I. Minutes: Approval of the October 21, 1986 Senate Minutes (attached pp. 2-6).

II. Communications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution No.</th>
<th>Resolution Title</th>
<th>Presidential Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-217-86/Andrews</td>
<td>Recognition of Deceased Faculty</td>
<td>Approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-218-86</td>
<td>Recognizing Women's Week</td>
<td>Approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-219-86/RC&amp;PPC</td>
<td>Proposed Conflict of Interest Policy</td>
<td>Forwarded to Jan Pieper for incorporation into Cal Poly's response to the Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-220-86/LRPC</td>
<td>Revised Enrollment Recommendations</td>
<td>Concurring with the recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-223-86/PPC</td>
<td>Instructional Funds for Sabbatical Leaves</td>
<td>Approved with minor wording changes for clarity of intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-226-86/PPC</td>
<td>Campus Smoking Policy</td>
<td>Forwarded to Environmental Health and Safety Sub-committee for reconciliation with current policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-227-86/PPC</td>
<td>School Dean Evaluations</td>
<td>Forwarded to school deans for their review and comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-228-86/Weatherby</td>
<td>Opposition to Proposition 61</td>
<td>Approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-229-86/EX</td>
<td>Support of Proposition 56</td>
<td>Approved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Reports:
A. President/Academic Affairs Office
B. Statewide Senators
C. Budget Committee Agenda Items for 1986/87 - Conway, Chair of the Budget Committee
D. The Academic Senate Question - Addressed to Malcolm Wilson
   What are the pros and cons of an Academic Senate representative attending meetings of the Deans' Council as a nonvoting and non-ex officio member?

IV. Consent Agenda:
   Resolution on Collective Bargaining - Executive Committee, First Reading (attached p. 7).

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Concentrations - Dana, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, Second Reading (attached pp. 8-11).
B. Resolution on Cooperative Education Classes - Dana, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, First Reading (attached pp. 12-14).
C. Resolution on Free Electives - Dana, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, First Reading (attached pp. 15-20).

VI. Discussion:

VII. Adjournment:
WHEREAS, The faculty and the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University are committed to maintaining and improving upon the high quality of education in the CSU on behalf of the taxpayers and citizens of California; and

WHEREAS, An analysis of the CSU collective bargaining proposals indicates several elements which we believe will have a negative effect upon the achievement and maintenance of quality education in the CSU, specifically the proposal to separate rank from salary and thereby substitute the values of the marketplace for the values of the academic community; and

WHEREAS, The CSU collective bargaining proposals further propose to alter significantly the faculty role in academic governance, specifically to limit the participation of faculty on the Faculty Early Retirement Program; and

WHEREAS, The CSU collective bargaining proposals represent a significant step backwards from rights and expectations established in previous agreements such as attempts to remove binding arbitration from the grievance procedure, attempts to remove careful consideration language for lecturers, and attempts to narrow benefit eligibility; and

WHEREAS, The CSU collective bargaining proposals contradict the Trustees’ stated commitment to collegiality and in fact appear to represent a commitment to its antitheses, specifically to proposals such as separating rank from salary which will have the effect of pitting faculty against management and each other to the serious detriment of the educational enterprise; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the faculty and the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University strongly urge the CSU management to negotiate in good faith with the CFA toward a contract that has as its primary goal, not the mastery of faculty by management, or the taking away of hard-won faculty rights, but rather the attainment of conditions and standards that encourage faculty to do the best possible job in the interests of their students and of the taxpayers and citizens of California; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be sent to Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds and the Trustees of The California State University.

Proposed By:
Executive Committee
October 28, 1986
A. Recognized Categories of Curricular Alternatives

4. Concentration

A concentration is a block of courses to be chosen with the approval of the student's adviser comprising from 18 to 39 quarter units providing essentially different capabilities for the student. No single course should appear in every concentration; such courses should be included in the major. A minimum of at least one-half of the total units (18-39), but no fewer than 12 of these 18-39 units must be in specified courses.

B. Guidelines Relating to Concentrations

7. "M" Courses in the major may appear in a concentration as well as in the core or basic curriculum display of the catalog.
Background Information on Concentrations and Options

In Winter Quarter, 1986, the Academic Senate was asked by the Provost to examine the possibility of combining the notions of options and concentrations in our curriculum. We were the only campus with such a distinction and it was causing confusion inside and outside the CSU system. As they existed, an option was defined as

"30 or more quarter units of specified courses not common to other curricular alternatives and designed to give the student substantially different capabilities than the other alternatives"

and a concentration was defined as

"18 to 29 quarter units providing essentially different capabilities for the student. A minimum of 12 of these 18-29 units must be in specified courses."

The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee surveyed all departments and found support for combining these notions under the name concentration.

On May 27, 1986 the Academic Senate passed a resolution changing the definition of a concentration to

"18 to 39 quarter units providing essentially different capabilities for the student. A minimum of 12 of these 18-39 units must be in specified courses."

and eliminating options.

On July 23, 1986 President Baker accepted the resolution with some conditions (see the attached letter).
Resolution on Concentrations

WHEREAS, On May 27, 1986 the Academic Senate passed a resolution (AS-213-86/CC) recommending combining options and concentrations into one category to be called concentrations; and

WHEREAS, On July 23, 1986 President Baker accepted the resolution with some conditions; and

WHEREAS, Some of those conditions need to be implemented for the current catalog cycle while some are more strategic in nature and will require time for discussions and evaluations; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Senate endorses the attached changes to proposed CAM sections 411 D.4 (new section B.7) and 411 A.5 (new section A.4) as suggested by President Baker; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the concerns of President Baker regarding
   a) whether concentrations should be required, and
   b) whether a student outside the major may have access to a concentration
be studied by the Senate and resolved before the next catalog cycle begins.
Memorandum

JUL 29 1986

Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate

Date: July 23, 1986

File No.: 

Copies: M. Wilson
G. Irvin
G. Lewis
S. Sparling

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: Academic Senate Resolution AS-213-86/CC
(Distinction Between Options and Concentrations at California Polytechnic State University)

The resolution is accepted with the following conditions:

1. Section D.3 (new section B.6): In my view, concentrations should not be required—they move toward excessive rigidity and specialization in the baccalaureate program.

Because the issue of overspecialization is a concern of the Trustees, the Chancellor's Office, and our campus, I request that the Academic Senate look into the issue of concentrations and recommend whether a student should be required to take a concentration in a major or should have available a more broadly-based curriculum, or both.

In addition, the Academic Senate should address the attendant issue of whether students outside the major should have access to a concentration, and if so, under what conditions.

2. Section D.4 (new section B.7). "M" courses should be clarified to read "Major" courses.

3. Section A.5 (new section A.4): This definition of the concentration should state that within a program, no single course should appear in every concentration. If this is the case, the course should be part of the major, not the concentration.

In addition, rather than requiring a minimum of 12 units of the 18 to 39 in specified courses, the section should read: one-half of the total units (18 to 39), but no fewer than 12 units shall be in specified courses.

4. The new CAM Language for implementation of this resolution will take into account the wording suggested by the Senate.

...
August 19, 1986

Anthony J. Moye
Associate Vice Chancellor
Educational Programs and Resources
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

Dear Tony,

Pursuant to discussions you had with President Warren J. Baker and our discussions on the same topic, I am formally requesting a budget increase to allow us to institutionalize Cal Poly's Cooperative Education program.

During academic year 1985-86 the Cooperative Education program enrolled an annual average of 185 students (555 total enrollments) plus 312 students during Summer Quarter. As you are aware these have been Extended Education enrollments for which students now pay $44.00 per unit. In order to keep the fees at a level which would not unduly discourage participation the campus has held the unit value of these full-time assignments at 4 quarter units. The problems we are experiencing with the present arrangement are as follows:

- The amount of revenue we are able to generate through student fees is inadequate to cover budget requirements of the program. This is so even though we have augmented the program by utilization of approximately 5 FTEF positions to support the Cooperative Education faculty who actually work with the placement, supervision, and evaluation of the students on assignment. The provision of these positions places a heavy burden on the other academic units which must generate them.

- Holding the unit value to 4 units for purposes of affordability has created problems for students who have been or are receiving financial aid assistance requiring payback when the units fall below 6. In addition, the 4 units for a full load restriction creates an inequity with internship classes on the campus which have parallel time commitment requirements but award as many as 8 units.

- Even though the Cooperative Education program is a natural extension of the campus philosophy of "learn by doing" it is hard to justify to outside constituencies why it does not earn "regular" university credit instead of extension credit.

The campus is presently unable to accommodate all of the qualified applicants who would like to attend. This is due, in part, to a facilities deficit on campus and a number of other community and campus constraints related to numbers of bodies on campus. Our full-time Cooperative Education program places students at off-campus locations which do not impact the constraints noted above.
We are therefore requesting an initial "non-capacity" increase of 67 FTE for Cal Poly's academic year budget funded at the S-36 course classification level to allow us to move the program into the mainstream of the university. We further request that this "non-capacity" budget increase be considered as separate and unique from the 800 regular capacity FTE difference which now exists between our presently budgeted level of 14,200 FTE and our masterplan ceiling of 15,000 FTE.

The request for 67 FTE is based on an anticipated academic year total enrollment of 500 students each taking 6 units (the minimum for financial aid purposes). This would generate an annual average of 1,000 student credit units or 66.66 FTE. The cost to students would be less than their current costs in spite of the increase in units. We would anticipate incorporation of the summer quarter Cooperative Education FTE within our regular summer quarter budget.

It is our belief that the arrangement we have proposed will provide a vehicle which will allow the Cooperative Education program to prosper without impact on facilities and at the same time allow Cal Poly to accommodate more total students than would otherwise be possible were the FTE required to be carved from the masterplan projections.

The director and professional staff of the Cooperative Education program would be charged with seeking outside private/corporate support for travel and equipment needs of the program should this request be approved.

Since we are facing a budget deficit in Cooperative Education this year, it would be extremely helpful if the program could be switched over to General Fund support during the current fiscal year. It is probable that the time necessary to effect the change precludes making the switch for Fall Quarter 1986, but if the change could be made during either of the remaining quarters of the academic year we would be able to overcome the projected deficit for 1986-87.

Your continued support and encouragement in our efforts to institutionalize this exemplary program is greatly appreciated. We look forward to hearing from you soon regarding this request.

Sincerely,

Malcolm W. Wilson
Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs

cc: Warren J. Baker, President
Glenn W. Irvin, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and University Dean
Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate
Resolution on Cooperative Education Classes

WHEREAS converting Cooperative Education classes from extension courses to regular university courses may bring to our campus the resources needed to operate the program, but

WHEREAS some accrediting bodies have expressed concern about the rigor of the evaluation of students in co-op course,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee approves in principle the conversion of Cooperative Education courses to normal, non-extension courses of the University, subject to the Cooperative Education office providing the Committee documentation to assure the committee that the procedures to evaluate students performance are equivalent in rigor to those for regular university courses.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Charles H. Dana, Chair
    Academic Senate Curriculum Committee

Subject: PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON FREE ELECTIVES

Attached is a resolution from the Curriculum Committee concerning the issue of free electives in majors. Due to the urgency mandated by this being a catalog cycle year we request expedited treatment for this resolution in the Executive Committee and the Senate. People working on new curricula need to know the rules as soon as possible.
Memorandum

AUG 11 1986

Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate

Date: 1 August 1986

Academic Senate

File No.: 

Copies: M. Wilson, G. Irvin
G. Lewis
S. Sparring
School Deans

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: Academic Senate Resolution AS-214-86/CC (Free Electives)

I recognize the concern raised by the Academic Senate and the difficulty of the free elective issue for some programs. However, as I indicated last October,* I feel strongly that we must, whenever possible, avoid an inflexible curriculum which prevents students from freely electing some courses to meet their individual needs and interests.

I am, therefore, withholding approval of the resolution on free electives as it is currently written and asking the Academic Senate to reconsider the issue, perhaps with a process and guidelines for exceptions to a policy that recognizes the need for some free electives in most if not all of our curricula.

**"Cal Poly and California in the Next Decade," Presidential Address, October 10, 1985, p. 8.**
Background Information on Free Electives Issue

Summary
The Curriculum Committee had a number of meetings on this issue last year and recommended two possible resolutions to full Academic Senate (the committee members were about evenly split between two extremes on this). The full senate passed by a 2-1 margin the resolution saying that a major need not have any free electives. This summer President Baker rejected that resolution, sending the issue back to us.

History
During Winter quarter 1986 the Curriculum Committee received from Provost Fort (via the Senate Chair) a request to examine the existing policy on free electives. (These are officially called unrestricted electives in CAM section 411.1, but everybody calls them free electives.) According to CAM, each major must have at least nine elective units that are not restricted in any way (and three that may be restricted by the department). Prior to 1978, the minimum number of electives was still 12 but with only six that must be unrestricted. Since the increase in the number of GE&B units several years ago, several majors have received exemptions from this requirement because of existing levels of courses required for their major.

From discussions within the committee and from comments received from members of the university community, there seem to be at least four competing concerns that cause the problem:

1. The desire to give a student some choice in the direction of their education as embodied in the requirement for 9 unrestricted electives.

2. A desire to maintain the high quality hands-on education for which Cal Poly is noted. This is embodied in the number of units that are required as part of the major and courses supporting the major. In engineering this can be quantified because the accreditation requirements for engineering and technology majors are stated in terms of course units. In other areas the requirements may not be formally stated or are not quantified.

3. The desire to give the students a broadly based education as embodied in the number of GE&B units required. The level of GE&B was increased to about 79 units two catalog cycles ago.

4. A desire to give a student chance to complete a four-year degree in four years of work. This is embodied in a cap on the number of units allowed in a four-year degree. For a BS it is 198 units except in engineering where it is 210. For a BA it is 186.

A dilemma can arise when adding the units from 1, 2, and 3 together produces more than the unit limit specified by concern number 4.
Last year's committee discussed the issue and decided to draft several alternative resolutions to distribute to the campus community for comment.

One draft resolution said that concern number one above, the 9 free electives is what gives. The committee voted 4-4 to approve this resolution but due to the major split on the committee, it was still forwarded to the full Senate for consideration. This was the resolution that was eventually approved by a 2-1 vote by last year's Senate.

Another draft resolution said that concern number two is what gives, you will have nine free electives even if you have to give up some of the courses required by the major. The committee voted 5-3 in favor of this resolution and it was also forwarded to the full Senate but was not voted on by that body.

The other draft resolutions were attempts to define conditions under which concern number one may be ignored and an exemption from the CAM requirement can be granted. When these were circulated for comment, no one seemed to understand them so they were not forwarded to the Senate.

The committee did not want to touch the hot potato of free electives and so proposed no resolution attacking concern number three. In recent years there have been some ad hoc attempts before the senate to solve the problem by modifying GE&B requirements. There has been an exemption from GE&B area D.4.b for some majors and there were some (rejected) attempts to add engineering courses to various GE&B.

The committee never considered trying to attack concern number four since 196 or 210 units are already high levels of units!
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS--86/

Resolution on Free Electives

WHEREAS, Students are required to take a broad spectrum of courses by the General Education & Breadth requirements; and

WHEREAS, The units for General Education & Breadth requirements have been increased in recent years; and

WHEREAS, CAM section 411.1 requires 12 units of electives, 9 of which may not be restricted in any way by the student’s curriculum (“free electives”); and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s hands-on learning by doing philosophy may require many more design and project units than other schools; and

WHEREAS, This has made it difficult if not impossible for a number of disciplines to maintain their traditional quality of program or even minimum legal or accreditation requirements within the maximum number of units allowed in their four year degree curriculum; and

WHEREAS, This has caused in recent years exemptions to be granted to the section 411.1 requirements on an ad hoc basis; and

WHEREAS, Some curricula have pre-chosen for their students most if not all of the General Education and Breadth courses where students are allowed a choice; and

WHEREAS, It is desirable for all students to have the freedom to take courses of their own choice in the attainment of a bachelor degree; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the curriculum of each major should strive to follow the requirements of CAM section 411.1, and to include more than the minimum units of unrestricted electives, if possible. Exemptions to this requirement will be considered on an individual basis by major; and be it further
RESOLVED: That petitions for exemptions should be submitted with the normal catalog proposals. Petitions must provide documentation as to why 9 units of unrestricted electives cannot be provided in the major. Items that will be examined in approving exemptions will include

a) that the curriculum is up to the maximum number of units allowed by regulation for the Bachelor degree being offered by the curriculum

b) that the major includes as much freedom as possible for the students to choose courses where such choices exist in established General Education and Breadth requirements

c) the requirements of accrediting bodies

d) any other material the submitting department believes will be helpful in understanding the reasons for needing an exemption;

and be it further

RESOLVED: That exemptions are part of the curriculum proposal and must be approved with the rest of a department's package of materials during the catalog revision cycle. Where an exemption is given, the curriculum should be reviewed with each catalog cycle to see if the conditions that required the exemptions still exist.

Passed by Curriculum Committee 8-0-0
Memorandum

To: William D. Forgeng  
Metallurgical Engineering Department

From: Donald E. Morgan, Head  
Industrial Engineering

Subject: Nine Free Elective Action of Academic Senate

The resolution pending makes the implicit assumption that all or any part of nine free elective units shall be provided by reducing the Engineering courses when applied to us.

I suggest that the matter be referred to the GE & B committee with instructions to prepare a plan to provide for three units of required GE & B courses to be reduced for the high unit load curricula, and these three units be made a free elective. The reduction load should not be unfairly shoudered by Engineering courses, only. We are something like 67% over the breadth requirements stated by ABET, our accrediting organization.

I presume that you have a copy of these from the Dean of the School of Engineering's office.