

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

Academic Senate Executive Committee
Wednesday, August 16, 1995
UU 220, 2:00-5:00pm

- I. Minutes:
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs:
 - D. Statewide Senators:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. Staff Council representative:
 - G. ASI representatives:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Committee vacancies:** (p. 2).
 - B. **Request for emeritus status-Norman Murphy:** (p. 3). [PLEASE COME INTO THE ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE TO REVIEW THIS FILE BEFORE THE MEETING.]
 - C. **Resolution to Approve Indirect Cost Distribution Policy:** (pp. 4-8).
 - D. **Cal Poly Plan survey.**
 - E. **Academic Senate/university-wide committees--recommendations for reorganization:** [to be distributed].
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
 - A. **Academic Calendar changes for 1996-1998.**
 - B. **Statewide changes in Affirmative Action.**
 - C. **Organization of ITS and computing allocations.**
 - D. **Proposal for the Cal Poly Governance Council.**
- VII. Adjournment:

08/08/95

ACADEMIC SENATE/COMMITTEE VACANCIES for 1995-1996

ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE VACANCIES

CAED	Budget Committee	
	Constitution & Bylaws Committee	
	Fairness Board	
	Instruction Committee	
	Long-Range Planning Committee	(Donna Duerk, Gerald Smith)
	Personnel Policies Committee	
	Program Review and Improvement Committee	(James Rodger)
	Status of Women Committee	
CBUS	Status of Women Committee	
CENG	Budget Committee	(Joanne Freeman)
	Constitution and Bylaws Committee	(Saeed Niku)
	Fairness Board	(Carl Hsieh)
	Long-Range Planning Committee	(James Beug, Ali Shaban)
	Personnel Policies Committee	(Carl Hsieh)
	Program Rev and Impr Com	(John Connely, Joanne Freeman)
	Status of Women Committee	
	University Professional Leave Committee	
CLA	Budget Committee	
	Constitution and Bylaws Committee	
	Curriculum Committee	(Nancy Clark, Alexis Olds)
	Fairness Board	(R Cruikshanks, R Murray, F O'Toole)
	GE&B Committee	(L Bomstad, L Houlgate, J Snetsinger)
CSM	Constitution and Bylaws Committee	(Ray Terry)
	Curriculum Committee	(Nilgun Sungar, Ray Terry)
	Fairness Board	(Marylud Baldwin)
	GE&B Committee	(J Rogers, R Smidt, N Sungar, R Terry)
	Instruction Committee	
	Library Committee	(Mary Rigler, Ray Terry)
	Long-Range Plg Committee	(Dwayne Head, Ray Terry)
	Personnel Policies Committee	
	Program Review and Improvement Committee	
	Status of Women Committee	(M Baldwin, N Sungar)
	University Professional Leave Committee	
PCS	Budget Committee	(Julia Waller)
	Curriculum Committee	(Susan Somppi)
	Instruction Committee	
	Status of Women Committee	(Jere Ramsey, Wendy Spradlin)

Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee:

Present members:	Linda Halisky (English)	
	Rami Shani (Mgt)	
	VACANCY	(Lee Burgunder)
	VACANCY	
	VACANCY	

State of California

RECEIVED

CAL POLY
San Luis Obispo
CA 93407

Memorandum

JUN 28 1995


To : Harvey Greenwald
Chair, Academic Senate

Academic Senate

Date : June 21, 1995

File No.:

Copies : Norman Murphy
Michael Suess

From : Robert D. Koob 
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Request for Emeritus Status--Norman Murphy

Appended is a copy of a letter dated March 31, 1995 addressed to Edna Chun from Dr. Norman Murphy, a former Student Services Professional--Academic Related employee who retired in 1991.

At the time of his retirement, Dr. Murphy was considered for emeritus status. His department head (Kerry Yamada) and the Vice President for Student Affairs (Hazel Scott) did not favorably endorse the award of emeritus status and consequently, it was not awarded.

Dr. Murphy has requested that the 1991 decision not to award emeritus status be reconsidered because of alleged bias. Since Dr. Yamada and Dr. Scott have both retired, they are unavailable to reconsider the matter. Consequently, the reconsideration request was referred to the tenured members of his former department (Psychological Services). The tenured staff advised me on June 9, 1995 that it could not make an unbiased decision to recommend granting or not granting emeritus status and recommended that individuals from the faculty ranks who are not familiar with Dr. Murphy review his files and recommend whether he should be considered for emeritus status.

I must point out that the decision has been made that he has satisfied the fifteen year requirement. At issue is whether his service is deemed to have been meritorious. Please refer this matter before the appropriate faculty committee and advise me whether the request for emeritus status is recommended. I am forwarding his personnel action file for review. Dr. Murphy has requested the opportunity to make a verbal presentation to the faculty members selected to review this matter, however, I will leave that decision to the discretion of the committee.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

Adopted: May 30, 1995

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

AS-444-95/RC
RESOLUTION TO
APPROVE INDIRECT COST DISTRIBUTION POLICY

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached Indirect Cost Distribution Policy; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached Indirect Cost Distribution Policy be forwarded to President Baker and Vice President Koob for approval and implementation.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Research Committee
Date: April 25, 1995

INDIRECT COST DISTRIBUTION POLICY

Whereas indirect costs recovered on grants and contracts are reimbursements by the sponsor to the University for real costs that the University has incurred;

and whereas the University is committed to furthering the development of faculty and student research, creative activity, and instructional support activities (e.g. fellowships, curriculum development, student services) on the campus;

the following indirect cost distribution policy is proposed:

1. A fixed percentage of the indirect costs (IDC) recovered on all grants and contracts will be returned to the project investigators and their administrative units (academic administrative units or research centers/institutes that have received senate approval). These funds will be restricted in their use as outlined subsequently in the policy.
2. To qualify for a return of IDC to either a project investigator or an administrative unit the grant or contract must have earned full indirect cost income. ~~equal to 20% of the total direct costs, or the federally negotiated rate on a federal grant or contract in the event that this is less than 20% of total direct costs.~~
3. If a grant/contract qualifies for a return of IDC, 15% of the recovered indirect costs will be returned to the project investigator(s) and 15% to the administrative unit.
4. Distribution of the indirect cost returns computed as above will be made on a quarterly basis. Eighty percent of the 30% to be returned will be distributed at that time. The remainder will be held in reserve until the end of the fiscal year. Direct cost overruns on a project will be covered from the portion of indirect cost income remaining for distribution to that project. Should the overruns exceed the funds available, they will be covered from the indirect cost allocation due to the project in the next fiscal year, before any subsequent distributions are made. Amounts less than \$100 for a fiscal year will not be distributed.
5. The remaining indirect costs will be pooled with those recovered on sponsored projects that did not qualify for a return of IDC, and used to support the Department of Sponsored Programs in the Foundation and the University Grants Development Office. Any funds remaining after the justifiable expenses of these two units have been met, will be transferred to the Dean for Research and Graduate Programs, to be used in support

of the development of research for faculty on the campus.

6. The amount transferred to Research and Graduate Programs will not exceed the total amount returned to project investigators and administrative units in a given fiscal year. Should this occur, additional amounts will be returned to the project investigators and administrative units in proportion to their IDC earnings, so that the total amount of IDC distributed to them is equal to the amount assigned to Research and Graduate Programs.
7. If insufficient funds remain after the distribution to project directors and administrative units to cover the legitimate expenses of the Grants Development and Sponsored Programs offices, the deficit will be covered from the General Fund of the University. Approval of this allocation will be the responsibility of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
8. All sponsored projects are expected to recover full indirect costs (for FY '93-'94, approximately 22% of total direct costs) from the sponsor. Project investigators will make every reasonable effort to assure this.
9. Funds that are returned to project investigators may be used for professional development activities and research expenses. They may not be used to pay additional salary of any kind to the project investigator. Examples of appropriate uses of these funds are:
 - Professional travel
 - Books, journals, office supplies
 - Telephone, postage, photocopy, photographic expenses
 - Secretarial services
 - Student assistant expenses
 - Dues for professional organizations
 - Publication costs
 - Additional released time
10. Funds that are returned to administrative units may be used for any appropriate purpose except to provide additional salary of any kind to project investigators.
11. Sharing of indirect cost returns among several investigators on a single project will be based on the percent effort devoted to the project by each investigator. Only principal and co-investigators will share in the return. The same parameter will be used to determine the sharing of indirect cost returns among administrative units on projects that involve more than one such unit.
12. The Academic Senate Research Committee will develop criteria to assess the impact of the provisions of this policy. The Committee will review the policy at the end of each fiscal year and make recommendations for changes, as appropriate, in a written report to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

Impact of the Application of this Policy to the '93-'94 Fiscal Year (see attached table.)

If this policy had been applied in 1993-1994, 43 project investigators in six colleges, and 20 administrative units in six colleges, would have received returns of indirect cost income, ranging from \$130 to \$13,248 for individual project investigators (total: \$75,291), and \$130 to \$30,297 for individual administrative units (total: \$75,291). A total of \$150,582 would have been returned to project investigators and administrative units. The operating expenses of the Sponsored Programs and Grants Development Offices would have been met fully and * \$5,047 would have remained for the Office of Research and Graduate Programs.

* It should be noted that the Grants Development Office drew on reserves to cover part of their expenses. If GDO expenses had been fully covered, an additional \$18,000 would have been used, resulting in a deficit of \$12,953 rather than a surplus. The deficit would have had to be covered from University funds and no funds would have been transferred to the Research and Graduate Programs Office.

Application of Proposed Indirect Cost Policy to FY 93/94

DISTRIBUTION THRESHOLD, # OF DOLLARS

\$99.99

PD RECOVERY THRESHOLD FOR DIST =

19.99%

THEN PERCENT TO PD =

12.50% OF IDC RECOVERED ON PROJECT

Total to Project Directors

\$75,291

DPT RECOVERY THRESH =

19.99%

THEN PERCENT TO DPT =

12.50%

Total to Departments

\$75,291

Distribution Total

\$150,582

SCH	DEP	DEPDISBOTH	SCH	PD	PDDIST
AGRI	AE	944	AGRI	CAVALETTO	182
AGRI	ASIN	523	AGRI	WILLIAMS	762
AGRI	CRI	5,316	AGRI	DAUGHERTY	148
AGRI	DPTC	2,639	AGRI	HUNT	375
AGRI	DRSC	163	AGRI	HALLOCK	635
AGRI	ITRC	1,333	AGRI	RICE	3,512
AGRI	SOIL SCI	342	AGRI	VILKITIS	1,169
ARED	ARCH	3,580	AGRI	TONG	2,639
ARED	DESI	9,926	AGRI	REIF	163
BUSI	IT	130	AGRI	STYLES	1,333
ENGR	AERO	1,023	AGRI	DINGUS	138
ENGR	ARDFA	30,297	AGRI	RICE	204
ENGR	CSCI	408	ARED	POHL	3,590
ENGR	ELEE	1,592	ARED	POHL	9,668
ENGR	ME	2,364	ARED	RODGER	258
LIBA	PSHD	827	BUSI	GAY	130
SCMA	BIO	4,341	ENGR	CUMMINGS	1,023
SCMA	CHEM	1,433	ENGR	CHATZIOANOU	3,551
SCMA	CTED	675	ENGR	HOCKADAY	7,418
SCMA	PHYS	7,436	ENGR	KOLKAILAH	292
			ENGR	MACCARLEY	356
			ENGR	MARTIN	1,041
			ENGR	SULLIVAN	11,246
			ENGR	VAN'T RIET	194
			ENGR	WALSH	6,199
			ENGR	FISHER	408
			ENGR	MACCARLEY	738
			ENGR	NAFISI	527
			ENGR	TANDON	326
			ENGR	CARPENTER	1,356
			ENGR	CHIVENS	467
			ENGR	MEDIZAHDEH	541
			LIBA	LEVI	340
			LIBA	VALENCIA-LAVER	487
			SCMA	HANSON	3,074
			SCMA	HOLLAND	656
			SCMA	HOLLAND/HANSON	611
			SCMA	CENSULLO	164
			SCMA	JONES	248
			SCMA	WILLS	1,021
			SCMA	CICHOWSKI	675
			SCMA	FRANKEL	1,660
			SCMA	HOFFMAN	1,904
			SCMA	KNIGHT	1,237
			SCMA	ROSEN	2,635

Sims - Exec 8/16/95

Adopted: May 30, 1995

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



AS-443-95/GSC
RESOLUTION ON
GRADUATE RESEARCH AND THESIS "SP" GRADE CHANGES

- WHEREAS, The campus has the authority to determine policy on "SP" grades in graduate research and thesis courses; and
- WHEREAS, The current policy on this matter is unnecessarily restrictive and places undue burden on students; and
- WHEREAS, Completion of the required number of units of thesis research does not satisfy the thesis requirement; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That grades of "SP" issued by an instructor in graduate research and thesis courses will be replaced by an "NC" if a final grade has not been assigned within three (3) years of registration for the course.

Proposed by the Graduate Studies Committee
May 3, 1995
Revised May 30, 1995

Post-it Fax Note	7671	Date	7/11	# of pages	1
To	<i>Susan Opara</i>	From	<i>Bonnie King</i>		
Co./Dept.		Co.			
Phone #	<i>1508</i>	Phone #	<i>2186</i>		
Fax #	<i>1725</i>	Fax #	<i>5292</i>		

File D - Expo 8/16/95

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dan Howard-Greene
Executive Asst. to the President

FROM: Dean Bruno, Director *LYB*
Major and Real Estate Gifts

SUBJECT: Naming of the Alumni House

DATE: August 14, 1995

COPIES: Bill Boldt

Enclosed is a draft of the letter from President Baker to the Vice Chancellor's office requesting permission to rename the Alumni House to the Albert B. Smith Alumni and Conference Center. The format of the this letter follows suggested CSU policies and procedures. I have also provided biographical information on Al Smith for you to review with the members of the executive committee of the Academic Senate.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

DRAFT

August 14, 1995

Douglas X. Patiño
Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
The California State University
400 Golden Shore, Suite 116
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Vice Chancellor Patiño:

In recognition of a significant donation by Mr. Albert B. Smith, we are proposing to rename the existing Alumni House building, the Albert B. Smith Alumni and Conference Center. Mr. Smith's substantial bequest to Cal Poly includes the Swanton Pacific Ranch and Railroad in Santa Cruz and other personal assets.

In accordance with the January 1995 revision of the Policy and Procedures on Naming California State University Facilities and Properties, we have consulted with the Executive Committee of the campus Academic Senate. We trust that the following resolution will be accepted by the Board of Trustees at their September meeting:

BE IT RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University that the Alumni House building at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, be designated the Albert B. Smith Alumni and Conference Center.

Sincerely,

Warren J. Baker
President

xc: Frank Lebens

ALBERT B. SMITH BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Leaving San Jose State College in the early 1940s to attend Cal Poly because the campus was bisected by a rail line was the first step in alumnus Albert B. Smith's ('44 crop science, '56 ag education) more than 50-year involvement with Cal Poly and its College of Agriculture.

Smith had three passions in life: teaching, ranching and the railroad; and he generously shared those passions with the University's faculty, staff and students during his lifetime. He ensured those legacies would continue after his death by establishing a trust donating his \$22-million estate, including his 3,200-acre Swanton Pacific Ranch, to the College of Agriculture.

Al Smith was as equally generous with his time and experience. Beginning in 1987, he allowed the ranch to be used as a "living laboratory," where hundreds of interdisciplinary students could work and live. Smith shared his experiences and worked alongside the students, teaching them about the rangeland, timberland and cropland. He instilled in them a feeling of responsibility and commitment to the preservation of natural beauty. Swanton Pacific continues to provide a unique educational opportunity for Cal Poly students to participate in a total farm laboratory experience.

Smith's working one-third scale steam railroad on the ranch was also bequeathed to Cal Poly. Faculty, staff and students will continue to expand the track and maintain the locomotives built for the 1915 Panama-Pacific International Exposition.

Prior to his death, Smith provided significant resources to the College of Agriculture to enhance ag programs, finance ranch operations, provide grants for student research, construct additional instructional facilities on the ranch so more students could live there and take general education classes via the University's distance learning capabilities. He also underwrote the salary of the professor in charge of academic programs on the ranch.

His advice was equally as important as his financial resources. Smith served as a very active member of the College of Agriculture's Advisory Council and had close relationships with President Baker and the deans of the College.

In 1988, Smith was named the honored alumnus from the College of Agriculture and, in 1993, became the first recipient of Cal Poly's President's Medal of Excellence.

Inia - Exec 8/16/95

To: Academic Senate Executive Committee August 15, 1995
From: Harvey Greenwald
Subject: Survey

Enclosed are copies of two proposals from the Survey Committee which consists of: Susan Currier, Linda Dalton, Glenn Irvin, Patricia Ponce, Dick Shaffer, Bob Smidt, George Stanton, Jack Wilson, and myself.

1. The first proposal involves a pilot survey that would be administered to a test group of individuals during the last week of the Summer Quarter. Its purpose would be to gain information that could be used to refine the survey so that an improved survey could be sent to the entire faculty during the Fall Quarter. It is likely that the open ended questions would not be part of the survey that would be sent to the entire faculty.
2. The second proposal involves the creation of focus groups to discuss the larger issue of quality. It is hoped that these focus groups could begin during the Fall Conference.

Both of these proposals will be discussed at the Executive Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday, August 16.

***Faculty Survey on Spending Priorities and Educational Quality
Conducted by The Academic Senate***

Anticipating an extended downturn in state funding for higher education, Cal Poly's administration is searching for alternative revenues to sustain the quality of the education we offer students. Therefore, President Baker has proposed an initiative, known as the Cal Poly Plan, for augmenting state allocations to Cal Poly with higher fees from students.

Preliminary discussions with the Chancellor's Office have begun, but certainly no decisions, which would involve students, faculty, and staff, as well as the CSU Trustees and, probably, the legislature, have been reached. Indeed, the very frame for a Cal Poly Plan remains, so far, undefined.

What is clear is that such a plan would require accountability for the effective use of resources in pursuit of our agreed-upon goals and mission. To this end, the university is trying to gather important information from both students and faculty. During fall registration, students were surveyed to determine their priorities for spending the additional dollars generated by a local fee increase. By means of the attached instrument, the Academic Senate is asking faculty to determine their spending priorities for the same dollars. We're also asking faculty to help define quality at Cal Poly since quality will figure importantly in any system of accountability.

At this point, the Academic Senate neither accepts nor rejects the notion of the Cal Poly Plan. It won't take a position without a full discussion in the Senate. To help us shape discussion in the interim, we ask that you complete and return the attached survey. Your individual thoughtful responses to this survey may be crucial if faculty are to be accurately represented. The Academic Senate is concerned that faculty maintain a position of leadership. Your responses will be anonymous, and all results will be presented in summary form only. We look forward to hearing your views. Please feel free to call me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Harvey Greenwald, Chair
Academic Senate (ext. 1657)

Please return completed survey to the academic senate office.

State of California

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California
93407

Memorandum

To: Sample of Summer Faculty

Date: August 15, 1995

Copies:

From: Harvey Greenwald, Chair
Chair, Academic Senate.
Ext. 1657

Subject: Trial Questionnaire

The Academic Senate is attempting to pretest a questionnaire that we plan to send to all faculty early in fall quarter. We have selected a few faculty who are teaching summer quarter to help us refine the questionnaire. As you may be aware, often past questionnaires have been used without pretesting and have led ambiguous or confusing results. We are trying to avoid that problem by asking you to answer the following questionnaire.

- Please actually fill out the questionnaire as though it is the finished product. When you find an area that is confusing, awkward or you feel misses something important, place a check next to that spot. DO NOT write your comments yet. Please wait until you have finished the questionnaire. It is important that you also examine the flow of the questions, and if you stop to write comments you may miss other problems. When you are finished you will see that the last question asks you for your comments. Please feel free to give us your comments there, or if you would prefer, write comments on the margins of the questionnaire, or use additional paper.

If it is possible we would like to receive your completed questionnaire and comments by Monday, August 28th, although we will accept your input at anytime. If you have any questions, please call me at ext-1657, or Richard Shaffer at ext-1374.

Thank you in advance for your valuable help.

A. Possible Areas For Increased Funding

The Cal Poly Plan proposed by the Administration would increase student fees to make up for the decline in State support. Should the Poly Plan be approved by the Trustees and the Legislature, the fees could be used for a number of different purposes. The Cal Poly Academic Senate is interested in your views about where the increase funding should be directed.

For the following questions, please indicate whether you feel each area should get a Major Increase, Slight Increase, Stay the Same, Slight Decrease, or a Major Decrease in funding. (Circle one number in each row.)

Do you feel the areas should get a:

		Major Increase	Slight Increase	Stay the Same	Slight Decrease	Major Decrease	No Opinion / Do Not Know
Professional Development							
1.	Training or workshops on general teaching effectiveness.	1	2	3	4	5	0
2.	Release time for course development / modification.	1	2	3	4	5	0
3.	Training in computer applications (word processing, spreadsheets, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5	0
4.	Training /workshops on higher level, specialized computer applications.	1	2	3	4	5	0
5.	Training in multi-media.	1	2	3	4	5	0
6.	Release time for research.	1	2	3	4	5	0
7.	Sabbaticals.	1	2	3	4	5	0
8.	Travel for professional meetings /training.	1	2	3	4	5	0

Do you feel the areas should get a:

		Major Increase	Slight Increase	Stay the Same	Slight Decrease	Major Decrease	No Opinion / Do Not Know
Faculty Staffing							
9.	Hire tenure track faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	0
10.	Hire full-time non-tenure track faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	0
11.	Hire part-time non-tenure track faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	0
12.	More faculty teaching summer quarter.	1	2	3	4	5	0
Teaching Load							
13.	Funding to reduce class sizes.	1	2	3	4	5	0
14.	Funding to reduce teaching unit load.	1	2	3	4	5	0
15.	Funding for more student or graduate assistants.	1	2	3	4	5	0
Course Offerings							
16.	Offer more sections of general education classes.	1	2	3	4	5	0
17.	Offer more sections of classes in the student's major.	1	2	3	4	5	0
18.	Offer more summer quarter classes.	1	2	3	4	5	0
19.	Offer more early or late classes.	1	2	3	4	5	0

Do you feel the areas should get a:

		Major Increase	Slight Increase	Stay the Same	Slight Decrease	Major Decrease	No Opinion / Do Not Know
Student Support Services							
20.	Disabled student services.	1	2	3	4	5	0
21.	Academic advising centers.	1	2	3	4	5	0
22.	Faculty advisor training	1	2	3	4	5	0
23.	Release time for faculty advising.	1	2	3	4	5	0
24.	Academic Skills Center (learning assistance).	1	2	3	4	5	0
25.	Psychological Services.	1	2	3	4	5	0
26.	Careers and Placement.	1	2	3	4	5	0
27.	Health Services.	1	2	3	4	5	0
28.	Extra curricular enrichment -- recreation, student life activities, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	0
29.	Housing services.	1	2	3	4	5	0
Library Services							
30.	Buy more books and materials.	1	2	3	4	5	0
31.	Create more electronic access.	1	2	3	4	5	0
32.	Increase operating hours.	1	2	3	4	5	0

Do you feel the areas should get a:

		Major Increase	Slight Increase	Stay the Same	Slight Decrease	Major Decrease	No Opinion / Do Not Know
General Departmental/School Budget							
33.	Department equipment.	1	2	3	4	5	0
34.	Support staffing / Student assistants.	1	2	3	4	5	0
35.	Other departmental operating expenses.	1	2	3	4	5	0
Equipment							
36.	Equipment for use in faculty offices.	1	2	3	4	5	0
37.	Equipment for students in courses in major.	1	2	3	4	5	0
38.	Equipment for students in non-major / general education courses.	1	2	3	4	5	0
39.	Increasing general access to information technology in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	0
Other Programs							
40.	Speakers forums.	1	2	3	4	5	0
41.	Improving students' computer access to their academic records and evaluations.	1	2	3	4	5	0
42.	Training for support staff.	1	2	3	4	5	0

- B. Comments:** Please comment further on any areas we may have missed that you feel should be funded more fully.

C. Priorities

- | | Item
Ranking | How much
would you
spend on this
out of \$100?
(Question 2) |
|---|-------------------------|--|
| 1. We would like to know how you would rank the areas of funding listed above. Please tell us which of the areas you feel should be given the <u>highest</u> priority for additional funds. (You may use the number of the item above if you prefer.) | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| Now, which of the areas do you believe is the <u>second</u> highest priority for additional funds? | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| The <u>third</u> highest priority for additional funds? | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| The <u>fourth</u> highest priority for additional funds? | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| And finally, the <u>fifth</u> highest priority for additional funds? | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| | Should total: | \$100 |
2. We know that \$100 is not much for each of the areas in serious need of funding. But, suppose you had one hundred dollars to spend on the five under funded areas you listed. How would you divide up the \$100? (Please put the dollar figure next to the item in number 1 above. Make sure that your figures total \$100.)

D. Quality

Understanding that productivity will always be a concern, we are interested in trying to figure out what faculty at Cal Poly mean by another dimension of the educational experience; quality. We would like your opinions and suggestions on the following topics. (Please use additional paper if needed.)

1. What does "the **quality** of education" at Cal Poly mean to you?
2. Now for the really hard part, do you have an idea about how one could measure "quality of education"?

E. Background Information

What College do you belong to? _____

What Department do you belong to? _____

How many years have you taught at Cal Poly? _____

How old are you? _____

Are you (Circle one) Full-time Part-time

What is your academic rank /title? _____

Are you tenured (circle one)? Yes No

G. Final Comments

Remember from the cover letter that you are pretesting this questionnaire to find any poorly written portions or to find areas that we have missed. Do you have any comments about the questions on this questionnaire, the general organization of the questionnaire and/or the topics covered.

FOCUS GROUPS FOR DISCUSSION OF QUALITY EDUCATION AT CP

By Subcommittee on Identifying Factors of Quality Education (Jack Wilson, chair, Susan Currier, Linda Dalton and Glen Irvin) 8/11/95

RECOMMENDATION #1 - Two focus groups of 15 people each, 2 from each of the 6 colleges, and one each from UCTE, the Library and Professional Consultative Services be formed and meet once for 3 hours during WOW Week. Group members will be selected the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

Faculty with some expertise as focus group facilitators and familiar with quality issues in higher education as well as thoroughly understanding the purpose of the process will direct the group's discussions. Department chairs and heads have been asked, via e-mail, to recommend faculty for this and so far about 7 names have surfaced.

Each focus group will begin with a brief overview of the Cal Poly Plan.. Group members will have recieved, with the invitation letter, brief materials intended to spark their imagination .

The results of the two focus groups would be presented to the Executive Committee for further action. It is highly likely that the experiences of the first two groups would be useful to the three focus groups which would be formed to meet later, but early fall quarter.

The Executive Committee should decide what the entire process for closure of the quality identifaction process will be before the first two focus groups meet. It is only fair to apprise those groups, as well as the campus, of that early on.

OVERVIEW - The overview will point out the need for identifying educational quality at Cal Poly. Since CP is already recognized at different levels for its excellence, it will be important to point out the need for this exercise as part of a Cal Poly Plan process.

First, there is great pressure on the Chancellor's Office to fund CSU campuses uniformly on a FTES (full time equivalent student basis). Presently we are among the highest in that category. Secondly, the legislature is providing reduced funding per FTES for increased CSU enrollment over and above the 1992-93 base. For example the campus will receive \$4500 per FTES for the additional 300 (?) students (over the 1994-95 enrollment level) which the legislature has mandated that CP accept. This compares to the average funding of \$8500 (?) per FTES at CP. Clearly, while the pressure is on

Cal Poly to grow, the funding per additional student provided by the legislature is not commensurate with the present costs of educating a student here.

Thus, two things should be made absolutely clear to the participants in the focus groups. First, Cal Poly is already a leader in undergraduate education in California and the nation. The faculty should be complemented for this. They should also be complemented highly for working harder than ever over the past four or five years to maintain the high quality of education here in spite of reduced funding. But, increased SCU/s per FTEF (full-time equivalent faculty), they have increased 7% across the campus in the past few years, probably cannot be maintained. With the prospect of even further effective reductions in funding, on an FTES basis, it seems that new approaches must be tried in order to maintain educational quality here while preventing faculty burnout.

Because of its reputation, Cal Poly is uniquely positioned within the CSU to explore opportunities that exist under increased freedom from the strictures of both the Chancellor's Office and Sacramento. This is the essence of a Cal Poly Plan.

Faced with decreasing financial support from Sacramento and possibly from the CSU itself, the key to a Cal Poly Plan is the campus being able to raise student fees above the CSU level. For that to be possible politically, the students, the public and the legislature must 'see' what benefits will be derived for Cal Poly students. Thus defining quality education is essential. The students will be polled this fall to ascertain what they would expect from the campus if they were to pay increased fees.

RECOMMENDATION #2 - Three more focus groups be formed to act during the early part of fall quarter. They would be structured the same as the first two, thus a total of 75 faculty would be involved in the focus groups.

RECOMMENDATION #3 (Structuring the focus group's discussions) - We recommend that the first two focus groups focus on identifying quality factors of Cal Poly. This probably would take two to two and one-half hours. The question of measuring quality will no doubt arise. But, we feel that measuring quality might be covered in the last hour or so, if time permits, or covered at some later meeting of the group or even with an entirely different format. Our reasoning is that we believe that identify quality factors is important enough without engaging the group in discussion of measuring. Also, it appears that it is not essential for the campus to be able to 'answer' the question of how to measure quality by December, while it is essential to the process of developing a Cal Poly Plan that we can identify quality factors by that time.

The following questions are suggested to engage and focus the focus group members in their discussion.

I. What does Cal Poly do well and what does it do differently? The facilitator will entertain general responses, then prompt participants, if necessary, to probe the following.

A. Distinctions between (1) results, such as placement of graduates in jobs or graduate school; (2) process, such as student-faculty interaction, cocurricular activities, student services and the intellectual climate on campus and (3) resources such as the library, percent of faculty with terminal degrees, experience of faculty in research, consulting and community service and faculty awards.

B. Differences between Cal Poly and (1) other CSU campuses, (2) the UC and (3) other universities.

II. Given its mission and the possibility of increased resources per FTES, what should Cal Poly do with those resources to ensure that educational quality is maintained?

III. What would you need as a faculty member to help Cal Poly do a better job?

Closure - Summarizing the results of the discussion and telling focus group members what fruits their efforts will hopefully bear.

Mine - Exec 8/16/95

State of California

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

MEMORANDUM

Date: August 16, 1995

To: Harvey Greenwald, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Laura Freberg, Chair
Academic Senate Instruction Committee

SUBJECT: Review of Exceptional Grade Change Requests

The Grade Change Subcommittee, consisting of Laura Freberg, Ali Shaban, Ken Riener, and Marcia Friedman (ex officio), has met every two weeks throughout the Summer Quarter. We have reviewed grade change requests for grades that are over one year old.

To date, 99 exceptional cases have been reviewed. The following is a summary of the type of courses and action taken by the subcommittee:

<u>Course Type</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>Returned</u>	<u>Pending</u>
Senior Project	27	2	9	17
Other UG Courses	13	3	5	8
Graduate Courses	<u>10</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>
TOTAL	50	5	14	30

Petitions are returned to faculty when information is missing or unclear. The pending cases were submitted prior to the most recent subcommittee meeting and have not been considered yet.

General Conclusions:

1. Senior project is a problem.
 - Students and faculty continue to view senior project as "open-ended. Projects are being undertaken that are not appropriate for two quarters of work.

- The campus is undecided on how to handle “old” senior projects. Some students are being advised to re-enroll or take Concurrent Enrollment, while others are being processed through grade changes. Since considerable money and inconvenience is involved for students, a consistent means of dealing with these projects must be developed and communicated.
 - It is estimated that 10-15% of Cal Poly students complete all requirements *except* senior project. This is an incredible waste of resources on all accounts.
2. Routine grade changes are not a problem. The policy works well in this area.
 3. The recently approved graduate grade change resolution should resolve most of the problems with graduate courses.

Recommendations:

- The Academic Senate should initiate a dialogue regarding senior project:
 - Should Senior Project be required of all students?
 - What types of activities should be accepted?
 - Who should decide Senior Project policy? Departments, Colleges, or the campus as a whole?
- No student should participate in graduation ceremonies unless that student has completed ALL graduation requirements. Academic Records says that this is a policy that can reasonably be implemented with the cooperation of the faculty.
- Faculty should be reminded that grades should **not** be changed on the basis of additional work handed in after the end of the quarter, with the exception of I and SP grades.
- Faculty should be encouraged to assign letter grades for meeting specified course objectives in senior project and independent study courses. Most of the grade change problems arise from assignment of I or SP grades.

In addition, there are clearly campus “cultures” within colleges and departments that are contributing to high frequency of exceptional grade changes. The Subcommittee is actively seeking to educate these faculty regarding campus policy.

I would like to take this opportunity to especially thank Associate Registrar Marcia Friedman for her assistance with our work.

We will continue to assess the exceptional grade changes with the intent of “fine-tuning” existing campus grading policy. Thank you for your support.