MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, April 13, 2004
UU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: none

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair:
   B. President's Office:
   C. Provost's Office:
   D. Statewide Senators:
   E. CFA Campus' President:
   F. ASI Representatives:
   G. Other:
      1. ConnElrod: Report on proposed changes to registration and add/drop procedures (pp. 2-6).
      2. [TIME CERTAIN 4:00PM] Jerry Hanley: Report on modem pool decision (pp. 7-9).

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Hem(s):
   A. Election of Academic Senate officers.
   B. [TIME CERTAIN 4:45PM] The Academic Senate Executive Committee will meet in Closed Session.

VI. Discussion Hem(s):

VII. Adjournment:
Summary of Proposed Changes to the Registration and Add/Drop Procedures  
Registration and Scheduling Committee - March 29, 2004

REGISTRATION PROCEDURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 unit cap during initial rotations</td>
<td>14 unit cap during initial rotations; a wait list will be generated when the class reaches the enrollment limit. Students can add themselves to the wait list during the initial rotation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 unit cap after initial rotations</td>
<td>22 unit cap after initial rotations; wait list will automatically add students into classes as spaces become available and they do not exceed their 22 unit cap. All current checks will occur (e.g., time conflicts, enabled prerequisite checking, etc) before a student is added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~3 week rotation period with 2 cycles per day</td>
<td>~2 week rotation period with 3 cycles per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADD/DROP PROCEDURES (ONCE CLASSES HAVE STARTED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 week + 1 day add period; 2 week drop period</td>
<td>Shorten the add and drop periods each by 3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a class is not full: Students add classes using POWER or CAPTURE.</td>
<td>If a class is not full: Students add classes by using an ePermit number obtained from the instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a class is full (or enrollment has been zeroed): Students add using paper permits signed by instructor.</td>
<td>If a class is full: Students must meet two criteria in order to add classes, 1) be on the wait list and 2) use an ePermit obtained from the instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop using POWER or CAPTURE</td>
<td>Drop using POWER or CAPTURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Departments will not be allowed to zero out enrollments
Goals:
- To maximize student success in the classroom
- To treat students equitably in their pursuit to meet their educational objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>How does it achieve the goal?</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Students, especially those with low registration priority struggle to find satisfactory schedules that meet both progress to degree objectives as well as desirable timing. | Reduction in the number of units - from 16 to 14 - a student can register for during the initial rotation cycle | By reducing the number of units a student can register for during the initial rotation cycle, seat availability (for high demand courses) will be spread further into the registration cycle and students will be more likely to register for only those courses they really need. | • More likely that students in the middle of the registration cycle will be able to register for their high priority classes.  
• More likely that students with the lowest priority will be able to secure one or two of their classes needed to progress to degree  
• Students will less likely be able to "pad" their schedule  
• Reduces the ability for students with a high priority to "hold" classes for their friends with lower priority. | • Students who want to take more than 14 units may need to "enter" into the registration process a second time.  
• Students will less likely be able to "pad" their schedule. |
| Students attempting to increase their unit max levels must currently secure a form requiring signatures of either their advisor or department | Increase the maximum number of units - from 20 to 22 - a student can register for through the registration system without | | • Students wishing to take more than 20 units could do so without obtaining approval first  
• If a student could | • Students that are not prepared could become overloaded  
• Students wishing to take more than 20 units |
| Students attempting to add a specific course/section must continually check the system to see if any seats have become available or course sections have been opened/added | To implement "wait-listing" functionality that would automatically register a student (in registration priority order) into the course. Wait-listing would be the only way a student would be added to a course prior to the first day of classes. Once classes begin, in order to be added to a course, students will need to obtain an ePermit from the instructor as well as be on the wait-list. | How a student adds (or drops) a class during the registration cycle will be consistent for all students (i.e., all students will be treated equitably). A student would not have to check the status of a class that is closed. The student would be notified via email if they were added successfully. | Students can wait-list for their high priority demand courses which have reached the maximum enrollment even if they aren't able to immediately add them to their schedules. Students would maintain their priority order when trying to add into classes above the 14 units once the class has reached its enrollment limit. Students would be able to see (via the web) where they fall on a particular wait-list. Students are emailed when they are moved from the wait-list into a class section. If wait-lists are processed electronically, students could do so without obtaining approval first. | Wait-listing with an automatic notification may put an added burden on our email system. If a student is at the top of the waiting list and some restriction (i.e., pre-requisite, registration hold, etc.) prevents them from enrollment in a class they will not be enrolled into the class when an opening is available. Course demand may appear to be higher than actual demand since students can be on multiple wait-lists. Student must check their schedule via POWER more frequently. |
| Faculty want to minimize the amount of class time missed by students. | Reduce the add/drop period by three days. | Increases the likelihood of student success in a course by limiting the number of course sessions a student can miss prior to adding a class | Will be treated more equitably.  
- There would be a fair and efficient way for students to "crash" classes.  
- Automates the student's need to constantly poll closed classes.  
- Wait-list priority follows the same precedence as the registration priority  
- Students have three fewer days to adjust their schedules (e.g., "shop" for the "perfect" schedule)  
- Depts will no longer be able to change enrollment limits  
- Removes flexibility from depts to change enrollment limits  
- Could increase the number of "W" or "U" grades.  
- Students will have less time to determine if a class is appropriate for them.  
- Faculty will no longer have two weeks to decide who and who not to add. |
| There is no consistent process for adding courses at any level (department, college, at University). Faculty, students, and staff are confused and frustrated over this lack of consistency. An inordinate amount of time and energy is spent trying to find a "fix" to their enrollment issues. | To implement an ePermit process that will be activated from the first day of classes to the end of the add/drop period. To add a course once the quarter begins, a student must be on the wait-list and obtain an ePermit from the instructor. | By providing students with a single way to add a class, they will spend less time trying to figure out how to add a course and more time in the classroom learning. | • Reduces the need for manual processing of permits  
• Would ensure consistent add process for all classes  
• All faculty will need to participate  
• Requires significant faculty training (and accountability)  
• Enrollment may be lost if faculty do not participate in the ePermit process.  
• System used by individual faculty members to hand out ePermits could still vary across campus  
• With more students for adding courses at any level (department, college, or University). Faculty, students, and staff are confused and frustrated over this lack of consistency. An inordinate amount of time and energy is spent trying to find a "fix" to their enrollment issues. | Because of the length of the registration cycle (22 days for initial rotation; 10 weeks to complete the entire cycle), decisions and materials must be in place very early in the planning process. Also, the earlier registration starts for the next term, the less is known about academic success issues for the current term.  
Increase the number of registration cycles from 2 per day (7am and 1pm) to 3 per day (7am, 11am, and 3pm)  
Increasing the groups to three per day will allow for the initial rotation cycle to be reduced by seven work days thereby allowing for more planning/publication time.  
• More time for the academic depts to plan  
• Better student understanding of their current academic progress/status  
• Processes do not overlap quarters (e.g., registration for next quarter occurs prior to the census date of previous quarter.  
• With more students being processed in a given day, there may be an increase in the number of questions/calls/issues that staff will need to deal with. |
ATE: April 6, 2004
TO: ACADEMIC SENATE
FROM: JERRY HANLEY
RE: ANNOUNCEMENT RE: MODEM POOL DECISION

This is intended as a briefing for those most directly impacted by the decision to end Cal Poly’s modem pool service, and to communicate the migration and mitigation pathway for the limited number of current campus users who will be directly affected.

Cal Poly’s Imagine modem pool service is being decommissioned at the end of the current academic year. To minimize the impact on current users, the service will be phased out in three stages starting mid-June and ending mid-July 2004. Spring Quarter 2004 will be used to prepare the current users for the transition.

This decision was recommended by Information Technology Services (ITS) and endorsed by Cal Poly’s Information Resources Management Policy and Planning Committee (IRMPPC). For additional details, timelines, and background on this decision, please see the modem pool analysis and recommendations posted at http://irmppc.calpoly.edu/documents.html.

Impending budget cuts required ITS to take another hard look at the range and level of support and services it provides to the campus as a whole. Given the substantial budget reduction facing Cal Poly and ITS in particular in FY2004/05, the modem pool service was determined to be less critical (relatively and absolutely) than other competing, more essential and/or expanding services that support core institutional activities that require ITS resources. Consequently, it was identified as a suitable candidate for elimination.

The potential decision to eliminate the modem pool has been raised and reviewed with campus computing advisory committees several times in recent years. While the core reasons for raising the question in the past remain the same, making the recommendation and subsequent decision now are driven by hard budgetary choices and the following:

1. Campus demand for dial-up modem service has appreciably diminished in recent years, but the costs (in terms of State resources) have not.

2. The initial justification for the University to provide dial-up service no longer exists, i.e., lack of reliable and cost-effective alternative solutions in the local community.

3. The modem pool technology is quickly becoming obsolete and thus more costly to service and support. Nor is it cost effective or feasible any longer for the University to upgrade the technology for the existing service, which, due to its slow speed, cannot adequately accommodate essential instructional activities.

4. The range of viable, cost-effective, reliable and widely available commercial alternatives has increased significantly. These services offer users more current and competitive support and/or more advanced technologies and bandwidth speeds.

5. With this range of available commercial service offerings, impending budget cuts make it not viable or cost-effective
for ITS to subsidize a service that is no longer critical to support Cal Poly's operation or educational mission.

6. Dial-up modem services also currently represent a substantial and unnecessary risk to the University due to, our experienced difficulties in tracking potential problems (e.g., security breaches, virus infected messages, etc.) initiated by computers that use the modem pool. Resolving this issue for this service would incur additional costs which ITS cannot justify or absorb at this time.

7. This risk is also significantly increased by the general reluctance or inability of modem pool users to keep their home computers current due to the slow speed and lengthy time required to download critical operating system patches and current anti-virus software updates via the modem pool.

Unsecured computers using campus networks represent a genuine threat to the University and related data (e.g., grades, research, course materials, etc.). However, commercially available options offer more efficient access to maintain appropriate patches and anti-virus safeguards and may provide increased protection from unwanted (SPAM) e-mail.

It is clear that the pressures of the current budgetary constraints require immediate action to shed costs in the areas of least impact. Therefore, the decision to eliminate the modem pool has been reached. The question now is how best to implement the decision to ensure an effective transition with minimal disruption to the campus community.

As part of the mitigating strategies and transition plan, emphasis will be placed on:

1. Assisting current modem pool users to find useful alternatives from existing outside commercial service providers;

2. Shifting use/demand to campus-based resources that are better managed and more effective in meeting instructional needs; and

3. Providing specialized consulting and support services to ensure a smooth transition to a more reliable or more robust means of remote access to conduct University business. This includes "The Road Warrior" initiative to support individuals who travel or lack access to a fixed remote service at critical times, as described in one of the documents posted at http://irmmppc.calpoly.edu/documents.html.

In summary, ITS will phase out current users between mid-June and mid-July 2004. This will be done with careful attention, advice and consultation from campus computing advisory committees. The results of this consultation will be to first identify, document and communicate the best mitigating strategies and alternative options, followed by a clear commitment by ITS to then provide sound support that minimizes the impact this change will have on current campus modem pool users.

We regret any concerns that the suddenness of this decision may have raised. Our goal was to reach a decision as expeditious as possible through appropriate campus channels, and then immediately communicate the decision and detailed plans to affected users.

If you have any further questions or concerns or suggestions for making this a smoother transition, we encourage you to engage your representative on the Administrative or Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing (aacc.calpoly.edu, iacc.calpoly.edu). You may also contact its@calpoly.edu or the ITS Service Desk at 6-7000.

Please check the following websites for regular updates and support
strategies during the transition period: http://uss.calpoly.edu.

Sincerely,

Jerry Hanley
Inter Provost/Chief Information Officer
Information Technology Services