

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

FILE COPY

Academic Senate  
Executive Committee Agenda  
March 31, 1992  
UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>
Andre, Barbara	StLf&Actvs
Andrews, Charles (C)	Actg
Botwin, Michael	ArchEngr
DeMers, Gerald	PE/RA
Devore, Jay	Stats
Gamble, Lynne (VC)	Library
Gooden, Reginald	PoliSci
Kersten, Timothy	Economics
Koob, Robert	VPAA

<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>
Lomas, Charles	EngrTech
Mori, Barbara	SocSci
Murphy, James	IndTech
Peach, David	Mgtmt
Russell, Craig (Secty)	Music
Shelton, Mark	CropSci
Vilkitis, James	NRM

Copies: Warren Baker  
Glenn Irvin  
Howard West  
Geoff Austin  
Kristin Burnett

2-25, 3-10, + 3-12-92  
minutes were  
removed

- I. Minutes:  
Approval of the February 25, March 10, and March 12, 1992 Academic Senate Executive Committee minutes (pp. 3-11).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):  
Current Charges of Academic Senate Committees 1991-1992, Winter Quarter (pp. 12-14).
- III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair
  - B. President's Office
  - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
  - D. Statewide Senators
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
  - A. Academic Senate/committee vacancies:  
Academic Senate committees:

SAED	Constitution & Bylaws	('91-93 term)
	Elections	('91-93 term)
	Library (replcmt for P Pangotra)	('91-92 term)
	GE&B Blue Ribbon Committee (replcmt for Bilbija)	

  
Status of Women Committee:  
Part-time faculty representative  
  
GE&B Subcommittee Area E:  
One vacancy + an alternate  
  
University-wide committees:  
University Union Advisory Board  
Two vacancies (one member and one proxy; this is a voting position)
  - B. Determination of Academic Senate election results for the Schools of Agriculture and Liberal Arts.

Continued on page two ----->

- C. Strategic Planning Document - procedure for finalizing the Faculty Response to the Strategic Planning Document.
  - D. Athletics Governing Board - determination of process for selection of nominees.
  - E. Resolution on Review of Proposal for Graduate Studies at Cal Poly-Shelton, Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee (pp. 15-17).
  - F. Resolution on Revision to Budget Reporting Guidelines-Rogers, Chair of the Budget Committee (pp. 18-19).
- VI. Discussion:  
Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2062-92/AA&FA "The Student-Athlete in the CSU" (pp. 20-24).
- VII. Adjournment:

3/92

CURRENT CHARGES of  
ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES  
1991 - 1992

Winter Quarter

Budget Committee

1. Ongoing charge(s):
  - a. review of Program Change Proposals when appropriate
  - b. review of lottery funds
  - c. review of the academic year's campus budget
  - d. review of the long-range planning required by budget cuts
  - e. review of resource allocation
  - f. review of budget impact of curriculum proposals when appropriate
2. Resolution explaining modification to the Budget Reporting Guidelines
3. Preparation of budget recommendations

Constitution and Bylaws Committee

1. Miscellaneous Bylaw changes for clarity
2. Review of Academic Senate restructuring report of Jan '89
3. Revision of the Resolution on Majority Vote

Curriculum Committee

1. Ongoing charge(s):
  - review curriculum proposals
2. Review of Experiential Education guidelines
3. Revise process of curriculum development

Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee

1. Ongoing charge(s):
  - a. selection of 3 DTA recipients
  - b. selection of Trustees' Outstanding Professor Award nominee
2. Should tenure requirement be eliminated for DTA eligibility?

Elections Committee

1. Ongoing charge(s):
  - a. Academic Senate/committee elections
  - b. Special elections
2. Streamlining the elections process

Fairness Board

1. Ongoing Charge(s):
  - Hear grade grievances

General Education and Breadth Committee

1. Ongoing charge(s):
  - review GE&B proposals as received
2. Comprehensive review of the GE&B program
3. Review upper division requirements in light of the IGETC and full/partial certification
4. Review implications to Area F from new transfer procedures
5. Introduction of a cultural pluralism requirement within the GE&B program

Instruction Committee

1. Add/drop policy
2. Change-of-grade policy

Library Committee

Long-Range Planning Committee

1. Why do majority of Cal Poly student take longer than four years to graduate?
2. Are the concentration, options, and specializations offered at Cal Poly a hinderance?
3. What is impact of the 20 minors on campus?
4. Is the GE&B program excessive (if transfer student is GE certified should s/he be required to take more classes for major)?
5. Is declaring a major upon entering Cal Poly a factor?
6. Does adhering to the CSU factor of approximately 60% transfer students impact this problem?
7. What is the effect of the quarter system of scheduling on this issue?

Personnel Policies Committee

1. Votes of confidence for administrators
2. Revision of procedures for selection of dean committee
3. Recognition of excellent advising in the RTP process
4. Recommendations for increasing the hiring/retention of underrepresented faculty

Research Committee

1. Ongoing charge(s):
  - a. Review of CARE Grants and its guidelines
  - b. Review of State Faculty Support Grants and its guidelines
  - c. Review of Student Research Competition submittals
  - d. Review of ARDFA facility; its administration and allocation of overhead
2. Patent and copyright exploitation
3. The use of human subjects
4. Whether centers/institutes should be "sunsetting"
5. Possibility of allocating funds for journal publications

Status of Women Committee

1. Monitoring progress of the implementation of the new sexual harassment policy
2. Assisting in the coordination of sexual harassment and sexual assault advocacy programs
3. Draft report on status of women at Cal Poly

Student Affairs Committee

1. Are "excessive daily coursework assignments" being required of Cal Poly students?
2. Address issues of AS-369-91/EX on Ethnic Diversity
3. Review material on American Freshman Survey

University Professional Leave Committee

1. Ongoing charge(s):  
Review leave applications

Adopted:

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

AS- -92/LRPC  
RESOLUTION ON  
REVIEW OF PROPOSAL FOR GRADUATE STUDIES AT CAL POLY

- RESOLVED: That the attached Review of Proposal for Graduate Studies at Cal Poly be accepted and forwarded to the Graduate Studies Committee; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the final draft of the Graduate Studies Proposal be submitted to the Academic Senate for review and approval.

Proposed By: The  
Academic Senate Long-  
Range Planning Committee  
Date: March 31, 1992



**REVISED  
DRAFT**

-16-

**RECEIVED**

MAR 3 1992

Long Range Planning Committee  
February 28, 1992

**Academic Senate**

Review of Proposal for Graduate Studies at Cal Poly

The Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) reviewed the October 3, 1991 proposal initiated by the Graduate Studies Committee for Graduate Studies at Cal Poly. In making this review they also referred to the 1989 Report of the Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU (*Graduate Education in the California State University: Implementation Plan for Meeting Public Needs Consistent with Educational Priorities* and the *Recommendations on Graduate Education* approved by the Trustees at the September 11, 1991 meeting.

In general the LRPC agreed with the Cal Poly proposal. Since Cal Poly is committed to a graduate program limited to 10 to 15 percent of the overall enrollment, that program should be a quality program. Many of the current graduate programs need to be upgraded in order to satisfy the definition of quality stated in the Trustee's Implementation Plan. Current programs need to be reviewed critically to determine their quality and the requirements for improving them. The proposal from the Graduate Studies Committee has many good recommendations for doing this.

An extremely important point is that any change in the graduate programs at Cal Poly should not erode the funding support base for undergraduate studies, which remain the primary mission of the institution. Many items in the proposal, such as the statement on page five, "Graduate programs shall be allocated the resources necessary for their development and maintenance." are so general and may be interpreted in so many ways that resources could be pulled from undergraduate education and redirected to graduate programs. It seems unlikely that additional state funding will be available to the campus to augment funding for graduate programs. The LRPC recommends that additional funding for graduate studies at Cal Poly be sought from sources outside the general fund. This includes aggressive pursuit of funding for graduate fellowships. Both graduate and undergraduate programs require adequate funding and neither should suffer at the expense of the other.

The recommendation on page six, "that<sup>17</sup> the key university-wide services supportive of graduate studies be focused in a single office in the line administration" was another area of concern to the LRPC. While all agree there should be a central office to contact for general information, this does not mean that all graduate studies support functions are best conducted in a single office. The functions of admissions and record keeping are perhaps best handled by the centralized processing that now occurs. This allows the university to have specialists in the areas to keep abreast of campus, system-wide, state, and federal regulations regarding procedures, student records, and student rights. A separate graduate application form was recommended by the 1989 Advisory Committee report. This seems like a good idea. It might be possible to more clearly define graduate program roles for certain individuals within the current service offices. The single point of contact could be achieved within the current graduate studies structure since the information necessary is available in the SIS Plus system; however, the point of contact should be highly visible and located in an area of normal student traffic. Graduate coordinators in each degree program need to work closely with department faculty to insure that master's candidates have been accepted by a faculty committee/advisor before enrolling in graduate courses.

The graduate programs at Cal Poly should adhere to most of the standards in the Trustee-approved implementation plan; however, there were some distinct areas of concern in this regard. Recommendation 1.a.3 calls for a core curriculum where appropriate. The appropriateness should be determined by the faculty involved with the program at the local campus level. Recommendations 2 and 5 should not detract from nor erode the funding base for undergraduate instruction. Dollars earmarked for graduate studies should be in addition to undergraduate support, not merely dollars shifted from undergraduate support to graduate support. These dollars should be real added dollars in the budget. Similarly, funds generated by graduate programs should not be allocated to undergraduate instruction (proposal, page 4), but rather used to maintain or improve graduate program quality. Recommendation 3 would require 70 percent of the coursework in a program to be at the graduate level. This is a standard which is above what has been the national standard for graduate programs in the U.S. In addition, this would impose a hardship on low-enrollment graduate programs by increasing the need for graduate level courses, many of which would have less than break-even enrollment. The LRPC questions the system-wide implementation of this standard.

The concerns discussed here should be addressed by the Graduate Studies Committee before seeking final approval of the graduate studies proposal.



RESOLUTION

BUDGET PROCESS

BACKGROUND: The CSU is now faced with budget reductions of unprecedented proportions.

In addition, there has not been a timely involvement of the faculty in the budgetary process at Cal Poly until this year. As a consequence, the Academic Senate Budget Committee and the Academic Senate have operated in reaction to the budget, rather than as consultants to the preparation of the budget.

WHEREAS: The established procedure for the involvement of the Cal Poly Academic Senate in the budget preparation process allows for limited participation of faculty; and,

WHEREAS: Budget decisions directly affect the instructional program of CAL POLY; and,

WHEREAS: The faculty has the primary responsibility for the instructional program; and,

WHEREAS: The current funding does not appear likely to improve significantly in the foreseeable future; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the University shall create a Faculty Position Bank, that shall consist of faculty positions which are to be available during contraction of budgets or expansion of budgets; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That during periods of budget contraction that require faculty reduction, those schools whose tenured and tenure-track faculty will not be affected by lay-off will "lend" to the Faculty Position Bank only positions held by part-time or full-time temporary appointees; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That a school faced with faculty reduction may apply to "borrow" from the Faculty Position Bank, only after all faculty positions that are not tenured or tenure-track in the school have been released; and, be it further

RESOLVED: When faculty reduction is necessary within a school, said reduction should be implemented on a vertical basis; and be it further

- RESOLVED: When resources become available, those schools that have borrowed from the Faculty Position Bank must repay those positions before positions may be filled by the borrowing school; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That during periods of budget expansion, that will permit an increase in faculty positions, the University will place these new positions into the Faculty Position Bank; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That for purposes of allocating new faculty positions, schools seeking new positions or the return of "borrowed" positions, will be required to submit Budget Change Proposals (BCP); and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate take an active role in the BCP evaluation process.

Proposed by the Academic Senate  
Budget Committee  
Date: March 31, 1992

ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY



AS-2062-92/AA & FA  
January 9-10, 1992

THE STUDENT-ATHLETE IN THE CSU

- WHEREAS, Intercollegiate athletics is an important activity in the California State University; and
- WHEREAS, There is heuristic and social value of competitive sport for our students; and
- WHEREAS, Athletic competition in the CSU has made a dynamic contribution to nearly all of our campuses, helping to build a sense of community as well as to promote community support; but
- WHEREAS, Recent studies, such as the March, 1991 report of the Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (KFCIA) and the February, 1990 report of the American Association of University Professors Special Committee on Athletics (AAUP) document widespread public concern regarding the frequently questionable relationship of some programs in intercollegiate athletics to the primary mission of colleges and universities, which is to educate students; and
- WHEREAS, The KFCIA has issued a call for the reform of intercollegiate athletics, asserting that "[i]t is time to get back to first principles. Intercollegiate athletics exist first and foremost for the student-athletes who participate, whether male or female, majority or minority, whether they play football in front of 50,000 or field hockey in front of their friends" (KFCIA p.8); and
- WHEREAS, The KFCIA has published (March, 1991) and the AAUP has adopted (June 1991) guidelines for intercollegiate athletics; and

(over)

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate CSU firmly believes that the obligation of the California State University is to educate, as well as to graduate, our students; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate CSU firmly believes that programs in intercollegiate athletics should reflect the academic values of the California State University; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate CSU firmly believes that our academic values, as they pertain to intercollegiate athletics, should be expressed in a statement of principles common to all campuses of the California State University; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the "Principles for Intercollegiate Athletics Programs in the CSU" appended to this resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to issue an executive order implementing the "Principles for Intercollegiate Athletics Programs in the CSU" to provide necessary guidance for faculty, students, and administrators in the appropriate operation of CSU intercollegiate athletics programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees and Chancellor to lodge authority and responsibility with the individual campus presidents for all aspects of their athletic programs.

### **Institutional Principles**

1. Athletic administrators should ground all regulatory procedures in the primacy of academic values.
2. The faculty is responsible for the curriculum and for protection of academic standards.
3. CSU campus committees overseeing or advising on athletics should be primarily composed of faculty representatives recommended by the campus academic senates.
4. Faculty representatives appointed by campus presidents to athletic governance organizations, such as the NCAA and regional athletics consortia, should be endorsed by their academic senates.
5. Presidents should be fully committed to principles of equity (as defined by Title IX of the 1963 Civil Rights Act).
6. Presidents should commit themselves to an annual review of their athletics programs in areas pertaining to gender equity (to include schedules, facilities, travel arrangements, coaching, participation, and distribution of resources). These reviews should be compiled in an annual CSU report for general distribution.
7. Campuses should undertake comprehensive annual policy audits (to include admissions, academic progress, graduation rates, and ICA budgets) for the purpose of monitoring compliance with the principles set forth in this document. These audits should be compiled in an annual CSU report for general distribution.
8. Graduation rates for student-athletes should be as high as those of other students.
9. Satisfactory graduation rates should be used as a criterion for the certification of each segment of the institution's athletic program.

(over)



Eligibility and Admission of Prospective Students

10. Each campus must develop the means by which to make certain that student-athletes understand that their primary obligation to themselves and to the University is to be students. Students must understand that representing their campus by participation in inter-collegiate athletic competition is a privilege, one contingent upon satisfactory academic performance, upon steady progress toward a baccalaureate degree, and upon social conduct which reflects the values of the University.
11. All prospective student-athletes should have a reasonable prospect of graduating and should normally meet regular admissions standards. Such judgments should be made by admissions officers.
12. Student-athletes accepted as "special admits" should be treated on the same basis as all other applicants for special admission and should be constrained by the same requirements for satisfactory progress.
13. Students whose high school course of study renders them academically ineligible or partially ineligible under NCAA rules specifying units, course patterns, and GPA must (1) sit out a year and (2) meet the normal requirements for eligibility before competing.
14. The honoring of 'letters of intent' should be made contingent upon production of high school graduation grade point averages and test scores equivalent to those required of all other students. Students who are invited for campus visits should be informed that all scholarship offers are contingent upon their meeting academic standards appropriate for admission.
15. California Community College and junior college transfer students should meet the standards for transfer required of all other students.
16. Student-athletes should be released from letters of intent either (1) if the coach who recruited the student leaves or (2) if the program is put on NCAA probation.

Eligibility of Continuing Students

17. Student-athletes should be constrained to take the regular array of college majors and should follow courses of study leading to completion of a major. They should not be counselled or permitted to enroll in courses simply to earn units necessary for eligibility.

18. In order to remain eligible, student-athletes must demonstrate satisfactory progress toward a degree.

19. Athletic eligibility should be determined on a term-by-term basis.

Wm - Exec Com 3/31/92

State of California

California Polytechnic State University  
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

## MEMORANDUM

Date: March 30, 1992  
Copies:

To: Glenn Irvin  
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs  
  
via: Charles Andrews, Academic Senate Chair

From: Bob Wolf, ~~Chair~~  
Academic ~~Senate~~ Fairness Board

Subject: Reaction to Irvin-Koob Memo, August 12, 1991, Regarding  
Changes of Grade Policy

The following comments are numbered to correspond to the numbering of the paragraphs contained in the above-referenced memo:

1. There is a perceived problem that the submission of grades is due too soon after final exams and does not allow possible acceptance of late or extra credit papers from students. Many universities have grades submitted much later than Cal Poly (three weeks later at some universities in the CSU system).
2. The only basis for a change of grade seems to be too restrictive. What if the instructor, after turning in the grades, discovered the student plagiarized to some degree or another a paper/project? Also, vague deadlines given by the instructor or the "special" situation of a student may justify the acceptance of a project/paper after grades have been submitted.
3. What is the logic of the sixty-day time period? Why can't an instructor also initiate a change of grade? An error may be found by the instructor due to a misplaced paper or there may be other valid reasons to warrant such a change?
4. The signature by the department chair/head seems too antithetical to the professional autonomy of the instructor. Is the instructor to be trusted or not with the determination of a grade for a student?
5. Please give a few, specific examples of "extraordinary circumstances" to better ascertain that all students are treated similarly.

If the Fairness Board can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to contact me.

Hand ExecCom 3/31/92

DOCUMENTS ON FILE IN THE  
ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE

- 3/2/92 Memo/attachments, Kerschner to Presidents, re "Recommendations from Panel of Experts on Campus Climate"
- 3/10/92 Memo/attachments, Wilcox to Campuses, re "Senate Positions on Budget Issues (Policy Position re '92/93 CSU Budget Requests and Proposed Student Fees and Dealing with Reduced Funding: Maintaining the Quality of the Educational Program)"
- 3/11/92 Campus responses to the Academic Senate CSU Resolution "The Student-Athlete in the CSU"
- 3/12/92 Memo/attachments, Wilcox to Senate Chairs, re "Proposed Changes in Legislation Covering the Basic Teaching Credential"
- 3/12/92 Memo/attachments, Wilcox to Munitz, re "Status of Senate Resolutions" acted on at March 5-6, 1992 meeting
- 3/16/92 Memo, anonymous author, re rules for establishing priorities during the "Budget Crisis at Cal Poly and the CSU System"
- 3/24/92 Memo/attachments, Suess to Deans, re "Appointment and Payroll Procedures for Summer Quarter 1992"
- 3/27/92 Memo/attachments, Wilcox to Senate Chairs, re "Urgent Requests" for community action and communication regarding the CSU funding crisis

*Final Exec Com 3/31/91*

GRADUATE STUDIES AT CAL POLY  
a proposal initiated by  
the Graduate Studies Committee

October 3, 1991

Mission and goals

Graduate studies in The California State University system involves programs leading to the master's degree and in some instances, to joint doctoral degrees in collaboration with doctoral degree granting institutions in the state. The term "graduate work" also applies to postbaccalaureate work leading to a credential or certificate. CSU campuses offer the Master of Science and the Master of Arts degrees as well as applied degrees (both first and second professional degrees).

The goal of graduate education at Cal Poly is to offer students advanced study in professional and technical programs relevant to professional currency and scholarship, and consistent with the overall mission of the university. Generally, master's degree programs will satisfy this need, although in certain instances, joint doctoral programs will be the appropriate means.

The master's degree indicates that the holder has mastered a program of study in a particular field sufficiently to pursue creative projects in that specialty. The degree is normally awarded for the completion of a coherent program designed to assure the mastery of specified knowledge and skills, rather than for the accumulation of a certain number of random course credits after the baccalaureate.

Graduate education has many benefits. The concentration on advanced learning, characterized by problem-solving and the search for new knowledge, creates an intensified intellectual environment that benefits students, faculty and, thus, the entire campus community. It offers faculty members the opportunity to pursue intellectual inquiry and research in greater depth than at the baccalaureate level. The emphasis on applied educational programs and research directly benefits the State of California and its industry.



## Background

Cal Poly offers master's degree programs that are concentrated in a highly selected number of areas. In 1989, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation team noted in its report that since its last study, master's programs have continued to develop and mature: "Several of the master's programs have grown notably in size and quality during the past decade. . . ." One programmatic area--the MS degree in Counseling--offers only master's level programs, but this is the exception "since graduate programs at Cal Poly operate in a campus culture that remains primarily undergraduate in orientation." The report goes on to note that as faculty qualifications continue to increase, "it is reasonable to expect that graduate programs will continue to be strengthened."

Some of the evidence the WASC team used is shown in the snapshot of enrollments given in the Appendix. This chart shows that the number of master's candidates has increased over 35% in the last five years, and the number of master's degrees offered has increased from fifteen to nineteen. In addition, qualifications of new faculty have improved and external grants for research have grown tenfold in the last decade to over \$4,200,000, garnering the equivalent of over \$5000 in research dollars for each graduate student on campus--twice the amount earned per student by our nearest competitor in the CSU. What is remarkable about this record of achievement is that it has been achieved under particularly trying circumstances.

A Cal State committee was formed three years ago to study the master's degree on the then nineteen campuses. Its thorough report and implementation plan, which identifies a number of areas of serious concern, was approved by the Trustees at its September, 1991 meeting. The campus Graduate Studies Committee, responding to and building on this report, notes the following impediments to quality graduate programs:

- an admissions office that finds it increasingly difficult to accommodate the special needs of graduate admissions in the crush of undergraduate applications

- a graduate curriculum review process that does not include evaluation by a university-wide group committed to with the welfare of graduate programs

- mode and level funding that uses 15 student credit units as the fulltime load for graduate students rather than a 12 or 9 student credit unit load.

- an administrative environment that mingles graduate and undergraduate concerns routinely, even when their needs are distinct and clearly different

inadequate instructional workload credit for faculty members advising students on theses, especially second and third readers

inadequate funding for library and support services crucial to advanced work

no general fund support for graduate assistantships for research or teaching

no recognition in the financial aid program for the unique needs of graduate students, or the crucial role that out-of-state tuition waivers play in building a program

no identity for graduate students outside the department through such perquisites as the assignment of library carrels or the allotment of special recognition at graduation

#### Enhancing graduate studies

This is an opportune time to examine the role of graduate studies at Cal Poly. Senate Bill No. 1570 (the Nielsen Bill), signed into law in the Fall of 1990, reaffirms the primary mission of The California State University as the provision of undergraduate and graduate instruction through the master's degree, with continued authorization of the joint doctoral degree. In addition, the university-wide Strategic Planning Committee, formed to assess the direction the campus should pursue, proposed in its working draft ("Cal Poly Strategic Planning Document," September, 1991) for consideration by the campus the following statement about graduate studies:

Cal Poly shall support and develop quality graduate programs that complement the mission of the university.

#### Objectives:

- A. By 1995, Cal Poly shall ensure that 10 to 20 percent of each graduating class is in graduate programs. These include postbaccalaureate credential programs, masters degrees, and joint Ph.D. or professional doctorates. Masters degree programs that combine the strengths of two or more disciplines are encouraged.
- B. By the end of the 1992-93 academic year, Cal Poly shall establish a strong supportive structure to assure that the university community provides necessary financial, instructional, library, and administrative resources for graduate programs.

Following on these initiatives, this proposal seeks to improve the environment for graduate level instruction by developing a campus-wide constituency that will serve as an advocate for graduate studies, by directing more attention and support to the development and review of graduate programs, and by providing an identity for graduate studies that consolidates the university-wide administrative support services for graduate programs into a single point of contact for students.

Graduate programs properly developed can become an important source of resources for instruction at both graduate and the undergraduate level. Advanced study in a discipline or profession provides students and faculty the opportunity to win external grants which in turn strengthen the program and offer resources for study, travel, and professional development of the kind we can no longer expect to receive from the state's general fund.

#### Guiding principles

The following principles are proposed to guide the further development of graduate studies at Cal Poly:

1. Graduate instruction shall be pursued with a commitment proportionate to that which has been traditionally directed towards the undergraduate instructional program.
2. Graduate and undergraduate programs shall be handled individually in those areas where the needs are distinct such as admissions and new program development and review.
3. The primary responsibility for the conduct of the graduate program in matters not affecting the university at large shall remain at the level of the nearest instructional unit, which may be the school or department depending on the scope of the graduate program administered.
4. Graduate programs shall be guided by a campus-wide group of faculty members who are committed to graduate education. This group shall be an enabling rather than a prescriptive body.
5. Graduate programs shall be subject to periodic review, following campus-wide procedures which may involve off-campus reviewers in the discipline.
6. New and continuing graduate degree programs shall be justified in their own terms and merits as they relate to the campus's instructional mission.

7. Graduate programs shall be allocated the resources necessary for their development and maintenance. These resources shall be clearly identified and shall provide an appropriate infrastructure of facilities (including library and information technologies) which enables the conduct of graduate work and research at an appropriate level and in an appropriate and timely fashion. Low enrollment graduate programs judged vital to the university's mission may be given special consideration for support.

#### Recommendations and analysis/rationale

Three key elements are essential to the welfare of graduate studies: organization, resources, and identity. Organization consists of a university-wide advocacy group, the line organization, and departmental support. Resources include both physical and human ones. Identity consists of tangibles and intangibles which together create the profile of the program and give it recognition among its peers.

#### A. ORGANIZATION

**RECOMMENDATION:** That there be a campus-wide academic policy formulating body which has primary responsibility for graduate studies policy and curriculum.

**Discussion:** Currently those bodies which are key to setting policy for graduate studies--the curriculum committee in particular--do not have significant representation from faculty involved in graduate studies. This proposal addresses that issue by constituting a body comprised mainly of faculty members with a deep commitment to and involvement in graduate studies as the principal group to guide graduate studies on campus.

The group shall be an advocate for graduate instruction and will have responsibility for policy, for the strategic direction of graduate studies, for the level of excellence for new and established programs, and for coordinating admission and monitoring the progress of graduate students. On matters of policy, the actions of the group shall be sent to the executive committee of the Academic Senate for ratification within a prescribed time frame. On matters of curriculum and program, the actions of the group shall be sent to the curriculum committee of the Academic Senate for ratification within a prescribed time frame. Such actions shall be taken to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for consultation before becoming final.

The key person at the school or departmental level shall continue to be the graduate coordinator, who shall be responsible for the integrity and administration of his or her department's graduate programs.



**RECOMMENDATION:** That the key university-wide services supportive of graduate studies be focused in a single office in the line administration.

**Discussion:** Currently important university-wide roles and services relating to graduate studies are spread among a number of disparate offices. The graduate studies office is responsible for policy, for the implementation of CSU standards, for monitoring student progress, and for thesis review. But graduate curriculum is coordinated out of another office, admissions from a third, records from a fourth, and so on. Thus, the campus-wide functions that affect graduate students directly are distributed among a number of offices, some of which may not always be sensitive to the needs and concerns of graduate students.

This recommendation would eliminate that deficiency by creating a central point of identity for graduate students, a graduate studies office where graduate students would go to handle their extra-departmental needs. The actual processing of the paperwork may not be performed physically in that office, but the graduate student would have the impression that this was so, and would thus have a coherent image of graduate studies supportive services outside the academic department. In so doing, the graduate studies office will present a coherent image to faculty and students alike.

## B. RESOURCES

**RECOMMENDATION:** That adequate physical resources be made available for graduate studies.

**Discussion:** The CSU-wide study of graduate programs has urged that funding formulas be revised to provide greater support for the graduate programs in terms of facilities. Needs that must be addressed include dedicated study space for graduate students, e.g. library carrels, improved facilities for research, and better materials, including books, materials, supplies, and equipment.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That adequate human resources be made available to graduate studies, including appropriate time for faculty and staff development, thesis supervision, teaching, administrative duties, and research.

**Discussion:** It is widely recognized, as the CSU-wide study has noted, that the human resources necessary for sustaining quality graduate programs are not sufficiently recognized in the current CSU mode and level formulas. Critical areas of deficiency include: inappropriate levels for defining a full time student load for graduate programs (15 units); lack of appropriate workload definition for thesis advising; lack of support for



graduate teaching and research assistantships; and lack of support for merit-based fellowships and out-of-state tuition and fee waivers.

In adopting the graduate study report and recommendations in September of 1991, the Trustees recommended that when the state revenue situation turns around, workload for faculty with significant responsibility for graduate instruction be reduced. This can be accomplished, the report said, "by changing the definition of a full-time equivalent graduate student to 12 Student Credit Units instead of the current 15, but negotiating an increase in the weighting assigned to graduate course units, or by adjusting the normative ratios by which faculty positions are generated for graduate instruction."

In addition, the current mode and level formulas do not address the need for assigned time and clerical support for graduate coordinators. All these issues compound the difficulty of mounting graduate programs of excellence.

#### C. IDENTITY AND PEER REVIEW

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the university seek ways to enhance the identity of graduate studies.

**Discussion:** For many years Cal Poly has articulated its image as that of a preeminent undergraduate institution. This posture has led to distinction nation-wide as a university known for excellence in undergraduate instruction and for uniqueness in its careful understanding of and dedication to its role and mission. But the posture has also inadvertently created problems for the graduate studies program by creating, endorsing, and supporting many traditions that are focussed almost solely on the needs and ends of the undergraduate enterprise. As a result, graduate programs, despite their excellence, have not enjoyed the status accorded undergraduate instruction.

This document proposes that the university actively seek ways to continue to enhance the graduate program by looking for those actions and activities that will increase the awareness of graduate studies on the campus. A key in this endeavor will be the implementation of peer review and recognition, which will elevate the status of graduate studies among the faculty, and thus among the whole academic community.

#### Conclusion

The Graduate Studies Committee proposes this document for consideration as a guiding statement intended to enhance and strengthen graduate programs on campus. The proposal is part of the campus self evaluation begun with the WASC Accreditation Self Study and continued by the Strategic Planning Committee. It

seeks to sharpen the role and mission of graduate studies within the institution as Cal Poly continues to evolve from its early beginnings as a polytechnic high school to a fully mature comprehensive university. It proposes principles to guide the University as it takes its next steps in that process.

## 1991/92 GRADUATE PROGRAMS

**Aeronautical Engineering M.S. (1988)**

**Agriculture M.S. (1969)**

Specializations:

- Agricultural Engineering Technology
- General Agriculture
- Food Science and Nutrition
- International Agricultural Development
- Soil Sciences

**Architecture M.S. (1988)**

Specializations:

- Professional Practice
- Environmental Design

**Biological Sciences M.S. (1967)**

**Business Administration M.B.A. (1969)**

Specializations:

- Business Administration
- Agribusiness

**Chemistry M.S. (1971)**

**City and Regional Planning M.C.R.P. (1975)**

**Civil and Environmental Engineering M.S. (1988)**

**Computer Science M.S. (1973)**

**Counseling M.S. (1988)**

**Education M.A. (1948)**

Specializations:

- Computer-Based Education
- Counseling and Guidance
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Educational Administration
- Reading
- Special Education

**Electronic and Electrical Engineering M.S. (1988)**

Specializations:

- Computer Engineering
- Electrical Engineering
- Electronic Engineering

**Engineering M.S. (1988)**

Specializations:

- Biochemical Engineering
- Industrial Engineering
- Mechanical Engineering
- Metallurgical and Materials Engineering

**English M.A. (1968)**

Emphases:

- Literature
- Linguistics
- Writing

**Home Economics M.S. (1968)**

**Industrial and Technical Studies M.A. (1972)**

**Joint MBA/Engineering M.S. (1990)**

Specialization:

- Engineering Management

**Mathematics M.S. (1968)**

Specializations:

- Applied Mathematics
- Mathematics Teaching

**Physical Education M.S. (1968)**

Emphases:

- Wellness Movement
- Human Movement and Sport

# GRADUATE ENROLLMENT

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>1986-87</u>	<u>1987-88</u>	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>	<u>1990-91</u>
AGRI (45)	64/26	70/29	55/30	58/22	69/23	62
ARCH (45)	29/12	13/5	27/19	19/9	21/5	18
CRP (68)	16/3	18/2	24/4	34/5	28/4	15
MBA (96)	97/36	114/41	123/55	141/61	128/64	118
AERO (45)	-	-	-	2/0	10/1	19
CE (45)	-	-	-	3/3	6/3	9
CSC (45)	58/13	55/22	40/13	54/24	57/11	71
ED (45-48)	123/29	132/47	175/35	172/74	225/70	235
EL/EE (45)	-	-	-	7/10	21/7	28
ENGR (45)	37/15	36/28	47/19	27/10	22/10	23
ENM	-	-	-	-	-	7
ENGL (48)	21/5	17/0	24/6	27/3	41/8	51
CNSLG (90)	42/0	49/4	36/4	39/2	47/8	44
HE	3/3	2/1	1/0	1/4	-	-
IT (45)	12/4	10/5	7/4	11/4	7/5	8
PE (45)	27/4	13/8	14/10	29/7	30/9	29
BIO (45)	14/3	13/8	11/5	9/1	16/6	15
CHEM (45)	8/5	7/0	0/4	6/0	6/3	4
MATH (45)	10/1	18/1	23/7	16/3	12/4	22
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>561/159</b>	<b>567/201</b>	<b>623/215</b>	<b>656/242</b>	<b>746/241</b>	<b>778</b>

Number in parentheses = amount of units required for degree

Number before slash = Fall quarter census - master's candidates only

Number after slash = Graduates for academic year (no data for 90-91 grads)