Chair, Tim Kersten  
Vice Chair, Rod Keif  
Secretary, John Harris

I. Minutes

II. Announcements

III. Reports

Academic Council (Keif)  
Administrative Council (Harris)  
CSUC Academic Senate (Hale, Riedisperger, Weatherby)  
President's Council (Kersten)

IV. Committee Report

THE CHAIR REQUESTS WRITTEN REPORTS FOR THIS MEETING.

V. Business Items

A. Resolution Regarding Procedures to Develop the General Education and Breadth Requirements (Wenzl) (Second Reading) (Attachment)

B. Multi-Criteria Admissions Program (Moran) (First Reading) (Attachment)

C. Resolution Regarding Governing Structure of Multi-Criteria Admissions Systems (Executive Committee) (First Reading) (Attachment)

D. Resolution on +/- Grading (Brown) (First Reading) (Attachment)

E. Resolution on Augmentation of Technical/Craft Positions (Lutrin) (First Reading) (Attachment)
GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES
Completion date for each phase is in parentheses.

Phase I: Establishment of Desired Outcomes of General Education at Cal Poly
(November 1, 1981)
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
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. (February 1, 1982)
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 (December 10, 1982)

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 ensure 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 (March 1, 1982)

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.
RESOLUTION ON MULTI-CRITERIA ADMISSIONS PROGRAM,
Student Affairs Committee
(Susanne I. Moran, Chair)

BACKGROUND RATIONALE

The proposal for a Multi-Criteria Admissions Allocation Program basically calls for eliminating the one-dimensional selection/allocation criterion, grade point average, in favor of multiple criteria such as: grades in specific coursework, completion of a specific pattern of coursework, activities and awards, leadership roles, etc.

WHEREAS Cal Poly is an impacted University receiving far more applications than can be accommodated;
AND WHEREAS the present method of selecting applicants takes into account overall grade point average only;
AND WHEREAS Cal Poly has conducted a pilot study which has indicated the feasibility of multi-criteria allocation;
AND WHEREAS there is a need to inform prospective applicants and their counselors in a timely manner;
BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate supports the development of Multi-Criteria Admissions Allocation Program;
AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an annual review be conducted and a progress report given to the Academic Senate.
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

RESOLUTION ON MULTI-CRITERIA ADMISSIONS (Executive Committee)

WHEREAS, It appears that California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo will be implementing a multiple criteria system for admission of undergraduate students; and

WHEREAS, The specific criteria used in such a system and the relative importance of each criterion will affect the academic qualifications of incoming students; and

WHEREAS, The non-academic criteria used in such a system will affect the overall character of the student body and the character of student life at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, The faculty via its Academic Senate has a responsibility for assuring the quality of the educational environment at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo; and

WHEREAS, The faculty via its Academic Senate has a responsibility for maintaining and improving the quality of the various academic programs on the campus; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the governing structure of the multiple criteria admissions system include seven, four-member committees (one from each School), appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate upon recommendation of the caucus of each respective School. Each committee shall recommend appropriate criteria for admission to its School to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and be it

RESOLVED: That the governing structure of the multiple criteria admissions system include a four-member ad hoc committee of the Academic Senate, appointed by the Chair of the Academic Senate, to review all proposals for criteria and their relative importance to insure the integrity of the admissions criteria university-wide. The recommendations of this committee are to be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the Academic Senate.
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.
PROPOSAL FOR AUGMENTATION OF TECHNICAL SUPPORT

WHEREAS, As the formula for technical assistance has not changed since 1971; and

WHEREAS, Rapid technological changes have resulted in vastly increased use of more and complex equipment in the instructional laboratory programs requiring more technical support personnel; and

WHEREAS, A new emphasis on laboratory safety requires additional attention and time from technical support personnel; and

WHEREAS, The instructional mission of Cal Poly requires a far greater proportion of instruction in the laboratory mode; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate urge the President to request that the Chancellor provide a special augmentation for technical/craft positions to California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.
ABSTRACT

Exploding demand for technical support personnel during the past decade have forced a diversion of support positions from clerical and blanket uses to technical/craft categories. Five reasons can be identified:

1. Health and safety regulations
2. New technologies
3. Computing demands
4. Expansion of Inventory
5. Equipment obsolescence

Each of these problems impacts each of the nineteen campuses, but the cumulative impact is uniquely severe at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, where the fraction of instruction in the laboratory mode is by a substantial margin the highest in the system. The burgeoning demands created by the five causes produce an inevitable result: funds and positions are being diverted from other instructional needs that cannot spare them to new demands which cannot do without them.

We propose an augmentation of the "0.22 standard" for faculty generated by instruction in the laboratory mode. We further propose that the augmentation be accomplished in two stages:

Stage 1: Program Maintenance Proposal Modification
Because the percentage of instruction in the laboratory mode so greatly exceeds that of all other system campuses, we propose a special allowance for Cal Poly of 19 technical/craft positions.

Stage 2: Program Change Proposal
We propose that the Chancellor appoint a task force to develop an appropriate system-wide program change proposal.

[Signature]
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WHEREAS, It appears that California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo will be implementing a multiple criteria system for admission of undergraduate students; and

WHEREAS, The specific criteria used in such a system and the relative importance of each criterion will affect the academic qualifications of incoming students; and

WHEREAS, The non-academic criteria used in such a system will affect the overall character of the student body and the character of student life at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, The faculty via its Academic Senate has a responsibility for assuring the quality of the educational environment at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo; and

WHEREAS, The faculty via its Academic Senate has a responsibility for maintaining and improving the quality of the various academic programs on the campus; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the governing structure of the multiple criteria admissions system include seven, four-member committees (one from each School), appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate upon recommendation of the caucus of each respective School. Each committee shall recommend appropriate criteria for admission to its School to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and be it

RESOLVED: That the governing structure of the multiple criteria admissions system include a four-member ad hoc committee of the Academic Senate, appointed by the Chair of the Academic Senate, to review all proposals for criteria and their relative importance to insure the integrity of the admissions criteria university-wide. The recommendations of this committee are to be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the Academic Senate.

May, 1981