

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO  
ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - AGENDA

August 18, 1981

F.O.B. 24-B

3:00 PM

Chair, Tim Kersten  
Vice Chair, Ron Brown  
Secretary, Harry Sharp

- I. Minutes
- II. Announcements
- III. Discussion Items
  - A. Deferral of the curriculum cycle
  - B. Academic Planning Committee proposal (Attachment)
  - C. The governance of the multicriteria admissions program.
  - D. General Education and Breadth
  - E. Council of Academic Deans (Attachment)

# Memorandum

Tim Kersten  
Chair, Academic Senate

Date : July 15, 1981

File No.:

Copies : W. Baker  
M. Wilson

From : Hazel J. Jones *HJ*  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Proposed Academic Planning Committee

RECEIVED

JUL 17 1981

Academic Senate

Attached is a proposal to establish an Academic Affairs Planning Committee as a standing committee appointed by President Baker. The membership of the committee would be comprised of five faculty and three administrators, with the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs chairing the committee, which would be advisory to and report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The present proposal incorporates most of your suggestions about the structure and composition of the committee.

I would be pleased to discuss this with you and with the Executive Committee of the Senate as appropriate. Feel free to distribute copies of the proposal.

Attachment

ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE  
California Polytechnic State University  
San Luis Obispo

1. Overview

In an institution such as Cal Poly, whose central mission is career education, it is essential that the University identify its long range goals and establish mechanisms for the change, development and evaluation which will make it possible to reach those goals in an orderly fashion.

2. Purpose

In order to develop a comprehensive planning process for the ongoing assessment of both internal and external factors which influence the University and to provide advice and recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs regarding the goals of the University and the most effective and orderly ways in which to achieve those goals, an Academic Planning Committee will be established.

3. Objectives

- a) Clarify and articulate the philosophy of the University and its educational purposes.
- b) Recommend mechanisms for the systematic incorporation into the planning process of pertinent internal and external data.
- c) Propose programs, structures, and support systems which are derivatives of the planning processes.
- d) Recommend appropriate reference points for the evaluation of academic planning.
- e) Advise and recommend on other matters, as requested by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

4. Committee Membership

The University President shall appoint a nine-person committee, with three-year staggered terms, comprised of the following:

- ~~a) Three faculty chosen from a list of six nominated by the Chair, Academic Senate.~~
- b) Three administrators chosen from a list of six nominated by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- c) Two faculty at large, chosen by the University President.
- d) The Associate Vice President for Academic Programs, who will chair the committee.

# Memorandum

To : Hazel J. Jones  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Date : July 29, 1981

File No.:

Copies : Warren Baker  
Malcolm Wilson

From : Timothy W. Kersten <sup>R</sup>  
Chair, Academic Senate

Subject: Proposed Academic Planning Committee

Thank you very much for your memorandum of July 16, 1981 on the above subject. I agree that your current suggestion is a good one. The basic structure of the group is sound and the chances for a successful and productive planning effort by this group seem good.

However, I do have a couple of questions. First, do we wish to restrict the planning committee's charge to academic affairs only? Our earlier discussion seemed to envision a group which might pursue a wider number of issues. Personally, I am of two minds on this topic. I can see benefits to narrowing the focus and accelerating the operation of the committee thereby, but on the other hand it would seem also useful to have a single group which overviewed all kinds of planning for the University.

Secondly, I am concerned with the structure of the appointment process. I have long wondered whether the submission of a list of numerous nominees is an appropriate method for determining Senate representation on groups such as this. I also wonder why the President appoints two faculty. It seems to me that faculty representatives ought to be selected by the elected representatives of the faculty. The administrative perspective will clearly be reflected by the administrators sitting on the committee and by the administrative officers who receive and digest the committee's work. The affect of the current proposal for committee membership tends to dilute the responsibility of the Academic Senate as the elected voice of the faculty.

In addition, a committee of this importance should be chaired by either the Vice President for Academic Affairs or by the President. In this way the committee's level of importance within the University structure will be commensurate with the importance of its charge.

Accordingly, I would make the following suggestions concerning the committee membership. The five faculty representatives should be nominated by the Chair of the Academic Senate subject to the ultimate approval of the President. I would further recommend that the Vice President for Academic Affairs chair the committee if the committee's charge remains narrowed to academic planning

Hazel J. Jones  
Page Two  
July 29, 1981

only. If the charge is broadened then the President should chair the committee.

Finally, in order to avoid duplication of effort, possible misunderstandings, and working at cross purposes, I suggest that the committee also maintain close and regular exchanges of information and work with the Long Range Planning Committee of the Academic Senate. I would hope that language to this affect would be placed in the objectives statement for the University Planning Committee.

I would be pleased to discuss these matters with you further if you would like, or to discuss them with the President and you as we did during our December 5, 1980 meeting which, as I recall, was a highly productive exercise.

TWK:ss

# Memorandum

RECEIVED


AUG 5 1981

Date : July 31, 1981

File No.:

Copies :

Academic Senate

From : Hazel J. Jones   
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Academic Planning Committee

I appreciate your comments on the Academic Planning Committee proposal. I've asked Norma to arrange a meeting for you and me with Dr. Baker to discuss the proposal, along with other agenda items you and he may have.

The charge to the committee is not really restricted - it is, in fact, quite broad. The committee deliberations should be and will be wide ranging. Nearly everything that happens on a campus impinges in some way, to some degree, on the academic area and is thus of legitimate concern to the academic area.

# Memorandum

Warren Baker, President  
Hazel Jones, Vice President for  
Academic Affairs

Date : July 20, 1981

File No.:

Copies :

From : Timothy Kersten, Chair  
Academic Senate

Subject: Council of Academic Deans

As per our discussion on June 15, 1981, I am forwarding suggested language for CAM 172.A.1. I have attempted to construct the functions statement in a broad manner while adhering to the concept of a Council which is a part of the normal line of administration within the university.

I agree with Vice President Jones that the Committee on Committees should consider this issue in the relatively near future.

## Suggested Language for CAM 172

### A. 1) Council of Academic Deans

#### a) Functions

To review and recommend as requested by the President or Academic Vice President on procedural matters affecting the various schools within the university. To review and recommend as requested by the President or Academic Vice President on educational policy matters affecting the various schools within the university. To bring to the attention of the Academic Vice President any matter pertaining to administration or educational policies or procedures of the university which affects the various schools within the university. Recommendations of the Council of Academic Deans shall be forwarded to the Academic Vice President.

#### b) Membership

Vice President for Academic Affairs (Chair)

Deans of the Instructional Schools (7)

~~Chairman of the Academic Senate (Ex-officio, non-voting)~~

Director, University Library

**Memorandum**

JUL 7 REC'D

cc : Dean William Langworthy  
Dean Jon Ericson ✓

Date : July 6, 1981

File No.:

Copies : Hazel Jones  
Dale Andrews  
Carroll Price II  
Bob Lucas  
Mike Wenzl

From : Warren J. Baker

Subject: Proposal for General Education Study

It is clear that as we look toward the development of our general education program at the University that considerable thought and discussion must occur if we are to develop a comprehensive program. Much of this is now being accomplished through the regular channels of faculty involvement in various committee studies. Like most activities outside of instruction, this is a considerable burden on the faculty, albeit one that they accept willingly.

It is also clear that to implement a sound general education program, it will be necessary that faculty members who advise students understand the objectives of the program and the various alternatives available to a student in achieving the desired results. In my view, this will require a series of workshops over two or three years as well as a systematic evaluation effort. All of these tasks mentioned above are time-consuming and place a significant burden on our limited resources. In the past, we have discussed the need to develop a comprehensive proposal to seek funding to upgrade general education on this campus. We have a relatively unique situation as a polytechnic university attempting to improve its general education program. I think that we may be able to find funding to accomplish some of the tasks cited above if we had a comprehensive proposal.

I would like to have the two of you take the responsibility for generating such a proposal that could be reviewed by the Council of Academic Deans and receive appropriate endorsements for submission to outside funding agencies. Professor Wenzl and other faculty who have worked closely with the development of the general education program could provide some of the detailed information necessary to address these issues. Information on the criteria necessary to qualify for various funding sources and help with the proposal format are available through the office of Academic Affairs.

// Since a great deal of thought has been put into the general education program over the last two years, I would hope that these thoughts could be crystalized into a proposal ready for submission to funding agencies by September 30.



Warren Baker, President

7/10/81

REC

JL

Jon M. Ericson

Academic Senate

H. Jones  
D. Andrews  
C. Price  
B. Lucas  
M. Wenzl  
W. Langworthy  
H. Sharp

Proposal for General Education Study

After receiving your memo this week, I had a phone discussion with Bob Lucas and a conversation with Mike Wenzl. Lucas will be sending me some material, and Wenzl and I will meet again next week. Dean Langworthy is on vacation now, as I will be in August, but he'll be returning next week and I anticipate we will be meeting then.

As I believe you know, the School of Communicative Arts and Humanities made an extensive effort to propose reasonable means to meet the new General Education requirements on an interim basis. A copy of the November 1980 memo with the School's recommendations is attached. The first paragraph of that memo outlines the deliberative process that led to the School's recommendations. As indicated, there has been extensive involvement by faculty and others in the process of developing this School's contribution to the upgrading of general education on this campus.

You may not know that subsequent to this School's activities and actions of fall, 1980, a School Task Force committee was established to coordinate School efforts in planning for general education. That committee was composed of some of the best talent this School has, and was chaired by Christina Orr-Cahall. In her capacity as Special Assistant to the Dean, Dr. Orr-Cahall was assigned .50 administrative time in winter and spring, 1981, to chair the School's G.E. coordinating committee, and to head the development of a proposal to fund study for the long range.

No proposal was developed because Dr. Orr-Cahall was told by central administration early in winter quarter that such proposal development was inappropriate, that any such proposal would be developed by a University committee.

At the present time Dr. Harry Sharp has an administrative assignment in my office for the purpose of coordinating the general education planning that is going on now. Our immediate concern is with the development of a course to meet the "critical thinking" requirement, and the possible development of a single, unified course that would meet the entire 13-14 unit requirement in oral and written communication, and in critical thinking.

In the G.E. section we are now working on, the Chancellor's Executive order calls for "A minimum of nine semester units...". Even our current

10  
Warren Baker, 7/10/81, page 2.

planning is made more difficult because this campus has not yet decided if nine semester units equates to 12, 13, or 14 quarter units. We will nevertheless proceed on the universally accepted method of multiplying semester units by 1.5, and plan for a minimum of 13.5 which must round to 14 to be in accordance with Executive Order 338..

Two items from Dr. Sharp are enclosed for your information.

Attachments