MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
Tuesday, May 3 2011  
UU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes:  
Approval of Academic Senate minutes for April 12 2011 (pp. 2-3).

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

III. Regular Reports:  
A. Academic Senate Chair:  
B. President’s Office:  
C. Provost:  
D. Vice President for Student Affairs:  
E. Statewide Senate:  
F. CFA Campus President:  
G. ASI Representative:

IV. Special Reports:

V. Consent Agenda:  
http://records.calpoly.edu/curric-handbook/docs/Continuous_Course_Summary/Continuous-Course-Summary.doc (p. 4).  
BS Ag Comm new degree program (also on business agenda as a second reading item on May 3)  
BUS 205 Personal Finance  
BUS 342 Fundamentals of Corporate Finance  
CSC/CPE 349 Design and Analysis of Algorithms  
CSC/CPE 435 Introduction to Object Oriented Design Using Graphic User Interface  
FSN 210 Nutrition  
FSN 250 Food and Nutrition: Customs and Culture  
STAT 217 Introduction to Statistical Concepts and Methods

VI. Business Item(s):  
A. Resolution on the Strategic Plan: Mehiel, chair of Strategic Plan Task Force, second reading [the Cal Poly Strategic Plan-V7 is attached to the resolution as background material. It does not need to be printed for the Senate meeting. It can also be viewed at http://www.academicaffairs.calpoly.edu/StrategicPlan/pdfs/sp_web.pdf] (pp. 5-30).  
B. Resolution on Proposed New Degree Program: Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Communication: Flores/Gearhart for Agricultural Education and Communication Department, second reading (pp. 31-36).  
C. Resolution on Academic Advising: Harris, chair of Instruction Committee, first reading (pp. 37-39).  
D. Resolution on Proposed New CAFES Department: Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES) Department: Moody, Department Head for NRM/Piirto, Department Head for ERSS, first reading (pp. 40-54).

VII. Adjournment:
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
Tuesday, April 12, 2011
UU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: The minutes of March 1 and March 8 were approved as presented.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: none.
B. President’s Office: none.
C. Provost: none.
D. Vice Provost for Student Affairs: none.
E. Statewide Senate: Foroohar reported that at its March meeting the Statewide Academic Senate met and passed several resolutions, including a resolution on “Amending the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University to Include a Statement Upholding Academic Freedom.” Fernflores added that an electronic election to participate in the system wide ratification of the resolution will be conducted campuswide.
F. CFA Campus President: Thorncroft reported that a CFA chapter meeting will take place on Thursday, May 27. Anyone with suggestions, comments, or questions is encouraged to attend.
G. ASI Representative: Storelli announced that the ASI Board of Directors is hard at work on college council issues with President Armstrong, deans, members of the board of directors, and college council members.

IV. Special Reports: none.

V. Consent Agenda: All curriculum proposals presented were approved.

VI. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on a Working Definition of Learn by Doing (Learn by Doing (LBD) Task Force): Stern presented this resolution which requests that the Academic Senate adopt the attached definition of Learn by Doing. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

B. Resolution on the Strategic Plan (WASC Strategic Plan Task Force): Mehiel presented this resolution, which requests that the attached draft of the Cal Poly strategic plan be endorsed as a framework for providing guidance on operational decisions and planning across Cal Poly. Resolution will return as a second reading item.
C. Resolution on Academic Advising (Instruction Committee): M/S/P to address the resolution at the next Senate meeting.

D. Resolution on Proposed New Degree Program: Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Communication (Agricultural Education and Communication Department): Gearhart presented the resolution, which request that the proposed degree program, Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Communication be approved. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

VI. Adjournment: 4:50 pm

Submitted by,

[Signature]

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
# Continuous Course/Curriculum Summary

**For Academic Senate Consent Agenda**

**Note:** The following courses/programs have been summarized by staff in the Registrar's Office for review by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC) and Academic Senate (AS)

Date: April 12, 2011

## Winter-Spring 2011 Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate (AS)</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS Agricultural Communication: new degree program</td>
<td>Recommended for approval 10/21/10</td>
<td>First reading: 4/12/11. Agendized for second reading: 5/3/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 205 Personal Finance (4) 4 lec</td>
<td>Reviewed on 3/10/11; returned to college for more information; reviewed 4/7/11; approval recommended</td>
<td>Agendized for 5/3/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 342 Fundamentals of Corporate Finance (4) 4 lec (existing course proposed to be offered in new online mode)</td>
<td>Reviewed 4/7/11; approval recommended</td>
<td>Agendized for 5/3/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC/CPE 349 Design and Analysis of Algorithms (4) 3 lec, 1 lab (existing course proposed to be offered in new online mode)</td>
<td>Reviewed 4/7/11; returned to dept for more information; approval recommended</td>
<td>Agendized for 5/3/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC/CPE 435 Introduction to Object Oriented Design Using Graphic User Interface (4) 3 lec, 1 lab (existing course proposed to be offered in new online mode)</td>
<td>Reviewed 4/7/11; returned to dept for more information; approval recommended</td>
<td>Agendized for 5/3/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSN 210 Nutrition (4) 4 lec GE B5 (existing course proposed to be offered in new online mode)</td>
<td>Reviewed 4/7/11; returned to dept for more information; approval recommended</td>
<td>Agendized for 5/3/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSN 250 Food and Nutrition: Customs and Culture (4) 4 lec GE D4 (existing course proposed to be offered in new online mode)</td>
<td>Reviewed 4/7/11; approval recommended</td>
<td>Agendized for 5/3/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 217 Introduction to Statistical Concepts and Methods (4) 4 lec (existing course proposed to be offered in new online mode)</td>
<td>Reviewed 4/7/11; returned to dept for more information; approval recommended</td>
<td>Agendized for 5/3/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, A strategic plan can be summarized as a roadmap framework to achieving the institution's long-term goals and objectives; and

WHEREAS, The key components of an academic strategic plan should be composed of a vision statement, a mission statement, a set of goals to achieve the mission and vision, and a set of key performance indicators; and

WHEREAS, The vision of the institution describes the overarching long-term goal of the institution; and

WHEREAS, The mission of the institution describes why it exists; and

WHEREAS, The goals in the strategic plan should be specific, measurable, and should lead to the achievement of the institution's vision and support its mission; and

WHEREAS, Key performance indicators should be specific, measurable, and should be informative as to whether the institution is making progress towards its identified goals; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate believes that a strategic plan is a necessary component to moving the University towards its long-term goals, and a strategic plan acquires operational utility when it provides a framework for collaborative decision making and institutional alignment; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate strongly supports strategic planning as an essential component of institutional success and recognizes a necessary condition for a successful strategic plan is collaboration and acceptance among a broad assortment of the Cal Poly community, including the General Faculty, administration, staff and students; and

WHEREAS, The vision in the current draft of the strategic plan revolves around The Cal Poly Strategic Plan - V7 moves Cal Poly toward becoming the premier comprehensive polytechnic university; and

WHEREAS, The WASC report Report of the WASC Visiting Team Capacity and Preparatory Review states that there is a need to "...continue to refine their [Cal Poly's] definition of a comprehensive polytechnic university in ways that can be embraced by all members of the University," and
WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Strategic Plan – V7 provides a framework for continuing discussion and a summary of where Cal Poly stands as an institution; and

WHEREAS, Identifying peer and aspirational institutions and key performance indicators are activities central to measuring Cal Poly’s progress toward achieving our strategic goals; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Strategic Plan – V7 proposes several decisions which are consistent with maintaining and enhancing the core competencies of Cal Poly including preparing whole system thinkers, increasing integration of faculty, staff and students, Learn-By-Doing as a core pedagogy, and restoring economic vitality; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate endorse The Cal Poly Strategic Plan – V7 as an emerging framework to provide guidance on operational decisions and planning across Cal Poly; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate develop a committee whose sole charge is to work collaboratively with the administration on further developing and implementing the Cal Poly strategic plan; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate continue to work collaboratively with the Cal Poly community to further develop and enhance the notion of Cal Poly’s identity as a comprehensive polytechnic university; and be it further

RESOLVED: Any key performance indicators used to measure Cal Poly’s progress toward goals elucidated in strategic planning process should be specific, measurable, and should be informative as to whether the institution is making progress towards its identified goals; and

RESOLVED: That based on the strategic planning activity undertaken at the 2010 Academic Senate Fall Retreat, the Academic Senate endorse the following key performance indicators as central to the successful execution of the strategic plan:

- Full Time Equivalent Student to Full Time Equivalent Faculty and Tenure/Tenure-Track to Lecturer headcount ratio;
- retention, progress toward degree and graduation rates of students, and;
- the ability of Cal Poly graduates to gain employment in meaningful economic sectors in California and the Global context and be successful in those careers.

Proposed by: WASC/Senate Strategic Plan Task Force
Date: February 22 2011
Revised: April 25 2011
CAL POLY STRATEGIC PLAN – V7

STRATEGIC PLAN PURPOSE

The primary purpose of this Cal Poly strategic plan is to provide the direction and core framework for institution-wide continuous strategic planning and future initiatives. This plan together with divisional and unit, and college and department strategic planning, shall align with WASC reaccreditation and also will form the foundation for the Cal Poly capital campaign planning.

The plan articulates the Vision for Cal Poly and outlines the system for tracking progress relative to that Vision. This will include the perspectives of key stakeholder groups and be benchmarked relative to comparison institutions groups. The plan expresses the core values for the institution, individual and community, and summarizes the immediate specific strategic decisions. The process to develop action plans and strategic initiatives is outlined.

Note that in addition to the annual review of progress, the plan itself will be reviewed and updated each year as needed.

VERSION HISTORY

The original Version 1 of the plan was developed during fall quarter 2008 and disseminated for comment January 15, 2009. It had been built on several existing strategic planning documents including the Access To Excellence CSU plan, college strategic plans, and the reports of the 2008 strategic planning Five Working Groups discussed at the August 21, 2008 strategic planning workshop.

After extensive feedback on Version 1 during spring quarter 2009 from the campus community and external partners, Version 2 of the plan was developed. That version was presented and discussed with the President’s Cabinet and university leadership, May 2009. Based on their feedback, successive Versions 3-6 were circulated among the Cal Poly leadership, central administration and college leaders. This current working draft Version 7 has been developed based on that combined feedback.

It should be noted that while the structure, form, style and expression in Version 7 differ significantly from the original Version 1, most of the core elements of the original version remain. Feedback on this current working draft Version 7 is invited.

Erling A. Smith
Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives and Planning
SUMMARY

VISION
- Nation's premier comprehensive polytechnic university
- Nationally recognized innovative institution
- Helping California meet future challenges in a global context

TRACKING PROGRESS
- We will track progress toward achieving the vision using key performance indicators
- The key performance indicators will be directly linked to the vision and connected to the different perspectives of the primary stakeholder groups
- We will measure ourselves against a comparison institutions group
- Each year we will review our status, looking for opportunities for improvement and realignment throughout the institution
- Each year, we will review proposals for action, realigning, opportunities, initiatives and investment

VALUES
- Institutional
  - excellence, continuous improvement and renewal
  - transparency, open communications and collaboration
  - accountability, fiscal and environmental responsibility
- Individual
  - professionalism, personal responsibility, and ethical
  - lifelong learner and seeking personal excellence
  - campus citizen and team member
- Community
  - multicultural, intellectual diversity and free inquiry
  - inclusivity and excellence, mutual respect and trust
  - civic engagement, social and environmental responsibility

DECISIONS
- Enhancing differentiation
  - Continue to develop unique comprehensive polytechnic identity
  - Shift definition to all majors as "polytechnic" preparing whole-system thinker graduates
  - Increase integration and interlinking of disciplines, faculty, staff and students
  - Build on core Learn-By-Doing pedagogy to ensure all students have a comprehensive polytechnic multi-mode education
- Restoring economic viability
  - Strategically manage revenue, costs, allocation or resources, improve effectiveness and efficiency
  - Shift mix of students to increase proportion of graduate students and international students
  - Implement institution-wide vision-driven and evidence-based decision-making and continuous improvement
  - Adopt and implement comprehensive enrollment management

ACTION
- All divisions and colleges will develop plans linked to this institutional plan and its strategic decisions.
- Plans will be tied to the institutional Mission and Vision identifying the contributions and roles, and highlight opportunities for collaboration and partnering.
- The plans will encompass the stakeholder perspectives, incorporate Cal Poly values and use the institutional key performance indicators along with other appropriate metrics.

APPENDIX
VISION
Premier polytechnic, innovative institution, helping California

Cal Poly will be the nation's premier comprehensive polytechnic university, a nationally recognized innovative institution, focused to help California meet future challenges in a global context.

Questions and Answers
The Vision statement raises several strategic questions: Is this vision consistent with the Cal Poly mission? Is the vision achievable from our current position? What are the gaps between our vision, mission and our current position? Does the vision align with our preparation for WASC? Are we committed to being the best at our defined mission? Do we agree that Cal Poly is defined as a comprehensive polytechnic university with the mix of professional, STEM, humanities and social science programs that implies? Do we wish to define ourselves in terms of polytechnic colleges, polytechnic programs and/or polytechnic students? Do we accept the recommendation to expand our expectations of students to emerge from Cal Poly as whole-system thinkers? Do we continue to commit ourselves to project based learning – the emerging definition of "learn by doing"? Are we committed to transparency of process, sustainability of operations as an element of whole-system thinking, and innovation as a necessary element of continuous improvement? Do we accept that the arc of history for Cal Poly implies a continuing growth of our graduate student proportion? Do we accept the premise that resources determine size? (Does not necessarily limit growth, but focuses on how growth might be achieved rather than just hoping for state money.) Do we endorse a definition for productivity of the University as the best possible graduate per unit of resources expended?

Is this vision consistent with the Cal Poly mission?
Yes. Each of the three primary aspects of the vision statement – premier polytechnic, innovative institution and helping California – aligns and crosslinks to each of the three core aspects of the mission – teaching and learning, scholarship and research, and outreach and service – as expressed in our mission statement:

"Cal Poly fosters teaching, scholarship, and service in a learn-by-doing environment where students and faculty are partners in discovery. As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly promotes the application of theory to practice. As a comprehensive institution, Cal Poly provides a balanced education in the arts, sciences, and technology, while encouraging cross-disciplinary and co-curricular experiences. As an academic community, Cal Poly values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility."

However, while the mission statement describes our historic, enduring and continuing institutional purpose, the vision statement is an elevation, pointing to where we wish to go from our current position.

Is the vision achievable from our current position?
Our current position is that Cal Poly is a well-established, recognized and highly ranked institution; a comprehensive polytechnic state university, with baccalaureate and
graduate level programs in science-, technology- and mathematics-based professions, and academic and professional programs in the arts and sciences. Cal Poly is known for its learn-by-doing environment and comprehensive multi-mode educational experience that prepares graduates for successful lives and careers as long-term performers and leaders in agriculture, architecture, the arts, business, education, engineering and the sciences. Cal Poly and many of our programs enjoy very high ranking. Competition for our unique Cal Poly education is extremely strong as is the demand for Cal Poly graduates because of their ready-on-day-one capabilities and long-term performance and leadership. Cal Poly contributes significantly to the economy and well-being of California. Clearly, our current position is on the trajectory towards achieving the vision.

What are the gaps between our vision, mission and our current position?

The vision calls us to be the premier comprehensive polytechnic university. Cal Poly graduates must be second to none. The total educational environment and experience we provide must enable the growth and learning of our students so they emerge as premier graduates with the skills they need for sustained future success in the challenges ahead. We must commit to ensuring our curricula and programs are the best and are continuously improving. We must ensure that the student learning we intend – as expressed in our University Learning Objectives, and program and course outcomes – is being achieved and demonstrated by robust assessment methods. In addition, we must make sure that all aspects of our support operations are focused on ensuring the progress and success of our students.

In parallel, we must commit to continuing development and expansion of our individual skills and excellence – faculty continuing their development as teachers, scholars and campus citizens, and staff and administrators continuously improving as skilled professionals and lifelong learners. Every new hire must be better than the last and even better than any one of us! Regardless of position, each of us must be dedicated to the progress and success of our students.

Meanwhile, we must continue to work hard on improving the Cal Poly learning and support infrastructure. In spite of excellent progress on the Master plan at providing many new academic buildings and residence halls during the past decade, continued progress will be far more challenging in the years immediately ahead. Many classrooms are in urgent need of renovation and upgrade. The increasing scholarly expectations on faculty have increased demand for more research laboratories, better computing facilities and an upgraded and expanded library and similar vital “common goods” of a successful university. However, we will need to be more creative and innovative, and where appropriate use technology as part of the solution to these challenges.

Does the vision align with our preparation for WASC?

Definitely. The principal theme of our WASC self-study has been “Our Polytechnic Identity” examined from different points of view including integrated student learning, the teacher-scholar model and learn-by-doing. These align and crosslink to the three principal aspects of the vision – premier polytechnic, innovative institution, and helping California. The work of all the WASC groups has contributed to the development of the strategic plan and expression of our vision.
Are we committed to being the best at our defined mission? – creates a commitment to continuous reflection, self examination and improvement.

Yes. We have a long history of leadership in undergraduate higher education and because of the reputation we have earned we attract the highest quality student and have built a faculty and staff of the highest standing. Our unique Cal Poly mission remains relevant and central; and our graduates because of their inherent quality, abilities and skill sets they possess are ever more critical to help California meet its current and future challenges.

To continue to be the best, every year we must seek to be better than the year before, with intentional continuous reflection, examination and improvement of all we do, at both the individual and institutional levels. Indeed, the primary purpose of the strategic plan is to provide the common direction and shared core framework for continuous strategic planning and future initiatives as we seek to be even better.

Thus, we need to review all aspects of the mission and prioritize. Then, we will need to track our progress continually and benchmark ourselves against a comparison institutions group to make sure our trajectory and position is right. No single measure and no single point of view will be sufficient so we will need to monitor several – though a limited set of – quantitative progress, quality and resources indicators, balancing the different aspects and perspectives of the Cal Poly mission. Each year, we will report and score our progress, balancing the different aspects, and examine opportunities for improvements, strategic initiatives and investments.

For example, we need to pay more attention to improving the graduation rate and student progress to degree; we need to systematically listen to alumni and employers to ensure the quality of our education and graduates is always relevant and moving forward; we also need to develop ways to demonstrate and highlight faculty scholarship in its fullest sense and showcase these important contributions; and we need to continually upgrade our facilities and infrastructure.

Do we agree that Cal Poly is defined as a comprehensive polytechnic university with the mix of professional, STEM, humanities and social science programs that implies?

Yes. We are both a comprehensive university and a polytechnic university and these two overlapping aspects of the Cal Poly identity reinforce each other. The range of our programs provides us intellectual breadth, balance and institutional strength and is an important reason for our continued success and durability. An important arm of our strategy is to continue to enhance this competitive advantage of our institutional differentiation.

Cal Poly is a polytechnic university, one of only 12 four-year universities/campuses nationwide with “polytechnic” in their name. A feature common to most “polytechnic” institutions is a focus on programs in math-, science- and technology-based professions. Certainly this is true for Cal Poly with over 1/3 of the degrees being in the STEM fields, 3/4 of the degrees in the Professions, and 84% of our degrees in the Professions and STEM combined.

In addition, the Professions and STEM is a common unifying component of our Cal Poly identity. For example, all Cal Poly colleges have at least one program that is in the Professions, and almost all our colleges have programs that are in STEM. Further, CLA and CSM, in addition to their majors in the Professions, STEM, and other academic
disciplines, play a critical role in the foundational general education core of all our graduates.

Cal Poly is also a comprehensive university. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classifies institutions by their graduate programs using four field groupings: Humanities, Social Sciences, STEM and the Professions. Carnegie identifies an institution as “comprehensive” only if it has graduate-level programs and graduates in all four Carnegie field groupings. Perhaps surprisingly only 21% of the 1213 institutions overall and only 13% of the 804 master’s level institutions are in this category. Of the 12 “polytechnic” and 24 “institute of technology” four-year institutions combined only 5 are classified as comprehensive: three doctoral level research universities and two master’s level universities; and only three are designated as polytechnic. We are one of only very few “comprehensive polytechnic” universities. [See the Appendix for more information on Carnegie classifications and Cal Poly and also http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp]

**Do we wish to define ourselves in terms of polytechnic colleges, polytechnic programs and/or polytechnic students?**

For many years, we have used the total enrollment in CAFES, CAED and CENG as our surrogate measure of how “polytechnic” we are, but that is a limiting construct and not fully representative of the broader scope of the polytechnic identity of Cal Poly today. Polytechnic universities have a significant focus on undergraduate and graduate programs – typically technology, science, or math-based – that prepare individuals for professional careers. This is certainly true of Cal Poly but we now have programs in the Professions in every college, i.e. extending well beyond our historic “polytechnic” colleges.

Regardless of their major, all Cal Poly graduates will need much more of their education to tackle the challenges of the future. Of course, they will continue to need the depth of knowledge of their discipline that we have always provided. But this depth must also be integrated with breadth, balance and literacy in technology, the arts and sciences – a comprehensive polytechnic general education. Therefore, we will need to develop our programs further to prepare all our students regardless of the major to become “comprehensive polytechnic” graduates.

**Do we accept the recommendation to expand our expectations of students to emerge from Cal Poly as whole-system thinkers – implies an expansion of project based learning to highly interdisciplinary teams?**

It is clear that the problems of today and the challenges of tomorrow for California and in a global context will need graduates who have depth and breadth in an integrated education and are whole-system thinkers. The challenges are many and most are complex requiring a multi-disciplinary and integrated interdisciplinary team rather than a solo individual approach.

Cal Poly graduates are valued for being “ready day one” and also being long-term high performers and typically have the characteristics needed. However, we need to ensure this is an intentional outcome and added value of the educational experience we provide. We should look at all our programs both individually and collectively to ensure that the full set of learning experiences do indeed prepare our students for the challenges of their future.
Future Cal Poly graduates should have integrated breadth, balance and literacy in technology, the arts and sciences and depth of their total education to be whole-system thinkers and leaders. These will be important differentiators of Cal Poly graduates. They should demonstrate expertise, work effectively and productively as individuals and in multidisciplinary teams, communicate effectively, think critically, understand context, research, think creatively, make reasoned decisions, use their knowledge and skills, and engage in lifelong learning. This will be true for all our graduates regardless of major, preparing them for full and enriching lives, ready for entry into their chosen careers or advanced study and to contribute to society.

Meanwhile, each of us should model the expectations we have of our graduates, i.e. from working effectively and productively as individuals and as part of a multidisciplinary team, to being life-long learners and whole-institution thinkers, and campus citizens, sharing a common purpose – the success of our students.

Do we continue to commit ourselves to project based learning – the emerging definition of “learn by doing”?

We must ensure that we remain leaders and innovators in higher education pedagogy, this must be part of Cal Poly being the best. Learn-By-Doing is a core part of a Cal Poly education and a well-known part of our identity differentiating us from other institutions. LBD provides our students hands-on active learning beyond and complementing their work in the classroom and their co-curricular activities.

Like all aspects of our pedagogy, we must continue to improve and enhance LBD to intentionally mobilize higher levels of learning. Project-based learning (PBL) can be classified as a mode of LBD; and capstone projects are an example of PBL. But LBD, PBL, and capstone experiences are opportunities for a deeper, richer education to develop the whole-system thinker, comprehensive polytechnic graduate for the future. We should explore introducing these integrative experiences early in a student’s time with us, perhaps as a foundational part of all our curricula.

Are we committed to transparency of process, sustainability of operations as an element of whole-system thinking, and innovation as a necessary element of continuous improvement?

Transparency must be a fundamental Cal Poly value together with open communication, accountability, evidence-based decision-making, and continuous improvement. All of these will assist us in our strategy of restoring economic viability. This past year we have been working hard to improve access and sharing of institutional data and in easy-to-understand formats; we have also been working on improving internal communications particularly in these difficult times of budget uncertainty.

Meanwhile, Cal Poly is a leader in sustainability of operations with a well-developed process and a record of progress to continuously improve our performance. We also have expertise in sustainability as an academic and research field. Indeed, fully-developed, sustainability can embody whole-system thinking.

We need to be innovative and creative as we seek continuous improvement and renewal in our programs and in our operations. Cal Poly also has opportunity to contribute to the field of innovation, another potentially integrative theme we have expertise in and should develop further.
Do we accept that the arc of history for Cal Poly implies a continuing growth of our graduate student proportion?

Yes. Although approximately 10% of Cal Poly degrees are at the master’s level, overall both graduate enrollment and its proportion have been declining slightly during the past decade; currently it is at about 5% of the total enrollment. Increasing our graduate proportion would yield many benefits.

For many of our majors, a baccalaureate degree is considered only an “entry-level” degree and increasingly a graduate degree is considered the first “professional” degree. Indeed, several employers have moved to hiring only at the advanced degree level.

A greater proportion of graduate students would increase the heterogeneity of the campus population, increasing the presence of national and international students and enhancing the education of all. Graduate students also serve as academic role models for our undergraduates. A deeper graduate education presence would help us further develop our research and would certainly enhance our national and international reputation. It would also support faculty in becoming teacher-scholars.

We would have to identify strategic opportunities for growth in areas where we have strength and reputation, and can build on our existing infrastructure. Note that we do have some competitive advantage of having made only a limited investment in graduate programs so far and thus we have the opportunity to be selective, creative and agile.

Do we accept the premise that resources determine size? (Does not necessarily limit growth, but focuses on how growth might be achieved rather than just hoping for state money.)

As part of our strategy to restore economic viability, we need to decouple our institutional size from the state allocation as much as is feasible. For example, the Cal Poly Plan and the College-Based Fee recognize our unique and different mission and higher cost and quality of the education we provide. We need to carefully steward and manage all our resources, continually look for ways to streamline our activities without sacrificing Cal Poly quality.

We also need to explore expanding non-state revenue sources, again without sacrificing quality. Examples include out-of-state and international students as an increasing proportion of our students, licensing intellectual property; increased grants income and continuously growing philanthropy.

We should build on our core strengths and competitive advantages wherever possible, have a sound business plan and monitor returns on such investments.

Do we endorse a definition for productivity of the University as the best possible graduate per unit of resources expended?

This expresses the value that Cal Poly has always provided. We know our graduates are among the best – we must maintain and continue to improve their quality. We must look toward ensuring more of our students reach graduation, by facilitating progress to degree, improving year-by-year retention, as always without compromising our standards. This provides value to each individual and all students while also improving our performance and efficiency.
Cal Poly has a long history of being the best; we must never take that position for granted, we must earn it every year, and every year we must do better, even in these the most difficult economic times.

**TRACKING PROGRESS**

*Key performance indicators, stakeholder perspectives, and comparison institutions*

We will track progress toward achieving the vision using key performance indicators. The key performance indicators will be directly linked to the Vision and connected to the different perspectives of the primary stakeholder groups. We will measure ourselves against comparison institutions groups using target benchmark levels for the key performance indicators. Each year, we will review our status, looking for opportunities for improvement and realignment throughout the institution. Each year, proposals for action, realigning, opportunities, initiatives and investments will be reviewed. As needed, colleges, departments and administrative units will develop action plans and pursue strategic initiatives.

**Use Key Performance Indicators**

We will track progress toward achieving the vision using key performance indicators, measures of progress (quantitative outcomes), quality (level of service), and resources (financial, personnel and facilities.) Note that every year we will review each key performance indicators and assess continued relevancy and value. Sample key performance indicators are listed below:

**PROGRESS** indicators include: student success measures: graduation rates e.g. 6-year, 5-year, and 4-year, year-by-year retention rates, progress-to-degree rates, disaggregated; institutional and program rankings; demographic heterogeneity: proportion of students and employees by ethnic, gender, socio-economic, international categories; numbers of graduates, graduates in the Professions and STEM fields, and advanced degree graduates; student learning: attainment of University Learning Objectives and program and course objectives; faculty excellence: annual institutional total scholarly contributions, teacher-scholar indicator (to be developed), research grants, patents, etc.; staff excellence: % in-range progressions and awards; revenue: value and basis of endowment, annual operating revenue from all sources; and sustainability of operations: BTU/sq.ft.

**QUALITY** indicators include: surveys, annually of students and employees, multi-year of alumni and employers, quarterly of departing students and employees; retention rates of continuing and non-continuing students and employees; satisfaction surveys of employers with graduates’ depth of knowledge and breadth of skills; and student-to-faculty ratio.

**RESOURCES** indicators include: expenditures per student: faculty-to-student ratio, student support staff to student ratio, enrollment capacity to student ratio, cost of instruction per graduate, expenditures per faculty: faculty support staff to faculty ratio, and development expenditures per annual gift income.
KPIs Aligned to Vision

- Premier comprehensive polytechnic university
  - Ranking and Program recognition
  - Comprehensive range of programs
  - Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills
  - Quality of faculty and facilities
  - Student-to-faculty ratio
  - Retention, progress-to-degree, and graduation rates
  - Diversity and heterogeneity
  - Cost-of-attendance
  - Strategic allocation of resources
  - Annual gift and endowment growth
  - Communication of successes, achievements, awards, and economic impact

- Nationally recognized innovative institution
  - Ranking and Program recognition
  - National awards
  - Innovative academic and co-curricular programs
  - Development of Comprehensive Polytechnic Graduate
  - Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills
  - Faculty scholarly output
  - Continuous quality improvement
  - Use of appropriate technology
  - Sustainable practices
  - Communication of successes, achievements, awards, and economic impact

- Helping California meet future challenges in a global context
  - Number and quality of graduates in areas of CA human resources need
  - Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills
  - Retention, progress-to-degree, and graduation rates
  - Number and availability of jobs and employment rate of graduates
  - Number of graduates going on to graduate school
  - Entering student quality
  - Diversity and heterogeneity
  - CA intellectual property and innovation
  - CA competitiveness and economic impact
  - Institutional financial needs
  - Communication of successes, achievements, awards, and economic impact

Include stakeholder perspectives

The KPIs will be linked to the three aspects of the vision statement: “the nation’s premier comprehensive polytechnic university,” “a nationally recognized innovative institution,” and “focused to help meet the challenges of California in the global context.”
The four perspective groups include those of: external accountability groups such as governing bodies and accreditation agencies; our external beneficiaries such as potential, continuing and completing students, parents, employers of our graduates and research funding agencies; internal individuals such as employee professional growth and development to maintain the intellectual capital and intrinsic institutional value embodied in individual faculty, staff, management and executive personnel; and internal institutional perspectives such as those quality aspects in which we must excel namely our programs, support activities, operations, resources, and advancement.

Note that every year we will review the relevancy of each key performance indicators relative to the vision and the perspectives of stakeholder groups.

**KPIs Aligned to Stakeholder Perspectives**

- **External accountability**
  - ***Governing Bodies***
    - Ranking and program recognition
    - Comprehensive range of programs
    - Diversity and heterogeneity
    - Retention and graduation rates
    - Graduate attainment of learning objectives and outcomes
    - National awards
    - Continuous quality improvement
    - Number and quality of graduates in areas of CA human resources need
    - Diversity and heterogeneity
    - CA intellectual property and innovation
    - CA competitiveness and economic impact
  - ***Accreditation Agencies***
    - Skills and abilities of graduates
    - Robust assessment of learning
    - Programs
    - Resources – faculty, facilities and finances
    - Professional development and currency of faculty, staff, management and executive
    - Continuous quality improvement
    - Entering student quality

- **External beneficiaries**
  - ***Students***
    - Program choice, ease of migration
    - Student life and satisfaction
    - Access to faculty
    - Rankings
    - Innovative academic and co-curricular programs
    - Number and availability of jobs and employment rate of graduates
    - Number of graduates going on to graduate school
  - ***Parents***
    - Student-to-faculty ratio
    - Graduation rate (4-yr)
Cost-of-attendance
Mentoring and support, safety
Ranking and Program recognition
National awards
Number and availability of jobs and employment rate of graduates
Number of graduates going on to graduate school

- **Alumni**
  - Ranking and Program recognition
  - National awards
  - Economic impact Institutional financial needs

- **Employers**
  - Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills
  - Quantity of graduates in area of need

- **Research Funding Agencies**
  - Quality of faculty and facilities
  - Faculty track record
  - Institutional support infrastructure

- **San Luis Obispo**
  - Economic impact
  - Environmental impact
  - Community impact

- **Internal individual**
  - **Faculty**
    - Support expenditures per faculty
    - Satisfaction with instructional and scholarship support infrastructure
    - Publication and other scholarly output
    - Teacher-Scholar metric
    - Student progress-to-degree
    - Number of graduates going on to graduate school
  - **Staff**
    - In-rank progressions and professional development opportunities
    - Opportunities for innovation
    - Student progress-to-degree
  - **Management**
    - Resources
    - Opportunities for innovation
    - Student progress-to-degree
  - **Executive**
    - Ranking
    - Faculty, student and program national awards
    - Patents, licenses, and intellectual property
    - Number and quality of graduates in areas of CA human resources need

- **Internal institutional**
  - **Academic Affairs**
Retention, progress-to-degree, and graduation rates
Student-to-faculty ratio
Strategic allocation of resources
Faculty scholarly output
Development of intellectual resources
Use of appropriate technology
Development of Comprehensive Polytechnic Graduate
Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills

• Administration & Finance
  Expanded number and amount of revenue sources
  Continuous quality improvement
  Strategic allocation of resources
  Use of technology as appropriate
  Sustainable practices

• Student Affairs
  Residential facilities and student life
  Innovative co-curricular programs
  Well-rounded, balanced graduates

• University Advancement
  Annual gift and endowment growth
  Communication of successes and achievements, awards, economic impact

Measure against comparison institutions

We will measure ourselves against a comparison institutions group of 4-year institutions. It should be emphasized that this group is not presented as a “peer” group or an “aspirant” group to which we aspire. While some institutions in the group may be considered peers and some may be those we aspire to emulate in some aspects, included are also institutions that could be classified as sub-peers in some or many categories and in that they may look to Cal Poly as a model to aspire to.

The comparison group was developed from three subgroups: National sample subgroup, Polytechnic and Institute of Technology subgroup, and Other Regional Competition subgroup. The National sample subgroup includes institutions from each of the six regional accreditation regions, California Postsecondary Education Commission four-region comparison institutions, and University of California and California State University systems. Criteria for inclusion in the National sample are: Carnegie categories, institutional mission and program mix, student quality and institutional selectivity, ranking, and financial aspects. Carnegie categories considered are Basic, Size and Setting, and Enrollment Profile. Institutional mission and program mix includes the proportion of the Professions to the Arts and Sciences, presence of programs in agriculture, architecture and engineering, polytechnic or institute of technology, comprehensive or STEM-focused graduate instructional program. Student quality and institutional selectivity includes mean SAT or ACT scores and acceptance rates. Ranking includes scores and percentile rank in US News and World Report category. Financial aspects include instruction budget per student and endowment yield per student.

The comparison group includes some polytechnics and institutes of technology, a coop-based university, and some regional competitors. It also includes a few institutions
recognized to be “on the move to the next level” with strategic plans successfully implemented and measured progress. Almost all institutions have graduate level programs, and most are public though some are private institutions. No single institution is like Cal Poly but the group taken as a composite contains important aspects of Cal Poly.

The preliminary 2009 comparison institutions group are shown in the table following. During fall 2009 quarter, the office of Institutional Planning and Analysis will conduct a detailed analysis of each of the candidate institutions with respect to the KPIs and stakeholder perspectives. IP&A will report on possible changes to the group that would include significantly reducing the number of institutions that we will track in future years. In addition, colleges and other units are encouraged to review the institutions from their perspective and relevancy. Similarly, note that during each and every year of the plan, and consistent with the principle of continuous improvement, we will critically review each of the institutions at a detailed level for their continued candidancy in the group.

Comparison Institutions 2009
[By Carnegie category, then by sample subgroup: national, polytechnics and institutes of technology, and other regional competition]

- Research University/Very High Activity
  - Cornell University
  - University of California, Davis
  - University of California, San Diego
  - University of Colorado – Boulder
  - University of Connecticut
  - Georgia Institute of Technology
  - Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
  - Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
  - University of California, Irvine
  - University of California, Santa Barbara
  - University of California, Santa Cruz
  - Washington State University

- Research University/High Activity
  - Clemson University
  - Drexel University
  - University of Maryland – Baltimore County
  - Missouri University of Science and Technology
  - Polytechnic Institute of New York University

- Doctoral Research Universities
  - Worcester Polytechnic Institute

- Master’s Level
  - Boise State University
  - Northern Kentucky University
  - University of North Carolina, Wilmington
  - University of Northern Iowa
  - Arizona State University Polytechnic
Review our Status

Each year, we will review our status, looking for opportunities for improvement and realignment throughout the institution. Key performance indicators will be continuously monitored and reported annually for Cal Poly as a whole institution, and by college and program, division or unit. Annual action plans will be reviewed and amended as needed. Each year, proposals for action, realigning, opportunities, initiatives and investments will be reviewed. As needed, colleges, departments and administrative units will develop action plans and pursue strategic initiatives. Strategic initiatives to take advantage of new opportunities or to improve progress will be reviewed. In addition, the key performance indicators themselves along with the comparison institutions groups will be reviewed for continued appropriateness and relevancy and updated as needed.

VALUES

Institutional, individual, and community

Cal Poly is committed to the learning, progress and success of our students

- Institutional
  - excellence, continuous improvement and renewal
  - transparency, open communications and collaboration
  - accountability, fiscal and environmental responsibility

- Individual
  - professionalism, personal responsibility, and ethical
  - lifelong learner and seeking personal excellence
  - campus citizen and team member

- Community
• multicultural, intellectual diversity and free inquiry
• inclusivity and excellence, mutual respect and trust
• civic engagement, social and environmental responsibility

STRATEGIC DECISIONS
Enhancing differentiation and restoring economic viability

The key strategies to achieving the vision are those that maintain Cal Poly differentiation, leverage core competencies, and sustain competitive advantages, together with those that restore financial viability by strategically managing revenues, costs and allocation of resources. Detailed institutional action plans for proceeding with the following strategic decisions are in development. However, part of this strategic plan is that every campus unit should examine their role and contribution with respect to these initiatives.

- Cal Poly will continue to develop its unique comprehensive polytechnic university identity by emphasizing programs in the professions that are science-, technology- and mathematics-based, and academic and professional programs in the arts and sciences.
  - Maintains our institutional differentiation
  - Leverages our existing core competencies
  - Sustains our competitive advantage

- Cal Poly will define all majors as “polytechnic” having depth of expertise in the professional or academic discipline, and breadth, balance and literacy in technology, the arts and sciences, integrated seamlessly to prepare whole-system-thinker graduates.
  - Increases our institutional differentiation
  - Leverages our existing core competencies
  - Sustains our competitive advantage
  - Expands our inclusivity and strengthens sense of community and commonality
  - We will need curricula development activity

- Cal Poly programs will be more integrated to connect and interlink our disciplines, faculty, staff and students, all as partners in teaching, learning, scholarship and service, to provide a comprehensive polytechnic educational experience and common polytechnic identity.
  - Increases our institutional differentiation
  - Leverages our existing core competencies
  - Sustains our competitive advantage
  - Expands our inclusivity and strengthens sense of community, partnership and commonality
  - We will need curricula development activity
o Cal Poly will build on its core learn-by-doing pedagogy to ensure all students have a comprehensive polytechnic multi-mode education that could include project-based, cross-disciplinary, co-curricular, multi-mode, experiential and international opportunities.

- Increases our institutional differentiation
- Leverages our existing core competencies
- Sustains our competitive advantage
- We will need curricula development activity
- We may need review of all programs and course offerings

o Cal Poly will shift the mix of students to increase the proportion of graduate students and international students while maintaining the quality and polytechnic identity of our graduates.

- Increases our cultural diversity, increases heterogeneity
- Elevates our academic scholarly climate
- Improves our economic viability
- We will need expansion of recruitment strategies and support services
- We may need curricula development activity
- We will need review of all programs and course offerings
- Offsets anticipated declining in-state K12 pool that is STEM-ready
- Enhances global perspectives

o Cal Poly will restore institutional economic viability by strategically managing revenue, costs and allocation of resources, improving effectiveness and efficiency, while maintaining quality.

- Improves our economic viability
- Sustains our competitive advantage
- We will need comprehensive management of enrollment, retention, progress and graduation, costs, and review of curricula to optimize course offerings
- Expand the number and amount of revenue streams such as more effective use of summer quarter, on-line STEM curricula for P12 teachers, etc.
- We will need strengthened relationships with our external partners and stakeholders

o Cal Poly will adopt and implement comprehensive enrollment management.

- Will improve alignment and match of student to appropriate program choices
- Will remove all institutional barriers to timely graduation
- Will improve retention, progress-to-degree, and graduation rates, and providing value to each student by reducing their total cost
- Will improve ability to plan course offerings, optimize schedules, and use of faculty time
- Will need comprehensive review of curricula
Cal Poly will adopt and implement institution-wide vision-driven and evidence-based decision making and continuous improvement processes.

- Improves our economic viability by identifying opportunities to reduce costs, improve effectiveness and efficiencies
- Continually reallocate resources to the most effective methods of increasing enrollment, retention, progress and graduation
- Can increase agility by decreasing elapsed time for decision-making and implementation
- Align budgets and other resources to desired achievement of mission and vision

**ACTION PLANS AND INITIATIVES**

All divisions and colleges will develop plans linked to this institutional plan and its strategic decisions. Those plans will be tied to the institutional Mission and Vision statements identifying the contributions and roles, and highlight opportunities for collaboration and partnering. The plans will encompass the stakeholder perspectives, incorporate Cal Poly values and use the institutional key performance indicators along with other metrics that are specifically appropriate. Plans, progress, initiatives and opportunities would be reviewed annually. Note that all the plans combined together with this institutional plan will form the foundation for planning the next Cal Poly capital campaign.

Cal Poly is developing its second comprehensive campaign. Extensive planning for the campaign has positioned the university advancement team to begin fundraising for the campaign in July 2010. The priorities of the campaign are in alignment with the Cal Poly Strategic Plan and include:

- Sustainable and Healthy Communities
- Learn by Doing and the 21st Century Polytechnic Experience
- Innovation/Leadership/Entrepreneurship

Core campus-wide fundraising priorities include:

**Faculty Support:** Endowed faculty positions and other faculty support mechanisms will allow Cal Poly to attract and retain the highest quality faculty in their fields and to grow existing and new centers of excellence on campus.

**Academic Programmatic Support:** Cal Poly’s evolving curriculum demonstrates the university’s emerging commitment to cross-disciplinary learning opportunities and newly emerging fields of study. Innovative curriculum and academic centers require investments in program development to maximize the intellectual capital generated throughout the academic community. Private support will augment state funding to develop leading-edge programming and ensure access to challenging learning opportunities.

**Student Support:** The ability to attract and retain quality students and to provide an enriched academic learning environment will help strengthen the student experience and enhance the prestige of a Cal Poly degree. This support takes the form of scholarships,
project-based learning support, student/faculty research projects, graduate fellowships, and service learning opportunities.

Facilities/Capital Investment/Technology Support: Private support, whether solely funded or augmented with state funds, will provide critical space for students and faculty to enjoy an innovative learning and teaching environment through new construction, renovation, laboratory modernization, and information infrastructure enhancements designed to enhance student life.

Common Goods: Some activities and facilities on campus are designed to serve the whole university – all colleges, students, faculty, and staff. Without acknowledgement, they tend to be “orphans” with no direct constituency. The campaign will specifically identify them and build a fund-raising strategy around them.
## APPENDIX

### Table 1: CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION TYPES</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION CATEGORIES AND SUBCATEGORIES</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASIC</strong> [1713 institutions]</td>
<td>Doctoral [283 institutions]</td>
<td>Doctoral degrees &gt;20/yr</td>
<td>Research University - Very High Research Activity</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s [663 institutions]</td>
<td>Doctoral degrees &lt;20/yr &amp; Masters degrees &gt;50/yr</td>
<td>Larger Masters degrees &gt;200/yr</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s [767 institutions]</td>
<td>Doctoral degrees &lt;20/yr &amp; Masters degrees &lt;50/yr</td>
<td>767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIZE &amp; SETTING</strong> [1752 institutions]</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>10,000+</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>% On-campus Residential (R) &amp; % Part-time (PT)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3,000-9,999</td>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1,000-2,999</td>
<td>645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Small</td>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENROLLMENT PROFILE</strong> [1586 institutions]</td>
<td>% Graduate &amp; Professional program students (G&amp;P)</td>
<td>Shown for institutions with student body of baccalaureate and graduate students only.</td>
<td>Very High UG G&amp;P=0-9%</td>
<td>592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High UG</td>
<td>10-24%</td>
<td>526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority UG</td>
<td>25-49%</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority G&amp;P</td>
<td>50-100%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERGRADUATE PROFILE</strong> [1719 institutions]</td>
<td>% Part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td>PT&gt;40%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-39%</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-19%</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SELECTIVITY</strong></td>
<td>Freshmen scores. [Includes only 1543 institutions with PT&lt;40%]</td>
<td>More Selective</td>
<td>Top fifth</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>Middle two-fifths</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Transfer in</strong></td>
<td>Includes only the 1116 Selective and</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td>566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Undergraduate Instruction Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative proportion of A&amp;S and P</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences (A&amp;S), and Professions (P)</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>&gt;20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S-Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S+P</td>
<td></td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td></td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+A&amp;S</td>
<td></td>
<td>501</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grad Program Coexistence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% graduate degrees awarded in fields corresponding to UG majors</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences (A&amp;S), and Professions (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate Instruction Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Program</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Sciences (A&amp;S), and Professions (P)</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>&gt;20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant - plurality in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hum &amp; SS</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive - degrees in each of Hum, Soc Sci, STEM, &amp; Professional fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Med/Vet</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Med/Vet</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Doctoral Program or degree awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant - plurality in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive - degrees in each of Hum, Soc Sci, STEM, &amp; Professional fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Med/Vet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Med/Vet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: DEGREES, MAJORS, PROGRAMS & EFFORT by CARNEGIE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC FIELD GROUPINGS</th>
<th>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</th>
<th>PROFESSIONS</th>
<th>OTHER PROFESSIONS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONS + STEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Social Sciences (and Liberal Studies &amp; Economics)</td>
<td>26% Degrees</td>
<td>74% Degrees</td>
<td>16% Degrees</td>
<td>16% Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences &amp; Mathematics (and Earth Sciences)</td>
<td>25% Majors</td>
<td>75% Majors</td>
<td>42% Majors</td>
<td>86% Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sciences</td>
<td>35% Programs</td>
<td>65% Programs</td>
<td>43% Programs</td>
<td>81% Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Technology</td>
<td>53% Effort</td>
<td>47% Effort</td>
<td>43% Effort</td>
<td>69% Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Business Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development, Graphic Design, Journalism, Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesthetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degrees: 26% 74% 16% 84%
Majors: 25% 75% 42% 86%
Programs: 35% 65% 43% 81%
Effort: 53% 47% 43% 69%
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Table 3: COLLEGES by CARNEGIE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</th>
<th>Sciences &amp; Mathematics (and Earth Sciences)</th>
<th>Computer Sciences</th>
<th>Engineering, Technology</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Accounting, Business Admin</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child Dev, Graphi Comm, Graphic Des, Journalism, Public Policy</th>
<th>Kinesthetics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>CAFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>CENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>College of Architecture and Environmental Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENG</th>
<th>College of Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>College of Science and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>Orfalea College of Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED NEW DEGREE PROGRAM:
BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN AGRICULTURAL COMMUNICATION

1. RESOLVED That the proposed new degree program, Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Communication, be approved.

Proposed by: Agricultural Education and Communication Department
Date: February 16 2011
Summary of Statement of Proposed New Degree Program

February 16, 2011

1. Title of proposed program:

   Bachelor of Science degree in Agricultural Communication

2. Reason for proposing the program:

   The Bachelor of Science degree in Agricultural Communication was developed to address a specific need within the agriculture industry and fill the void created by not having a degree in Agricultural Communication in existence within the CSU system and California. Industry professionals, including the members of the Industry Advisory Council of the Agricultural Education and Communication Department, note a need for professional communicators with a specific knowledge of the complex agronomic, environmental and economic conditions within the agriculture industry. As a major California industry, agriculture plays a pivotal role in our state's economic future. This degree is being developed to assist the industry in the daunting task of communicating the importance of the food and fiber system to its more than 37 million citizens of the State.

   In a college-wide strategic visioning activity, the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences’ faculty and staff identified the increasing need for social, people and communication skills. Additionally, participants recognized the need for industry and academic partnerships. The declining public image of agriculture was identified as a social trend.

   The Agricultural Communication major will help the college address its strategic plan by enhancing the students’ ability to communicate effectively. The students will be provided instruction within the classroom, as well as being provided experiential opportunities both on- and off-campus to further develop their communication skills. Experiential opportunities include such things as internships, work experience, and collaborative assignments in the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication.

3. Expected student learning outcomes and methods for assessing outcomes:

   Learning Outcomes – Upon successful completion of the program, students will be able to:

   A. Demonstrate and apply excellent written, verbal, listening and visual communication skills.

   B. Demonstrate knowledge of current communications practices, including effective writing, layout and design, photography, computer skills, and oral communication.

   C. Demonstrate the ability to work in a professional communication setting through experiential-learning (i.e. internships, work experience, student organizations).

   D. Analyze and communicate effectively about major issues in agriculture, including the acquisition of information from credible sources and distilling it into proper form for distribution.

   E. Understand the importance of effective communication in the agriculture industry.

   F. Use and evaluate technologies that enhance the communication process.
G. Apply ethical practices in daily work and recognize media and corporate roles and responsibilities in the industry and society.

H. Demonstrate awareness and sensitivity to cultural demographics of an increasingly global agriculture industry.

I. Develop a high degree of agricultural literacy and an adequate reservoir of skills and knowledge in agricultural subjects to meet the need of the agricultural communication profession and the industry.

   a. **Agricultural Business and Economics** – Demonstrate an understanding of a range of topics in agricultural business including marketing, agricultural economics and government policies that affect agricultural business.

   b. **Agricultural Systems Technology** – Demonstrate an understanding of a range of topics in agricultural systems including safety principles and practices, and operation of power equipment.

   c. **Animal Science** – Demonstrate an understanding of animal production practices and animal facilities management.

   d. **Environment and Natural Resources** – Demonstrate an understanding of the principles of sustainability and the relationship between agriculture, the environment and society.

   e. **Food Science** – Demonstrate an understanding of food processing and food safety.

   f. **Plant Science** – Demonstrate an understanding of topics in plant science, including plant nutrition, crop production practices and emerging technologies.

   g. **Agricultural Issues** – Demonstrate an understanding of the current issues affecting agriculture.

**Assessment Methods**

Scoring Rubrics: Scoring rubrics were developed for each embedded signature assignment in each course offered with the AGC prefix.

Constituent assessments – Assessments of learning outcome achievements by important constituency groups such as members of agricultural and related industries, alumni, and graduating seniors help determine our success in achieving the desired learning outcomes and guide program improvement. Feedback from the industry advisory council and surveys will be employed.

**Feedback Mechanisms**

Curriculum improvement – A departmental curriculum committee evaluates the data collected and implements curricular adjustments (may include revisions of course content, development of new courses, or revisions of requirements or sequencing) to increase learning outcome achievement levels.

Student evaluations – Faculty will utilize the feedback from student evaluations to guide improvements in teaching techniques, learning activities, equipment, and alterations in course content or emphasis to improve each course’s ability to foster the desired outcomes.

Direct student involvement in funding decisions – The student fee committee in the department will make recommendations regarding the expenditures of funds to improve the program and enhance student learning experiences.
Industry Advisory Council – The program will be annually reviewed by a group of industry professionals/experts.

4. **Anticipated student demand:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Majors</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate briefly what these projections are based upon:

Given the history of the Agricultural Communication minor, it is anticipated the students at the initiation of this major will come primarily from the Agricultural Science major. A few students currently pursuing a minor in Agricultural Communications may also decide to pursue the major instead.

5. **If additional resources (faculty, student allocations, support staff, facilities, equipment, etc.) will be required, please identify the resources needed and from where you expect them to come:**

There is no anticipated need for any additional resources. In fact, the students currently pursuing their interest in Agricultural Communication through the Agricultural Sciences major must complete 192 units to graduate. This major requires only 180 units. The program is more likely to initially decrease resource needs rather than increase the resources required.

6. **If the program is occupational or professional, briefly summarize evidence of need for graduates with this specific education background:**

The students who have earned the minor in agricultural communications have enjoyed a favorable job market. Anecdotally, some of the top students are in positions of influence in the agricultural policy arena. The last three California Secretaries of Agriculture and a former Governor have employed our graduates as a part of their communication team. Other alumni with the agricultural communication minors own public relations agencies or communication firms.

7. **If the new program is currently a concentration or specialization, include a brief rationale for conversion:**

Cal Poly currently offers a minor in Agricultural Communication with approximately 40 students enrolled. The conversion primarily affects students enrolled in the Agricultural Science major with a Career Area Path of Agricultural Communication. Such students would experience a change in degree requirements from 192 units to 180 units to graduation.
8. **If the new program is not commonly offered as a bachelor’s or master’s degree, provide a brief, compelling rationale explaining how the proposed subject area constitutes a coherent, integrated degree major which has potential value for students:**

No campus in the California State University System offers a degree in Agricultural Communication. No other CSU campus offers a minor in agricultural communication; however, CSU Chico and CSU Fresno allow students to focus their studies in agricultural communication within the agricultural education major.

In Land Grant Universities across the United States, agricultural communication has emerged as a separate and distinct discipline. Some of the notable universities with agricultural communication majors include The Ohio State University, Texas A&M University, Kansas State University, Oklahoma State University, University of Florida, University of Missouri-Columbia, and others.

There are twenty chapters of Agricultural Communicators of Tomorrow (ACT) with close to 400 student members. The ACT is a widely recognized student professional organization within the agricultural communication profession. Cal Poly has had a highly successful ACT chapter for many years. Three former Cal Poly students have served as national officers of the ACT association.

9. **Briefly describe how the new program fits with the mission and/or strategic plan for the department, college, and university:**

**Campus Mission**

Cal Poly fosters teaching, scholarship, and service in a learn-by-doing environment where students and faculty are partners in discovery. As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly promotes the application of theory to practice. As a comprehensive institution, Cal Poly provides a balanced education in the arts, sciences, and technology, while encouraging cross-disciplinary and co-curricular experiences. As an academic community, Cal Poly values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility.

The agricultural communication major fits with the campus mission by fulfilling the following specific provisions:

- By applying communication theory to practical projects in agricultural communication;
- By offering a broad-based curriculum; and
- By emphasizing ethics in mass media.

**CAFS Strategic Plan**

In a college-wide strategic visioning activity, the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences’ faculty and staff identified the increasing need for social, people and communication skills. Additionally, participants recognized the need for industry and academic partnerships. The declining public image of agriculture was identified as a social trend.

Following this activity, core values for the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences emerged. Leadership development was highlighted as one of the core values. The statement in the document reads, “we emphasize student leadership and the development of management skills, particularly as they relate to communication, cooperation and teamwork.”

The Agricultural Communication major will help the college address its strategic plan by enhancing the students’ ability to communicate effectively. The students will be provided instruction within the classroom, as well as being provided experiential opportunities both on- and off-campus to further develop their communication skills. Experiential opportunities include such things as internships, work experience, and collaborative assignments in the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR COURSES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGC 102 Orientation to Agricultural Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGC 339 Internship in Agricultural Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGC 407 Agricultural Publications</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGC 426 Presentation Methods in Agricultural Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGED 404 Agricultural Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Project</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGED 460 Research Methodology (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGC 461 Senior Project I (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGC 462 Senior Project II (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 111 General Biology or BIO 161 Introduction to Cell &amp; Molecular Biology (B2/B4)*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM 110 World of Chemistry (B3/B4)*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMS 301 Business &amp; Professional Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMS 416 Intercultural Communication (USCP)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 222 Macroeconomics (D2)*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 310 Corporate Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC 377 Web and Print Publishing or JOUR 390 Visual Communication for the Mass Media</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 203 News Reporting and Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 205 Agricultural Communications</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR 312 Intro to Public Relations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 118 Pre-Calculus Algebra or MATH 116/117 (B1)*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT 217 Introduction to Statistical Concepts and Methods or STAT 218 Applied Statistics for the Life Sciences (B1)*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 212 Agricultural Economics (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 301 Food and Fiber Marketing (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 312 Agricultural Policy (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Systems Technology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAE 121 Agricultural Mechanics (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAE 141 Agricultural Machinery Safety (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCI 112 Principles of Animal Science (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose 1 additional:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 221 Intro to Beef Production (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 222 Systems of Swine Production (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 223 Systems of Sheep Mgmt (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 224 Equine Science (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSCI 230 General Dairy Husbandry (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM 225 Intro to Poultry Management (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Agriculture</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB 401 Managing Cultural Diversity in Ag. Labor Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Natural Resources</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 121 Intro to Soil Science (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG 360 Holistic Management (4) (F)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAE 340 Irrigation Water Management (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose 1 additional: (D5)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 308 Fire and Society (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 323 Human Dimensions in Natural Resources Mgmt (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSN 230 Elements of Food Processing (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSN 275 Principles of Food Safety and Hazard Analysis (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Science</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCS 120 Principles of Horticulture and Crop Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Issues</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose 1 course:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG 452 Issues Affecting California Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCI 476 Issues in Animal Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOT 329/HCS 329 Plants, Food and Biotechnology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives – 7 units selected to enhance expertise in any area of study. Limited to maximum of 3 units of special problems and enterprise projects.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Major Units</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 required; 28 units in major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min of 12 units required at 300-400 level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A Communication</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 ENGL 133/134</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 COMS 101/102</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Reasoning, Argumentation and Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B Science and Math</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Math/Stats (in major)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Life Science (in major)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Physical Science (in major)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Lab taken with either B2 or B3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Literature</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Philosophy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Fine/Performing Art</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Upper Division Elective</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C Elective (any class from CI-C4)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D/E Society and the Individual</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 American Experience</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Political Economy (in major)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Comparative Social Institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Self Development (CSU Area E)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Upper Division Elective (in major)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area F Technology Elective</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area F (in major)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GE</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, Advising is an integral part of the student's learning experience and academic success at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, In order to guide our students toward timely graduation, the University will provide them with consistent and accurate advising; and

WHEREAS, Student advising can be conceptualized as having two essential components: 1) discipline-based advising such as course contents, course electives, career opportunities, and preparation for graduate schools, and 2) advising on general curricular and university requirements including academic policies and procedures, academic probation, and referral to support services; and

WHEREAS, The students need to understand the different roles that faculty and professional advisors play to help the students succeed in their academic career and the types of assistance the faculty and professional advisors can provide; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate accept and endorse the Academic Advising Council's Advising Syllabus concerning the different roles and responsibilities of faculty and professional advisors and students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Advising Syllabus be distributed and made available online at http://advising.calpoly.edu to all students and faculty members for their information and use.
Academic Advising Syllabus

Contact Information for College Advising Centers

Agriculture, Food, & Environmental Sciences .................................................. Contact Departmental Offices
Architecture & Environmental Design ................................................................. 805-756-1325
Business .............................................................................................................. 805-756-2601
Engineering ....................................................................................................... 805-756-1461
Liberal Arts, by major:
  ART, COMS, ENGL, JOUR, MU, PHIL, TH ....................................................... 805-756-6200
  CD, PSY, SOC, ANT/GEOG, SOCS ............................................................... 805-756-2808
  ES, GRC, HIST, MLL, POLS ........................................................................ 805-756-7452
Science & Mathematics ................................................................................... 805-756-2615

Our Vision and Mission

Cal Poly strives to provide effective academic advising in an encouraging and welcoming atmosphere to support students as they navigate their undergraduate academic experience and learn to value their education, in order to foster individual academic success.

Academic Advising at Cal Poly is an on-going, intentional, educational partnership dedicated to student success. Cal Poly is committed to building collaborative relationships and a structure that guides students to discover and pursue life goals, support diverse and equitable educational experiences, advance students’ intellectual and cultural development, and teach students to become engaged, self-directed learners and competent decision-makers.

Which Academic Advisor You Should See

Faculty Advisor
- Advising for major and support courses
- Concentration and elective selection
- Interpretation of courses
- Senior project
- Mentorship
- Internships
- Career/graduate school selection
- Referral to appropriate support services

College Professional Advisor
- Academic policy and procedure
- Overall degree requirements
- Students on academic probation and other specific student populations with specific needs
- Referral to appropriate support services

How to Maximize Your Advising Experience

- Think through what questions you have and contact the appropriate advisor.
- Take the initiative to meet with your academic advisor regularly and follow through with recommendations.
- When you email faculty or staff members, use your Cal Poly email account (@calpoly.edu) and be sure to sign your name. Be professional. Be sure to clearly explain questions or requests.
- Check your Cal Poly email daily, and reply in a timely manner to all correspondence methods (both email and phone calls).
- Silence your cell phone prior to advising appointments.
What We Expect of You, the Student

You are responsible for fulfilling all the requirements of the curriculum in which you are enrolled. Be an active learner by fully engaging in the advising process. Students share responsibility for a successful university experience and are expected to contribute to effective advising experiences by doing the following:

- Be on time for your scheduled appointments and cancel or reschedule if necessary.
- Be prepared to discuss your goals and educational plans during meetings with advisors.
- Keep and organize personal copies of all important documents relevant to your academic career and progress to degree.
- Become knowledgeable of the university catalog, campus-/college-/major-specific academic policies and procedures, academic calendar deadlines and degree or program requirements.
- Review your Degree Progress Report (DPR) each quarter and seek assistance to resolve any errors or questions in a timely manner.
- Inform an advisor of any concerns, special needs, deficiencies, or barriers that might affect academic success.
- Attend advising appointments and programs.
- Be open and willing to consider advice from advisors, faculty, and other mentors.
- Accept responsibility for your decisions and your actions (or inactions) that affect your educational progress and goals.

What You Can Expect of Your Advisors

Advisors share responsibility for a successful university experience and are expected to contribute to effective advising experiences by doing the following:

- Provide a respectful and confidential environment where you can comfortably discuss academic, career, and personal goals and freely express your concerns.
- Understand and effectively communicate the curriculum, degree/college requirements, graduation requirements, and university policies and procedures.
- Assist you in defining your academic, career, and personal goals, and empower you to create an educational plan that is consistent with those goals.
- Actively listen to your concerns, respect your individual values and choices, and empower you to make informed decisions.
- Serve as an advocate and mentor to promote your success.
- Encourage and support you as you gain the skills and knowledge necessary for success.
- Respond to your questions through meetings, phone calls, or email in a timely manner during regular business hours.
- Collaborate with and refer you to campus resources to enhance your success.
- Maintain confidentiality of your student records and interactions.
- Keep regular office hours and be available to meet with you.
- Participate in evaluating and assessing advising programs and services to better serve you.

For more information, answers to frequently-asked advising questions, and a list of advising resources, go to http://advising.calpoly.edu.
WHEREAS, The College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences (CAFES) has identified several benefits for combining two current departments—Natural Resources Management (NRM) and Earth and Soil Sciences (ERSS)—into one new department called Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences Department; and

WHEREAS, These benefits, as well as the structure of the new department, are outlined in the attached Reorganization NRM-ERSS Cooperative Agreement to form Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES) Department;

WHEREAS, Approval for combining these two departments into a single new department has been approved by the Dean of CAFES, both NRM and ERSS department heads, and all, except one, NRM and ERSS faculty members; therefore be it

RESOLVED That the proposal for a new CAFES department, Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences Department, be approved.
Reorganization NRM-ERSS Cooperative Agreement to form Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES) Department

Reorganization Committee: Tom Rice, Chip Appel, Samantha Gill and Brian Dietterick
Department Heads: Lynn Moody and Doug Piirto

March 7, 2011

Representatives from the Natural Resources Management Department and the Earth and Soil Sciences Department, in open communication with all faculty and staff from these departments and the Dean of the CAFES, propose a reorganization to form a new department housing all existing programs. The new department name will be Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES). Numerous committee and department meetings have identified benefits, challenges, and resolutions to reorganizing. This document summarizes important items that have been discussed and agreed upon by faculty and staff from both departments.

Reorganization will:

1. Address the worldwide societal need to teach and train individuals equipped to manage natural resources and understand important environmental issues including climate change, ecosystem degradation at every scale due to pollution and contamination, water quantity and quality, scarcity or depletion of resources, with a focus on sustainability.

2. Combine faculty with complimentary and collaborative expertise. New faculty hires will be shared among programs, improve faculty research opportunities, provide more effective course offerings, and enhance employment opportunities for our graduates.

3. Provide a single department capable of addressing the increasing demand prospective students have to pursue meaningful natural resources and environmental science and management careers.

4. Maximize efficiency of staff to serve a broader-based student population.

The existing departmental resources along with several discussion items are outlined below.

A. Faculty and Administrative positions

Department Head

The current makeup of faculty will be reorganized in the new department under one Department Head. That Department Head will be Dr. Douglas Piirto. The commitment
of Dr. Piirto satisfies the desire of the Dean to have a Department Head that is committed full time to the start-up of NRES. The present Department Head of the Earth & Soil Sciences Department will return to an academic year faculty appointment at Professor rank (1.0 FTEF). A national search to fill the department head position will commence in a time frame commensurate with Dr. Piirto’s retirement to successfully recruit an individual that best represents the new department. The search will take place during the final year of Dr. Piirto’s appointment as Department Head, assuming he is able to anticipate that decision one-year in advance. Having Dr. Piirto become the Head of the new department, allows ample time for the new department to be better established and improve the likelihood that highly-qualified candidates will be recruited. Further there is the recommendation that “at least one degree in forestry is preferred” be in the list of desired qualifications to best maintain industry advancement opportunities and meet accreditation standards to maintain eight forestry-related faculty. If the Department Head were not to have a forestry background, it is understood that an additional forestry faculty position will be needed to preserve the accreditation standard.

Faculty

The current faculty and staff personnel composition is as follows:

**Earth and Soil Sciences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
<th>Appointments other than teaching within ERSS</th>
<th>ERSS FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lynn Moody</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Soil Physics, Pedology, Mineralogy, Geology</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Chip Appel</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof</td>
<td>Soil and Water Chemistry, Tropical Soils</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Thomas Rice</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Soil Science, Pedology</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Terry Smith</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Soil Fertility</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil/landscape ecologist</td>
<td>Asst. Prof</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brent Hallock</td>
<td>FERP</td>
<td>Soil and Water Conservation, Erosion Control</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Natural Resources Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
<th>Appointments other than teaching within NRM</th>
<th>NRM FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Douglas Piirto</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Silviculture, Forest Operations and Utilization</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Chris Dicus</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brian Dietterick</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Forest Hydrology, Watershed Management</td>
<td>0.67*</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Samantha Gill</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Forest Biometrics</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John Harris</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Outdoor Recreation/Conflict Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Scott Sink</td>
<td>Asst. Prof</td>
<td>Forest Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Rich Thompson</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Resource Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. James Vilkitis</td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Environmental Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Norm Pillsbury</td>
<td>FERP</td>
<td>Watershed Management/Forest Mensuration</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Wally Mark</td>
<td>FERP</td>
<td>Forest Heath/Forest Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Administrative FTEFs from service as Director of Swanton Pacific Ranch

### Administrative and Technical Staff

#### Earth and Soil Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
<th>Admin FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Wallravin</td>
<td>ASC I</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Stubler</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technician</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural Resources Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area of Expertise</th>
<th>Admin FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Calcagno</td>
<td>ASC II</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Reimer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technician</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Curriculum

Majors

All four majors (Forestry and Natural Resources, Environmental Management and Protection, Earth Sciences, and Soil Science) as well as the five minors (Disaster Management and Homeland Security, Geographic Information Systems for Agriculture, Water Science, Soil Science, and Land Rehabilitation) have been solely or jointly administered by NRM and ERSS. Under NRES these programs will be administered by curriculum groups who make recommendations to tenure-track faculty and the Department Head. Decisions will be made about the best program strategies (which may include combining majors) that are achievable by NRES and provide the greatest benefit to our students.

Graduate programs
The MS in Forest Science and the MS in Agriculture with specializations in Soil Science will continue to be administered as they presently exist.

C. Voting rights

Each tenure-track faculty member within NRES will have the same vote on all future departmental matters.

D. Department funding model

There will be one centralized departmental budget. This budget will consist of state, corporation, and CBF accounts. Allocation of CBF funds will be determined by committee recommendation to the Department Head. Particular emphasis will be on assessing individual program needs and student representation in those programs.

Budgets from the existing two departments will be combined into one operational budget for NRES and will be the responsibility of the Department Head.

E. Personnel

Personnel evaluation committees will consist of committee members from the Cal Poly tenured faculty with consultation of the person being evaluated. The guiding principles for all department personnel policies will be based on a combination of the currently existing personnel policies of each department.

No faculty or staff positions will be lost by the formation of NRES.

Staff responsibilities will be determined by the Department Head upon consultation with all staff members.
F. Physical Resources

No physical resources will be lost by the formation of NRES.

Department office is proposed to be in the new Science and Math Building (to be completed in 2014). Until that building is completed, Building 11 and Building 26 will be staffed under the direction of the Department Head with consultation of faculty and staff.

Equipment and storage rooms will be maintained as they currently exist.

All existing and planned classroom space currently within the NRM or ERSS departments will be maintained and scheduled by representatives of NRES.

The Earth & Soil Sciences Department currently maintains a cooperative arrangement with Geology faculty in the Physics Department regarding use of the ERSS Department vans for field trips for GEOL and ERSC courses required of, or restricted electives for, Earth Sciences and Soil Science majors, and students pursuing the Geology Minor. This cooperative arrangement will continue.

G. Swanton Pacific Ranch Participation

The Directorship of the Ranch has been connected to the Natural Resources Management Department since 1996. It is desired this association be maintained and continue to include a 0.67 responsibility to the Dean of the CAFES and a 0.33 Department responsibility. Additionally, faculty and staff participation will continue in various advisory and professional capacities including the position of forest coordinator, participation in forest management committees, educational planning, computer and GIS support, field trip coordination, and teaching assignments.

H. Class Scheduling

For an initial two-year period, staffing plans and scheduling will be done by a committee of the current schedulers under the purview of the Department Head. After this two year period, the faculty and staff will discuss designating one scheduler for NRES.

I. Accreditation and Certifications

Maintaining accreditation by the Society of American Foresters (SAF) is crucial to the FNR major and will continue to be a priority.

Maintaining the curricula of the new department in order to ensure graduates meet U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) standards (GS 457 – Soil Conservation, GS 460...
- Forestry, GS 470 – Soil Science, GS 1315 – Hydrology, etc.) for various avenues of
government employment as well as professional certifications such as CPSS – Certified
Professional Soil Scientist, CPESC – Certified Professional in Erosion and Sediment
Control and others mutually agreed to by the faculty will continue to be a priority.

J. Committee Assignments

All faculty members are expected to participate in Departmental, CAFES, and University
committees as is appropriate for their expertise and experience. CAFES committees will
each have one representative from NRES.

K. Department Visioning and Strategic Planning

Visioning and strategic planning for the new department formation will commence
immediately with participation from the full faculty and staff from both departments.
The expectation is that a new visioning and strategic plan would be well underway by the
time NRES is formed.

L. Advisory Council

There will be one advisory council for NRES. This advisory council will initially be
composed of the members from the current ERSS and NRM advisory councils, with the
understanding that the make-up of the advisory council shall change over time.

M. Department Name

The name of the department, Natural Resources Management and Environmental
Sciences (NRES) was selected after open discussions among faculty, staff, advisory
councils, and other constituencies beginning in November 2010. Numerous surveys
were taken and a decision was reached by faculty vote on February 15, 2011.

N. Discussion and Agreement

Significant discussion on forming a new department in CAFES has been occurring for a
long time but in earnest since August 2010. Numerous meetings have been held that
have involved faculty, staff and to some extent our students. A signature page is attached
to this document that indicates two situations:
1. Confirmation that fair and open discussions on the creation of a new CAFES
department have occurred.
2. Consensus in terms of moving ahead with the creation of a NRES Dept. per the
discussion items that are described in this document.
Signature page

Current Department Heads:

- Douglas Piirto
  Dr. Douglas Piirto
- Dr. Lynn Moody
  Dr. Lynn Moody

Faculty:

- Chip Appel
  Dr. Chip Appel
- Scott Smith
  Dr. Scott Sink
- Chris Dicus
  Dr. Terry Smith
- Brian Dietterick
  Dr. Richard Thompson
- Samantha Gill
  Dr. James Vilkitis
- Brent Hallock
- Dr. John Harris
- John H. Harris
- Dr. Wally Mark
- Dr. Wally Mark
- Norman Pillsbury
  Dr. Norman Pillsbury
- Thomas Rice
  Dr. Thomas Rice

Staff:

- Ellen Calcagno
- Jeff Reimer
- Craig Stabler
- Lisa Wallravin
State of California
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Memorandum

To: Dr. Rachel Fernflores, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Dr. Douglas D. Piirto, Head
Natural Resources Management Department

Date: March 5, 2011
Copies: NRM/ERSS
Faculty/Staff

Subject: NRM/ERSS Department Reorganization.

A proposal is being considered by the Cal Poly Academic Senate focused on forming a new department called Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES) in the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences (CAFES). I have organized my comments here to discuss the following:

1. Benefits of Reorganization
2. Vetting process
3. Key Points of the Reorganization Cooperative Agreement
4. Ecosystem Management and Collaboration
5. Need for a Timely Decision
6. Concluding Comment

Benefits of Reorganization

The following benefits have been identified with the NRES Reorganization Proposal:

1. Enhancement of educational programs will be a strategic goal.
2. One major CAFES home will be created for students interested in natural resources and environmental programs with a career focus. A stronger identity to meet these needs will result with creation of one CAFES department.
3. The new NRES Department will be better equipped to address worldwide society needs involving management of natural resources and environmental issues.
4. Faculty will be combined with complimentary and collaborative expertise allowing for curriculum flexibility for students. Faculty resources will be shared between programs where possible.
5. A bigger organization will be created which will hopefully be less affected by budget reductions and retirements.
6. Increased administrative support will result over the long-term in enhanced efficiency.

**Vetting Process**

A committee was formed by Dr. Dave Wehner, CAFES Dean, to discuss the idea of forming a new department. The committee is comprised of Dr. Tom Rice, Dr. Chip Appel, Dr. Samantha Gill and Dr. Brian Dietterick. The committee in consultation with ERSS and NRM faculty, staff and CAFES Administrators developed a Reorganization Cooperative Agreement (RCA) which was signed by all but one of the ERSS and NRM faculty and staff. Significant vetting of the proposal has occurred by faculty, staff and respective advisory councils for each department (please refer to attached letter from the NRM Advisory Council). This vetting process started last August 2010 and continues to the present. All faculty including FERPs were kept informed via e-mail and with meetings that were conducted both at the department level and jointly. Dean Wehner facilitated some of these meetings to insure that he was fully informed of all concerns. Additionally, the proposal has been reviewed by the College Deans and Provost.

**Key Points of the NRM-ERSS Reorganization Cooperative Agreement**

1. **Title:** Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences. A large number of titles were evaluated by both internal and external audiences. A vote was taken at our joint meet of ERSS and NRM departments to arrive at this decision.

2. Department Head, Faculty and Staff positions are identified. Future faculty/staff planning and evaluation processes are discussed. Upcoming strategic planning involving faculty, staff and university administrators will more fully address a hiring plan that will accommodate the needs of the new department.

3. Undergraduate and graduate programs (i.e., majors, minors, concentration) comprising the new department are listed. We have discussed the needed to undertake a curriculum review process and that will be further elaborated in our upcoming strategic planning process.

4. Voting rights and expected faculty participation on committees are described.

5. Department Funding Model is discussed.

6. Physical Resources are listed.

7. Past, present and future involvement with Swanton Pacific Ranch is described.

8. Short- vs. long-term concerns regarding class scheduling are addressed.

9. Accreditation and certification of existing programs will be maintained.

10. Strategic planning will be initiated immediately upon Academic Senate review and approval.
11. One new Advisory Council will be created comprised of existing NRM and ERSS members with new additions already occurring.

The NRM-ERSS Cooperative Agreement was formally reviewed and finalized at our February 15, 2011 joint meeting. Signature by NRM-ERSS faculty and staff on the March 7, 2011 RCA document indicates two things:
1. Confirmation that fair and open discussions on the creation of a new CAFES department have occurred.
2. Consensus in terms of moving ahead with creation of a new Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences Department.

**Ecosystem Management and Collaboration**

Ecosystem management is a central theme for both the FNR and ENVM majors. The model assumes that graduates will be working in a collaborative, interdisciplinary context. As such, FNR and ENVM students are asked to collaborate in an interdisciplinary setting. Some historical context is provided below:

1. Dr. Baker some 30+ years ago stated that the NRM Dept. would include Environmental Resources embedded into the Forestry and Natural Resources program. That initial direction then led to a broad based (i.e., ecosystem management) FNR degree that was formalized in the early 1990s and accredited by the Society of American Foresters in 1994 and re-accredited in 2004. The same nine NRM faculty members that created the FNR major then went to work to create an Environmental Management and Protection major which was approved about 7 years ago.

2. All nine NRM Faculty are involved in the delivery of the ENVM and the FNR degrees. For example, ENVM majors take NR 215 taught by either Dr. Gill or Dr. Pillsbury. ENVM majors take NR 326 and NR 465 taught by Dr. Thompson. Both FNR and ENVM majors take NR 416 taught by faculty and lecturers. Both ENVM and FNR students take NR 140 from me. NR 320, Watershed Management, is taught by Dr. Pillsbury and both ENVM and FNR majors take that course. NR 306, Natural Resources Ecology, is a main line course for both majors that is taught by faculty and lecturers. NRM Faculty and lecturers teach: NR 404 Environmental Law and NR 408 Water classes taken by both ENVM students. The NR 142 Introduction to Environmental Management is taken by ENVM students only and is taught by a local environmental manager who works for the County Environmental Coordinators Office.

3. A NREM position which will focus on the ENVM major is currently being advertised.
4. NRM has close ties to Swanton Pacific Ranch. Many forestry and environmental management learn-by-doing opportunities exist there. Most recently, we are finding that ENVM and FNR students are attracted to our 5-week summer NR 475 course that is taught at Swanton.

**The Need for a Timely Decision**

A timely decision to proceed this spring would enable the transition process to occur within the context of:

1. Fiscal year/academic year concerns
2. Dr. Moody’s plans to return to teaching in September, 2011
3. Needs to initiate strategic planning this Spring and Fall quarters
4. Using summer to begin restructuring administrative services, fiscal/budget management, office allocation, staff planning, RPT/personnel management, and a whole host of other details associated with forming a new department
5. Ongoing and near future faculty hiring plans. Currently two positions are being advertised to support the new department with close collaboration occurring.

**Concluding Comments**

The vast majority of faculty and staff associated with the NRM and ERSS departments see a number of good things that can develop with formation of a new NRES department as I have tried to outline here. We look forward to discussing this further with the Academic Senate. Thank you for your consideration.
Dr. David J. Wehner  
Dean, College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences  
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Subject: New Department within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences

Dear Dr. Wehner:

The Advisory Council for the Natural Resources Management (NRM) Department at Cal Poly appreciates your time at our recent meeting on November 18, 2010, notably your informative presentation regarding your new graduation initiative and the creation of a new department within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences (CAFES) that will encompass the Natural Resources Management Department, the Soil Science Department, and the Earth Sciences Department. The Advisory Council greatly appreciates your continued support of the NRM Department, one which continues to produce outstanding graduates for a critical natural resource management workforce in the State of California, and beyond. The NRM Department has come a long way during its 40 year history, especially since it sought and received accreditation from the Society of American Foresters (SAF) in 1994. Your continued support of the Department has been a vital component to its success.

Following your presentation, the Advisory Council continued to discuss the creation of a new department within the CAFES and wanted to share our thoughts and recommendations with you. We feel that the integration of these three departments would be invaluable, given the overlap in disciplines and academic focus and the limited enrollment facing the Soil Science Department. As professionals in the natural resources management and environmental protection fields, we recognize the importance of each of these disciplines in analyzing and managing natural and environmental resources, but also feel that the creation of a new department within the CAFES should proceed without compromising the forestry education at Cal Poly. With this in mind, we offer the following recommendations as you move forward in the creation of the new department:

- Maintain faculty expertise to cover education in the basic and advanced areas of forestry, specifically those areas covered on the California Professional Foresters Examination. While some cross-discipline teaching is possible within the major, it is simply not feasible for forestry faculty to provide expertise in all subject areas of forestry. The Advisory Council feels it is critical to maintain a minimum level of forestry expertise to adequately teach and prepare forestry students.

- Retain SAF accreditation for the Department. The Advisory Council feels strongly that all efforts should be made to retain this distinction and status. It was a significant effort to acquire this accreditation, and, although we realize that it may place staffing constraints on the Department, its value in producing competent, skilled graduates in the forestry and natural resources field is
Dr. David J. Wehner
Subject: New Department within the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences

immeasurable. Additionally, this accreditation has benefits for those graduates seeking to take the California Professional Foresters Examination. Specifically, a Cal Poly graduate with a Bachelor of Science degree in Forestry and Natural Resources can apply this educational experience toward four of the seven years of experience necessary to take the exam.

- Retain a focus on the Environmental Management and Protection discipline within the department. This major and study area has proven to be successful for the Department and the need for graduates with this training continues to grow.

- Once the new department is established, begin to search for new faculty to best fill the needs of the new department. With pending and upcoming faculty retirements, it will be important to identify discipline gaps and fill these positions accordingly. This process should also seek to maintain staff resources and technical support staff critical for maintaining a hands-on, learn-by-doing approach that is critical for producing highly-qualified and industry-ready graduates.

- The future new department head should be an appropriate fit with the range of disciplines included in the department. Consideration of candidates should also factor in the effect it may have on SAF accreditation. The Advisory Council concurs with your decision to retain Dr. Piirto in the interim and we all look forward to supporting him and the CAFES through this process.

- Decisions regarding the creation of the new department should occur by June 2011 so that teacher/classroom scheduling can be adequately planned and implemented.

The Advisory Council also supports the intent of the new initiative intended to decrease the time necessary to graduate from the CAFES. However, the unique nature of the Natural Resources Management curriculum has some inherent challenges that may make graduation in a four-year time frame infeasible. For example: the department has no control over the availability of required classes outside of the department or the college; many students have work commitments, some with summer jobs in the fire suppression field that can delay returning in time for fall courses; and the many courses in the Forestry and Natural Resources/Environmental Management and Protection programs with lab components require additional time commitments. Each of these factors can contribute to slowing a student's movement through the degree program. The Advisory Council hopes that decisions in respect to this initiative are made thoughtfully and that adequate resources (classroom space, faculty, staff) are made available to the new department to successfully graduate students without losing the learn-by-doing approach that makes Cal Poly so unique.

In closing, the Advisory Council appreciates the opportunity to contribute to Cal Poly and trust you will proceed thoughtfully as you develop the new department. We look forward to supporting you, the NRM Department, and the CAFES during this transition.

Sincerely,

Scott W. Eckardt
RPF #2835
Chair, NRM Advisory Council (2008-2010)

cc: Dr. Doug Piirto, NRM Department
Summary statement from James Vilkitis

Resolution on New CAFES Department: Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES)

(prepared for May 3 2011 Academic Senate meeting)

When contacted in late March 2011, I expressed strong concerns regarding the proposed Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences (NRES) Department that, if approved, would result from the reorganization and merger of the existing Natural Resources Management Department and the Earth and Soil Sciences Department. The major concerns I've identified are directed at the inadequacy of the vetting process, the lack of core faculty and resource allocations in support of the ENVM major, and the absence of a strategic plan that adequately addresses an implementation and resource allocation plan.

Over the past 30 years, I have developed and implemented the ENVM curriculum and major. I am the lead and only dedicated faculty member for the major, which currently has over 200 students. I have also integrated the program with industry and maintained industry and professional ties. When the vetting process took place during fall quarter 2010, I was off-campus on sabbatical leave and not contacted for direct input regarding the proposed merger. The vetting committee consisted of two faculty members from the Forestry major and two faculty members from the Soil Science major; there was no representation of the ENVM major on that committee.

In the two departments, the majority of the faculty members are either foresters or soil scientists. In reviewing the faculty-to-student ratios for each major, the following is provided: a core of five faculty members has been established by the dean for Soil Science majors (130 students; 5:130 ratio); eight faculty members for the Forestry major as required by its accreditation body (200 students; 8:200 ratio), and one faculty member for the ENVM major (200 students; 1:200 ratio). Additionally, there is little or no overlap of ENVM with the other two majors. ENVM is directed at the management of resource users and the assessment of their activities on the human environment as prescribed by law, whereas Forestry and Soil Science are intricately involved with only the science and management of within each discipline.

The "proposal" for a merger of the NRM and ESS departments as presented is merely a concept of what may occur. It is not a "strategic plan" for implementing a transition nor does it identify how the department will function as a cohesive unit. It addresses very broad issues in very vague terms. Relevant current concerns need to be adequately addressed and a format developed for the transition phase in order to integrate the goals and learning outcomes for each major. Resource allocations need to be established equitably for each major, including assigned time for supervision of lectures, faculty allocations, office support, etc.