

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

FILE COPY

ACADEMIC SENATE
Academic Senate Executive Committee Agenda
June 13, 1995
UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

- I. Minutes:
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
PLEASE COMPLETE THE ATTACHED FORM AND RETURN TO MARGARET AT THIS MEETING (p. 2).
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office:
 - D. Statewide Senators:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. Staff Council Representative:
 - G. ASI Representatives:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
 - A. **General education and breadth:** Discussion of attached report (pp. 3-7).
 - B. **Curriculum reform:** Discussion of charges to the Curriculum Committee including larger-unit courses and its response to "Visionary Pragmatism" (pp. 8-12).
 - C. **Academic Senate committees:** (1) faculty interest responses (2) filling committee vacancies (3) reorganization (to be distributed).
 - D. **Budget input:** What is appropriate Senate input into the budgetary process?
 - E. **Faculty contract:** If a merit pay policy is put into effect this fall, the potential deadline for creating criteria and procedures for implementing said policy will be October 15, 1995.
 - F. **Cal Poly Plan:** Ongoing discussion.
 - G. **Summer calendar:** Executive Committee schedule of summer meetings/agenda items for these meetings.
 - H. **Academic Senate Calendar for 1995-1996 (p. 13).**
 - I. **Carryover items for 1995-1996:**
 - a. Resolution to Support Academic Senate CSU... 'Principles that Guide Programs to Achieve Educational Equity and Faculty Diversity...'
 - b. Resolution on Revisions to the California Polytechnic State University Strategic Plan [to include global awareness].
 - c. Resolution on Program Review and Improvement Committee's Report on Programs Reviewed during 1994-1995.
 - d. Resolution to Request Department Name Change for the Chemistry Department.
 - e. Resolution on "U" Grades.
 - f. Resolution on Guidelines for Experiential Education.
- VII. Adjournment:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

1995-1996

NAME: _____

POSITION ON THE ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

DEPARTMENT: _____

COLLEGE: _____

OFFICE PHONE NO: _____

DEPARTMENT PHONE NO: _____

HOME PHONE NO: _____

EMAIL ADDRESS (full address) _____

**VACATION DATES or OTHER DATES YOU WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE DURING THE
MONTHS OF JUNE, JULY, AUGUST, AND SEPTEMBER:**

State of California
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

RECEIVED
CAL POLY
JUN 7 1995

Memorandum

Academic Senate

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
Academic Senate

June 5, 1995

From: The Academic Senate's GE&B Committee*

cc: College deans
Bob Koob
Senate Exec. Comm.

Re: Proposed New G.E. Model

Attached are (1) a general education philosophy statement, (2) a revised GE model, and (3) a brief narrative setting forth the criteria for knowledge, skills, and concepts identified with the four proposed GE Areas in our model. While there are some specifics that need to be included in some of this, there is sufficient detail for the Academic Senate to discuss the merits of this model vis-a-vis the current general education program.

Our goal was to craft a new model that would, in comparison with the present gen ed program, be more integrative, encourage the development of more academically challenging courses, and provide more flexibility to students in fulfilling their G.E. requirements. Above all, our intent was to strengthen general education, not to provide a convenient way for programs to deemphasize the intellectual importance of general education for all Cal Poly students.

The Senate's GE&B Committee has wrestled with a number of different ideas and approaches to general education in formulating this model. As you know, we did not have the freedom to prepare what we would consider to be an "ideal" G.E. program. Rather, we had to work within the constraints of E.O. 595. The E.O. 595 requirements are sound, but they promise more than can be delivered within 72 quarter units. We are all aware of other factors that impinge upon a general education program as well: (1) how economic cutbacks affect what can be offered and the type of instruction delivered, (2) the University's concern that students not be needlessly hindered from completing their undergraduate requirements in a timely fashion, and (3) the time and effort required of the Evaluations Office and other support staff as they determine the requirements of

transfer students. And, we appreciate that some of the changes we incorporated into our model will be welcomed by some quarters of the campus community and opposed by others.

Our model was developed in an open and collegial manner. We debated the wisdom of the changes that appear in the model. It is a committee product that emphasized knowledge, skills and concepts rather than turf concerns.

The two most distinctive features of this model are that it allows for more double-counting and it provides for a capstone experience. Double-counting major/support/G.E. requirements is not intended to be automatic. Programs that seek to double-count would be held to the criteria of E.O. 595 and approval to double-count would be left to the Academic Senate. The capstone experience is intended to expose students to different perspectives that various disciplines have on major issues and ideas. We envision the creation of between 8 and 21 themes. In addition, this model was designed to encourage more opportunities for the U.S. Cultural Pluralism requirement to be met and technological issues to be included in G.E. courses across several Areas.

This proposal is not submitted as a finished product. We recognize the need for campus-wide responses to the model. Ideally, these responses can be used to strengthen what we offer or to fuel the development of an entirely new model. There will be some new members of the GE&B Committee next year. We recommend that they be assigned the task of taking this model to the next step which is to refine the model based on the campus reaction to it. We also suggest that the GE&B Committee and the Curriculum Committee work in concert on this, at least through Fall Quarter, 1995. This collaboration should begin during Fall Conference week and members should receive adequate release time for their efforts.

The campus would benefit from a stronger G.E. program and we encourage efforts to make this a reality.

*Lee Burgunder (Bus.), John Culver (PolS), Bill Forgeng (Mat. Engr.), Glenn Irvin (Admn.), Bob Smidt (Stat.), George Stanton (Testing), James Vilkitis (FNR).

Philosophy Statement for GE at Cal Poly

General education is an integral component of an undergraduate education. The General education and breadth program is designed to compliment and to be integrated into the undergraduate major. The purposes of GE& B are to:

1. Broaden beyond the major the scope of content stuents are exposed to;
2. Provide information and instruction designed to integrate subject matter areas;
3. Present widely useful fundamental knowledge, including influential ideas of the world's cultures;
4. Instruct students in the use of basic abilities common to educated people; and,
5. Encourage an appreciation for continuous intellectual development, the immense range of ideas, and the wide variety of cultural perspectives.

Thus, while it is neither possible nor desirable to present students with a static set of facts that "all should know," it is feasible to expose students to significant concepts emanating from outside their major, their culture, and their personal experiences, and to do so from an educational context incorporating integrative concepts and instructional techniques.

Moreover, in addition to the nature of the content coverage embraced, the GEB program includes training in powerful mental skills, such as the abilities to: think clearly and logically; comprehend, apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information/data; communicate effectively both orally and in writing; and reason quantitatively.

Attainment of the educational objectives embodied in the GEB program will cause students to value and pursue meaningful life-long learning, as well as to develop positive and productive attitudes, values, and perspectives. For example, students should understand that they are not isolated entities but members of a world with diverse cultures, lifestyles, and views; be cognizant of scientific inquiry and the effect it has on our lives; understand the relationship of economics, politics, and social policies that inform our society; recognize their duties to society at large and the benefits of being active participants in life in its broadest sense; and other attitudinal orientations that bespeak and befit a well-educated person and Cal Poly graduate.

A Revised Model for GE&B at Cal Poly

☐ In addition to Area I.1, at least one course must be taken from an approved list of courses with substantial written communication requirements.

☐ Students must take a minimum of 72 units of GE classes.

☐ Course's in the student's major prefix may not be used to satisfy the electives component of Areas I, II and III.

Area I: Arts and Humanities

Students must take a minimum of 20 units in Area I

1. Written Communication
2. Oral Communication
3. Critical Analysis
4. Fine and Performing Arts
5. Electives

Area II: Social and Behavioral Sciences

Students must take a minimum of 20 units in Area II

1. Three courses that address human social, political and economic institutions and behavior (2 courses cannot be taken from the same prefix);
2. One course in Human Understanding;
3. Electives: no more than two courses may be taken with the same prefix within Area II;

Area III: Scientific Inquiry

Students must take a minimum of 20 units, including a 1-unit lab in either 1 or 2 below, in Area III.

1. Physical Science class;
2. Life Science class;
3. Math/Statistics classes (minimum of two)
4. Electives

Area IV: Capstone (upper division)

Students must take a minimum of 12 units in Area IV.

Option A--capstone experience;

Option B--three upper division GE courses; (1) one course must be from Area I, (2) courses must be from at least two different areas, and (3) not offered by a student's College. (note: this option is intended as an interim measure until a sufficient number of capstone themes are established).

Area I: Arts and Humanities (20 units)

Courses in I.1 and I.2 emphasize the content and form of communication. They provide an understanding of the psychological basis and the social significance of communication and how communication operates in various situations. Courses in I.3 address the relationship of language to logic. They provide students with the ability to analyze, criticize and advocate ideas, to reason inductively and deductively, and to reach factual or judgmental conclusions based on sound inferences drawn from unambiguous statements of knowledge or belief. Courses in Area I.4 increase awareness and appreciation in the traditional humanistic disciplines such as art, dance, drama, and music. These courses examine the interrelationship between the creative arts, the humanities, and self.

Area II: Social and Behavioral Sciences (20 units)

Courses in II.1 concern the behavior and historical backgrounds of human social, political, and economic institutions. Problems in these areas have a contemporary and historical focus. Courses in II.2 are designed to equip human beings for lifelong understanding and development of themselves as integrated physiological and psychological entities.

Area III: Scientific Inquiry (20 units)

Courses in III.1 and III.2 are intended to impart knowledge of the facts and principles which form the foundations of living and non-living systems. They promote the understanding and appreciation of the methodologies of science as investigative tools and the limits of scientific endeavors. The appropriate laboratory experience is to be taken in conjunction with either a III.1 or III.2 course. Courses in III.3 address mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning and their application.

Area IV: Capstone (12 units)

Courses in Area IV are organized around themes that promote interdisciplinary inquiry into topics of broad economic, social, political, cultural, scientific, technological and artistic significance. Students are to complete 12 units of coursework within a single theme. The themes contain a minimum of 20 units. Students can take no more than 2 courses from their own college and no more than one course from their own department. No more than half of the units in each theme can come from one College.

RECEIVED

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT
CURRICULAR REFORM

APR 5 1995

Academic Senate

This report is a response to a request by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to review two reports on curricular reform, "Visionary Pragmatism," and the report of the Student Throughput Committee. We confined our examination of the two reports to issues which are the responsibility of the committee, i.e., University curriculum. The Curriculum Committee would like to note that members are in agreement with the broad educational principles put forward in "Visionary Pragmatism."

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Reduction in number of classes below 4 units
2. Admission of undeclared majors under certain circumstances
3. Clearer definition of minors, concentrations and Advisor Approved Electives within majors and resulting reforms
4. Regular review of all university programs by external body
5. Additional Concerns
 - Class Size/Equity of Faculty Workload
 - Change of Majors
 - Major Unit Requirements
 - Experiential courses
6. Further Work by the Committee
 - Review of Senior Projects
 - Integration of Co-Curriculum

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Larger unit classes

The committee recommends that the number of courses earning less than 4 unit credits be reduced.

Advantages include:

- increased ease of transferability for incoming students
- easier scheduling for students
- reduction of sequenced classes
- reduction in faculty course preparations and student load

cc: G (mail) 4.17.95

2. Admission of undeclared majors

The Committee recommends granting colleges the discretion to admit undeclared majors.

Advantages:

- Students continue to receive support from and identify with a campus program.
- Students benefit from flexibility in the choice of classes in their first year. In fact, this grants freshmen at Cal Poly the same flexibility our junior college transfers enjoy in their first two years before entering Cal Poly.
- Colleges retain control over resources as well as student curricula, perhaps instituting a "college core" curriculum.

3. Clearer definition of minors, concentrations and Advisor Approved Electives within majors and resulting reforms.

Recent curricular reform has resulted in some confusion over the differences between these offerings. The committee recommends the following definitions:

Minor: A coherent course of study which stands alone from a major and provides a student with broad knowledge of and competency in an area outside the student's major.

Concentration: A coherent and specialized course of study within a student's major degree program which presupposes knowledge of the major degree field.

Advisor Approved Electives: A coherent course of study which is relevant to but not necessarily within the student's major degree field.

In addition, the committee recommends the following reforms of major curricula in keeping with the above definitions:

The Committee recommends that Majors comprise a core curriculum of courses which faculty believe represent the basic knowledge which qualifies a student to earn a major degree in that field, and that students augment that core by choosing one of the above additional courses of study (minor, concentration or AAE).

Combining a core with an additional coherent course of study has the following advantages:

- allows students to design their own curriculum, tailoring it to their specific career goals and interests
- retains faculty and departmental control through advisor approval of the non-core components of the curriculum

-- facilitates change of majors by integrating previous course credit into the student's program without compromising the core knowledge required by the new department

The committee recommends that support courses should be included within the major core and noted, where appropriate, as course prerequisites.

4. Regular review of all university programs by external body.

Many other curricular issues were raised in both reports including the value of the "upside down" curriculum and the role of electives in the curriculum. The committee felt that such issues should be addressed on an individual basis and that curricular requirements differ by discipline.

The committee believes that peer review -- that is, review of curriculum by faculty knowledgeable in the specific field -- is the most responsible manner in which to address such reform. The committee therefore recommends that Cal Poly institute regular outside review of every program, including those subject to accreditation by professional associations, by faculty from comparable institutions.

5. Additional Concerns

The committee identified a wide range of issues which merited attention but did not require specific curricular reforms.

Class size/Equity of Faculty Workload

a. should remain small, but where that is no longer feasible, larger classes should be offered in two mode format, lecture and activity or recitation, to provide sufficient contact and discussion.

b. seminars for freshmen should be considered in order to integrate students into the university and provide close and positive contact with faculty from the beginning of the student's career.

c. equity in faculty workload across campus should be a top priority.

Change of Majors

Committee recommends easing restrictions on changing majors through the following possible means:

- a. departments should attempt to consider enrolled students changing major a first priority in admissions
- b. the home department should allow students to forego progress in the major while in the process of changing major

Major Unit Requirements

Curriculum committee has promoted a reduction in unit requirements over the past 3 years and continues to support the integration of new information into existing curricula rather than their expansion.

Experiential Courses

The committee recommends grading for experiential courses (coops, internships, enterprise projects and student teaching) on a C/NC basis only due to the difficulties in ensuring standardized expectations for such individualized instruction.

6. Further Work by the Committee

The Curriculum Committee proposes to initiate two studies in academic year 1995-96:

1. Request campus-wide review of senior projects by departments.

Both reports reviewed by the committee question whether senior projects have become an impediment to student graduation. The committee did not feel that either report offered conclusive evidence to support such an assumption. Further, the committee was not comfortable with identifying student graduation as the sole criterion in determining the value of senior projects.

The Committee recommends that in the next academic year (95-96), the Curriculum Committee conduct a review of departmental policies on senior projects.

2. Study methods to integrate co-curricular activities into the curriculum.

Reform of curriculum should be accompanied by increasing awareness of the value of co-curricular activities in enhancing and augmenting university education. The committee felt strongly that such measures would improve the climate on campus, enrich students' educational experience and

demonstrate to students how to integrate learning into their daily lives.

Academic Senate Calendar for 1995-1996

All Senate and Executive Committee meetings are held in UU 220 from 3:00 to 5:00pm unless otherwise noted.

September 11	Fall Conference: 1:30pm Academic Senate Standing Committees (Chumash) 2:45pm Academic Senate General Session (UU 207)
September 19	Executive Committee
October 3	Senate
October 10	Executive Committee
October 24	Senate
October 31	Executive Committee
November 14	Senate
November 28	Senate (if needed)

December 4 through January 1, 1996 - finals and quarter break

January 9	Executive Committee
January 23	Senate
January 30	Executive Committee
February 13	Senate
February 20	Executive Committee
March 5	Senate

March 11 through March 24, 1996 - finals and quarter break

March 26	Executive Committee
April 9	Senate
April 16	Executive Committee
April 30	Senate
May 7	Executive Committee
May 21	Senate
May 28	Senate (if needed)

June 3 through June 16, 1996 - finals and quarter break

The calendar is structured to have an Executive Committee meeting the Tuesday following each Academic Senate meeting. It also allows for 14 days between the Executive Committee and the next Academic Senate meeting for the completion and timely delivery of the agenda to the senators before the Academic Senate meetings.