions and Records
Registrars
Chancellor's Office Staff
4. Request for State funding shall be based on relatively fixed costs for administrative and operational costs, variable costs for direct support services and one-time costs for equipment and specialized supplies.

5. Several reports and evaluations are now required by State law.

The CSU is committed to serve the needs of students with disabilities. Staff will continue to actively participate in statewide committees and communicate with other state agencies to ensure the needs of students with disabilities are being met.

In recognition of the serious need for adequate support for disabled students, especially those with learning disabilities, campuses have been using miscellaneous resources to provide a modicum level of the three newly identified essential services. For the time being, it is expected that campuses will continue to provide services within existing resources. However, since 1987 the CSU has received a minimal amount of funding from the State to provide diagnostic assessment and intensified levels of recognized services to students with learning disabilities. Additional funds are necessary to serve the growing number of students with learning disabilities. For that reason, the 1989 Trustees' budget includes a request for an additional $967,000 to more adequately fund services for students with learning disabilities and comply with AB 746.

This policy will be reviewed on a regular basis by the systemwide advisory committee. Questions relating to this policy should be addressed to Ms. Judy Klein Osman, Acting Systemwide Coordinator (213) 590-5992 or ATSS 635-5992.

LRK/DDH/JKO:bn

Attachment
POLICY FOR THE PROVISION OF
SERVICES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

January, 1989
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POLICY FOR THE PROVISION OF SERVICES TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

I. BACKGROUND

This policy is in response to State and Federal resolutions and legislation regarding the provision of services to students with disabilities in postsecondary education. These include Assembly Bill 746 (1987), ACR 3 (1985), ACR 201 (1976), and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

II. PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The California State University is committed to provide opportunities for higher education to students with disabilities, to increase the representation of persons with disabilities in its student enrollment, and to make its programs, activities and facilities fully accessible to persons with disabilities.

The specific objectives to achieve these goals fall into the areas of mainstreaming, awareness and access, support services, and resources.

A. Mainstreaming

1. To provide opportunities for students with disabilities to satisfy their academic, cultural, and social interests and to prepare them for further education or employment;

2. To ensure that campus and systemwide policies address the needs of students with disabilities; and

3. To assist students with disabilities to maximize their independence and become integrated into the campus community.

B. Awareness and Access

1. To ensure that all students have full access to campus facilities and programs;

2. To increase the awareness and responsiveness of the campus community to students with disabilities;

3. To encourage the review and adaptation of educational policies and curricula to ensure full access for students with disabilities; and
4. To increase off-campus outreach efforts (e.g. to community colleges) to encourage qualified persons with disabilities to pursue postsecondary education.

C. Support Services

1. To provide adequate support services for students with disabilities to participate in the full range of campus programs and activities; and

2. To involve students in assessing current needs and to recommend new and expand services as needed.

D. Resources

1. To initiate and direct efforts to increase the effective utilization of available campus resources to benefit students with disabilities; and

2. To provide liaison with external agencies serving the needs of students with disabilities.

III. PROGRAM COORDINATION

A. Systemwide Coordination

The Chancellor's Office shall be responsible for the systemwide planning, implementation, and coordination of all programs and services for students with disabilities within the California State University.

B. Campus Coordination

One person on each campus shall have the primary responsibility for planning, implementing and coordinating all campus programs and services for students with disabilities.

IV. DEFINITIONS

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 provides the following definition of handicapped:

...any person who (i) has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits one or more major life activities, (ii) has a record of such impairments, or (iii) is regarded as having such impairment.
A "qualified handicapped person" with respect to postsecondary education services is defined in the same regulations as:

...a handicapped person who meets the academic and technical standards requisite to admission or participation in the recipient's education program or activity.

Discrimination is prohibited by the following paragraph included in Section 504:

No qualified handicapped person shall, on the basis of handicap, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity...

The California State University has established the following categories for reporting purposes:

1. Visual Limitation: blindness or partial sight to the degree that it impedes the educational process and necessitates procurement of supportive services or programs.

2. Communication Disability: limitation in the processes of speech and/or hearing which impedes the educational process and necessitates the procurement of supportive services or programs. Students in this category shall not require interpreting services.

3. Deaf: limitation in the process of hearing which impedes the educational process and necessitates the procurement of supportive services or programs. Students in this category shall require oral or sign language interpreters.

4. Mobility Limitation: limitation in locomotion or motor functions which indicates a need for supportive services or programs. Included in this category would be persons who have asthma, cardiovascular problems, or who do not have motor functions necessary to lift or carry items normally used in an academic setting (i.e., books and supplies).

5. Learning Disability: a generic term that refers to the heterogeneous group of disorders manifested by significant difficulties in the acquisition and use of listening, speaking, reading, writing, reasoning or mathematical abilities. These disorders occur in persons of average to very superior intelligence and are presumed to be due to central nervous system dysfunction. Even though a learning disability may exist concomitantly with other handicapping conditions (e.g., sensory impairment) or environmental influences (e.g., cultural/language differences) it is not the direct result of those conditions or influences.
6. Other Functional Limitations: any other dysfunction of a body part or process which necessitates the use of supportive services or programs, and which does not fall within the categories listed above.

For reporting purposes, an individual should be counted in one category only -- that of the primary dysfunction. Temporary disabilities do not constitute a separate category, but shall be placed in one of the above categories, based on the nature of the disability.

V. VERIFICATION OF DISABILITY

State funds allocated to the campuses for support services and programs shall be based on the number of professionally verified disabled students who request approved services and are regularly enrolled. A professionally verified disability means a condition certified by a licensed physician, psychologist, audiologist, speech pathologist, registered nurse, social worker, rehabilitation counselor, physical therapist, corrective therapist, learning disability specialist, or other appropriate professional. Where the nature and extent of the disability is obvious (e.g. amputee, blind, quadriplegic) the Director of the Disabled Student Services or designee may verify the disability. In those cases where the Director is unable to verify the disability, the student shall either provide the verification documentation to the Director, or sign a release authorizing the campus to obtain necessary documentation from one of the above professional persons or agencies. A student with a learning disability must provide testing/evaluation results that are dated no more than three years prior to the date of request for learning disability services.

Any CSU student who has transferred and received services from a California community college or University of California campus as a disabled student will be eligible for disabled student services provided by the CSU.

Each campus shall maintain confidential records identifying its students with professionally verified disabilities. These records shall indicate the student’s name, address, social security number, nature of disability, supportive services needed, and:

1. verifying statement by the Disabled Student Services Director, or
2. documentation supplied by the student, or
3. documentation obtained through a release form signed by the student, or
4. documentation signed by a California community college or University of California Director of Disabled Student Services or his or her designee.

VI. FUNDING

State funds allocated to the campuses shall be based on formulas approved by the Department of Finance. State funding shall be used to meet goals and objectives and provide services as specified by AB 746 (Chapter 829, Statutes of 1987) including relatively fixed costs associated with the basic ongoing administrative and operational costs of campus programs, continuing variable costs for direct support services, and one-time variable costs such as equipment and specialized supplies.

State funds shall be utilized to support activity which is consistent with the stated goals and services indicated in this policy. Funds shall not be used to duplicate services available to all CSU students.

A. FIXED COSTS FOR ADMINISTRATION/OPERATION

It shall be the responsibility of each campus to provide for the following administrative and operational functions:

1. Access to, and arrangements for, adaptive educational equipment, materials, and supplies required by disabled students.

2. Liaisons with campus and community agencies, including referral and follow up services to these agencies on behalf of disabled students.

3. On-campus and off-campus registration assistance, including priority enrollment, assistance with applications for financial aid, and related college services.

4. Special parking, including on-campus parking registration, temporary parking permit arrangements, and application assistance for students who do not have state handicapped placards or license plates.

5. Supplemental specialized orientation to acquaint students with the campus environment.

6. Activities to coordinate and administer specialized services including consultation with faculty for students with special academic needs associated with their disabilities.

7. Activities to assess the planning, implementation, and effectiveness of these services and programs.

8. Liaison with campus outreach personnel to increase the representation of students with disabilities.
9. Activities to increase general campus awareness of students with disabilities.

B. VARIABLE COSTS FOR DIRECT SUPPORT SERVICES

The following support services for students with disabilities shall be provided by each campus. Availability of these services may vary depending upon the needs of students and available funding. The use of such services by any student with a disability shall be voluntary.

1. Diagnostic assessment, including both individual and group assessment not otherwise provided by the institution to determine functional, educational, or employment levels or to verify specific disabilities.

2. On-campus mobility assistance to and from college courses and related educational activities;

3. Disability-related counseling and advising, including specialized academic, vocational, personal and peer counseling, that is developed specifically for students with disabilities and not duplicated by regular counseling and advising services available to all students.

4. Interpreter services including manual and oral interpreting for hearing impaired students.

5. Reader services to coordinate and provide access to information required for equitable academic participation if this access is not available in other suitable modes.

6. Test taking facilitation, including adapting tests for and proctoring test taking by, students with disabilities.

7. Transcription services such as providing Braille and large print materials not available through other sources.

8. Specialized tutoring services not otherwise provided by the institution.

9. Notetaker services for writing, notetaking, and manual manipulation for classroom and related academic activities.

C. ONE-TIME COSTS

One-time variable costs shall include expenditures for the purchase of supplies or the repair of equipment, such as adapted educational materials, equipment or vehicles.
Attendants, individually prescribed devices, readers for personal use, or other devices or services shall not be provided. Additional services may be offered based on the nature and resources of each campus and the need of its population of students with disabilities.

VII. RECRUITMENT, SELECTION AND SCHEDULING OF SUCH SUPPORT SERVICES STAFF AS INTERPRETERS, READERS AND SIMILAR PERSONNEL

The Director of Services to Students with Disabilities or his or her designee shall be responsible for the recruitment and selection of persons to serve as interpreters, readers, notetakers and similar support service personnel. Students with disabilities needing assistance of such persons shall have an opportunity to be involved in the selection process to determine their appropriateness and ensure that the level of skills of the person under consideration is adequate.

VIII. PROVISION OF SERVICES

Student requests for services should be made to the Office of Disabled Student Services as early as possible in order to facilitate scheduling or acquisition of personnel, equipment and/or materials. Disabled Student Services Directors shall establish campus guidelines to implement the provision of services. Students with disabilities denied a requested service may appeal the decision to the campus Vice President or Dean of Student Affairs, utilize the campus student grievance procedure, or utilize the Federal 504 grievance procedure.

IX. ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. Systemwide

A systemwide Advisory Committee on Services to Students with Disabilities shall be established by the Chancellor's Office.

Purpose: The Systemwide Advisory Committee on Services to Students with Disabilities shall review, evaluate, and recommend systemwide educational and administrative policies that affect students with disabilities and advise the Chancellor on needs and concerns of students with disabilities.

The Systemwide Advisory Committee shall meet a minimum of once per year and shall maintain and disseminate minutes of these meetings.
Membership and Terms of Office

a. Chair, to be appointed by the Chancellor (1) two year term;
b. Vice President/Dean of Student Affairs (1) two year term;
c. Directors, Disabled Student Services (3) two year overlapping terms;
d. Students with Disabilities (3) one year term;
e. Academic Senate Representatives (3) two year terms;
f. Chancellor's Office Coordinator, Services to Students with Disabilities (1) indefinite term;
g. Representative, Division of Budget Planning and Administration, Chancellor's Office (1) indefinite term;
h. Representative, Division of Physical Planning and Development, Chancellor's Office (1) indefinite term;
i. Dean, Academic Affairs/Educational Support, or Designee, Chancellor's Office (1) indefinite term.

Membership should include representation from a variety of campuses and disability groups.

B. Campus

Each campus shall establish an Advisory Committee on Services to Students with Disabilities.

Purpose: The Campus Advisory Committee shall assist in the evaluation of current campus policies and procedures relating to students with disabilities, develop plans relating to programs and services for students with disabilities, recommend priorities, and develop timelines.

Membership: Members of the Campus Advisory Committees shall include students, staff, faculty, and administrators. Members of the committee shall be appointed by the campus president or designee. Additional members may be appointed from the off-campus community. Membership shall include representation from a variety of disability groups and academic disciplines.

X. REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS

A. Enrollment Data and Use of Services

Each campus shall submit data annually on verified disabled enrollment, which shall include the student's name, social security number, disability category, and services provided. This data will be submitted by the campus Disabled Student Services Director to the Chancellor's Office and be used for developing budget requests and preparing systemwide reports.
B. Systemwide Program Evaluation

Pursuant to AB 746, the Chancellor's Office shall:

1. Develop and implement, in consultation with students and staff, a system for evaluating state-funded programs and services for students with disabilities on each campus at least every five years beginning in 1990. At a minimum, the evaluation shall provide for the gathering of outcome data, staff and student perceptions of program effectiveness, and data on the implementation of the program and physical accessibility requirements of Section 794 of Title 29 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

2. Commencing in January 1990, and every two years thereafter, submit a report to the Governor, the education policy committees of the Legislature, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission on the evaluations developed pursuant to Section X.B.1. This biennial report shall also include a review on a campus-by-campus basis of the enrollment, retention, transition, and graduation rates of disabled students.

C. Architectural Barrier Removal Review

Reviews of campus architectural barriers shall be conducted every five years beginning in 1990 by Physical Planning and Development to improve access for students with disabilities.

D. Campus Program Review

Annual written evaluation of services to students with disabilities shall be conducted by each campus. Such evaluations shall include student input and summaries will be forwarded for inclusion in the systemwide review.

E. Policy Review

The Policy for the Provision of Services to Students with Disabilities shall be reviewed by the Systemwide Advisory Committee every five years beginning in 1990. A report including recommendations shall be prepared for the Chancellor of the California State University.

(1462h)
Background: Since 1968 the CSU has had in place a policy advocating and providing budgeting for the accreditation of all academic programs for which officially recognized professional accreditation was available. In the early 1980's the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) developed a set of nine principles to guide the accreditation process. These principles are:

1. Evaluation must place its emphasis on the outcome of the educational process.

2. The standards applied in the accreditation process must not discourage experimentation, innovation or modernization, either in teaching methods or in the curriculum itself.

3. Recommendations should be diagnostic, not prescriptive.

4. The accreditation report must explicitly recognize institutional diversity.

5. Accreditation should not encourage the isolation or self-containment of an academic program.

6. The burden of accreditation must be kept as light as possible, both for the institution being accredited and for the accreditation team.

7. The institution being accredited should be consulted as to the composition of the accreditation team, and has a right to expect that a majority of team members will be drawn from peer institutions and comparable programs.

8. In the case of professional schools, although there must be a significant input from the profession itself, the ultimate authority over educational policies must remain firmly in the hands of the academic institutions.

9. The greatest help an accrediting agency can offer to a program is to demand that its educational goals be clearly stated and that the program be reasonably calculated to achieve those goals.
RESOLUTION ON ACCREDITATION GUIDELINES

Whereas, Concern with certain of the processes and policies of particular accrediting agencies has been expressed periodically in meetings of the Academic Vice Presidents, the Executive Council of the CSU Board of Trustees and elsewhere; and

Whereas, The CSU needs to be well-served in its relationships with various accreditation agencies; and

Whereas, There is the possibility that different accreditation agencies may operate independently at different institutions, resulting in potential abuses; and

Whereas, The CIC Statement of principles has been adopted by the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (March 1987), by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (1986) and by the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of the California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo, California endorse the nine principles enumerated in the CIC Statement of March 14, 1984 and summarized in the background statement above; and be it

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of the California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo, California urges the CSU Academic Senate to recommend to the CSU Board of Trustees and directly urges the CSU Board of Trustees to adopt the CIC principles as system policy for the conduct of accreditation reviews.

Instruction Committee
Approved: April 13, 1989
Vote: 8 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain
WHEREAS, The Cal Poly AIDS Prevention Task Force has presented a proposal for the installation of condom dispensing machines on campus (January 13, 1989); and

WHEREAS, The Student Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate has discussed this proposal; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the California Polytechnic State University Academic Senate support the attached Cal Poly AIDS Prevention Task Force Proposal.

Proposed By:
Student Affairs Committee
March 15, 1989
Memorandum

To: Warren J. Baker, President
via
Hazel J. Scott, Dean
Student Affairs

Date: January 13, 1989

File No.: 
Copies:

From: Cal Poly AIDS Prevention Task Force

Subject: CONDOM AVAILABILITY PROPOSAL

The Cal Poly AIDS Prevention Task Force has been meeting regularly and has developed a proposal for the installation of condom dispensing machines on campus. This two-phase proposal came from the Condom Committee of the Task Force.

Rationale: The world-wide epidemic of AIDS and HIV infection has continued relentlessly. Once infected with the HIV virus, the individual is infectious and with time will develop AIDS. Presently AIDS appears to be 100% fatal. It is well documented that adolescents and young adults are quite sexually active; that at these times their judgment is often impaired by the circumstances or by drugs, especially alcohol. There is no reason to believe that Cal Poly students are different in this regard. Although educational efforts have been extensive and the students appear to have good knowledge of AIDS, significant behavioral changes have not occurred. Although AIDS is fatal, the HIV infection is preventable. Preventive measures include:

- no sharing of intravenous drugs or equipment (total non-use is better
- avoidance of pregnancy in those known to be HIV infected
- chastity, or,
- faithful monogamous relations
- safe sex practices

In those sexually active who are not in a monogamous situation, preventive measures include the use of condoms. Condoms offer about a 90% protection against HIV infection, other sexually transmitted diseases, and pregnancy. The addition of the germicide/spermicide non-oxynol-nine gives some added protection to condoms. To be useful, condoms need to be available readily at low cost and obtainable with a minimum of embarrassment. Although moral and sexual responsibilities are part of our educational efforts, it must be remembered that exposure to a fatal disease is a heavy penalty for being unwise. Condom availability and usage are valuable preventives for AIDS.
CONDOM AVAILABILITY PROPOSAL
January 13, 1989
Page 2

PHASE ONE:

It is recommended that condom vending machines be placed in men and women's restrooms in or near the following locations:

- Mott Gymnasium
- University Union
- Kennedy Library
- Computer Science Buildings
- Snack Bar
- Vista Grande Restaurant
- Cellar

These sites were selected for their accessible location, heavy student traffic, and extended hours of operation.

Additionally, condoms will continue to be available at the Health Center Pharmacy during its normal hours of operation.

PHASE TWO:

Following the experience of condom vending machines in Phase One locations, it is further recommended that condom machines be installed in male and female restrooms in each residence hall complex.

Further information about HIV infection, AIDS, condoms in prevention of HIV disease, universities with vending machines is available. Our group is prepared to clarify questions about this proposal. Contact person - James H. Nash, M.D., Student Health Services, Ext. 1211.
Adopted: ______________

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

Background statement: In 1983-1984 the CSU Task Force Report on Foreign Language Requirement recommended that the system establish a graduation requirement equivalent to two semesters of lower division foreign language instruction, to be applied to students in all disciplines.

The ASI Student Senate of California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo, opposed the requirement in Resolution #84-08 (November 30, 1983); the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Academic Senate likewise opposed the requirement in its Resolution AS-155-84/IC (January 31, 1984). The requirement was not implemented.

On April 15, 1988, the CSU Foreign Language Council approved a proposed new Foreign Language Baccalaureate Requirement involving an exit examination, not specifically course work. The FLC agreed to await the release of a “needs assessment” to be completed by the Office of the Chancellor before submitting the new proposal to the CSU Academic Senate. On November 17, 1988, the FLC-CSU unanimously passed the motion: “The FLC-CSU shall undertake immediately a campaign to cause the CSU to adopt and implement the proposed CSU Foreign Language Baccalaureate Requirement adopted unanimously by the FLC at its meeting in Sacramento on April 15, 1988.”

The FLC-CSU believes that the need for a foreign language exit requirement has become more acute in the interim; that the CSU is at a disadvantage in Intersegmental Committee deliberations on foreign languages in view of the absence of a foreign language requirement; and further, that the absence of a foreign language exit requirement is a serious anomaly in view of the recently-implemented CSU foreign language admission requirement.

A Committee on Testing was established to accelerate the dissemination of information about competency-based examinations, as well as the training of CSU foreign language faculty in such procedures. A proposed implementation schedule for the proposed requirement would hold entering freshmen to the requirement in 1992; freshmen and sophomores in 1993; freshmen, sophomores and juniors in 1994, and all CSU students in 1995. Such phasing-in would additionally permit foreign language departments to prepare for the implementation of the requirement and to develop methods in consultation with community colleges for assisting upper-division transfer students.

AS—-89/____

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE EXIT REQUIREMENT

WHEREAS, The needs assessment to be performed by the Office of the Chancellor has not yet been completed; and

WHEREAS, Proficiency examinations necessarily lead to additional course work in the prescribed subject for most students; and

WHEREAS, Curricula on this campus are typically heavily encumbered; and

...
WHEREAS, Proficiency examinations in foreign languages necessarily focus on mechanical aspects of the language rather than the larger values such as cultural knowledge and sensitivity; and

WHEREAS, Proficiency examinations in foreign languages are typically of a low and perhaps insignificant level or require considerable course work to pass (which would pose enormous quantitative and qualitative problems for our curriculum); and

WHEREAS, Justifiable emphases on foreign language can be accommodated via general education requirements; and

WHEREAS, Many programs on this campus are impacted and thousands of otherwise qualified students are denied admission to this University, and such a proficiency examination would impede the flow of students through our programs; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University strongly disfavor the addition of a proficiency requirement in foreign language for graduation and that the statewide Academic Senators of California Polytechnic State University be strongly urged to oppose such a requirement at the system level.

Proposed By:
Instruction Committee
March 17, 1989
Vote: 7-1-1
Background: The Fall Conference Week is a tradition at Cal Poly that has existed for more than three decades. Begun as a welcome-back period for faculty, the format was expanded under President Robert E. Kennedy to a week. For most faculty, the Fall Conference Week is a tradition of apparently unknown origins whose format has not been questioned.

RESOLUTION ON FALL CONFERENCE WEEK

Whereas, Substantive activities during the Fall Conference Week are of unequal significance to newer, and to more experienced faculty; and

Whereas, Cal Poly already has a longer academic calendar than most (perhaps all) other CSU campuses; and

Whereas, The interval between the summer and fall quarters can be less than a full week and / or be so short as to necessitate extending the summer quarter final examination period through Saturday; and

Whereas, Many experienced faculty regard the Fall Conference Week of varied significance on a day-to-day basis, and react and participate accordingly; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fall Conference should be rescheduled so as to allow Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday to be used for the orientation and edification of new faculty and departmentally organized events such as retreats, and to concentrate those matters of universal applicability and significance on Thursday and Friday of that week.

Approved: April 13, 1989
Vote: 7 Yes, 0 No, 1 Abstain
To: Charles Andrews, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Raymond D. Terry, Chair
    Instruction Committee

Re: Proposed Academic Calendars for 1990-1992

The Academic Senate Instruction Committee met on Thursday, 4/13/89, at
11:00 a.m. to discuss the information package which you provided with your
charge to the committee on 4/10/89.

Eight members of the Instruction Committee were present including 5 school
members and three ex officio members.

By consensus of those present, the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
approves the proposed academic calendars for 1990-1991 and 1991-1992. We
further endorse the guidelines provided by the "Academic Calendar
Norms and Definitions," subject to the following reservations:

1. The Final Exam period should be shortened, for example, to three or four
days.

2. There remains too little time between Spring and Summer Quarters.

3. There is often too little time between Summer and Fall Quarters for those
teaching during the Summer Quarter.

4. The Fall Conference Week should be eliminated or greatly reduced in
length. A Resolution will follow.
Background: At present the University is operating on an approved Academic Calendar extending through the end of 1990. Forthcoming catalog deadlines make it timely to begin campus-wide consultation on the calendar for the next catalog issue, 1990-1992. In accordance with CAM 481 the Vice President for Academic affairs has proposed a calendar to the President for approval following appropriate consultation including the Academic Deans' Council, Academic Senate, Student Senate, Student Affairs Council, Foundation, and Dean of Students.

RESOLUTION ON THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR


Approved: April 13, 1989
Vote: 8 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain

Instruction Committee
### ACADEMIC CALENDAR 1990 - 91

#### SUMMER QUARTER 1990

- **JUNE 21** THURSDAY
  - BEGINNING OF UNIVERSITY YEAR
  - BEGINNING OF SUMMER QUARTER
  - SUMMER QUARTER CLASSES BEGIN

- **JULY 4** WEDNESDAY
  - ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- INDEPENDENCE DAY

- **JULY 5** THURSDAY
  - LAST DAY TO DROP CLASSES

- **JULY 6** FRIDAY
  - LAST DAY TO ADD CLASSES AND LATE REGISTER

- **AUGUST 9** THURSDAY
  - END OF SEVENTH WEEK

- **AUGUST 28** TUESDAY
  - LAST DAY OF CLASSES

- **SEPTEMBER 1** WEDNESDAY-SATURDAY
  - FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD

- **SEPTEMBER 2** SUNDAY-SUNDAY
  - ACADEMIC HOLIDAY

#### FALL QUARTER 1990

- **SEPTEMBER 10** MONDAY
  - BEGINNING FALL QUARTER (FACULTY ONLY)

- **SEPTEMBER 17** MONDAY
  - FALL QUARTER CLASSES BEGIN

- **SEPTEMBER 25** FRIDAY
  - LAST DAY TO DROP CLASSES

- **OCTOBER 1** MONDAY
  - LAST DAY TO ADD CLASSES AND LATE REGISTER

- **OCTOBER 2** FRIDAY
  - END OF SEVENTH WEEK

- **NOVEMBER 2** MONDAY
  - ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- VETERANS' DAY OBSERVANCE

- **NOVEMBER 30** FRIDAY
  - ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- THANKSGIVING

- **DECEMBER 3-7** MONDAY-FRIDAY
  - FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD

- **DECEMBER 8** SATURDAY
  - FALL COMMENCEMENT

- **DECEMBER 9** SUNDAY-SUNDAY
  - END OF FALL QUARTER

- **JANUARY 6** MONDAY
  - ACADEMIC HOLIDAY

#### WINTER QUARTER 1991

- **JANUARY 7** MONDAY
  - BEGINNING OF WINTER QUARTER

- **JANUARY 15** MONDAY
  - WINTER QUARTER CLASSES BEGIN

- **JANUARY 21** FRIDAY
  - LAST DAY TO DROP CLASSES

- **JANUARY 22** MONDAY
  - LAST DAY TO ADD CLASSES AND LATE REGISTER

- **FEBRUARY 18** TUESDAY
  - ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. BIRTHDAY OBSERVANCE

- **FEBRUARY 25** TUESDAY
  - LAST DAY TO ADD CLASSES AND LATE REGISTER

- **APRIL 1** FRIDAY
  - ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- GEORGE WASHINGTON BIRTHDAY OBSERVANCE

- **APRIL 15** FRIDAY
  - LAST DAY OF CLASSES

- **MARCH 15** MONDAY-FRIDAY
  - FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD

- **MARCH 23-25** SATURDAY-SUNDAY
  - ACADEMIC HOLIDAY

#### SPRING QUARTER 1991

- **APRIL 17** MONDAY
  - BEGINNING OF SPRING QUARTER

- **APRIL 28** FRIDAY
  - SPRING QUARTER CLASSES BEGIN

- **MAY 17** MONDAY
  - LAST DAY TO DROP CLASSES

- **MAY 27** MONDAY
  - LAST DAY TO ADD CLASSES AND LATE REGISTER

- **JUNE 7** FRIDAY
  - END OF SEVENTH WEEK

- **JUNE 15** MONDAY-FRIDAY
  - ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- MEMORIAL DAY

- **JUNE 20** SATURDAY
  - FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD

- **JUNE 25** SATURDAY
  - SPRING COMMENCEMENT

- **JUNE 28** SUNDAY
  - END OF SPRING QUARTER

- **JUNE 29** SUNDAY
  - END OF UNIVERSITY YEAR (FACULTY ONLY)

- **JUNE 30** SUNDAY
  - ACADEMIC HOLIDAY

### SUMMARY OF CALENDAR DATES 1990-91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Year/Quarter</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWF Days</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTH Days</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Class Days</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter/Year End</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Work Days</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Year Work Days (F-W-3P) = 170
### Summer Quarter 1991

- **June 20** Thursday
  - Beginning of University Year
  - Beginning of Summer Quarter
- **July 4** Thursday
  - End of Second Week of Instruction — Last Day to Drop a Class
  - Academic Holiday — Independence Day
- **July 5** Friday
  - End of Second Week of Instruction — Last Day to Add a Class
- **July 8** Monday
  - Last Day to Register Late and Pay Late Registration Fee
- **July 11** Thursday
  - End of Third Week of Instruction — Census Date
- **August 8** Thursday
  - End of Seventh Week
- **August 27** Tuesday
  - Last Day of Classes
- **August 28-31** Wednesday to Saturday
  - Final Examination Period
- **September 1 - September 13** Sunday-Sunday
  - Academic Holiday

### Fall Quarter 1991

- **September 15** Monday
  - Beginning of Fall Quarter (Faculty Only)
- **September 23** Monday
  - Fall Quarter Classes Begin
- **October 6** Friday
  - End of Second Week of Instruction — Last Day to Drop a Class
- **October 7** Monday
  - Last Day to Add a Class
  - Last Day to Register Late and Pay Late Registration Fee
- **October 11** Friday
  - End of Third Week of Instruction — Census Date
- **November 8** Friday
  - End of Seventh Week of Instruction
- **November 11** Monday
  - Academic Holiday — Veterans' Day
- **November 27**, Wednesday
  - Academic Holiday — Thanksgiving
- **December 6** Friday
  - Last Day of Classes
- **December 9** Monday-Friday
  - Final Examination Period
- **December 14** Saturday
  - Mid-Year Commencement
- **December 15** Sunday-Sunday
  - End of Fall Quarter

### Winter Quarter 1992

- **January 5** Sunday-Sunday
  - Academic Holiday

### Spring Quarter 1992

- **March 30** Monday
  - Beginning of Spring Quarter
  - Spring Quarter Classes Begin
- **April 10** Friday
  - End of Second Week of Instruction — Last Day to Drop a Class
- **April 13** Monday
  - Last Day to Add a Class
  - Last Day to Register Late and Pay Late Registration Fee
- **April 17** Friday
  - End of Third Week of Instruction — Census Date
- **May 15** Friday
  - End of Seventh Week of Instruction
- **May 25** Monday
  - Academic Holiday — Memorial Day
- **June 3** Monday
  - Last Day of Classes
- **June 8-12** Monday-Friday
  - Final Examination Period
- **June 13** Saturday
  - Commencement
  - End of Spring Quarter
  - End of University Year (Faculty Only)

### Summary of Calendar Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Year Work Days (T-F-SF) = 170
RESOLUTION ON
BICYCLE AND SKATEBOARD USE ON CAMPUS

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the attached report of the Public Safety Advisory Committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the use of bicycles should be prohibited within the inner core of the California Polytechnic State University campus which is defined as the area of the campus bound by North Perimeter and South Perimeter Streets/Roads (commonly identified as outer perimeter roads); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the use of skateboards on the California Polytechnic State University campus be prohibited.

Proposed By:
Executive Committee
April 18, 1989
BICYCLE AND SKATEBOARD USE ON CAMPUS

INTRODUCTION

The problems of bicycles and skateboards were highlighted when each campus president received BA-88-06 from Vice Chancellor Dale Hanner. The content of the document centered around the concern for potential legal liability when campuses do not enforce adequate regulations to control bicycle and skateboard use. It was requested that each campus review individual bicycle and skateboard regulations and procedures to control the potential for accidents. An accident at Cal State Chico involving a bicycle and pedestrian (faculty member) resulted in permanent injury to the pedestrian and subsequent legal action. Accidents involving skateboards have also been publicized system-wide.

PROBLEM AT CAL POLY - BACKGROUND

SKATEBOARDS

The present "Skateboard Policy" at Cal Poly is as follows:

"The use of skateboards, roller skates, coasters or similar devices on the California Polytechnic State University campus is prohibited:

A. In any building
B. On any roadway
C. In any bicycle lane
D. Anywhere in the academic core, which is defined as the area bound by North Perimeter Road around South Perimeter Road to College Avenue, the west boundary of which is described as College Avenue, north to and including the walkways which line College Avenue with North Perimeter Road. This area shall include both sidewalks and bicycle lanes of the boundary streets. The prohibition of Section D applies only from 2400 hours on Sunday through 2400 hours on Friday and during special campus events occurring on weekends such as Poly Royal and homecoming."

Exemption

Special events involving skateboards, roller skates, coasters or similar devices which have been authorized by the Student Life and Activities and cleared through the university police office are exempted from the above prohibition.

THE PROBLEM

Cal Poly has become a very popular area for skateboarders, in particular, to off-campus youngsters. Strict regulations in the City of San Luis Obispo have highlighted the campus as a skateboard area and even more in recent years. The regulations are very difficult for many to understand as only a portion of the campus is restricted. Many persons who are stopped for violation of the regulations state that they were unaware that they were operating their skateboard in a restricted area.
Calls to Public Safety are continuous, especially during the summer and immediately following the end of the public school days. Most calls are in the area of the Student Union/Administration buildings. Near misses of pedestrians are the majority of calls.

Attempts to Solve the Problem

Public Safety police officers respond to all calls. First offenders are generally provided with educational information, i.e., regulations, dangers, consequences of future contact, etc. Second offenders are most times cited and in some cases, the skateboard is confiscated. Release of the skateboard is to the parent. Special enforcement techniques have been utilized to solve the problem.

Violators are most difficult to apprehend as they are very mobile, both on a skateboard and on foot. At the present time, it is the procedure of Public Safety to attempt to stop all persons operating a skateboard in the restricted areas. This is time consuming and from experience, not effective.

Public Safety Advisory Committee - Health and Safety Subcommittee - Parking-Traffic Subcommittee

The problem of skateboards on campus has been discussed numerous times at Health and Safety Subcommittee meetings. Near misses have been reported to members. The consensus over the past few years has been to prohibit the use of skateboards on campus. The issue has also been discussed at Parking-Traffic Subcommittee meetings the past several years. At the most recent meeting of the Subcommittee (March, 1988), a motion was made and seconded that skateboards should be eliminated from the campus; the motion passed.

RECOMMENDATION

That the use of skateboards on the campus of California Polytechnic State University be prohibited. This would eliminate the present regulations.

Impact of Approval of Recommendation

1. A consistent regulation. Public Safety will not have to explain regulations, i.e., areas where skateboards are permissible, etc.
2. Easier regulation to enforce.
3. Positive action in preventing injury to pedestrians and skateboarders.
4. Reduce the possibility of legal action against the University.

BICYCLES

At the present time, bicycles are allowed throughout the campus. Exceptions are on sidewalks and the provision that bicycle lanes will be used. In that bicycles are defined as a vehicle, sections of the vehicle code can be enforced, i.e., stopping at stop signs, etc.
THE PROBLEM

The problem is that the operators of bicycles fail to abide by the laws. On campus the main violations are failure to stop for stop signs, speed and failure to utilize bike lanes, i.e., riding on sidewalks and in roadways. The most serious problem occurs on the Inner Perimeter Road, easterly-westerly, where bicycles travel downhill attaining unreasonable rates of speed. This area is impacted with pedestrian traffic which results in a serious safety problem.

Attempts to Solve the Problem - Outer Perimeter Road

For several years the Public Safety Department has operated a student bicycle patrol whose main goal is to present safety awareness programs to the bicyclist. Safety issues are discussed with emphasis on obeying traffic regulations.

At least twice each year (past two years) special enforcement programs have been administered by the Police Section. After advertising regarding times and places of enforcement, citations are issued to violators. Approximately 75 citations were issued each day of the program.

Inner Perimeter Road

The bike patrol has concentrated on this location since its inception. Members have gone to the point of walking on the roadway, keeping pedestrians out of the bike lanes and bicyclists off the walkways. Enforcement is most difficult as police vehicles cannot be used. Lack of police manpower has limited foot patrol in the area. Inner Perimeter Road presents the biggest safety problem as it relates to possible injury to both pedestrians and bicyclists.

Public Safety Advisory Committee - Health and Safety Subcommittee - Parking-Traffic Subcommittee

The potential safety problems of bicyclists operating on the Inner Perimeter Road has been an issue discussed by the Health and Safety Subcommittee for years. In 1988, the Committee membership voted to send a letter to the Chairperson of the Parking-Traffic Subcommittee voicing this concern and requesting that the issue be studied and recommendations be made to solve the problem.

The issue has been a constant discussion item at the Parking-Traffic Subcommittee meetings. At the March, 1988, meeting a motion was made and seconded to recommend that bicycle riding be restricted within the campus core. The specific motion was that, "the riding of bicycles within the Inner Core of the campus as defined by the Outer Perimeter Road be restricted to Via Carta in a north/south direction;" the motion passed.

RECOMMENDATION

That the riding of bicycles within the Inner Core of the campus is defined by the Outer Perimeter Road be restricted to Via Carta in a north/south direction. It is further recommended that the appropriate consultation with student and faculty organizations take place during the Spring Quarter 1989 with anticipated implementation of the final resolution to begin during the Summer Quarter 1989 with the emphasis in the Fall Quarter of the 1989/90 academic year.
Impact of Approval of Recommendation

1. Reduction, with the goal of elimination, of safety hazards which could result in serious injury to pedestrians and bicyclists.

2. Possible negative impact by a segment of the campus population.

3. Adherence to B.A. 88-06.

4. Easier for Public Safety to enforce regulations.

CONCLUSION

This report has outlined the problems of the use of skateboards on campus and the operation of bicycles on the Inner Perimeter of campus. It has also listed recommendations agreed upon by members of the Public Safety Advisory Committee. It is felt that all alternatives to solve a problem have been attempted and strong actions are now needed.

Attachments
Memorandum

To: Charles T. Andrews, Chair
    Academic Senate

Date: February 22, 1989

File No: 

Copies: William Rife
        Peter Lee

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

Subject: Proposal for Joint MBA/MS Degree

I would like to forward to the floor of the Academic Senate the attached proposal for a joint MBA/MS degree program from the schools of Business and Engineering. As the proposal was approved in concept by the 1987-88 Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, there is no need for the current committee to reconsider the material which has been modified in its displays and editorially but not in substance.
School of Business and School of Engineering
MBA/MS Engineering with Specialization in Engineering Management
1989-90

Date: March 9, 1989

I. DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSALS

A. Degree Program

1. Joint MBA/MS Engineering with Specialization in Engineering Management
   (see attached)

B. Minors

1. None

C. Concentrations or Specializations

1. None

II. NEW COURSES

Graduate School of Business

A* 1. GSB 579 Manufacturing Strategy (4) 4 sem C5
A* 2. GSB 582 High-Technology Marketing (4) 4 sem C5
A* 3. GSB 590 Seminar in Sociotechnical Systems (4) 4 sem C5

Industrial Engineering

A* 1. IE 556 Technological Project Management (4) 4 sem C5
A* 2. IE 557 Technological Assessment and Planning (4) 4 sem C5
A* 3. IE 558 Engineering Decision Making (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C4/16
A* 4. IE 559 Engineering Research and Development (4) 4 sem C5

III. DELETED COURSES

1. None

IV. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

Number, Title, Unit Value, C/S Number, Description and Prerequisite Changes

1. None

V. GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH COURSES

1. None

VI. CURRICULUM CHANGES

1. None

CC = Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
AS = Academic Senate
VP = Vice President for Academic Affairs
A* = approved June 1988
## First Year
### Fall
1. GSB 511 Financial Accounting (4)
2. GSB 513 Organizations and Management (4)
3. GSB 514 Legal Aspects of Management and the Market System (4)
4. Technical Elective in Specialization (3) (new)

### Winter
1. GSB 521 Accounting for Management Planning and Control (4)
2. GSB 523 Managerial Economics (4)
3. GSB 524 Marketing Management (4)
4. IE 557 Technological Assessment and Planning (4)

### Spring
1. GSB 531 Managerial Finance (4)
2. GSB 532 Quantitative Business Analysis II (4)
3. GSB 533 Aggregate Economic Analysis and Policy (4)
4. GSB 534 Operations Management (4)

### Summer
1. GSB 598 Graduate Internship in Business (4)

## Second Year
### Fall
1. GSB 541 Organizational Behavior (4)
2. GSB 542 Marketing Research and Planning (4)
3. GSB 543 Information Systems for Decision Support (4)
4. IE 545 Advanced Topics in Simulation (3)

### Winter
1. GSB 551 Management in an International Environment (4)
2. GSB 552 Financial Analysis and Planning
3. IE 555 Computer Integrated Manufacturing (4)
4. IE 558 Engineering Decision Making (4)

### Spring
1. GSB 561 Business, Government and Society (4)
2. GSB 562 Business Strategy and Policy (4)
3. IE 556 Technological Project Management (4)
4. Technical Elective in Specialization (3)

### Summer
1. Business Elective (4)
2. Business Elective (4)

---

See footnotes on next page.
Curriculum for MBA/MS in Engineering with Specialization in Engineering Management (continued)

Footnotes

1. Interdisciplinary program requiring admittance to both the School of Engineering and the School of Business, and concurrent enrollment towards M.B.A. and M.S. in Engineering Degrees each with Specialization in Engineering Management.

2. Technical Elective to be selected from electives approved for Engineering Management Specialization which include:
   IE 470  Selected Advanced Topics (1-3)
   IE 500  Individual Study (1-3)
   IE 541  Advanced Operations Research (3)
   IE 543  Advanced Human Factors (4)
   IE 544  Advanced Topics in Engineering Economy (3)
   IE 559  Engineering Research and Development (4)
   CSC 420  Artificial Intelligence (3)
   CSC 421  Knowledge Based Systems (3)
   CSC 444  Health Information Systems (3)

3. Waived if satisfied prior to admission by IE 304 (Operations Research) or IE 305 (Operations Research II) or equivalent course. If waived, four (4) less units in total are required and an elective normally taken in last summer could be substituted.

4. Waived if satisfied prior to admission by appropriate IE 410 (Inventory Control Systems) or IE 411 (Production Systems Analysis) or equivalent course. If waived, four (4) less units in total are required and an elective normally taken in last summer could be substituted.

5. Not required for students who have taken an equivalent course in their undergraduate program. However, replacement course must be taken.

6. May possibly be taken earlier if other courses waived. Business elective courses include GSB 579, GSB 582, and GSB 590.

7. Total number of units could be reduced if previous coursework taken justifies waiver of some required courses (e.g., see footnotes 3 and 4 above).

DEW
12/19/88
April 24, 1989

To: Charles Andrews, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: John C. Rogers, Chair
      Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Resource Implications for Joint MBA/MS Degree

The Academic Senate Budget Committee has reviewed the summary information supplied from the Department of Industrial Engineering and the School of Business. Both the School of Business and the Department of Engineering have assumed that this new concentration will require no additional sections of existing courses during the initial startup. The School of Business will add three new courses and the Department of Engineering will add four new courses. Thus leading to a total increase of 28 WTU's.

Attached is a summary spread sheet prepared by the Academic Senate Budget Committee and an explanation of faculty resources needed from the School of Business.
MBA/MS JOINT DEGREE BETWEEN THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND THE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>GSB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MBA/MSEngr JOINT DEGREE PROPOSAL
APPENDIX G: Faculty resources needed to implement and sustain the proposed concentration or specialization.

I. Start-up phase: Assuming that initially, MBA/MSEngr students will be accommodated in existing sections of currently offered courses:
Required new courses:
BUS: 3 @ 4 credits = 12 credits/year
ENGR: 4 @ 4 credits = 16 credits/year
Total new WTU: 30 credits/year

Total additional faculty = .80 position

All the new GSB courses will be offered as electives in the "regular" MBA program, and thus will not require incremental faculty; it is assumed that at least 2 of the IE courses will be offered as electives in the MSIE program. Thus, the incremental total faculty would be more like:

Net new credits taught: 8 credits/year

Inasmuch as the MBA program generates over 125% of the positions required to actually teach the courses, these courses could be taught from the "dean's reserve," which is currently used largely for lab assistants, graduate assistants, and faculty assigned time. After two years, the additional credits taught result in additional faculty positions earned by the respective schools, and the program will become "self-supporting," in terms of faculty needs.

II. Full enrollment: Assumed to be 50 new students admitted to the program each year, or two sections of each course per year.

Total WTU's taught: 2 sections x 4 credits x 27 courses = 216 WTU's over two years
Total WTU's per year + 216/2 = 108/year

Total new faculty needed = 108/36 = 3.0 positions

The program will be expanded as demand grows and faculty positions are generated, so that the 3 new positions will not be needed all at once.
Elections Committee Report - Election Results for the Academic Senate, Statewide Academic Senate, and University Professional Leave Committee for the 1989-1991 Term

School of Architecture (3 vacancies)
Blackmon, Jack Architecture
Dalton, Linda City & Regional Planning
Weisenthal, Howard Architecture

School of Agriculture (3 vacancies)
Ahern, James Agricultural Management
Smith, Terry Soil Science
VACANCY

School of Business (2 vacancies)
Peach, David Management
VACANCY

School of Engineering (5 vacancies)
Harris, James EL/EE Engineering
Horton, William EL/EE Engineering
Moustafa, Safwat Mechanical Engineering

A runoff election is in progress for the remaining two vacancies. Nominees are:
Balasubramanian, K. Industrial Engineering
Lomas, Charles Engineering Technology
Mallareddy, H. Civil/Environmental Engineering
White, Donald Industrial Engineering

School of Liberal Arts (4 vacancies)
Coleman, James Social Sciences
Foroohar, Manzar History
LaPorte, Mary Art & Design
Simmons, James English

School of Professional Studies and Education (3 vacancies)
Acor, Pat Physical Education/Rec Adm
Murphy, James Industrial Technology

School of Science and Mathematics (6 vacancies)
Bailey, Christina "Tina" Chemistry
5 VACANCIES

Professional Consultative Services (3 vacancies)
Lutrin, Patricia "Sam" Student Life and Activities

A runoff election is in progress for the remaining two vacancies. Nominees are:
Gamble, Lynne Library
Harrigan, Pauline "Polly" Housing
Reynoso, Wendy Demko Student Academic Services
Waller, Julia Financial Aid

---------------->
Members elected to the University Professional Leave Committee:

SAED
NO NOMINATIONS RECEIVED

SAGR
Thomas J. Rice, Jr. (Soil Science)

SBUS
NO NOMINATIONS RECEIVED

SENG
H. Mallareddy (Civ/Env Engineering)

SPSE
Ann Morgan (Psychology/HD)

SSM
Jean Marie McDill (Mathematics)

Member elected to the statewide Academic Senate (three-year term):

SBUS
Timothy Kersten (Economics)
BACKGROUND STATEMENT: The existing situation of the world-wide epidemic of AIDS and HIV infection warrants the attention of all segments of the University. The seriousness of the AIDS and HIV infection (i.e. nearly 100% fatal) requires a course of action that will benefit the University both in the short run and the future. Serious thought and consultation is necessary to select that course of action that will reduce, if not eliminate the incidence of infection on this campus. Selection of a course of action should include consideration of related social and economic benefits and costs of the chosen alternative. Public image as well as the impact on the local and University community must be evaluated. Indeed, such an evaluation would require time and effort on the part of those engaged in the evaluation.

A current proposal suggests that condom vending machines be made available in men and women’s restrooms in specified public places on campus. This proposal concludes that the increased availability of condoms would reduce the incidence of AIDS and HIV infection on campus. However, such a solution is at best a bandaid approach to a more serious problem. The proposal does not attempt to correct the problem, but only treats the symptom.

It is believed that currently condoms are adequately available on campus and that an increase in condom vending machines would reduce the image of the campus and the overall purpose of Cal Poly, that of education. It is believed that an inadequate effort has been made to educate the University population of the source of condom supplies and to the aspects of AIDS. Therefore be it

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate support the efforts of the Cal Poly AIDS Prevention Task Force in educating the University population with respect to the availability of condoms and safe sex practices and as it further

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate assist the AIDS Prevention Task Force in evaluating the social and economic benefits and costs of implementing condom vending machines on campus.