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   Academic Council (Keif)
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   CSUC Academic Senate (Hale, Riedlsperger, Weatherby)
   President's Council (Kersten)

IV. Committee Reports
   THE CHAIR REQUESTS WRITTEN COMMITTEE REPORTS FOR THIS MEETING.

V. Business Items
   A. Resolution Regarding the Role of Research at Cal Poly (Dingus) (Second Reading) (Attachment)
   B. Resolution Regarding Consultation on Catalog Changes (Harris) (Second Reading) (Attachment)
   C. Resolution Regarding Student Withdrawal from Classes After the Census Date (Stowe) (Second Reading) (Attachment)
   D. Resolution Regarding Procedures to Develop the General Education and Breadth Requirements (Wenzl) (First Reading) (Attachment)
   E. Resolution on +/- Grading (Brown) (First Reading) (Attachment)

VI. Discussion Items
   A. TIME CERTAIN: 3:25 PM Special Guest: President Baker
      a. View of the Role of the Academic Senate at Cal Poly
      b. Role of the President's Cabinet
      c. View on the Role of Research at Cal Poly
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate accept this document from the University Research Committee as the guiding philosophy for encouraging research as one mechanism for professional growth of faculty at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this document be forwarded to President Baker.
ROLE OF RESEARCH AT
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY,
SAN LUIS OBISPO

Report of the
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH COMMITTEE
February 4, 1981

INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 1979, the University Research Committee received a charge from President Baker to develop a statement on the role of research at Cal Poly. A draft was prepared and distributed widely to faculty, consultative staff, and administrators for comment in the fall of 1980. The following statements incorporate many of these comments as well as the Research Committee's evolving views on this subject.

It is University policy that professional growth play an important role in evaluating the faculty at Cal Poly. Each department must ultimately decide how well an individual faculty member fulfills its professional growth requirement. The University Research Committee asserts that a faculty member's original contributions to his or her field is an excellent - though not the only - measure of professional growth.

To clarify the role of research in professional development, this report will:

1. Define what shall be meant by "research" at Cal Poly,
2. Summarize the benefits to be derived when a portion of the faculty is actively engaged in research activities,
3. Clarify what role research can play in the professional growth of Cal Poly faculty,
4. Identify the more serious impediments a faculty member faces when doing research at Cal Poly, and
5. Offer some solutions to these impediments with the hope that more solutions will be forthcoming as discussions on these matters continue.

DEFINITION OF RESEARCH

Because research is only one possible form of professional growth, it will be useful to list the basic categories of opportunities for professional development at Cal Poly:

A. Pedagogy: Building on their classroom experiences, faculty may improve instruction generally through the development of books, manuals, and instructional materials that advance the teaching profession.

B. Consulting and Service to the Profession: Some faculty may concentrate on maintaining active contact with their professions. This can take the form of private consulting, participating in conferences, active seminar participation, and providing leadership for and contributions to professional organizations.
C. Problem Solving: As faculty become involved in the professional activities described above, problems or opportunities may emerge that require a creative activity for solution. Creating solutions to the immediate problems of the classroom, business, industry, or government through applied research and development activities can be a productive area for professional growth.

D. Research: Faculty may pursue classical research activities, utilizing traditional approaches in the field, laboratory, computer center, or library to create new and generalizable knowledge. Similarly, faculty in the humanities and arts who develop new art forms and expressions are pursuing a form of research appropriate to their discipline.

Although the ultimate definition of "research" may vary with discipline, for the purpose of this paper, the activities listed under "C" and "D" constitute the definition of "research."

BENEFITS OF RESEARCH

The University Research Committee recognizes that undergraduate instruction is the primary purpose of the institution. Within this context, research can produce several benefits: 1) increased instructional effectiveness and relevance of the curriculum; 2) enhanced placement potential for Cal Poly graduates; 3) improved opportunities for accreditation of academic and professional programs; 4) augmented institutional resources through grants and contracts; and 5) greater attractiveness of the University to qualified faculty.

ROLE OF RESEARCH IN PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

The magnitude of the role research can play at Cal Poly is largely determined by the University's place in the hierarchy of public postsecondary education in California. The Donahoe Act (as reflected in the Education Code) assigns the primary responsibility for research to the University of California as follows: "It (UC) shall be the primary State supported academic agency for research." Of the California State University and Colleges, Title 5 states: "Faculty research is authorized to the extent that it is consistent with the primary function of the California State University and Colleges and the facilities provided for that function" (Sec. 40050).

Title 5 authorizes Cal Poly to pursue research in much the same language that it authorizes the University to emphasize its traditional areas of strength. And yet, that authorization has never been fully acted upon.

Research can be an important component in the professional growth of Cal Poly faculty. Consequently, the needs of those involved in research should be given a high priority. This priority will not be equal to that of instruction; however, administrators and department heads should recognize the values inherent in research activities and do their best to encourage those faculty who choose to pursue such activities. Because of the large teaching load and special commitment that Cal Poly faculty have to excellence in undergraduate instruction, it is recognized that some faculty will choose avenues of professional development other than research. It is important therefore to maintain an appropriate balance of these activities to keep these priorities in perspective.

IMPEDIMENTS TO RESEARCH

In its study, the University Research Committee identified a number of impediments to the development of research. The major impediment, of course, is
that the State budget provides no funds for faculty time or specific facilities to pursue research. Whereas the University of California is provided with a lighter teacher load and specialized research facilities, the California State University and Colleges' research program is dependent on non-State funds for faculty time and materials support. Given current teaching loads, faculty who pursue research must do so either on an overload basis, or on released time paid for by an outside grant. Faculty may use currently available facilities, but if specialized facilities are required, they must come from sources other than the general fund.

From the above, a number of problems and impediments have resulted:

1. Faculty self-selection: Many faculty chose Cal Poly solely because of their dedication to undergraduate instruction and not as a place also to pursue research.

2. Lack of incentives: Research is not uniformly used as one of the criteria for retention or promotion.

3. Heavy teaching load: Loads average more than 12 MTU's per quarter, and assigned time for research has rarely been granted.

4. Space-use policies: Policy favors teaching over research in the allocation of office and laboratory space, almost to the exclusion of any research.

5. Inadequate laboratory space: Laboratories are heavily utilized for teaching. There are too few wet labs. No labs are primarily research labs.

6. Inadequate computing resources: Faculty access to the Computer Center is limited; the policy prohibiting public use of the University's computer frustrates its use for consulting.

7. Insufficient internal funds for supporting and encouraging research: Discretionary funds are extremely limited. Unallocated overhead is used for a variety of purposes, often not in support of research. Operating expense funds are strained even in support of the instructional program.

8. Inadequate clerical support: Departments lack staff resources to assist in the preparation of proposals and manuscripts or to assist with the administration of projects lacking their own support staff.

9. Size of graduate program: Programs lack sufficient graduate students to justify courses closer to the frontiers of the discipline and to participate in research can create an impediment.

10. Limited track record: Sponsors do not see the institution as one having a research capability.

11. Teaching pool: Replacements for researchers on released time can be difficult to find.

12. Inadequate library research collections in some areas: Through inter-library loan, and computerized data bases, the library has access to a vast resource, but the delay can be a problem.
13. Travel funds: These are inadequate to support research and professional development.

14. Disparity in compensation rates for faculty doing research vs. teaching in the summer: Because of federal regulations, faculty who do sponsored research in the summer are paid about 15 percent less than their counterparts who are teaching.

15. Public image: Research at Cal Poly has low visibility in the community and the state.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCING THE RESEARCH ATMOSPHERE

The administration of Cal Poly should treat professional development as a high priority, second only to our teaching mission. Therefore this University must seek to create a campus environment which facilitates creative contributions. Attitudes that relegate research to a suspect activity must be dispelled; resources that could be used for research with little negative impact to the institutional program must be made available; faculty directing energies to research must be encouraged and aided by administration and support staff at all levels. The securing of additional resources to promote professional development must be a high priority for the University.

Four general areas need attention in order to create an enhanced research environment:

A. The development of human resources. It is important that the University have realistic expectations about what can be accomplished in the development of its human resources within the constraints of the CSUC system. Immediate efforts to encourage research could best be directed towards the junior faculty. Many sponsors have programs for promising new investigators that do not demand a proven track record. Junior faculty should be made aware that benefits to professional growth will continue to accrue if they put forth research efforts early in their careers. Job descriptions for new employees could clarify that professional growth will be expected for retention and promotion.

B. The development of physical resources. Plans need to be made and pursued for the identification, conversion, and/or construction of multi-purpose research facilities which can be used as centers for research, as well as for interdisciplinary problem-solving activities. Such a center or centers would create an identity for campus research activity which, because of its generally applied characteristics, could be unique in California post-secondary education. Such centers would offer effective utilization of research equipment purchased through sponsored projects for both teaching and problem-solving activities.

C. The development of a secure psychological climate for research. The University in some measure still nurtures an attitude that tolerates, but does not encourage, research. This attitude is encountered among academic administrators, as well as among various support units on campus. Tight budgets, of course, produce problems for the instructional as well as the research program, but it is difficult for researchers not to feel singled out if they see themselves as involved in an "un-Cal-Poly-like" activity. Administrators and support staff need to be informed that the University now supports and actively encourages research activities as important elements in the continued success of this campus and that faculty so involved have a legitimate call upon the resources of the campus.
D. The development of interaction and cooperation among faculty of various disciplines. The University, because of its polytechnic orientation, is ideally suited for mission-oriented research. Just as Cal Poly has a special instructional niche, so it also has a unique research resource to offer the State, business, and industry. An active development effort needs to be mounted to bring the problems of the State, the federal government, and industry to the campus for study. Such sponsored projects can contribute in important ways to building the institution's intellectual and physical capabilities as well as improving interactions and cooperation among faculty.

Given these areas of need, the University should consider the following changes:

A. The quality of faculty professional development should be an important criterion for personnel actions, recognizing the unique history of each Cal Poly faculty member.

B. Greater use should be made of current flexibility in the allocation of resources. For instance, the use of assigned time for instructionally related research is permitted, but little utilized. Such mechanisms for supporting research should be publicized and promoted.

C. More funds should be made available to support campus research. Increased funds for CARE grants are especially necessary, as are funds to support the costs of research development activities.

D. Campus researchers should have equal access to facilities and services wherever possible and practicable. To ensure access, departmental administration should seek actively ways to accommodate the needs of researchers.

E. The library acquisitions budget should be increased, and funds should be provided to subsidize the use of computerized information retrieval data bases.

F. Computer Center capabilities need to be augmented and made more accessible. The new central batch system may provide greatly improved support.

G. Private funding for both research facilities and faculty time should be sought. Buildings, as well as specialized laboratories, are needed.

H. Expanded organizations for the obtaining and administration of sponsored programs, including the possibility of a separate auxiliary unit specializing in grants and contracts, should be implemented.

I. Research and the results of research efforts should be widely publicized. Publicity could include a newsletter, awards for recognition of special contributions by the faculty, systematic publicity through the local newspapers, and distribution of summaries of University research activity.
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-112-81/CC
February 17, 1981

RESOLUTION REGARDING CONSULTATION ON CATALOG CHANGES

WHEREAS, Faculty consultation, via the Academic Senate, in the catalog curriculum process is vital; and

WHEREAS, University departments occasionally find it necessary to request catalog changes after catalog deadlines; and

WHEREAS, University departments currently request catalog changes after catalog deadlines without Academic Senate examination; and

WHEREAS, No procedure now exists concerning faculty consultation to proposed catalog changes after catalog deadlines; and

WHEREAS, Catalog time constraints make full Academic Senate catalog deadlines all but impossible; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate be authorized to act for the full Senate concerning those requested changes to the catalog after the catalog deadlines with the provision that the committee will reject any proposals of a controversial nature or which have no defendable reason for being submitted after the deadline.
WHEREAS, We are presently operating under the Trustees’ requirement that a student may withdraw from a class after the census date only for reasons which are "serious and compelling;" and

WHEREAS, We recognize that indeed there are serious and compelling reasons for which a student might need to withdraw from a class after the census date; and

WHEREAS, In many cases, such reasons cannot be adequately verified due to the nature of the problem, or to lack of resources, time or expertise, thus putting a premium on student dishonesty; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Trustees be requested to change the requirement which necessitates evaluation of such serious and compelling reasons, in favor of a substitute procedure allowing each student a strictly limited number of withdrawals after census dates without verification of reasons; and be it further

RESOLVED: That extensions of this strictly limited number of allowed post-census date withdrawals be allowed only under the most exceptional circumstances. If a student should feel that truly exceptional circumstances compel him/her to ask for an extension, then the student should be expected to provide ample documentation, provide sufficient avenues for verification and cross-checking of this documentation, and provide a defense of his/her exercise of all previous post-census date withdrawals. The student should be expected to present this case to a campus-wide board, with members given appropriate release time from instructional duties. It should be made clear that such extensions will rarely be granted, so that students and board members do not waste their time on capricious, frivolous, or poorly documented requests.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorses the enclosed procedures for the development of a General Education and Breadth Program at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.
GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES

Phase I: Establishment of Desired Outcomes of General Education at Cal Poly

A) General Education and Breadth Committee prepares and distributes draft of outcome statements to the faculty (including Professional Consultative Services) with a request for reaction and suggested modification. Faculty will be requested to indicate if acceptable or not acceptable. If not acceptable faculty should state the minimal change necessary to make acceptable (separately by section). The GE & B Committee will also distribute copies to ASI and other bodies, soliciting the contribution of ideas. This draft will be accompanied by a description of the process for the development of a long-range General Education and Breadth program, together with a background statement and names of contact people (all those on 1979-1980 and 1980-1981 GE & B Committees).

B) GE & B Committee holds workshops (clarification sessions) for interested groups.

C) GE & B Committee tallies responses, incorporates "minimal" changes as appropriate and decides whether to proceed to step "D" or return to step "A".

D) The Academic Senate conducts a referendum on the rewritten "desired outcomes" (separate vote on each section). If not acceptable, faculty should state the minimal change necessary to make acceptable (section by section). Those eligible to vote would include all individuals eligible to vote for Academic Senators. If a majority of those voting approve, move on to Phase II; if not, repeat process from step "C" above.

Phase II: Identification of the Knowledge and Skills Seen as Necessary to Achieve the Desired Outcomes.

A) The GE & B Committee prepares and distributes a draft of knowledge and skills statements, together with finalized outcomes statements (as in Phase I, Step "A" above). The GE & B Committee solicits comments, additions and modifications (section by section) on the knowledge/skills statements.

B) The GE & B Committee compiles and incorporates suggested changes and decides whether to return to Phase II, step "A" or continue to step "C" below.

C) The Academic Senate conducts a referendum on final rewrite (separate vote on each section). If not acceptable, faculty should state minimal change necessary to make acceptable (separately by section). Those eligible to vote will include all individuals eligible to vote for Academic Senators. If a majority of those voting approve, move on to Phase II, otherwise return to Phase II, step "B".
Phase III: Identification of Courses, Course Sequences and/or Other Methods of Achieving the Previously Identified Outcomes, Knowledge and Skills

A) The GE & B Committee distributes finalized outcomes, knowledge and skills statements to faculty. The committee solicits proposed methods for achieving all or some of these goals. In addition, the GE & B Committee asks for volunteers to be appointed to serve on the committees described below.

B) 1) Outcome Area Committees.
   The GE & B Committee appoints a separate committee for each of the outcome areas identified in Phase I. The charge for these committees will be to identify and develop courses, course sequences, and/or other methods of achieving the knowledge and skills identified in Phase II for their respective outcome areas. These committees will also be charged with serving as resource committees for the committees established in "2" below. Each committee will be composed of faculty representing disciplines involved with the outcome area for that committee. Each committee will include one member of the GE & B Committee.

   2) Interdisciplinary Committees.
   The GE & B Committee appoints two interdisciplinary committees whose purpose will be to develop instructional packages (courses, course sequences, and/or other methods) which involve integration of the knowledge and skills associated with two or more outcome areas. Each committee will include at least one member of the GE & B Committee. The GE & B Committee will make every effort to insure that each school as well as Professional Consultative Services has a representative on each of the interdisciplinary committees.

C) GE & B Committee reviews the work of the outcome area committees and the interdisciplinary committees and develops a first draft of a proposal for a comprehensive General Education program at Cal Poly.

D) First draft (in C) is submitted to the faculty for reaction and suggested modification. Faculty will be requested to indicate if acceptable or not acceptable. If not acceptable, faculty should state the minimal changes necessary to make acceptable.

E) GE & B tallies responses and makes modifications in the draft if necessary. Committee decides if it is necessary to repeat step "D" above or forward a proposal for a comprehensive General Education program to the Academic Senate for approval.

Phase IV: Determination of Process/Plan for Administration of GE & B

A) GE & B Committee develops a specific procedure for administration of the GE & B requirements after collecting ideas from Cal Poly faculty and other universities.

B) GE & B recommends administration procedures to the Senate.
CAL POLY GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH PROGRAM:
FLOW CHART OF THE PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING THE PROPOSAL TO BE RECOMMENDED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Please Note: Unless otherwise indicated, all tasks to be performed on behalf of the Academic Senate by its General Education and Breadth Committee.

**PHASE I:**
**ESTABLISH DESIRED OUTCOMES OF CAL POLY GENERAL EDUCATION**

- PREPARE DRAFT OF OUTCOME STATEMENTS
- DISTRIBUTE DRAFT AND SOLICIT FEEDBACK
- CONDUCT WORKSHOPS
- COMPILE FEEDBACK/REVISE DRAFT
- READY FOR VOTE?
  - NO
  - SIMPLE MAJORITY
  - YES
  - CONDUCT REFERENDUM ON OUTCOMES
  - NO
  - SIMPLE MAJORITY
  - YES
  - **PHASE II:**
  - IDENTIFY KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS SEEN AS NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE DESIRED OUTCOMES

- PREPARE DRAFT OF KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS STATEMENTS
- DISTRIBUTE DRAFT AND SOLICIT FEEDBACK
- COMPILE FEEDBACK/REVISE DRAFT
- READY FOR VOTE?
  - NO
  - SIMPLE MAJORITY
  - YES
  - CONDUCT REFERENDUM ON KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS STATEMENTS
  - NO
  - SIMPLE MAJORITY
  - YES

Copies to all faculty with request for reaction and suggested modification. Faculty to indicate if acceptable or not acceptable. If not acceptable, faculty to state the minimal change necessary to make acceptable (section by section). Copies also to ASI and other bodies, soliciting ideas. Draft to be accompanied by a description of the process for development of a long-range GE&B program together with a background statement and names of contact people (all those on 79-80 and 80-81 GE&B Committees).

Clarification sessions for interested persons.

Tally responses and incorporate minimal changes as much as possible.

Decide whether to proceed to vote or to distribute revised draft and repeat the process.

Academic Senate calls for a referendum to be conducted by its Elections Committee; includes all persons eligible to vote for Academic Senators. Voters to respond to outcome statements section by section. For any deemed unacceptable, voter to have opportunity to state the minimal change necessary to make acceptable (section by section).

Of those voting.

Academic Senate calls for a referendum to be conducted by its Elections Committees; includes all those eligible to vote for Academic Senators. Voters to respond to knowledge/skills statements sections by section. For any deemed unacceptable, voter to have opportunity to state the minimal change necessary to make acceptable (section by section).

Of those voting.
Phase III: Identify Courses, Course Sequences, and/or Other Methods for Achieving Outcomes, Knowledge, and Skills

Distribute finalized outcome, knowledge, and skills statements. Solicit proposals for methods to achieve them. Solicit volunteers to serve on committees for developing proposed methods.

Establish committees to develop proposals.

Outcome area committees work.

Interdisciplinary committees work.

Review proposals.

Prepare draft proposal for comprehensive GE & B program.

Distribute draft proposal.

Solicit feedback formally.

Compile feedback/review proposal.

Ready for Academic Senate?

No

Yes

Forward to Academic Senate for approval.

Phase IV: Determination of Process/Plan for Administration of GE & B Program

Solicit ideas from faculty and from other universities.

Compile ideas/prepare proposal.

Forward proposal to Academic Senate for approval.

Copies to all faculty.

Two types of committees:

1. Outcome Area Committees—A separate committee for each outcome area identified in Phase I is to identify and develop courses, course sequences, and/or other methods for achieving knowledge/skills statements identified in Phase II for their respective outcome areas; to serve as resource for interdisciplinary committees described below. Composed of faculty representing disciplines involved with the outcome area for that committee and 1 member of GE & B.

2. Interdisciplinary Committees: Two. Charge is to develop instructional packages which involve integration of the knowledge and skills associated with two or more of the outcome areas. GE & B will make every effort to assure that each school and PCS has a representative on each; 1 member of GE & B.

Copies to all faculty with request for reaction and suggested modifications. Faculty to indicate if acceptable or not acceptable. If not acceptable, faculty requested to state the minimal changes necessary to make acceptable.

GE & B to decide whether to proceed to the Academic Senate or to distribute revised draft and solicit feedback.

Send to entire faculty copies of proposal for comprehensive GE & B program adopted by Academic Senate along with request.
RESOLUTION ON +/- GRADING

Background: In response to recommendations from the CSUC Academic Senate and the Cal Poly Task Force on Grade Inflation, the Instruction Committee has been reviewing the grading system. The resulting resolution on Grade Definitions and Guidelines (passed February 17) established letter grade definitions which relate to performance levels, levels of achievement of course objectives, satisfactory progress toward graduation, and levels of preparation for enrollment in subsequent courses. Although the new grade definitions reasonably define the middle of each grade level, each category (especially B and C) still seems to encompass a very broad range of student performances and levels of preparation. The high C student and low B student, for example, are generally much closer in levels of achievement and preparation than the high C and low C students, yet the current grade system does not accurately reflect that.

The results of several informal polls (in which approximately 20% of the entire faculty participated) reveal considerable dissatisfaction with the current grade system. There was significant support (approximately 80% of respondents) for a grade system which allowed better discrimination between the current letter grade categories. The reasons cited for recommending a grading policy change stressed that allowing plus and minus levels within each grade category would be a fairer evaluation when student performance levels can be so distinguished. It has also been suggested that some of student test anxiety--especially during final exams--may actually be grade anxiety. The student is very conscious that falling just below a grade decision line can "cost" an entire grade point per unit credit. Although increasing the number of grade levels would increase the number of grade decision lines, the unit credits would increase in small increments, hence, there is less "risk" associated with being just below a line.

The proposed grading system is relatively common among universities. Five of the U.C. campuses, seven of the CSUC campuses, and a number of private institutions in the state currently use a grading system which records +/- grades. And a report (dated March, 1981) to the Educational Policies Committee of the CSUC Academic Senate, entitled "Selected Studies of Grade Reporting" recommends that the Senate urge individual campuses to adopt plus/minus grading systems.

RESOLVED: That the grading system be modified to record plus (+) and minus (-) symbols with the current letter grades when assigned by faculty and that the corresponding grade point assignments be as follows:
and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That when a student is to be graded on a CR/NC basis the grade CR will be assigned for grades C- and above and NC will be assigned for grades D+ and below.

**Notes Regarding the Resolution on +/- Grading**

The definitions of the letter grades A, B, C, D, F, and CR/NC are not affected by this resolution.

The plus and minus grades can be used to indicate levels of achievement or performance within each grade category.

Borderline grade decisions which faculty now make (between B and C, for example) must still be made. But the option to assign B- and C+ grades to students near that borderline would exist.

The grade point averages of those students who find themselves consistently just above or just below a grade decision line would more precisely reflect the performance levels of those students.

The very wide range of achievement levels of students who now receive C grades would appear as a range from C- to C+ if faculty make use of the +/- grades.

No A+ grade is included as the grade A already indicates an excellent achievement of course objectives. It is expected that offering a grade level above 4.0 would lead to a downward adjustment of GPA's by employers and graduate schools.

No F+ grade is included as that grade would seem to be meaningless if no course credit is obtained.

The grade CR should correspond to C-, etc., since the current C/D grade decision line would fall between the C- and D+ with the new grade levels. There is thus no change in performance level required to receive the grade CR.

The requirement that a student maintain a GPA of at least 2.0 to be eligible for graduation is not affected by this resolution.