

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO
ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - AGENDA
November 18, 1980

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

I. Minutes

II. Announcements

III. Business Items

- A. University Resources and Controversial Information (Beecher) (Attachment)
- B. Long Range Planning Resolution (Simmons) (Attachment)
- C. Guidelines for Withdrawal from Classes after the Census Date (Brown) (Attachment)
- D. Enrollment Quota Determination (Conway) (Attachment)
- E. Space and Facility Allocation (Conway) (Attachment)

IV. Discussion Items

- A. Academic Senate Representative to the Student Senate (Kersten)
- B. Role of the Academic Senate in Facilities Planning (Kersten)

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-104-80/LRP
November 18, 1980

RESOLUTION REGARDING SURVEY OF GRADUATES

- WHEREAS, A major goal of the university is to prepare students for employment in fields for which they were educated or in related fields; and
- WHEREAS, The education received should prepare graduates for promotion to positions of increasing responsibility and leadership; and
- WHEREAS, Data on the success of graduates is necessary to modify curricula to meet changes in employment fields; and
- WHEREAS, The Placement survey questionnaire mailed to students at graduation provides only limited information and not the data needed for effective long-range planning; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends to President Baker that the Placement Office be authorized and financed to begin a revised schedule of surveys of graduates beginning with the class of 1980-1981; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That continuing surveys be conducted of graduates in their fifth, tenth, and fifteenth years after graduation; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the faculties of the University, with the assistance of the Placement Office and other appropriate campus agencies, design the survey forms for their disciplines; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the confidentiality of individual responders be ensured; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That data and interpretations of data be available to those responsible for long-range planning.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-103-80/IC
November 18, 1980

RESOLUTION REGARDING GUIDELINES FOR WITHDRAWAL
FROM CLASSES AFTER THE CENSUS DATE

Background: A student may currently petition to withdraw from a class after the census date, but prior to the start of the eighth week. According to the catalog, the petition will be approved and the withdrawal authorized "only if there are serious and compelling reasons for the withdrawal in the judgment of the instructor and the department head." The petition requires the signature of both the instructor and the department head.

The definition of "serious and compelling reasons" recommended by the Academic Council in December 1976 were approved by President Kennedy in February 1977. But the definitions were never addressed by the Academic Senate nor have they been published in the catalog. In January 1980, the CSUC Academic Senate recommended local campus Senates to develop guidelines for evaluating the "serious and compelling reasons."

- WHEREAS, The university is impacted and many courses are oversubscribed, students should be expected to make a commitment to their courses prior to the census date; and
- WHEREAS, The university recognizes that there are "serious and compelling" reasons for which a student might need to withdraw from a class or classes; and
- WHEREAS, Each student should have available both the procedures and the kinds of reasons the university considers sufficiently serious and compelling to warrant withdrawal; and
- WHEREAS, The instructor of the course is the proper person to be consulted on the options available to the student with respect to progress within the course; and
- WHEREAS, The student's advisor is the proper person to be consulted concerning the ramifications of dropping a particular class or classes in terms of progress toward graduation; and
- WHEREAS, Neither the instructor nor advisor should be in the position of evaluating the serious and compelling reason for the petition to withdraw; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Council has determined that the department heads are able to evaluate the serious and compelling reasons for withdrawal petitions; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the following procedures for withdrawing from classes after the census date be adopted and be included in the catalog and the Campus Administrative Manual:

Procedure:

- a. Any student wishing to withdraw from a class between the third and seventh weeks of a quarter must petition to do so. Withdrawal petitions are available at the Records Office.
- b. The student shall consult both with the instructor of the course that is being dropped and with his/her advisor. Both the instructor and the advisor signatures must be obtained on the petition.
- c. The student shall present his or her petition to the instructor's department head, and the department head, after any appropriate consultation, shall grant approval or not in accordance with the guidelines set forth below.

and be it further

RESOLVED: That the following guidelines for interpretation of "serious and compelling reasons for withdrawal" be adopted and be included in the catalog and Campus Administrative Manual:

Guidelines for Serious and Compelling Reasons

After the census date a student may not drop a class and receive a "W" on the permanent record unless there is a "serious and compelling" reason. Whether the reason advanced by a student is in fact serious and compelling is a matter that requires judgment and interpretation.

It is not possible to describe in advance all the reasons that are acceptable or not acceptable as serious and compelling. The guidelines below should serve to illustrate the intent. Each case should be considered on its own merits.

1. Medical. Serious illness or injury of the student or of his/her immediate family which has resulted in inability to make up course material missed. Verification by the University Health Center or by the student's personal physician may be required.
2. Financial. For many different reasons a student's financial situation may become so critical that withdrawal from the University is the only recourse. In other cases, withdrawal from a part of the student's course list may be indicated. A student who requests withdrawal after the census date for financial reasons must offer an explanation for his decision to withdraw and may be asked for verification.
3. Personal. Problems of a psychological or other personal nature may indicate withdrawal from a course in order to preserve reasonable progress toward a student's educational goals. Depending upon the nature of the problem, appropriate verification by the University Counseling Center or the Health Center may be required.
4. Other. Withdrawals are permitted after the third week to correct faculty or administrative error as verified by the appropriate department head or

the Registrar.

There may be other serious and compelling reasons to withdraw from classes. Each such case is to be considered on its own merits.

It should be emphasized that poor grades, irregular attendance, or dissatisfaction with the course are not in themselves sufficient reasons to withdraw after the census date. The official drop period--the first three weeks of each quarter--is the proper time to evaluate preparation level, time commitment, normal progress, interest, etc., for each class.

Each school may further interpret these guidelines as to what constitutes "serious and compelling" reasons.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-105-80/BC
November 18, 1980

RESOLUTION CONCERNING ENROLLMENT QUOTA DETERMINATION

- WHEREAS, The determination of enrollment quotas and long-range enrollment guidelines for each school at this univeristy is potentially the single most important decision affecting the character, quality and operation of the University; and
- WHEREAS, Shifts in enrollment quotas from lower cost programs to higher cost programs, and vice versa, affect the allocation of resources at the university, particularly in a time of limited resources; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate had been consulted directly in the annual review of the college growth rate and distribution of enrollment by school (AB 71-1); and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate is now only indirectly involved in the annual review process consultation via informal contact through the President's Council Meetings (AB 74-3, revised); and
- WHEREAS, Enrollment quotas have not been discussed at the President's Council Meetings this year, and a decision on this matter must be made between November 1 and November 15 of each year (AB 74-3, revised); and
- WHEREAS, It is realized that the prime responsibility for setting enrollment targets and guidelines rests with the university president (AB 74-3, revised); therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That whenever policy decisions are to be made concerning enrollment quotas and long-range enrollment guidelines, formal consultation should occur between the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and a representative of the university administration. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will then decide if further consultation on the part of the Senate is required, and route it to the appropriate committees for action.

BACKGROUND MATERIAL CONCERNING BUDGET COMMITTEE'S SPACE ALLOCATION
RESOLUTION:

The amount of space allocated to an instructional program at Cal Poly is determined by state formulas involving FPE(Full Time Equivalent Students) and FTEF(Full Time Equivalent Faculty Members) generated by each school. The average is about 3.5 square feet per FPE, according to Executive Dean Douglas Gerard. Figures concerning FPE and FTEF are determined for the campus each March, and are submitted to the board of trustees along with campus proposals for major and minor capital outlay programs. These proposals are developed through consultation between the President, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President's Council, and the Executive Dean. No consultation takes place presently with the Academic Senate or its committees(i.e., Long Range Planning and Budget Committees) concerning space allocation at Cal Poly.

Important decisions affecting the instructional program are made at the University level involving the allocation of space, both in new construction and in renovated buildings on campus. A rank ordered priority list is developed on campus concerning both major and minor (projects costing less than \$100,000.00) capital outlay programs. Also use of renovated space(existing facilities which become vacant due to new construction - i.e., Dexter Library and Chase Hall) is determined by the University administration.

A current example of the renovation concept can be seen in the allocation of space in the old Dexter Library with the move into the Robert E. Kennedy library scheduled over quarter break before winter quarter begins. Only two general purpose classrooms are planned for this building, a building which the Chancellor's Office statewide restriction against the construction of general classroom facilities(as quoted in AB 74-3) does not apply to. Although, according to Dean Gerard, 'there is no shortage of general classroom facilities at the University, when the whole academic day is considered,' some questions could be asked. Could we replace some of the inadequate general classroom facilities, which are now utilized, by better ones in the Dexter Library complex? Why are only two general classroom facilities being considered for perhaps the only building in the foreseeable future, where a significant number of general purpose classroom facilities could be constructed? The new Engineering South Building, the next major construction project for the campus, will only have two general purpose classrooms built into it. This is only one issue that could be raised, if the Academic Senate by way of its committees was consulted in the space allocation decision making process.

The timeliness of the issue is apparent from the impacted status of the University, which makes space allocation an even more important concern. Therefore the following resolution is presented calling for consultation between the administration and the Academic Senate concerning space and facility allocation at the University.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-106-80/BC
November 18, 1980

RESOLUTION ON CONSULTATION IN SPACE ALLOCATION

- WHEREAS, The allocation of space and facilities on a university campus comprises a significant resource; and
- WHEREAS, This resource becomes even more important when the university campus, like Cal Poly's, faces an impacted status for several years; and
- WHEREAS, Some flexibility and discretion exists at the local campus level in the CSUC system concerning the allocation of this resource; and
- WHEREAS, The allocation of this resource impinges directly upon the quality of the instructional programs at Cal Poly; and
- WHEREAS, Currently the faculty at Cal Poly, who have the primary responsibility for instruction, have minimal input into the space allocation process via the Academic Senate and its committees, therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the administration of California Polytechnic State University should engage in meaningful consultation with the Academic Senate via the Executive Committee, and appropriate subordinate committees, as deemed necessary by the Executive Committee, whenever decisions are being made concerning current or future space allocation on the campus.