

## **Appendix I: Campus Engagement**

---

Part 1: WASC Steering Committee and Working Group Membership

Part 2: Campus Engagement During the CPR

Part 3: Comments Submitted on Draft Essays

## WASC Subcommittee Membership

Steering Committee						
First Name	Last Name	Position	Department	Division	Phone	Email
Denise	Campbell	Associate Vice President		Student Affairs	1521	dcampbel
Cassie	Carter	Director of Advancement	CSM	CSM	5713	crcarter
<b>David</b>	<b>Conn</b>	<b>Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Undergraduate Education</b>	<b>Academic Programs</b>	<b>Academic Affairs</b>	<b>2246</b>	<b>dconn</b>
Doris	Derelian	Professor	Food Science and Nutrition	CAFES	6130	derelian
Susan	Elrod	Director	Ctr. for Excellence in Science & Math	CSM	2875	selrod
Rachel	Fernflores	Instructor/Chair, Academic Senate	Philosophy	CLA		rfernflo
<b>Bruno</b>	<b>Giberti</b>	<b>Professor</b>	<b>Architecture</b>	<b>CAED</b>	<b>2036</b>	<b>bgiberti</b>
Anna	Gold	Associate Dean	Library	Academic Affairs	1258	
Brent	Goodman	Director	Institutional Planning and Analysis		5406	bgoodman
Kelly	Griggs	ASI President	ASI Government	ASI		griggs
Linda	Halisky	Dean		CLA	2706	lhalisky
Rachel	Henry	Administrative Coordinator	Academic Programs	Academic Affairs	7280	rrhenry
Doug	Keesey	Director and Professor	General Education, English	CLA	2228	dkeesey
Randy	Knight	Professor	Physics	CSM	1663	rknight
Bonnie	Konopak	Dean		SOE	2126	bkonopak
Tom	Mackin	Professor	Mechanical Engineering	CENG	1334	tmackin
Cheryl	Ney	Associate Vice Provost for Academic Progs.	Academic Programs	Academic Affairs	5059	cney
Mohammad	Noori	Dean		CENG	2131	mnoori
Skip	Parks	Dean		Continuing Education	7434	dparks
Rick	Ramirez	Associate Vice President	Finance	Admin. & Finance Division	2091	rramirez
Kelsey	Rugani	Student	Agricultural Science	CAFES	2841	krugani
Craig	Schultz	Director	User Support Services	Information Technology Services	6117	cschultz
Erling	Smith	Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives and Planning		Academic Affairs	2185	esmith21
Susan	Sparling	Director	Student Academic Services	Student Affairs	2301	sspar
Scott	Steinmaus	Associate Professor	Biological Science	CSM	5142	ssteinma
Tom	Trice	Associate Professor	History	CLA	2724	ttrice
Mary	Whiteford	Academic Programs Analyst	Academic Programs	Academic Affairs	5475	mwhitefo

Revised 11/25/2009

## WASC Subcommittee Membership

Overarching Theme: Our Polytechnic Identity						
First Name	Last Name	Position	Department	Division	Phone	Email
Cheryl	Andrus (AY 08-09)	Administrative Assistant	University Police	AFD	1116	candrus
Joe	Ciesinski	Student	Communications	CLA		jciesins
Juliette	Duke	Associate Director, Apartment Life and Ed.	University Housing	Student Affairs	6796	jduke
Ken	Habib	Assistant Professor	Music	CLA	2741	khabib
John	Harris	Instructor	Natural Resources Management	CAFES	2426	jharris
Sean	Hurley	Assistant Professor	Agribusiness	CAFES	5050	shurley
<b>Randy</b>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>Professor</b>	<b>Physics</b>	<b>CSM</b>	<b>1663</b>	<b>rknight</b>
Kate	Lancaster	Associate Professor	Accounting	OCOB	2922	klancast
Tom	Mackin (AY 08-09)	Professor	Mechanical Engineering	CENG	1406	tmackin
Skip	Parks	Dean	Continuing Education	Continuing Education	7434	dparks
Jeanine	Scaramozzino	Librarian	Library	Public Services	2690	jscaramo
Cammie	Schlemer	Student	Industrial Engineering	CENG	2690	cschleme

Theme 1: Learn-by-doing						
First Name	Last Name	Position	Department	Division	Phone	Email
Sema	Alptekin	Director and Professor	Honors, Industrial Engineering	Honors CENG	7029	salpteki
Jacob	Alvarez	Student	Psychology	CLA		jgalvare
Barbara	Andre	Associate Director	International Education	Academic Affairs	5837	bandre
Peggy	Browneller Paradis	Assessment and Evaluation Manager	College of Education	COE	5090	pbrownel
Casey	Callaghan	Manager	Animal Nutrition Center	CAFES	1120	ccallagh
Dennis	Derickson	Assistant Professor	Electrical Engineering	CENG	7584	ddericks
Wayne	Howard	Department Chair and Professor	Agribusiness	CAFES	5000	whoward
Brian	Kennelly	Department Chair and Professor	Modern Language, French	CLA	2889	bkennell
John	Lyons	Director	Business Services	Continuing Education	1589	jplyons
Kathryn	McCormick	Assistant Professor	Art and Design	CLA	1164	kmccormi
Tina	Muller	Learning Community Coordinator	University Housing	Student Affairs	6134	tmuller
Cornelius	Nuworsoo	Assistant Professor	City and Regional Planning	CAED	2573	cnuworso
Eric	Olson	Assistant Professor	Industrial Technology	OCOB	1754	eolsen
Liz	Schlemer	Instructor	Industrial and Manufacturing Eng.	CENG	2186	lschleme
Kaitlin	Spak	Student	CENG	Mechanical Engineering		kspak
<b>Tom</b>	<b>Trice</b>	<b>Associate Professor</b>	<b>History</b>	<b>CLA</b>	<b>2724</b>	<b>ttrice</b>
John	Walker	Associate Professor	Statistics	CSM	7128	jwtalker
Mary	Whiteford	Academic Programs Analyst	Academic Programs	Academic Affairs	5475	mwhitefo

Revised 11/25/2009

## WASC Subcommittee Membership

Theme 2: Teacher-Scholar Model						
First Name	Last Name	Position	Department	Division	Phone	Email
Xenia	Bixler	Director	Grants Development	Research and Grad Programs	2982	xbixler
Denise	Campbell	Associate Vice President	Student Affairs	Student Affairs	1521	dcampbel
Vicente	Del Rio	Professor	City and Regional Planning	CENG	2572	vdelrion
Lauren	Garner	Assistant Professor	Horticulture and Crop Science	CAFES	2479	lgarner
Joe	Grimes	Emeritus Director	Center for Teaching and Learning	Academic Pers.	2088	jgrimes
Al	Liddicoat	Interim Assistant VP and Professor	Academic Personnel	Academic Affairs	5217	aliddico
Charmaine	Martinez	Assistant Professor	Art and Design	CLA	2332	cmarti11
Wayne	Montgomery	Senior Assistant Librarian	Library	Library	2057	wmontgom
Susan	Opava	Dean	Research and Graduate Programs	Academic Affairs	1508	sopava
Dan	Peterson	Assistant Professor	Animal Science	CAFES	7633	dpeterso
Ryan	Santillan	Student	City and Regional Planning	CENG		nsantill
<b>Scott</b>	<b>Steinmaus</b>	<b>Associate Professor</b>	<b>Biology</b>	<b>CSM</b>	<b>805.550.4741</b>	<b>ssteinma</b>

Theme 3: Integration and Student Learning Group						
First Name	Last Name	Position	Department	Division	Phone	Email
Jennifer	Allen-Barker	Access Specialist	Disability Resource Center	Student Affairs	0134	jcbarker
Navjit	Brar	Reference Coordinator	Library	Library	2631	nbrar
Walt	Bremer	Professor	Landscape Architecture	CAED	2813	wbremer
Fred	DePiero	Assistant Dean	College of Engineering	CENG	2917	fdepiero
<b>Doris</b>	<b>Deralian (Fall 08/Winter 09)</b>	<b>Professor</b>	<b>Nutrition</b>	<b>CAFES</b>	<b>6130</b>	<b>derelian</b>
Tiffany	Fowler	Student		CAFES		ttfowler
Tom	Fowler (Fall 08)	Associate Professor	Architecture	CAED	2981	tfowler
Jeff	Jacobs	Assistant Professor	Natural Resource Management	CAFES	7628	jacobs
Monica	Schechter	Associate Director	International Education	Academic Affairs	5964	mschecht
Martin	Shibata (AY 08-09)	Director	Career Services	Student Affairs	5726	mshibata
Erling	Smith	Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives and Planning		Academic Affairs	2185	esmith21
<b>Susan</b>	<b>Sparling</b>	<b>Director</b>	<b>Student Academic Services</b>	<b>Student Affairs</b>	<b>2301</b>	<b>sspar</b>
Shannon	Stephens	Director of Academic Services	Athletics	Athletics	2762	sgstephe
Pat	Stoneman	Director	Academic Support	Continuing Education	6572	pstonema
Karen	Stubberfield	Manager	QI/Training	AFD	5407	kstubber
Doug	Swanson	Associate Professor	Journalism	CLA	6705	dswanson
Lou	Tornatzky	Area Chair	Industrial Technology	OCOB	2676	ltornatz
Danielle	Tucker		Social Science	CLA		dtucker
Debra	Valencia-Laver	Associate Dean	College of Liberal Arts	CLA	2706	dlvalenc

Revised 11/25/2009

## **Part 2: Campus Engagement During the CPR**

### **Spring 2008**

- Provost approves WASC Steering Committee membership.
- Steering committee approves charge to working groups.
- Working groups begin to meet and refine proposal questions, methods, and outcomes.

### **Summer 2008**

- WASC leadership meets with deans regarding self-study, assessment, and program review.
- WASC leadership meets with Strategic Plan leadership and Vice President for Advancement to create a shared vision of university direction.

### **Fall 2008**

- WASC leadership presents to faculty in all colleges and to Student Affairs professionals during Fall Conference, the week before classes begin.
- Ralph Wolff, Executive Director of WASC, presents to faculty and staff at Fall Convocation.
- Plenary meeting of all working groups open to the campus.
- Steering committee and working groups begin development of Cal Poly Student Survey.

### **Winter 2009**

- Focus groups of students, faculty, and staff conducted to aid in development of student survey.
- Student survey conducted.
- Steering committee and working groups begin development of Cal Poly Faculty/Staff Survey.

### **Spring 2009**

- Focus groups of faculty and staff conducted to aid in development of faculty/staff survey.
- Faculty/staff survey conducted.
- WASC leadership meets with Academic Assessment Council, which begins to consider campus-wide self-assessment exercise using the WASC rubric, “Educational Effectiveness Framework.”
- With help of Public Affairs, steering committee creates communication plan to inform and engage internal and external stakeholders.

### **Summer 2009**

- WASC leadership meets with Provost and deans to solicit their support for self-assessment exercise.

### **Fall 2009**

- WASC leadership presents to deans, department heads, college councils, student affairs directors, Academic Senate, and student government leaders.
- Plenary meeting of all working groups open to the campus.
- Draft report posted online with opportunity to comment.

- Campus comment on draft report solicited through multiple venues, including: campus portal, weekly staff/faculty newsletter, Cal Poly website homepage, email communication to entire campus, direct request to department chairs, student newspaper, student scrolling marquee, fliers around campus and in student housing, alumni portal, alumni newsletter, social networking, Cal Poly online news site, Cal Poly Magazine online version, stadium scoreboard.
- University Assessment Council makes commitment to self-assessment exercise, which includes department- and college-level conversations culminating with presentation to Dean's Council on the state of the campus “culture of evidence and inquiry.”

## Our Polytechnic Identity Comments

### Comment

"How should Cal Poly build on its 20th-century heritage as a highly rated, comprehensive, master's-degree-granting, polytechnic university to best respond to the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century?" By learning not to split infinitives in the first sentence of an important document. It is also a great idea to write clean English and not to invent master's-degree-granting gerunds as adjectives that serve to show how empty one's "polytechnic" education might be. Finally, since you force me to log on with my user id, you might want to think about how candid these comments really can be. I am a full professor, and no one can hurt me (much). But not so for my junior colleagues. Eric Fisher

Overarching Theme: Our Polytechnic Identity Institutional agility and campus-wide acceptance of the value of our comprehensive nature are crucial building blocks of an outstanding 21st-century polytechnic. Cal Poly's focus on the application of theory to practice will serve us well as we move forward in this increasingly global environment, but we must do two things to ensure its strength: 1) recognize that it is practiced \*\* what does "it" refer to in this sentence? throughout students' educational experiences, including both academic disciplines not traditionally considered polytechnic and the co-curriculum and 2) obtain the funding necessary to maintain this practice. \*\* what does "practice" refer to here? we have application of theory to practice and we have the practice of "theory to practice" confusing

"Challenge 2: Ensure that all graduates are whole-system thinkers with integrated and interdisciplinary strength across all university disciplines." Please, gag me with a spoon! I think you might want to say, "We strive to graduate students who think well and have a broad sense of our culture." You cannot keep on writing like this and expect people to take you seriously. Eric Fisher

I can't recall if I've said this, but I really appreciate all the work that the committee has put into their analysis. I feel the result is really admirable and makes a clear attempt at forward thinking. I especially like the whole-systems thinking that is espoused. I am struck by the non-parity in the recommendation below: "Ensure that all STEM programs integrate the humanities and social sciences into their curricula in coherent, meaningful ways. Ensure that all majors in the humanities and social sciences grapple with the promises and challenges of science and technology." Is there a reason why "all majors in the humanities and social sciences" should not integrate STEM into their curricula in coherent, meaningful ways? "grapple with the promises and challenges of science and technology" seems far less substantive than "integrate ....into their curricula in coherent, meaningful ways." Is this differential intended? If so, I'd be interested in the rationale behind it. This imbalance that I read in the text feels to me a perpetuation of the humanities and social sciences as "less than." than STEM majors. Another way of viewing it is that the statement seems to expect less from them than in the way of being a whole systems thinker. I may be reading this incorrectly. My feeling is that anything less than parity is a disservice to all our students for the hierarchy of disciplinary culture that it creates.

I think when we speak of diversity we should reinforce the idea that diversity need not be culture or ethnicity, but can be different views brought to the same issue. I think as a faculty we could model this diversity by collaborating across disciplines, something that is currently done in a one-off fashion. More institutional support and facilitation of this form of diversity would go a long way to enhance several of the stated goals for our student education. I would include a statement that broadens what diversity represents at this institution to one that incorporates cross-disciplinary perspectives.

## Our Polytechnic Identity Comments

Add new Challenge 5: Enhance campus sustainability and student ability to foster sustainability.

Insert the Sustainability Learning Objectives here:

Cal Poly defines sustainability as the ability of the natural and social systems to survive and thrive together to meet current and future needs. In order to consider sustainability when making reasoned decisions, all graduating students should be able to:

1. Define and apply sustainability principles within their academic programs
2. Explain how natural, economic, and social systems interact to foster or prevent sustainability
3. Analyze and explain local, national, and global sustainability using a multidisciplinary approach
4. Consider sustainability principles while developing personal and professional values

As representative of the new ANT-GEOG major, I concur with the entire statement and wish to add a suggestion and applaud a few in particular. Add: Under action items I, would also emphasize the utility of internships with respect to: increasing awareness and understanding of diversity and to becoming leaders in their chosen fields.

Enhance campus diversity and increase student awareness and understanding of diversity. ----- I think it important that we increase awareness for students, but also for faculty and staff.

Ensure that all graduates are whole-system thinkers with integrated and interdisciplinary strength across all university disciplines. (text removed) Increase the number of students who participate in international study programs. ----- How does having some/more students pursue international study ensure that all graduates are whole system thinkers with....

Identify, reward, and support excellence and innovation. Revise the university budget model to support excellence and innovation. ...in what? teaching, prof. development, advising, etc. I don't think you can revise a budget model until you've identified which area(s) of excellence and innovation you want to support.

on discussion of one of the peer institutions correct spelling of "discreet"; in this sentence the proper word is "discrete"

## Our Polytechnic Identity Comments

### Action Items - Basic Comment

Number the bullets so that it is easier to comment on them.

BULLET 2. Ensure that all graduates are whole.....

Last bullet - currently states: Review and revise the General Education Program to support these goals and to ensure that General Education is a critical, integrative component fo a university education.

Support Cal Poly's leadership, innovation, and vision in the GE Program to ensure critical progress in review, revision, and integration throughout the university.

Why change the sentence? To provide emphasis and recognition - Cal Poly is perceived to be a leader in GE progress/action throughout the CSU system, why not let WASC know that we are there in the forefront.....?

This would support BULLET 1 .....Move Cal Poly into the ranks of the outstanding.....

- to identify, reward, and support excellence and innovation.
- revise the University budget to support excellence and innovation

BULLET 3 - empower graduates to be leaders.....

Strengthen the Honors Program; make it more visible and prominent..... Are we really doing this? Why say we are...if we are not.....

Many of us who teach technical subjects find this document very troubling. In the name of defining our polytechnic identity, it presents a blueprint for dismantling our polytechnic identity. The term "polytechnic" indicates an emphasis on technology. It does not imply that comprehensive education is unimportant (nor do we); it implies that the teaching of technology is emphasized in some meaningful way -- for example, a larger percentage of graduates who have technical degrees as opposed to liberal arts degrees. To claim that the term polytechnic should be redefined so as to give little emphasis to technology is disingenuous. It would be more appropriate if the document stated that Cal Poly should be transformed into "Cal State SLO," another generic CSU campus. This would start a lively debate, no doubt: those who advocate a technological focus would oppose the shift in emphasis (and the resulting shift of resources), and those who advocate change would carry the burden of proof to show how a non-polytechnic University would better meet the needs of our state, nation, and world.

it seems that while "A commitment to diversity and sustainability" (Self study) is mentioned many times throughout the document so effort is made to narrow these topics down to a level where they become actual objectives. In order to fulfill these goals we need to make specific commitments, are we going to offer classes, develop course modules, establish a center, this self study needs to include a critique our current programs and illuminate how we will "Define and apply sustainability principles within their academic programs" (Sustainable Learning Objective One)

## Our Polytechnic Identity Comments

This is a very wordy document. If you want students to provide input I think you should summarize in some keynotes or bullet points exactly what information is enclosed. I am even being wordy after reading that...Without student input you wouldn't be able to provide a just evaluation of our college. Best of luck WASC, Max Chellemi University Union Advisory Board Engineering Representative California Polytechnic State San Luis Obispo

Hi. I am hoping you can see my name on these comments because I keep forgetting to put it in my comments, in the event you'd like to contact me. (Linda Vanasupa). I want to offer an observation. I am looking at the recommendations for Our Polytechnic Identity. I'm thinking about Systems Dynamics theory (again, the whole systems thinking thing), and I realize that those recommendations considered as the most powerful (highly leveraged) are missing from the list. I am drawing from Donella Meadows book, "Thinking in Systems: A Primer," Chelsea Green Publishing (2008). Of course, she was a pioneer at MIT in systems thinking. She identifies a list of 12 places to intervene or types of interventions in systems beginning with least powerful (in terms of systemic change) to most powerful. They are: 12 (least powerful): Numbers. (e.g. number of students) 11. Buffers (e.g., fund raising) 10. Stock and flow structures (e.g., # students/class) 9. Delays (e.g., time before notified of academic probation) 8. Balancing Feedback loops (e.g., what triggers academic probation) 7. Reinforcing feedback loops (e.g., grades) 6. Information flows--The structure of who does and does not have access to information (e.g. transparency in all matters of the university...budget, data...) 5. Rules 4. Self-Organization: The power to add, change or evolve system structure 3. Goals: The purpose of the system 2. Paradigms: The mind-set out of which the system--its goals, structure, rules, delays, parameters--arises. 1. Transcending paradigms I'd like to suggest that there is an opportunity to also look at some of the most powerful changes (4,3,2,1). I don't quite see these in the recommendations, although I may not have a complete understanding of them. For example.. 4. Self-organization...I think one recommendation may have touched on this, but a recommendation would be to incubate, foster and support experiments in self-organization within the campus community. Are there groups of faculty who would like to embark upon a self-organized experiment in "learn by doing?" Actually, I know many people that would like to do this, but are hindered by the structure of the university at every turn. 3. Goals...right now the stated goal is being the best. I commented somewhere about this. This whole "being the best" thing seems anachronistic in the face of our current global crises. Can we have a more humanly transcendent goal? 2. Paradigms: There are many old mindsets driving our culture at Cal Poly. One is the separation between liberal arts/humanities and STEM. I feel there is an opportunity to reconsider our mental models around who we are and our relationship to one another. 1. Transcending paradigms.: There is an opportunity for us here to ask if we have a higher purpose than "being the best." I think we do and I think it is serving some larger purpose in society. Well, that is one idea.

## Our Polytechnic Identity Comments

Hi. I am hoping you can see my name on these comments because I keep forgetting to put it in my comments, in the event you'd like to contact me. (Linda Vanasupa). I want to offer an observation. I am looking at the recommendations for Our Polytechnic Identity. I'm thinking about Systems Dynamics theory (again, the whole systems thinking thing), and I realize that those recommendations considered as the most powerful (highly leveraged) are missing from the list. I am drawing from Donella Meadows book, "Thinking in Systems: A Primer," Chelsea Green Publishing (2008). Of course, she was a pioneer at MIT in systems thinking. She identifies a list of 12 places to intervene or types of interventions in systems beginning with least powerful (in terms of systemic change) to most powerful. They are: 12 (least powerful): Numbers. (e.g. number of students) 11. Buffers (e.g., fund raising) 10. Stock and flow structures (e.g., # students/class) 9. Delays (e.g., time before notified of academic probation) 8. Balancing Feedback loops (e.g., what triggers academic probation) 7. Reinforcing feedback loops (e.g., grades) 6. Information flows--The structure of who does and does not have access to information (e.g. transparency in all matters of the university...budget, data...) 5. Rules 4. Self-Organization: The power to add, change or evolve system structure 3. Goals: The purpose of the system 2. Paradigms: The mind-set out of which the system--its goals, structure, rules, delays, parameters--arises. 1. Transcending paradigms I'd like to suggest that there is an opportunity to also look at some of the most powerful changes (4,3,2,1) . I don't quite see these in the recommendations, although I may not have a complete understanding of them. For example.. 4. Self-organization...I think one recommendation may have touched on this, but a recommendation would be to incubate, foster and support experiments in self-organization within the campus community. Are there groups of faculty who would like to embark upon a self-organized experiment in "learn by doing?" Actually, I know many people that would like to do this, but are hindered by the structure of the university at every turn. 3. Goals...right now the stated goal is being the best. I commented somewhere about this. This whole "being the best" thing seems anachronistic in the face of our current global crises. Can we have a more humanly transcendent goal? 2. Paradigms: There are many old mindsets driving our culture at Cal Poly. One is the separation between liberal arts/humanities and STEM. I feel there is an opportunity to reconsider our mental models around who we are and our relationship to one another. 1. Transcending paradigms.: There is an opportunity for us here to ask if we have a higher purpose than "being the best." I think we do and I think it is serving some larger purpose in society. Well, that is one idea.

Overall, I think this essay takes Cal Poly in a good direction. The emphasis on collaboration instead of competition is important, and the understanding that Cal Poly needs to move away from the practices of its past is a welcome change. Additionally, the emphasis on General Education and the liberal arts as valuable for all students is also appreciated. That said, I wish the statement on p. 3 regarding Cal Poly's polytechnic identity were closer to the definition given in the new strategic plan. Most of the statement here concerns the polytechnic part, and relegates "comprehensiveness" to a commitment to leadership. I would encourage the writers to better incorporate language regarding the arts, humanities, and social sciences into this section. Additionally, I would caution the Cal Poly community to carefully interrogate the notion of interdisciplinarity. That is, too often people assume that an interdisciplinary course is simply two faculty from different subjects team teaching a course. In fact, though, interdisciplinarity is a discipline in its own right. Before Cal Poly pushes forward too far with efforts designed to increase interdisciplinarity, I would encourage us to study best practices at other institutions. Finally, I agree that we need to "remove self-imposed barriers and establish an administrative framework that supports flexibility and change." However, I believe that the recent changes to Academic Programs actually moves us back to a more "silo-ed" structure. Thanks to all who worked so hard on this report. Such work is long and arduous, and is rarely adequately supported or appreciated.

I notice there is no mention of academic freedom. I think this is a really important topic considering recent events. Perhaps including and defining Cal Poly's perception of academic freedom should be included. Also, detailing how donors interact with the university should be documented so there are clear guidelines for ALL to follow.

I feel that sustainability is inadequately represented. It needs to be a prominent part of our identity.

## Our Polytechnic Identity Comments

The committee has done a beautiful job of laying out an aspirational future for Cal Poly. On the whole, the document occurs for me as future-oriented. Thank you. There is part of the aspirations that I am confused by. It is the notion of "being the best." It occurs to me that this paradigm of "dominance," or "best" is breaking down in the face of our pressing societal challenges. A friend of mine puts it this way in the context of the global conversation about the issue of climate change. It's as if we are all collectively in a burning building. Everyone knows that the building is burning and that we are all at danger of destruction. The conversation is about who is going to get credit for getting us out of the building or even who is going to pay for it or who is going to make money off of it. The idea of Cal Poly being the "best" feels a bit to me like arguing about who will get credit for saving our souls...at this time in our human history, it seems like an irrelevant goal. Perhaps we can instead look to significantly contribute to positive community health through creating living examples of businesses, social services and new economies that nourish our community and our environment.

Just a note of general support: Being relatively new at Poly, I have not been deeply involved in the WASC process so far. Thus, reading the draft report on Our Polytechnic Identity was a pleasant surprise. It reflects many of my own concerns, especially the issue of integrating the liberal arts and social sciences more fully and fundamentally into the educations of all of our majors (and, conversely, integrating the sciences more fully into the educations of liberal arts and social science majors). I was also very pleased to see the emphasis on improving the library. My experience has been that the library staff work very hard to do as much as possible with deeply inadequate resources, but in the end we simply need to commit a lot more to making the library an excellent research support. In sum: I support many of the draft report's ideas about integrating the polytechnic and comprehensive aspects of our identity. Thank you to the authors for producing such a thoughtful document.

## Our Polytechnic Identity Comments

Overall, I want to commend the committee on their enormous effort in getting this report written. I do have some general comments:

1. On our peer institutions, it would be helpful to know the number of undergraduate and graduate students and the typical student/faculty ratio. As part of our polytechnic identity we pride ourselves in the easy access our students have to faculty and staff. This should be a consideration with our peer institutions.
2. I believe it is premature to discuss the BA in Liberal Arts and Engineering Studies (page 4), since we have no data on the success of graduates from this program.
3. On page 4, the report states "...while learn-by-doing is practiced across campus, it is not always recognized by those outside of, and occasionally even within, certain disciplines. This lack of recognition may contribute to our collective failure to see our polytechnic and comprehensive natures as mutually supportive." This statement is vague and I can think of examples where this is not true. Some elaboration with specific examples would help.
4. On page 4, the next paragraph, on lifelong learning: For ABET accreditation we are required to demonstrate that our graduates (3-5 years after graduation) have achieved the goal of lifelong learning. We have survey data from both alumni and employers to support. There is data and we are successful!
5. On page 5, under Challenge 1: How does hiring world-class scholars help students? Using endowed chairs to support the mission of Cal Poly helps students. World-class scholars will not be interested (or able) to do the teaching load that will help the most students.
6. On page 5, I do not see evidence to support that research grants help improve graduation rates or improve student learning.
7. On page 6, declaring a minor like RIT or excessive flexibility in the curriculum will extend a student's time at Cal Poly. How do we get students out in 4 years?
8. On page 6, give examples on how barriers are self-imposed by the faculty. I can think of many examples that are contrary to this statement.
9. On page 7, Challenge 3, team based multi-disciplinary senior projects are being done in engineering. Data is available about its success and problems.
10. On page 7, paragraph about honors program: Are we willing to sacrifice the many students to benefit the few "leaders". New resources should be used to help as

## Our Polytechnic Identity Comments

The report addresses several important concerns I've had during my education at Cal Poly, but there was one thing in particular that caught my eye: "This practice needs a thorough assessment and re-examination, based on real evidence of student success." It is the final sentence in a paragraph under challenge 2, but I feel that that idea is far more important than the report gives mention to. In order to become a high-caliber and unique polytechnic institution for the 21st century I believe that the administration's focus should be on what Cal Poly's strengths actually are. Cal Poly's learn by doing philosophy was one of the primary selling points for my choice to spend my college career here, and I think it is for many students. However, this catch-phrase also has real world and academic implications that are not as monitored as perhaps they could be. It is wonderful that teachers are given relative autonomy at Cal Poly, but their methods should be observed and learned from, not merely critiqued or coerced. The day to day means by which a professor enacts this philosophy should be studied in order to better learn how to improve the execution of that philosophy. In order to base this evaluation on "real evidence of student success" a large battery of study should be done. Alumni should give their opinions. The most popular teachers on campus should give lectures to the administration explaining what it is that they need to create an academic institution of a higher caliber. Students should have easy web based access to voice their opinions (this site for example, or polyratings.com) both anonymously and with a login. I believe firmly that this report should NOT be a top-down decree from the hill-top administration building (fittingly the highest elevation on campus) but should be a bottom-up development from the best and brightest faculty that make Cal Poly the institution it is known for. Ultimately, this bottom-up approach is what will define the 21st century. The two services students use most, Google and Facebook, use this approach. Google defines its search criteria from the knowledge and opinions of every web author on the internet. Facebook connects localized knowledge and relationships to create something that, in aggregate, is being studied by the largest advertising companies in the world to learn how they might do their jobs better. The 21st century will be defined by democratic bottom-up approaches such as these. In order to prepare students in a similar way, I firmly believe that the administration should employ similar strategies to learn from their constituents. These strategies should go far beyond simple web pages such as this. Teachers should be given opportunities to lecture and hold discussions about the future of Cal Poly in Chumash, the PAC, and other locations throughout campus. Students should be able to comment and debate the points teachers and administrators make. This process should also occur far more often than once a decade. The 21st century will move faster than a 10 year process will allow.

What about partnerships between different majors like the design department and the engineering department. Connecting students by integrating our learned knowledge into a cohesive system with alternate majors would be a radical and exciting step for the university.

Challenge 2 Paragraph 2 on p. 6 does mention sustainability. It should also mention explicitly that the second and third university level Sustainability Learning Objectives address this challenge: 2. Explain how natural, economic, and social systems interact to foster or prevent sustainability 3. Analyze and explain local, national, and global sustainability using a multidisciplinary approach Challenge 3 Paragraph 1 on p. 7 states "One possible action would be to encourage team-based, multi-disciplinary senior projects in which students from several different majors work together to solve an open-ended problem and then analyze the social/environmental impacts of their solution." This action is too weak for three reasons: 1. Courses already teaching systems thinking approaches to addressing complex problem specifically teach students the unlikelihood of being able to "solve" any problem. At best, systems approaches can "address" the problem and potentially improve the situation. We leave "solve" for textbook problems whose answers appear in the back of the book. 2. Prior to embarking on a senior project, students should already have practiced "analyzing" social, economic, and environmental impacts. Senior project is too late. See next comment. 3. Rather than just analyzing the social/environmental impacts of their solutions, project strategies should involve natural, economic, and social system interactions in ways that foster sustainability. Please strengthen this section to encourage multidisciplinary and systems approaches to foster sustainability, diversity, and life-long learning.

I feel that we need to focus on our polytechnic strengths, rather than water down that aspect of our university. Ag, Architecture, and Engineering are the colleges that have built our reputation. Right now, the self-study abandons any real meaning to the name of our university. Do we want to be Cal Poly or CSU San Luis Obispo. Andrew

## Our Polytechnic Identity Comments

This is a strong essay with its emphasis on cultural awareness and diverse types of knowledge. The globalization of the world economy and the United State's role as a leader of that process absolutely requires our college graduates be exposed to diverse ways of thinking. Those favoring a narrowing of the curriculum in favor of degree specialization should consider housing more of that knowledge in graduate education.

On behalf of the College of Engineering I want to express our serious concern regarding the following statement. The College of Engineering does not support the following "interpretation" of Polytechnic education, neither do we believe it is a feasible or truthful statement/objective. There is a difference between "Ensure that all graduates are whole-system thinkers..." and implementing this objective through the following unrealistic and impossible goal:

"Make "all majors are polytechnic" more than just a slogan. Ensure that all STEM programs integrate the humanities and social sciences into their curricula in coherent, meaningful ways. Ensure that all majors in the humanities and social sciences grapple with the promises and challenges of science and technology."

We will be more than happy to discuss this in more details, not through email but via a more direct dialogue. I only want to express the consensus of CENG faculty and the Chairs which is in strong disagreement with the above statement/goal.

## Learn-by-Doing Comments

### Comment

As the assessment representative for the new ANT-GEOG major, I concur with the intent of this item. However, substantive comment at this point is hindered by the lack of a working definition. In any case, I concur with the wisdom of the action items. I would recommend that in order to: "Strengthen learn-by-doing as our signature pedagogy" the requirements for internships should be expanded to more disciplines and internships should be "understood to be a learn-by-doing experience that integrates the broad sweep of senior-level learning."

The PDF says that it is theme 2, but the web page says that it is theme 1.

I am a faculty member at the OCOB. Our dean is proposing a restructuring of the senior project and I hear other colleges are considering a similar plan. The proposal is to have all students in a class of 60-80 develop a portfolio of their work over the years and write reflective essays about these. If you are as incensed as I am about this please communicate this to the deans. Our senior projects are one of the unique aspects of the Cal Poly Educational experience. Some faculty have stated that they cannot identify a single worthwhile senior project. Maybe they aren't doing them the right way but some of us are. The motivation behind this (at least that which has been communicated) is the high cost of the current projects. Unfortunately, this is yet another short sighted attempt to solve our current budget problem. Rather than approach it from a cost view I would suggest the colleges think about the potential revenue that business may pay for a viable output. This revenue may not only cover the cost but also add dollars to the colleges that would allow for scholarship funding, lab equipment etc.

This is one of the few well written documents I have read in this entire exercise. I would like to applaud the committee and the person who wrote this essay. Your comments were thoughtful, and your action items quite sound. Eric Fisher

I like the idea of "learn by doing". But I would like to point out some hypocrisies. The Cashiers office is not setup to take Credit/Visa payments Cal Poly is supposed to be a polytechnic. Why is it not set up for 20th century payment options. Cash/ checks only- what are we in the stone-age? As an Industrial Technologist that studies business practices, I am ashamed to see the Orfalea College of Business not using modern business principles--after all the school is a business, the teachers are the workers, and we the students are its products. In modern business, they strive to produce the highest quality product, at the lowest possible cost, produced just in time for the customer. A measurement of quality, developed by Motorola, that all business strive to achieve is 6 sigma. For a company to be six sigma, it can only have 3.4 errors per 1 million parts produced. Hospitals are another prime example. There are approximately 79 million babies born every year in the world. If hospitals were not six sigma, 269 babies would be delivered to the wrong parents. If each one of those babies were given 3 shots at birth (Measles, Chicken pox, Polio Vaccine) and the hospital wasn't six sigma, 807 babies would be given the wrong shots. I was unfortunate enough to get mononucleosis twice in my career at Cal Poly. I had to drop all my classes. Twice, the Orfalea college of business's Advising Center lost my withdrawal petition. TWICE, in 1 years time. To further my dismay, on the second failure to function, the Advising center was able to find my petition and turn it in late (Past the 6 week mark). However administration would not grant me a W because it was LATE! I instead had to take a W(F). I turned my petition in on time. I thought I was good to go. I had to find out the next quarter that there was a problem. Where is the 6 sigma policy? Why can't administration change my grade even though they know I turned it in on time. I think the advising center is just bullshit anyway and they should fire everyone in it. The whole idea of students getting educated in the bureaucracy of Cal Poly's inner-workings sets themselves up for failure. Students are cheap, yes, but they don't really care about the students they're advising--they just want that paycheck. Besides that, student workers are temporary--5,6 years max. I have one more thing to point out. The GWR. In my college career, I had the option of taking technical writing classes instead of standard english classes. It made sense to me. I'm getting a technical degree, from a technical college. So why do I have to write a fancy pants, standard english paper to graduate from college. Especially since on every paper I've written in college, I got to use technology--ie. spell check! I am used to seeing things written on a screen. Why do I have to write on paper? Why is it okay for me to take technical writing classes, and have to write a standard english paper? And why can't I use a computer to write my fancy pants essay? I can't think of a single professor that gave me the option of writing an essay in ink. AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA! Does my diploma mean that I was able to put up with the fallacies of Cal Poly? I wouldn't recommend this school to anyone.

## Learn-by-Doing Comments

The section could benefit from a few statements reminding stakeholders how INDIVIDUAL learn-by-doing activities contribute significantly to student learning. Specifically, individual homework and reading assignments provide students with key opportunities to learn concepts and improve self-discipline. Although I don't have more than anecdotal evidence, a large enough fraction of our students don't or can't read by the time they graduate.

My name is Agostino Matteucci. I have been a student here for nearly 17 years. I believe that I know more about this school than anyone on this campus. I actually took the time to read all of your accreditation articles and would like to make the following comments:

I believe that this current attempt to validate yourselves in the eyes of the academic world is the stuff with which we fertilize roses. anyone can see that this is an institute in serious trouble. and you have no answers. The problems to which i speak? well, let's start with the "CAL POLY PLAN" remember that one? what a dismal failure that was and to make it worse, if ANY of you were paying attention was the first stopgap measure to stem the tide of cut backs from the state to higher education. Instead of recognizing the dangerous trend of lessening funding from the state, you chose to do nothing in terms of stabilizing tuition costs and passed them on to the student. The Result? As an engineering student, it was discouraging to attend my last physics class and hear from the PHD professor, " I'm sorry most of the lab equipment is broken and I don't have the funding to fix it" " oh and I don't have the resources to hire a T/A to correct your homework,so it won't count towards your final grade."

He did post the answers outside the lab wall, but physics is discovery, and labs are a part of that. In fact, almost every lab I took at Cal Poly in those days featured broken equipment and apologetic professors. AGAIN lack of vision on your part.

Let's start with the next phase of poor thinking: The idea that "we'll just increase the school's attendance to 25,000+ students)" well that worked out ok didn't it? I believe you reached 19,000 and couldn't maintain quality of education or even sustain the growth financially. as the state continued to cut funding. again you look like a ship with no rudder; as you flounder back to a reasonable student populus.

So what joy have I encountered lately ? the latest student insult; the school furlogh; or the ultimate ripoff of a student's right to learn. We now PAY for a full quarters of tuition and only get 2/3 of it. You're lucky the attending student body is so ignorant of your actions; by rights, it should be staging protest the likes of which S.I Hiakawa would be proud. If you tried this at Berkeley, they would burn you in effegy.

Taking away 10 percent of a professors base pay sure was PAINLESS to you administrators, but it made an already difficult situation worse.

What do i mean? I'm talking about the dejected attitude of you teaching staff and how it affects us students. Do any of you know the feeling of paying \$1200.00 for ONE class only to have the professor say (and I quote) "well, they cut my pay ten percent, so I guess I'll just work ten percent less, I'm not adding any one in my class this quarter" just what a graduating senior wants to hear. And you wonder why it takes seniors so long to graduate.

Finally, the stone that sticks in my craw, You knew eighteen years ago that the state was going to cut funding; you have not done anything to stem the tide !!!! no investment programs aimed to stabilize rising tuition costs, no limiting construction actions in an attempt to control spending nothing. You people must be so glad you work for a state institution because if I ran my business like you run this school, they would have one word for me: Bankrupt !

I can whole heartedly say that the quality of education here is not increasing with the rise of tuition costs but just the opposite.

And a final note to consider, have you any idea how many former graduates are my friends here after 17 years of attending? I'd safely guess hundreds, I still keep in touch with most of them all by email, still send them greetings during the holidays. most of them are curious "when are you gonna get out of there ?" I reply, "when I'm done." Most of them make six figures by now, being in there forty's and either senior engineers or MBA business men and women. Curious that none of them that I've spoken to have ANY desire to contribute to the alumni foundation or donate any of their time or money to Cal Poly, one friend of mine a mechanical engineer of whom I've known since my twenties, recently told me " after the way that school treated us I'm surprised you even ask." when pressed and told of the situation here

## Learn-by-Doing Comments

I'm glad that somebody's taking the effort to define "Learn by Doing", since it's a buzzword that gets repeated ad nauseum. The problem with labs, as they currently exist, and the reason they're not truly "learn by doing", is that they are a cookbook activity to get a cookbook answer: "Do X to Y, and you should see Z. Write a report about it." This is very good at showing well-understood phenomena as a corollary to lecture, but not really useful for encouraging lifelong learning. Labs could better fit with industry practice and "learn by doing" by becoming more research-oriented. Students could design their own experiments and write papers for publication, instead of following a predetermined script and cookie-cutter report. This would further enhance Cal Poly graduates' ability to "hit the ground running" in industry. The larger part of "Learn by Doing" needs to be self-directed, either totally, or within a Professor-provided framework. Senior Project is a good example of this, and so are many of intercollegiate design clubs ("co-curricular clubs"?) that many students are involved in. Design clubs (and the assorted lab/shop facilities on campus) should be recognized as a vital component of Learn by Doing, and funded accordingly. Why not expand Senior project towards a "Junior Project", or something along that line? Students are already immersed in their major work from day one, so starting them on projects from day one should be fine.

As a Cal Poly undergrad (alumn) what learn by doing always meant to me was that in we spent less time in lecture deriving theoretical equations, and more time in lab observing and practicing. In grad school this created a challenge in my competition with students from other schools. There were some topic that we didn't cover in much depth at Cal Poly where other schools did. But on the other hand I exceeded their abilities in the lab and in my research. The benefit is that society gets diversity of backgrounds, some theoretical and some more practical. I am worried that in trying to define Lear-by-Doing, we will probably not cover all the aspects of what it means, and then as we change the rewards to match the new definition, we may loose some of the benefits that Lear-by-Doing has give us.

I came to Cal Poly as a grad student so it is possible that this is already being done. I would recommend three items. During undergrad orientation: 1) Provide each student with a coupon for a free writing notebook (Cornell style preferred) or savings toward an approved electronic writing instrument (i.e. palm pilot or laptop). 2) Teach students journalistic techniques and how to ask questions followed by an assignment requiring them to gather information and create a short professional report to turn in to writing lab for self improvement. 4) Have a graduate student who is willing and who has recently completing thesis present their project to the group as science reporting. I believe students can use these skills while completing their coursework, in their job/internship, and wherever they go to get all they want to get out of learn by doing.

Sustainability and diversity are cross cutting themes. I saw mention of diversity, but missed seeing any examples for sustainability. The complexities surrounding the topic of sustainability provide ample opportunities to apply a learn by doing pedagogy. One such example is in Steven Marx's ecoliteracy class where students experience natural settings and write about them. Another example is in a lower-level engineering course where students make solar panels and test them. Many other examples exist in all disciplines. There are over 25 clubs on campus where students are focusing on various aspects of sustainability-related topics. For example, there is the solar car club, Net Impact, the biodiesel club, etc. where students are learning about sustainable solutions through experimentation and adaptation. Kate Lancaster

We may be altering if we require students to declare a major or the difficulty in changing majors. If this is the case, how does that or should that effect the text of page 4.

## Teacher-Scholar Model Comments

### Comment

The abstract makes several assertions that appear to be the opinions of the authors but are not supported in the body of the essay. Furthermore, some of these opinions seem to skew the report and lead the authors to overlook some positive steps that Cal Poly has taken to foster the teacher-scholar model. Here is one important example: (1) "...progress toward the teacher-scholar model at Cal Poly has been hampered by the lack of an accepted working definition of the model..." The essay provides no evidence that there is a direct correlation between the lack of an accepted definition and the speed of progress toward the teacher-scholar model. Thus, the authors come very close to committing some version of the post hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy. The only substantial piece of evidence that indicates that faculty believe a full implementation of the teacher-scholar model may be difficult are the very palpable concerns about time and workload reported on pp. 8-9. Unlike in the case of the absence of a working definition for "teacher scholar", in the case of time and workload the causal connection is quite clear. Consequently, the abstract should be changed to reflect the findings in the essay. Furthermore, the essay does not consider any evidence that the University has taken positive steps to help faculty approach the teacher-scholar ideal. The two most obvious omissions are efforts by Deans to support faculty research through assigned time and the EFI program. More comments about the lack of a working definition of "teacher-scholar" posted under the category "General Comment"

Theme 2: Teacher-Scholar Model Institutional agility and campus-wide acceptance of the value of our comprehensive nature are crucial building blocks of an outstanding 21st-century polytechnic. Cal Poly's focus on the application of theory to practice will serve us well as we move forward in this increasingly global environment, but we must do two things to ensure its strength: 1) recognize that it is practiced throughout students' educational experiences, including both academic disciplines not traditionally considered polytechnic and the co-curriculum, and 2) obtain the funding necessary to maintain this practice. --- this abstract is identical to the abstract for Overarching Theme

I wish this report better reflected other means of scholarship "success" than grants. Faculty in the arts and humanities rarely bring in grants, but faculty from the CLA have won several of the University's awards for distinguished scholarship. Also, I am hesitant about a university-wide RPT committee. Disciplines are so different at Cal Poly, and I think such a committee would increase the level of anxiety felt by junior faculty around issues of RPT.

It's a bit difficult to determine the value of the "Creativity Contract" as I find the description of it rather vague. It threatens to add yet another thing for faculty members to produce, and one that closely mirrors the PDP. I see no reason why the PDP (especially given how frequently we are now required to update them in some colleges) is insufficient. I don't think the essay would be in any way weakened by dropping the "Creativity Contract" and instead emphasizing more action items, such as release time, that genuinely and concretely address the one impediment to the teacher-scholar model for which the essay cites evidence.

Working definition of "teacher scholar" and "Track Scholarship More Effectively" are odd action items. For the authors do not provide any evidence that these items would make it easier for faculty to approach the teacher-scholar model. Both action items may make it easier to assess how well we are approaching the ideal, but they do not, in any obvious way at all, contribute to us getting there.

It's a bit surprising that one of the proposed action items is \*not\*, for example, to expand the EFI program -- give release time (with adequate reporting obligations) to all who want it for developing their scholarship through the development of research grants.

## Teacher-Scholar Model Comments

I'd like to echo the comment already in this section that a university-wide RPT committee is a bad idea for the reasons cited therein. There are two other reasons why a university-wide RPT committee is a bad idea: (1) Some of my colleagues in other colleges seem to think my entire discipline is not very worthwhile. So imagine one such colleague raising problems for the tenure of someone in my department because of a bias against an entire discipline (or set of disciplines!). (2) We already have very frequent reviews with sufficient oversight by several layers of review. Why we would we want to add more service work for faculty when what we are trying to do, as the authors of the essay recognize, is *\*reduce\** service work. This is especially a concern for non-junior faculty who very likely would have to be the ones serving on such a committee. On some of our departments non-junior faculty already have a *\*lot\** of reviewing to do, which is one more thing that makes it difficult to pick up the latest book in their discipline.

The recommendation that "all faculty participate in using Digital Commons to showcase their work" has no bite. I believe it might be prudent to replace it with a recommendation to explore a different tool for gathering existing evidence of scholarship. Unless faculty are contractually required to do so, contributions to the Commons will remain voluntary. If contributions remain voluntary, we may never get a lot of faculty participating, because contributing to Digital Commons takes time. The instructions for contributors require that the very first thing one does is contact a person. So already I know I'll be exchanging e-mails, which takes time. I cannot, for example, simply up-load my papers as pdf files and forget about them (i.e., be guaranteed that they will not be made available to the public until the appropriate copyright hurdles have been surpassed). There is also the thorny issue of a mediated negotiation about copyrights. Even if this is rather simple, it is just one more thing for a faculty member to attend to -- a few more e-mails there probably -- so, again, more time. The payoff for investing that time is, unfortunately, rather unclear from the perspective of the average faculty member, especially these days when a lot of peer-reviewed journals are easily accessible electronically to the relevant audience and when some disciplines, such as physics, have well-established and widely-used discipline-specific pre-print archives. Do we have any evidence that faculty authors that contribute to the Commons find it valuable in a way that is significantly different from merely having their colleagues access their work in the usual ways or in other faculty-driven ways (e.g., on a faculty member's own web site)? The report cites no evidence that Digital Commons has been a success among faculty; if it has been a success according to some well-defined measure (or at least unsolicited faculty comments or some such thing), then that would tend to increase the probability that the recommendation would actually be achieved. A quick dip into the commons suggests otherwise. In CLA, 10/16 departments currently have any contributions. However, a quick scan of the departments with contributions suggests that many departments contain multiple contributions by a few faculty members. Thus, the scholarship of most of the faculty in most departments -- at least in CLA -- seems not to be represented (unless there is actually no other scholarship going on, which we all know is false). At the very least, it seems any recommendation for *\*all\** faculty to participate in the Commons must be honest about how many faculty are currently participating in Digital Commons and the obstacles we would face if we tried to *\*require\** that all faculty participate. The report should cite some evidence that having all faculty attempt to contribute to the Commons could be a success. For example, is there any evidence that if faculty participation in Digital Commons suddenly exploded, that the library has the resources to handle all the copyright clearance, digitizing, searching and file conversion in a timely manner? Finally, if the above remarks are vitiated by the suggestion to somehow link faculty e-portfolios to the Commons, at the very least the description of how that's supposed to work (the sentence at the bottom of page 3 and top of page 4) could be made much more clear. For, once again, there seem to be contractual issues concerning what a faculty member is *\*required\** to submit as evidence for promotion and what parts of what he or she submits can be made accessible to the public. A more interesting recommendation might be to develop a tool for tracking peer-reviewed publications *\*anonymously\** (so as not to violate RPT confidentiality). After all, it really is peer-reviewed publication (or the equivalent in performance or creative disciplines) that is the leading, though admittedly not the only, indicator of scholarship. The report already refers to one tool related to this when it cites (on p. 6) a survey of department chairs. Couldn't department chairs report anonymously the number of peer-reviewed publications in RPT files reviewed during any given year (or some such thing)? For example, would it violate the confidentiality of RPT if the chair simply reported to the Dean: "There were three junior faculty under review this year. Two of them completed one peer-reviewed article each. One associate professor was reviewed for promotion. He or she completed three peer-reviewed articles in the last five years" (or Deans just could have analysts count the beans -- or the beans might be counted electronically if e-portfolios for faculty are adopted). These reports could be kept confidential at the Dean's office and only aggregate numbers from the Dean's office be made available to future WASC Report authors and administrators. This type of tool would require very little extra work on the part of Chairs (maybe none) and Deans because it uses *\*existing\** evidence (or evidence that faculty typically create as part of RPT) and it does not increase the workload of faculty, who really should be busy writing those papers (or performing or creating and not commenting on WASC studies maybe?) in the first place!

## Teacher-Scholar Model Comments

My understanding was that these WASC essays were supposed to be themselves scholarly works. As such, the evidence cited needs to be reported in a rigorous way. The paragraph that reports the results of the faculty/staff survey needs to include a report (even if in a footnote) of standard statistical measures, especially the error margin of the findings. As a reader of the report, I have no idea of 60% of respondents means 6/10 or 600/1000. For all any reader of this report knows, the margin of error of the findings could be huge (say +/- 20%). Conversely, if the margins of error are small, then this helps make the case stronger. There is no evidence that the survey followed standard protocols. The situation is somewhat more muddled because staff are included (apparently) in the sample. While I am NOT saying that the view of staff is not valuable, it may be quite different than the faculty perspective. Overall, the entire section needs to be \*far\* more rigorous in its statistical reports and purported use of "evidence."

Add a proposed action item: Provide Faculty with release time, staff, and infrastructure (in addition to more library support) to support scholarly activities.

As the assessment representative of the new ANT-GEOG major, I am supportive of all of the action items. As is true with the "Learn by doing" topic, effective comment will have to wait for the Senate to create a working definition of the "Teacher-Scholar" model. I am especially supportive of: "Establish a university-level RPT committee" and in finding ways to clearly: "Track Scholarship More Effectively." Developing mechanisms to weigh the relative merits, quality, and substance of scholarship is a necessary underpinning to tracking scholarship. An example of this would be the development of a mandatory and reviewable methodology for assessing the quality and rigor of the journals being published in by scholars.

Make the RPT Process More Clear and Consistent Implement AS 690-09 Resolution on Promotion and Tenure Focus Group and AS-691-09 Resolution on Research and Professional Development. Establish a university-level RPT committee. ----- Making the process clear and consistent is appropriate. I don't think that having a university-level committee is helpful. It is already difficult to compare faculty from the same college. How would a comparison across colleges/programs work? Some faculty teach only in the major, others teach GE for students from across the campus. Some faculty pursue prof. development with graduate students in well-funded programs, others are working by themselves with little resources. Some faculty teach 12 units (or more) in a term, while others regularly teach less. Until these more basic issues are resolved I don't see how we could have university-wide RPT committee.

The teach scholar model is referred to as Theme 2, but in the PDF it is referred to as Theme 3. In abstract: "a comprehensive understanding" could be changed to "a common understanding" In abstract: "members are accomplishing as scholars" cahgned to "have accomplished as scholars" In abstract: "surprisingly high" to "high" On page 1: Change "asserted the economic value of the teacher-scholar model" to "asserted the teacher-scholar model has economic value" On Page 3: Remove the graphic. It does not help and it is misleading. On page 3 (title): Change "in implementing" to "implementing" and end with a question mark On page 3: "promotion package" is probably not the correct phrase. We don't submit promotion packages for retention. On page 3 (bottom): use Digital measures as one example. The faculty should decide if it is more appropriate to RPT, not the working group Pg 4: "Evidence of scholarship" could be retitled "Funding for Scholarship"? Only grants are accessed here, not scholarship. pg 5: The ";Long Beach is a " sentence is awkward. pg 6: "we have the evidence" could be "there is evidence" pg 6: collaboratin with g on the next line should be fixed. pg7: what is "2-20 weighted teaching units". Is "between 2 and 20 WTU" desired? pg7 (last paragraph): Add new paragraph at the word "On" pg 9: It is unclear what a creativity contract is. Unless we are very careful about how a university level RPT committee is created, it is likely to increase rather than decrease stress. pg10: The paragraph which starts "Cal Poly must" does not fit. pg11: Add period into "appropriately rewarded The"

Overall, the essay would benefit from a more rigorous treatment of statistical findings. For example, survey results are reported without any indication of survey methods, sample size, or margins of error. Some evidence of the likelihood that the survey results are representative of the relevant constituency would be welcome.

## Teacher-Scholar Model Comments

The issue of a working definition for the teacher scholar model mentioned in the abstract and in the body of the essay seems to be a bit of a red herring. A much more constructive and arguably accurate report of what faculty have achieved in the past few years is that *\*despite\** no robust guidance and support for the implementation of the teacher-scholar model, we actually have sketchy evidence that faculty are now more closely approaching the teacher-scholar ideal. That faculty are able to do this *\*without\** a working definition of "teacher-scholar" is no surprise at all. The term "teacher-scholar" is not all that subtle and has been in currency in higher education for over a decade (I first heard it as a post-doc at an institution that claimed to value such beasts... and I'm certain I am not alone). Faculty clearly understand that being a teacher-scholar involves a commitment to quality teaching that is informed (in some loose sense) by research and to research that either directly or indirectly finds its way to the classroom. Furthermore, faculty (especially non-junior faculty) clearly understand that at Cal Poly the adoption of the teacher-scholar model clearly changes the terms of employment for folks who were hired before this term was tossed around so much, because it translates for those folks into increased research expectations. In my own case, this is not an abstract concern. During my fifth year the publication expectations in my college were literally doubled, and I was simply expected to produce as there was no "grandfather" clause to help me out. Furthermore, by emphasizing the lack of a working definition of "teacher-scholar" the authors of the essay undermine some of their own claims later on. For how can we ever take any evidence from faculty about the implementation of the teacher-scholar model seriously (as described on pp. 8-9) if faculty are so confused about the meaning of "teacher-scholar." What's worse, the essay provides no evidence that progress toward the teacher-scholar model has actually been "hampered." Curiously, the essay leaves out evidence (especially efforts by Deans and the EFI program) that might be used to argue that progress toward the teacher-scholar model has been "facilitated" (and sometimes imposed) recently at Cal Poly. The authors might do well to consider these efforts and attempt to determine whether they constitute a significant contribution to our goal of achieving the teacher-scholar model. For example, and speaking for myself, receiving an EFI award was a *\*huge\** benefit that gave me the opportunity, among other things, to re-connect with cutting edge research in my discipline. The EFI gave me the two things that the essay *\*does\** cite as obstacles: Time and Books (not in our library) and resulted in the submission of a grant proposal to national funding agency. I doubt very, very much there is anything unique about my case. EFI is a great idea that works because it recognizes implicitly that we are not a research institution and hence we need to be freed from activities (especially I would humbly suggest grading of lower-division coursework) that most folks who compete for national grant awards seldom participate in.

Really nice, I'm glad this was done and that it was done this well speak volumes to the dedication and serious intent of the folks involved. Thank you. Chris Kitts

## Teacher-Scholar Model Comments

Comment of WASC Self-Study Report I would like to comment on the Teacher-Scholar Model section of the draft WASC report. The goal of the Teacher-Scholar Model is to promote faculty scholarship and student involvement in research. To me, that sounds like a reasonable goal. However, the section on “Evidence of Scholarship” is a listing of grants that the University has received and a discussion of the amount of money that has been provided to pay for student research assistants. Although the document gives lip service to the notion of a variety of types of scholarship, in reality, only funded research counts. When I finished reading this section, I felt a better title would be the “Teacher – Cash Flow Model”. For the first 10 years of my career at Cal Poly, I worked on over ½ million dollars of funded research for companies and government agencies. It was nice, applied research - the type of research the report says Cal Poly faculty are supposed to do. For the last 10 years, I have primarily worked on theoretical research and environmental / sustainability research. Because I wanted to be free to be creative and select the types of problems I work on, I have not sought grants to fund this research. It has been published in numerous journals and books, presented at national and international conferences, and lead to linkages with academics and institutions around the world. I find it disheartening to discover that it really doesn’t count since it did not generate cash flow to the university. Under the section “Current Impediments”, the report states that rewarding different forms of scholarship is important. What you do not seem to recognize is that a focus on grants and raising money is an impediment to doing research at Cal Poly. Several times during the last 10 years, my research has been blocked and inappropriately modified by the grants office (under the guise of Human Subjects Review) because it might offend donors to the university. To me, a focus on scholarship as a fund raising activity is a violation of academic freedom at Cal Poly. It is sad that the only evidence of scholarship that counts at Cal Poly is bringing money to the University. My students who worked as unpaid research assistants on my projects have gone on to professional and academic careers. They had important learning experiences, even if the University was unable to make money from these experiences. I think the committee needs to spend more effort developing measures of scholarship that do not depend on receiving grants. Yes, it is interesting and important to do research that private companies are willing to fund. But, if we ever hope to create a sustainable society, then academics must be encouraged to do research that companies and government organizations find uncomfortable. That is part of our ethical and intellectual role, and it should be encouraged, rather than told it doesn’t really count. Daniel Levi, Professor Psychology and Child Development Department

The key comment in this entire essay, in my opinion, is the warning against hiring like an R1 institution, but funding research like a community college. This is exactly what is happening now - the university stresses research accomplishments in the RPT process, but provides minimal resources toward that goal, and instead impedes this path by instituting extremely high teaching workloads. Many faculty feel overburdened by the high teaching load, coupled with research expectations for which they have no time. Morale among faculty seems to be decreasing quickly for this reason. The faculty teacher-scholar model that is encouraged seems like a good idea, but if research expectations are increasing (as they obviously have), then teaching expectations must be reduced, or else quality of both will drop tremendously, and faculty will become disillusioned with their jobs at Cal Poly. This has already happened to a large extent - older faculty (full professors and recent retirees) are clearly more happy with their jobs than junior faculty, in my experience. Faculty teaching workload must be reduced to implement this teacher-scholar model. Giving faculty 12 units of assigned time every 3 years to use as desired would be an example of implementing this reduction. □Doing otherwise just makes Cal Poly into a very poorly run R1 institution.

## Teacher-Scholar Model Comments

I strongly believe in the teacher-scholar model. It is extremely encouraging to see the university embracing this model. I also agree with the statement in the draft essay that lack of time is one of the biggest impediments to active scholarship that actively engages students. But, I have great doubts about the effectiveness of the solutions given in the draft essay for addressing this: "The R&PD Committee affirmed that reduced service obligations, a more efficient RPT process, and better guidance on how to prepare WPAFs and PDPs will increase faculty members' time for scholarly activities." The reason I don't have time for scholarship on a regular basis is the large teaching load I have. It is quite simple. The amount of time I spend on service, the RPT process and WPAFs/PDPs is an extremely small fraction of my total time. It feels like there is an assumption in this essay that is something like this... "teaching is important. This is shown by the large amount of teaching our faculty do" I don't think that you have to teach a large amount to value teaching deeply and have that be our top priority. Actually, I would even say that large teaching loads harm rather than help student learning. Large teaching loads not only prevent me from doing much research, but they also force me to compromise the quality of my teaching. When you add even the most minimal amount of scholarship to the picture (simply enough to keep active), you have to start making choices. Something has to go. This is true even if I am not doing any service. Summary: the large teaching loads we have are the main reason that faculty struggle to continue active scholarship that involve students. Please be more honest about this in the essay and come up with realistic ways of addressing this. So, what do we do about this? \* It is probably unrealistic to even think about an across the board teaching load reduction for faculty. \* The university and colleges could vigorously pursue external sources of funding to support faculty scholarship. Things like the SFSG are \*extremely\* helpful and there needs to more of this (but externally funded). It should be almost trivial for faculty who are active in scholarship to get minigrants and teaching reductions for their scholarship. \* The university and colleges should more actively encourage faculty to write external grants to fund their scholarship activities. This encouragement should take the form of teaching release/reductions to write grants. The existing programs to do this should be expanded dramatically. With the tough budget situation at the state level, this is fantastic way of bringing more \$ to the university while supporting faculty scholarship. Why not make it nearly automatic: if you write and submit a grant, you get teaching release that amounts to x% of the total grant amount. The university could tune x% according to the funding success rate in a way that paid for this program. Case in point: I currently have about 1-2 million dollars worth of external grants I would like to write. I have an extremely good track record of getting grants funded from places like NASA, NSF, DOD (well over %50). All of these projects would involve students and transform the classes I am teaching in significant ways. Some of the grants would have significant funds for department level computing resources. But, this year when I submitted my "professional plan" I left out all of these things. Why? Because I know that there is \*no way\* I will have time to write these grants, let alone do the work if they were funded. Without internally funded teaching release, I can't even get off the ground. \* The university should affirm its commitment to give faculty release time from teaching if they do get external funding for research. If I do get a grant, but I don't have the time to do the work, it is worse than never getting the grant in the first place. The university should support by using overhead from grants to fund this release time, \*and\* by formalizing policies that permit faculty to do this. All of these internal programs should be competitive (faculty should have to apply), but the amount of funding should be large enough that the success rate for faculty is very high (well over 50%). If the teacher-scholar model is really important to Cal Poly, the university administration should spend a significant amount of time developing support for this model. But first, they need to be more honest about the impact of our large teaching loads on scholarship. Reducing teaching loads does not mean we value teaching less. It means that i) we value teaching quality (not quantity) and that ii) we use the teacher-scholar model to frame how we think about the importance of teaching (and scholarship).

Linda Vanasupa here. I can't tell what you can see of my entry. Thank you so much for this clear analysis of our collective confusion about the teacher-scholar model. I want to note that what is repeatedly expressed as the greatest hinderance to professional development is our jobs as teachers. This is kind of funny to me, but I agree. I think we need to consider some very different structural changes in our education process that enable us to simulatenously function in both teaching and scholarly roles. (I wonder if you might consider adding this suggestion to you list of recommendations Just as an outsider, I would say that the list of recommendations seem to assume the existing system. The existing system is the fundamental problem. So, I keep asking myself if incremental adjustments to the existing system will give us a fundamentally different result. I don't know, but I'm leaning toward "No."

## Teacher-Scholar Model Comments

The discussion of the implementation of the teacher-scholar model would benefit from a clear analysis of the unique challenge, in a non-R1 institution, of including lecturers in the model.--- In an R1 institution, the teacher-scholar model can be implemented across all ranks because lecturers are typically Ph.D. students who, in a fairly concrete sense, are budding teacher-scholars. Furthermore, as we all know, as PhD students one typically has lots of time. Students at such schools, furthermore, have a fairly clear sense that if their instructor is a PhD candidate, that instructor is engaged in some form of research. --- However, at Cal Poly, our lecturers have no contractual requirement (or other sort of requirement) for doing research (though, of course, some lecturers are deeply involved in research). ---Implementing the teacher-scholar model without attention to this detail could inadvertently create two different types of instructors (the teacher-scholars and the lecturers) and potentially even resentment from lecturers, especially from those who are interested in research but who might be deemed to have a lower priority for, say, assigned time since evidence of research is not required for either their R or P.

The main argument in the section "Evidence of current scholarship" is very weak and rather flawed. For now I'll indicate only one main reason why. Using bare dollar amounts of grant monies as an indicator of scholarship among faculty is defective at the very least because no effort is made to adjust the dollar amounts to reflect important differences among the institutions being compared. For example, when one compares bare dollar amounts between SFSU and Cal Poly, one sees that Cal Poly is awarded only approximately 44% (22 mil) of the grant dollar amounts that SFSU receives (~50 mil). However, the \*per capita\* ratio is quite different. Per capital, Cal Poly faculty are awarded 64% (18k) of the grant monies SFSU receives (28k). Bare dollar amounts for grant money received is really a rather weak indicator of scholarship especially when no other factors are considered to "weigh" the amount of money received. Lots of other factors should be used to adjust the dollar amounts of grant moneys received besides the sheer number of faculty. For example, an institution may get more grants (overall) but less in dollar amounts depending on the nature of the grants. The graphs and discussion of the numbers in the section "evidence of current scholarship" give it an air of "science" that it clearly lacks.

## Integration and Student Learning Comments

### Comment

One of the things a non-faculty friend of mine asked me was, "what are the learning objectives for the faculty?" I was struck by the simplicity of this question and the fact that we faculty always believe students should be learning, but I know of no place on campus where "faculty learning objectives" are defined and honored (including in my own world). As we entered the 21st century, one of the trends in business that we powerful was that of "organizational learning." (P. Senge) I wonder if the Cal Poly community might embrace this idea. This is in the spirit of the recommendation about integrating the university's intellectual capacity. I think that we faculty often ignore our presence in the learning system (along with staff, administration). I very much like this recommendation on integration and ask that you consider applying the goal of learning beyond the students.

The action item on page 11, Integrate student learning and advising, should also mention need to build awareness and application of the SLOs (Sustainability Learning Objectives).

As the assessment representative for the new ANT-GEOG major, I agree in principle with the Theme but believe it in need of further clarification. The use of the word integration is understood but will read awkwardly by students and parents. The action items are reasonable but would benefit from additive goals. I support and have few quibbles regarding: "Revise the Mission Statement to include staff as partners with students and faculty in the enterprise of education." However, department leaders need the authority and power to insure that staff is of the quality that will optimally benefit students through integration. I support the following but also have suggestions for expansion of the action item: "Revise the senior project policy to insure that the project is truly integrative and can be used to assess the broad sweep of senior-level learning. Make the educational effectiveness of the senior project a focus of EER." Efforts will be made to do likewise with internships should be added. I also support the following but have a recommendation: "Revise the syllabus policy to include the provision of course outcomes, with reference to ULOs and program goals. Revise the course form to include reference to ULOs among the course outcomes." Department leaders must be required to review course forms and syllabuses and be granted the authority and power to ensure compliance. I also applaud the following but suggest that on campus internships be mentioned in the same context. "Continue to build awareness and application of the ULOs by structuring on-campus student employment as an intentional and reflective learning experience."

## Integration and Student Learning Comments

Theme 3:

Introductory paragraph

states that the WASC self study theme affirms several steps that should be taken to effectively connect learning at Cal Poly, one of which is to

"insure that the University Learning Objectives (ULOs) are our MOST IMPORTANT VEHICLE OF INTEGRATION ACROSS ALL CAMPUS PROGRAMS....."

If we say "this is our most important vehicle of integration," then the administration should support the ULO project that is now just entering its second year.

In action items, I recommend including the following:

--- Provide funding to continue the university-wide ULO project - a visionary and concrete action plan for the university to successfully integrate the ULOs through student learning in GE, the major, and the co-curriculum.

WHY?

Currently, the ULO project is emerging with a plan to move Cal Poly into the forefront as a LEADER for a model of student integrated learning. If the program continues, Cal Poly has the potential to be recognized as a leader in both the CSU system and nationally, which provides opportunities for donor contributions and expansion of national collaborations.

The PDF says that it is theme 1 and the web page says that it is theme 3.

I'm trying to get to the comments page.

## Integration and Student Learning Comments

I agree with the Department chairs who said that lab classes are most important to the Learn By Doing concept. So many schools want to cut labs out of the curriculum. I can tell you that in Computer Science, nothing could be worse than shutting down our labs, or reducing the hours we spend in lab classes. Experience is the best teacher when it comes to computer programming. Sitting down at a computer and writing programs is just as important as making swim team members do laps in the pool. In fact, taking away labs from Computer Scientists would be akin to taking away the swimming pool from the Swim Team! Lab classes are probably the one thing that prepares students MOST for the job world and working in industry. Also, I would like to add that so many instructors at Cal Poly think that "Learn By Doing" means assigning a difficult quarter project on the first day of class. This is probably the worst thing I've ever seen a school do. Take this example: Johnny enrolls in Japanese History 101. On the first day, the instructor says, "Ok, everybody get into a group of 2 or 3 people, and come up with a project relating to Famous Events in Japanese History for your quarter project." How can you possibly expect someone to choose a topic for their Quarter Project on the first day, in a subject they know nothing about? The reason they are taking the class is to learn about the subject, and instead, faculty who are bent on this great Learn By Doing mantra expect students to be experts in a subject on the first day. This has happened to me SO many times now I just can't count. So what does the student do? They have to go out and teach themselves about this new subject they've been thrown into, which begs the question of what we are paying the faculty for? If I have to teach myself as part of the great "Learn By Doing" experiment then I might as well just read books at home or go get a job in my field and save money on tuition! I have a friend who taught himself how to program in Java and he started his own company at home. He expanded, got employees, and grew the business over 6 years. He recently sold it to McAfee for 50 million dollars. He has no college degree, but now he's a millionaire and drives a Lamborghini. If Learn By Doing means teaching yourself without any help from faculty, then I think my friend has got "Learn By Doing" down pat. The whole concept of Learn By Doing is lost on both students and faculty. It seems to mean something different to everyone. The department chairs have it right when they say Learn By Doing means instructor-led lab classes. The faculty have it wrong when they say it means dumping work on a student and saying, "Figure it out on your own, kid." I simply can't learn that way. I am not like my friend; I find learning is really painful when I'm expected to just go figure things out on my own. I know my personal learning style is that I need guidance; I need a well organized curriculum, practice in lab classes, and access to instructor office hours. I'm paying tuition for Labs and faculty availability, not self-help books and self-guided tours of academic concepts.

Page 5 indicates initial progress with diversity learning objectives. It should also include the sustainability learning objectives adopted last June by the Academic Senate.

Something that does not get discussed in the document is the following fact, that I have been able to gather through observing students myself, and from talking to other professors. 1. The standards in many freshmen and sophomore level classes at Cal Poly is too low. The reason that makes me believe this is that, when me and my other colleges who teach 300 level courses receive these students we find that (a) they're dismayed that we would expect them to study between 8 and 12 hours per week on our courses, (b) They are not prepared in the same way our students were prepared when we teaching comparable courses at other universities. 2. I believe that the problem is cultural. It stems from the belief on the part of a portion of our faculty that our students are either not as bright or as interested in learning as, say, a Berkeley student or a Texas AM student. I don't know how widespread this problem is, but I have noticed it, and many of my colleagues who arrived at Cal Poly from other universities at roughly the same time have noticed it also. 3. I know we're not imagining this problem because we talk to our students and they confirm this fact: that in some classes at Poly it is easy to obtain a B without any kind of effort. 4. No amount of document writing is going to solve this problem if we as faculty do not engage in a conversation about the standards of rigor and excellence we wish to hold for our students. I remain available to talk some more about this if you wish. My email: ezambran@calpoly.edu

# Senate Committee on Research and Professional Development (R&PD) - Comments on the WASC Self-Study Report - November 2, 2009

## Preface

During the Fall 09 quarter, the committee reviewed the [draft version of the WASC Self-Study Report](#), in particular the [essay on the Teacher-Scholar Model \(Teacher-Scholar Model CPR DRAFT 10/15/09\)](#). Overall, the committee agrees with the need to discuss the Teacher-Scholar Model and its importance to Cal Poly, and appreciates the measures taken to solicit comments and suggestions from the Cal Poly community. Several of the committee members remarked that the essay was somewhat difficult to read, and recommended a more structured format with sections and subsections instead of the relatively loose one with questions as the main organizing principle. This document contains essential issues addressed during the committee meeting on October 26, 2009, and additional comments by individual committee members. Some editing was done to organize the comments and suggestions, first in a collection of general comments that refer to the document as a whole, and then specific ones referring to particular sections, usually identified by page numbers.

## General Comments

- Clarification of the term "Teacher-Scholar Model", especially in the particular context here. Most committee members had heard the term before, but were not familiar enough with it to have a clear understanding of what it means for Cal Poly.
- In its present form, the document refers to a number of outside documents, but does not provide bibliographic citations or hyperlinks for all. While this may be an essay, and not an academic paper, it relies on a significant number of other publications, and a "Bibliography" section collecting all those references would be very helpful.
- The whole document has a somewhat negative tone; for example, it sounds like there is an underlying assumption that faculty after tenure are significantly less engaged in research. If there is evidence to support this, it should be given or referenced. Otherwise, it should be indicated that this is anecdotal, based on personal opinions, or other informal sources.
- The R&PD committee report from 2008 is mentioned under support; other mechanisms that help with research-related activities are missing, such as the Statistics dept. consulting service.
- The focus in the report on promoting scholarship for junior faculty (senior faculty appear conspicuously absent from this issue) appears well intentioned; however, none of the proposed action items offer any specific details about how, on a university-wide level, this support will be accomplished or enacted. The only exception to this is the action item on funding the library. The other action items all involve procedure and definition.
- More specificity would be helpful when it comes to the promotion of scholarship through course reduction, faculty budgets, etc. In particular, what steps will the university as a whole, from the higher administration down to the departments, commit to in its efforts to develop teacher-scholars. Even though the self study writers may not want to include concrete examples, the formation of the CTL after the last WASC accreditation cycle offer some hope of funds being allocated. Many of these issues were also addressed in a senate resolution authored by the R&PD committee in 1999 ([AS-527-99-R&PDC.pdf RESOLUTION ON DEVELOPMENT OF A RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE AT CAL POLY](#)).

## Specific Comments

### Sections or Pages in the Draft Document

- abstract: "surprisingly high level of engagement"; "comprehensive understanding" should be "common understanding"
- p3 pyramid: most committee members felt that the attempt at visualizing these issues was not very useful, and recommended to get rid of it
- p3 last paragraph: connection between "Digital Measures" and RPT process; the paper seems to claim that "Digital Measures" is better than the current process; if this is the case, evidence

should be given; instead of specifying a particular product, mention it as an example; clarify the distinction between "Digital Measures" and "Digital Commons"; clarify the use of "Digital Measures" for different purposes (e.g. RPT vs. accreditation)

- p4 evidence of scholarship should be "funding of scholarship" since the measure here is in dollars; while this is an important factor in collecting evidence for scholarship, it should not be implied that it is the only one
- The charts on pages p4/5 are quite interesting; a chart with funding per faculty member or per student could be more meaningful, but it may be difficult to find that information
- p9 Creativity contract: What does this mean for faculty? Use the professional development plan instead. If the term "creativity contract" is kept, explain what it means, and how it differs from the professional development plan.
- p10: Support paragraph is inaccurate and unnecessarily controversial.
- p10: "enthusiasm is the contagion" sounds strange

## Action Items

- Establish a Working Definition of the Teacher-Scholar model

This is clearly very critical. The Boyers aspects were already approved by Cal Poly about 20 years ago [Susan, AI: can you provide references?]; a more recent reference is in [AS-527-99-R&PDC.pdf](#)  
**RESOLUTION ON DEVELOPMENT OF A RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE AT CAL POLY.**

- Make the RPT Process More Clear and Consistent

The committee discussed the establishment of a university-level RPT committee, and also the extension of the role of the college-level committees to both promotion and tenure decisions. There was no clear consensus on this issues, and committee members may submit their comments individually through the feedback Web page.

- Track Scholarship More Effectively

This description is much better than the respective paragraph in the main body. Digital Measures also goes beyond RPT.

- Provide the Library with an Appropriate Level of Support

The reference to "common goods" sounds a little strange; it's unclear what is intended here. It may be simply a question of terminology (related terms are "commons" and "public goods").

- Develop a "Creativity Contract" at Cal Poly

It is unclear to most members of the committee what this contract is, and how it relates to the professional development plan. Why introduce a new concept that is meaningless or confusing for many faculty, when we already have something that covers the same issues, and is familiar to most faculty. If there is a significant difference between the two, it should be made explicit.

TO: Bruno Giberti, Faculty Director WASC Self-Study

FROM: Michael D. Miller, Dean of Library Services

SUBJECT: Library comments on draft Capacity and Preparatory Review reports and recommendations

DATE: October 28, 2009

The CPR draft reports are of great value to the Library as we reflect on our own strategic goals in the light of the university's ambitions and priorities.

We are grateful to the report authors for wrestling complex and often contested concepts into words, and for calling on the campus to find common definitions of these concepts, in particular "learn by doing" and the "teacher scholar model."

We also believe the OPI group's proposed list of peer universities is one of the most convincing and useful lists yet developed at Cal Poly. It goes a long way toward providing a valuable context for understanding Cal Poly's distinctive polytechnic identity.

The call for "institutional agility" at the beginning of the OPI draft is crucially important. To realize this agility means that our ambitions for ourselves should be the same as our ambitions for our students (OPI, Action Items): to be "whole system thinkers" skilled at integrating diverse perspectives, and to demonstrate the confidence and the wisdom to act as leaders (OPI, Action Items).

One strategy for achieving that agility and whole-system thinking is to increase institutional support for research and learning programs that transcend the College structure. Among these are the "common goods," and centers of excellence that catalyze innovation and share best practices across the Colleges.

We particularly appreciate that the reports recognize, clearly and repeatedly, the important role that is played by the co-curriculum in contributing to the integration of student learning and students' accomplishment of University Learning Objectives.

To move Cal Poly into the ranks of outstanding polytechnic universities we must expose our students to the best ideas and information available to students anywhere. Our faculty save time and are empowered by efficient access to the communications and creative work of other scholars and professionals.

They also benefit directly from wide exposure of their own work to interested collaborators and peers.

We are therefore very grateful that the TSM report explicitly acknowledges in its action items the importance of continued and expanded funding to support both DigitalCommons@CalPoly and the Library's information resource programs.