

2015-2016 Retreat Discussion Topics Feedback

Topic 1. Academic Plan Themes

HOW IS IT FRAMED

Table 1

- #1: We aspire to be a premier university but the assessment of quality is given by others, not by ourselves.
- #2 is ambiguous in how it is written: a clear message is not conveyed

Table 2

- Second theme is somewhat confusing and poorly worded
- Going against the master plan? Really need PhD program as well

Table 3

- Too much as been crammed into one sentence. The writing tries to cover too much and it ends up being vague.

Table 4

- Jim LeCascio doesn't like the way the first paragraph is framed. It's a bad idea to assume that bachelor's degrees are not going to be enough: 1. there is no proof, 2. it will delay and possibly block first gens from getting a higher education degree. 3. It is a self fulfilling prophecy 4. Produced by those faculty who have a vested interest in it.
- Not very much agreement with the second paragraph either because it's difficult to be an undergraduate institution and add graduate programs with a teacher-scholar model since in that case faculty would spend more time with the masters students instead of undergraduates, and that you have to add more faculty. Post bacc programs would affect a department. It is doable as long as the tenure track to undergraduate student ratio is protected.

Table 5

- Is it clear?
- Could be clarified... seems to be a confusion between the leadership role and the model
- How will these types of programs be funded?
- Who will provide the leadership to bring all of the different types of programs from the different departments under one vision?

Table 6

- On first several readings, our group has a hard time making sense of what is meant by these terms ("expansive"?). It's hard not to feel that these are changes for the sake of changes. What does it mean in relation to "educational leadership"?
- Attempt to rewrite #1: "Cal Poly's opportunity for being a visible educational leadership model." This sentence at least makes sense: We have an opportunity to do something (be a visible model of educational . . . methods?) Are the faculty more visible? Or the programs? Or the students? Or the techniques? **Is it important to be visible?** (Is this for recruiting? Money

- Well-framed
- Vague, poorly written and of great concern if this is a plan to increase programs that do not serve undergraduates and/or the TSM. These do not serve or enhance our core mission. They may generate funds but they do not contribute to the TSM and require significant time that faculty do not have.
This needs to be much better defined to understand how this fits into our ULOs and mission. We need to maintain our mission to serve undergraduate students. Within the last 20 years the university shifted to a greater emphasis on faculty scholarship but did not invest properly in Masters programs. The opportunity to mentor and support graduate students benefits the faculty and university- we should enhance this model before taking on another.

WHAT IT MIGHT ENCOMPASS

Table 1

- Interdisciplinary programs, however, there are concerns with management of these programs: the university would have to develop rubrics for management, RPT, WTU's, facilities sharing, scheduling, curriculum coordination. We recommend that these details be codified before a particular innovative program is initiated.
- Concern about the corporatization of curricula at Poly. If a faculty member is also the member of a corporation, then there is an intrinsic conflict of interest.
- Do not wish to marginalize programs that have no or limited opportunities for corporate partnerships.
- Development of "Great Course" modules by Cal Poly faculty to sell to public – raising Cal Poly's profile and possibly generating revenue for both Poly and faculty.

Table 2

- Partner with UCSB or someone else to do PhDs?
- Recruit students from outside who might be less capable than your own graduating UGs.
- Should our students stay here for MS? We often discourage them
- For some the PhD is really a terminal degree (Engin really the MS)
- Provide specialized training that is often reserved for PhD types of things
- Invest in cutting edge technology to provide better job opportunities
- Certificates might help with this some as well.
- K-12 incoming preparation is a bit diverse, all over the board
- What do we want to do about bridge programs or ensuring high level incoming students
- But really we have much better incoming students than a majority of places
- We don't really have a bit ESL problem here
- But may have to plan more for the future
- Issues of workload, grading
- Will we become a professional school?

- Student exchanges. (Does this count as “globalization”? It involves learning about another culture (so maybe “global awareness”?). It could be beneficial to our students to be prepared to work all over the world, wherever their skills are most useful or can be best developed.

Table 7

- Teacher/scholar model might encompass student research opportunities.

Table 8

None.

Table 9

- When building residential infrastructure, base on actual data, not supposition or correlative data
- Learn by doing requires space. We cannot eliminate learn by doing space when building other structures.
- Retain face-to-face and ON-CAMPUS interaction for learn by doing activities, facilities, laboratories, experiential learning, project based learning, and residential opportunities.

HOW TO HIGHLIGHT THESE ACTIVITIES

Table 1

None.

Table 2

None.

Table 3

- A traditional undergraduate degree will no longer be sufficient for society’s needs and Cal Poly’s purposes.
- In all classes we need to give students challenging problems that reach across the disciplines.

Table 4

None.

Table 5

- What are some of the Cal Poly niches that could attract people from around the country (or internationally)?

Table 6

- Faculty could share with each other what works. Good web pages help.
- If this is mainly about being more visible, we could have webcasts about research, programs, etc.

Table 7

- Teacher/scholar model is great but needs to be supported to include student research. Faculty researchers are a very strong influence on students’ education. However, small class sizes means more class time instead of research. Perhaps, finding a way to consolidate smaller classes to free teachers’ time for research. Which in turn would mean more student research time as well.

Table 8

None.

- Character Development
- Values or Ethical Training
- Globalization – Raising global awareness
- Diversity and cultural
- Industry support
- Connections to external stakeholders
- Connectedness of program to outside world. Who outside the university cares
- Fit within CSU? Are there 10 other programs.
- Uniqueness of program. Competing with CSUs and Community Colleges.
- Type of program, BS, MS, Certificate
- Sustainable program – students, budget
- Innovative, disruptive – will it change the world. Will it have a major impact
- Resilience – adaptability, respond to changes, continuance.
- Does it build on competencies we have or would want to grow.
- High risk innovative vs low risk low impact.

Table 9

- WTUs for professional development so that we can have true TSM
- Re Collaboration across disciplines- for those who want to do it, the beuaracratc hurdles are problemtatic; change to “Better facilitate collaboration across disciplines for teaching and research”

HOW THESE CRITERIA MIGHT BE MEASURED

Table 1

- Quality of job leaving Poly
- Starting salary
- Mid-career salary
- Position is industry: entrepreneur, executive, management, etc.
- Number of jobs per graduating student (calibrated for number of jobs in industry, e.g., history graduate vs. engineer)
- Asking students exit questions: assessment document to determine what have learned with respect to ULO’s (entering assessment compared to graduating assessment)

Table 2

None.

Table 3

None.

Table 4

None.

Table 5

- Demand
 - Looking at comparable colleges with comparable programs

- Student success IF THIS MEANS their ability to succeed and adapt in life (i.e., NOT making classes simpler to increase graduation rates, which would have the opposite result). Not getting the grade they expected would be one factor that would encourage students to adapt and reconsider their approach to their education, for example.

Table 7

- Societal Needs
- Prospects for graduates
- Student success
- Excellence. But we would change this to Quality.

Table 8

None.

Table 9

- ULOs
- Ability to attract and retain faculty
- Facilities and technology
- Student success

Misc. Comments from Table 8 on Topic 2:

- Should be teaching vision for future and social needs, character development, citizens of the world. People concerned about what is happening around them. Putting more and more emphasis on technology, training and less on education as whole person. Univ is not workshop to train mechanics. Need to train people as good engineers. Must have “wholeness.”
- Red Herring that you are becoming technician. It is about training them to become an engineer, architect etc.
- We are having less and less emphasis on Liberal Arts and more and more on technical aspect. Intro finance, none of faculty want to teach corporate responsibility.

NOTES FROM MEETING

Dalton: A year ago, we put this diagram together to remind people that things do connect. Vision 2022 provides the high level framework that represents the values of our university. The academic plan closely parallels that. It needs to guide everything we do. Below that is the physical master plan. That intervening narrower band between the Academic Plan and Physical Master Plan are the more the more specialized things that happen from time to time. Some are physical and some are physical but narrower in scope. Last year we also adopted a strategy from literature called “Planning from the future backwards”. When you’re looking at the future, it’s good to look way ahead. About a generation ahead. The students we will have in 15 years are already born. We can look at the demographics and look ahead about 15 to 20 years. Looking any further out gets more and more speculative. Looking at an academic cycle when it takes so long to get anything done, it makes sense to look far enough ahead to change something. We jumped ahead and worked our way back to the present. Each college turned in two narratives: One before Thanksgiving and one

programs with the teacher scholar model in them because the faculty will be spending more time with graduate students. But we think it's doable as long as tenure track to undergraduate ration is protected. In the second one, we wanted to add all the undergraduate education into the list as well as faculty to student ration.

Table 5: One topic one, the highlights there were the idea of teaching post doc programs that it might possibly be driven by grants the faculty have and the research that goes with that. The idea of more 4+1 graduate program in specialized fields to meet market demands. One question that we had was how that might affect the metrics of four-year degree completion rates. Looking at the different niches Cal Poly excels in and how those meet the programs built around those niches can attract people from around the country.

Table 6: We also spent a lot of time trying to make sense of that sentence. It can be seen in two ways. We want to focus on being visible educational model, the other focuses on the expansiveness. We wondered if either of them are good in themselves and maybe we should be driving curriculum. We were also looking at number 2 and decided that everything on the list, the most important is for students to learn how to learn, think well, and adapt. We found student success questionable.

Table 7: We talked a lot about teacher-scholar and how we would seize it. If class sizes were more manageable, then it would free teacher scholars for more opportunities for students to be part of their research. And the second topic, we did a lot of talking about our important __, those were societal needs, prospects for graduates, student success, and excellence. But we want to change excellence to quality. There is a lot discussion on what is excellence.

Table 8: There was quite a bit of discussion on topic 1 about ??. Once we start talking about residential, undergraduate, etc. It returns to where you've been. There is a long list of criteria that might not be on the list.

Table 9: For the first one, we thought it was relatively well framed. The first part of it, we thought it was important to retain face to face and on campus interaction for learn by doing activities. For topic 2, the opportunity for visible and expansive __ vaguely written and of great concern depending on what the plan is and what kind of programs were going to increase. Sounds like something to generate funds, but it needs to be much better defined to see how this fits into our ULO and admissions. We rather see our university work on getting the graduate programs correct and to support the teacher scholar model.

Topic 4. Master Plan Campus Core Concepts

FEATURES YOU LIKE

Table 1

Table 1

- Vehicle roads
- Choke points for vehicles
- Campus access and parking
- Ratio of square footage of buildings to open space per plan
- Faculty office space: is this being considered?
- What is age-qualified housing on 1

Table 2

- Make buildings have more of a cohesive look
- Would be difficult with so many existing buildings
- Are large open spaces really used? Seems like not
- Taking out a lot of used buildings, seems like
- Maybe make them more green space
- Where are the lecture spaces and research labs?
- Make sure you don't block the views of the beautiful hills around campus

Table 3

- Need to look at bicycle traffic. Particularly within the open spaces there is potential for conflict between pedestrians and bicycles.
- #1 does not have a clear north-south freeway. Pedestrians may be confused.
- More space is required alongside #1 corridors, even though it is an interactive corridor.
- How's all that grass going to be watered in the future? Add rainwater collection.

Table 4

- Do all these concepts have the same classroom space? Is space being lost in any concepts? Will the class size be preserved?
- Will any of these concepts affect parking and building access negatively?
- Is there an outside influence/input/advice on these core concepts?

Table 5

- Lawn space and water sustainability, Interactive pedestrian street seems to not fit a university (if it's not academically-focused)
- Lawn space and water sustainability, building high to make up for reduced footprint (obstructing views, other restrictions for building height)
- Maintains a lot of the old buildings

Table 6

- Is there enough parking that's close enough to use (unlike PCV)? It's ok with us to have cars kept out of the center of campus but wonder about injuries, etc., that might motivate someone to want to drive closer to where they work / study.
- Is there enough focus on wellness – including faculty wellness (some faculty gym facilities) or spaces to socialize.
- Maybe most importantly, though: Do we really need all this? Wouldn't it be better to keep what works, even Bldg. 20 – especially given need for more money for instruction (i.e., existing needs)?

- We like the plaza between Mott Gym and the Science center on #2. We also like the interactive walkway on #1. Perhaps the two can be combined.

Table 4

None.

Table 5

None.

Table 6

- Hope for green / sustainable buildings (LEED certified).
- Faculty club (university club) for staff/faculty socializing.

Table 7

- How will these open spaces be green in the future?
- Incorporation of Greek life on campus.
- Lighting on and around campus.

Table 8

- On Proposal #3 remove part of 20 to open up Dexter and via carta intersection.
- Add café around building 20, activity area. May use patio space for café. Could have patio.
- Add café to building 3.
- Needs central tower, icon or monument building. May be at end of Dexter Lawn so it is visible through the campus core.

Table 9

- Needs a space for faculty that is not just offices or classrooms; somewhere faculty could socialize.

NOTES FROM MEETING

Dalton: The Master Plan process started a year ago in the fall. We spent most of the year vetting ideas together. We had 6 advisory committees that had campus community. Gave a lot of advice and came out in spring. Julie Maloney and I made the rounds to all the colleges. Over the summer, we did a synthesis of those ideas. Some goals for the core is to really increase activity in the core. Get what the architects and designers call a better sense place; a better sense of what the core campus is really all about. We can do that visually, we can do that with restructuring some of the design of the core. Buildings should not be single purpose buildings. We have, for example, a lot of ground floor activities that are very open. When you're walking along campus, you can see inside and what's going on inside of it. We did some analysis of the buildings on campus and Orange is the older, most structurally obsolete. They are the most desirable to replace. The next shade of orange is that we need to work on but renovation might be a better option given their age. The yellow are our newest buildings, which we shouldn't be spending more funds on right now. Three different concept maps. The common challenges are the topography, way finding, how the space is actually arranged, and where are we going to get the money. We looked at different ways to lay out different things. How much change is realistic?