

# Access to Excellence Meeting

## CAED College-wide Discussion Notes

February 13, 2007

### Background:

The CAED has been participating along with all the other colleges at Cal Poly in discussions related to the CSU Strategic Planning process, called “Access to Excellence”. During February, each of the five departments in the CAED began holding discussions among its own faculty to generate some of the seed ideas that were used to launch the first round discussions, focused on six identified “Domains” established by a CSU working group. Faculty, students, staff, and other stakeholders were invited to take part in the six Domain discussions, which were all held on February 6. Summaries of these are found separately.

On February 13, 2007, a general discussion was held to involve a wider circle of participants, and to help focus some of the earlier domain meeting recommendations. The outline below represents notes taken in large format in front of the participants. At this stage, no attempt has been made to prioritize or merge comments.

### Participants:

Approximately 35 faculty and staff, plus 17 students were in attendance at the February 13 meeting. Additional comments were provided by four members of the Dean’s Advisory Council from a February 12 meeting and have been incorporated into this summary

### Summary of Domains Discussed:

- |           |  |
|-----------|--|
| Domain 1: | Assuring Access  |
| Domain 2: | Connecting to P-12 Schools and to Community Colleges   |
| Domain 3: | Fulfilling Commitments to Multiple Stakeholders        |
| Domain 4: | Ensuring Success in Student Learning                   |
| Domain 5: | Faculty / Staff Excellence to Promote Student Learning |
| Domain 6: | Now and in the Future: Campus / System Identity        |

## General Ideas / Issues:

### **I. PRIMARY THEMES ACROSS ALL DOMAINS**

Toward the end of the meeting, participants attempted to list the major themes of the many domain discussions. These are as follows:

1. Provide Funding Stability: Need for more funds is paramount
2. Ensure Availability / Must meet demand for high cost programs
3. Promote Celebration / Provide Support for uniqueness of programs
4. Encourage Diversity of campuses they be recognized and enhanced.
5. Consider Growth Alternatives: Consider how to replicate ourselves (CSU Cal Poly)  
Not just how we expand
  - Establish Satellite Programs/campuses in other parts of state
  - Grown similar programs at other CSU campuses

### **II. MAJOR THEMES WITHIN EACH DOMAIN**

Participants at the six Domain meetings provided brief overviews, and these became a springboard for discussions on the top areas of concern or focus:

#### **Domain 1: Assuring Access**

##### **A. Strengths of the CAED**

- Summer career session [needs to be more strategic]
- Growing interdisciplinary experiences.
- CAED breadth of disciplines is unique in nation.
- Very bright students

##### **B. Challenges to the CAED and Cal Poly**

- Diversity lags our state
- Minority group interests in higher paying fields may mean less interest in our lower paying fields
- High school counseling is not good and many of our fields are not visible or understood
- Add non-MCA model criteria & Assess “Spatial”
- High % loss of H.S. architects and LA through change of major or even drop out despite their high entering gpa and SAT-
- Retention of minority and disadvantaged students- not well analyzed or understood. /  
Need to broaden understandings among faculty of culture of disadvantaged students and their particular challenges – this relates to Domain #4

#### **Domain 2: Connecting to P-12 Schools and to Community Colleges**

- Become more visible – engage students to all our fields
- Bring more groups of H.S. students to tour campus & meet students & faculty  
[Campus must do this- not each college]

### **Domain 3: Fulfilling Commitments to Multiple Stakeholders**

- A. Citizens of CA are our stakeholders – we are not serving them well when under funded, especially for high cost programs!
- B. WE NEED MORE POLYTECHNICS
- C. Our professional stakeholders affirm the value & need for our grads. They need to be more engaged.
- D. The Cal Poly challenge – we have excellence
  - How to protect & enhance it?
  - We have a clearer sense of identity
- E. Accountability:
  - Professional stakeholders
  - Accredited by professionals

### **Domain 4: Ensuring Success in Student Learning**

- Curriculum should acknowledge different cultural/ethnic/class backgrounds
- Change of Major process needs improved & track their paths

### **Domain 5: Faculty / Staff Excellence to Promote Student Learning**

- Governance
- Mission statement? Need clearer basis for programs
- Provide better faculty infrastructure / tech support
- Track / engage alum & grads

### **Domain 6: Now and in the Future: Campus / System Identity**

- General sense that Domain 6 issues covered in the discussion in other areas and in synthesis – participants to send in any further points
- Cal Poly in particular hurt by failure of Governor and legislature to admit to the citizens of the state that full support for higher education is not really possible, and that like most other states we are needing a model for state assisted education with on-going private support- this would give industry and professionals a positive signal to get involved and help.

## **III. SPECIAL STUDENT INPUT ON THEMES OF ACCESS AND SUCCESS:**

A group of students were asked to provide some perspectives based on their own experience of applying to Cal Poly and then becoming a student at our college. The discussion was used to suggest four types of greater visibility and support that need to be provided at both the College and the University level. These are summarized as: Reach+Excite+Attract+Retain

1. Access...this requires much greater combination of the following as part of Domain 1:
  - Visibility
  - Engagement
  
2. Connect to P-12 & Community Colleges ...this requires a stronger and broader presence as is under Domain 3:
  - Work through Professional Organizations & CAED alum + faculty etc.
  
3. Student Success – as related to Domains 4 and 5, students and faculty felt we need more:
  - Clear outcomes + assessment + tracking – to have better idea about the entire path of travel and overarching expectations
  - More community support – help in creating support groups among students, and also creating a stronger department and college wide culture of community---students in larger departments relate to peers in studio classes, but do not feel part of an entire department let alone the college
  - Provide resources for experiences and equipment and faculty to develop new courses
  
4. More detailed comments about experience and curriculum at CAED level
  - Studio culture helps connect within major & year in ARCH  
Could use more interaction w/other majors and other years [vertical]
  - Inter disc. Team projects – need them earlier in the course sequences, and more of them
  - Want to learn about other built environment fields
  - Currently students have to choose between abroad studies & interdisciplinary fourth year studios. We should encourage BOTH.
  - Competitions are very positive ways to learn especially in teams (examples– B. of A. Low Income Housing Challenge, U.L. I. competition, Reno competitions, etc.) Would like more of them. Solar decathlon was a great success for all
  - Need to build awareness of studios in other majors and & alignment of studio times for maximizing opportunities
  - Earlier “ Cross-fertilization” & joint learning in general would be a plus (note- college at one time had all majors in common courses for the first two years
  - Students not always clear about their “major” when they arrive and then take mostly non-CAED courses - need earlier introduction beyond Edes 101
  - Ongoing doubts & concerns: need forums for further discussions (note- Town Hall meetings held each quarter in all departments, but participation in architecture department ahs been lower than others...need to engage more arch. Students)
    - Community College students often feel their work prior to coming to Cal Poly is not valued...may have “worked it out” but do not get into 3<sup>rd</sup> year. However, they recognize they may have not gotten same base in design as the high school students who had first year design at Cal Poly.
    - Community Colleges differ – Not all have ARCH classes. Need to help bring greater alignment between CC’s and the CAED

# Access to Excellence Meeting

## Domain 1 Notes

February 6<sup>th</sup> , 2007

### Domain 1 – Assuring Access

Meeting Notes – February 6, 2007

TOM FOWLER – FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE

1. What are the strengths of your campus and the CSU system now?
  - Location is SLO
  - Mission of CSU (teaching and learning) as opposed to the UC system
  - Tradition (parents or other relatives attended Cal Poly)
  - Reputation
  - \*Growing, interdisciplinary nature
  - Issue oriented/ regionally oriented
  - Learn by doing in an applied way
  - Dealing with relevant issues state of CA/nation/globally
  - Focus on teaching and learning
  - Opportunity for environmental learning
  - \*Great students – high gpa's and sat test scores
  - \*Great faculty – mix of professional practice/academic/research backgrounds
  - \*CAED mirrors all professions of built environment
  - Application of technology
  - Better facilities college-wide (state of the art?)
  - Location on campus - all department building together in the CAED
  - Sense of place
2. What would you like either or both to be doing better in the future?
  - Relationship between Cal Poly and SLO
  - \*Lack of diversity leads to the need to make connections with underrepresented students and the establishment of support networks for increasing diversity while maintaining high standards
  - \*Improve high school counselors understanding of the departments on campus to aid them in career counseling
  - Need to go out into the community with information and informational materials
  - Need to keep up with technology and facilities

- More multi-disciplinary offerings
- \*Evaluate applicants beyond GPA/SAT by looking at spatial abilities, creativity, etc. perhaps through some sort of portfolio review
- Devote more time to recruiting transfer students
- \*Expand MCA model
- Balance subjective and objective
- \*Flexibility in declaring major
- Allow first year students to leave major undeclared
- \*Flexibility in switching majors within the CAED
- Publicize creative work our students are doing to address design issues in exciting ways to attract P-12
- Address the compelling issues of our time

3. What changes need to occur at each level (campus and system) in order to do what each should be doing?

- Summer programs for high school students
- Graduate acceptance needs to be accelerated
- Decrease faculty/staff administrative loads which are becoming increasingly complicated
- Increase appropriate facilities – studio spaces, lecture rooms, shared university spaces, etc.
- Minimize institutional hurdles
- \*Remember educational mission
- \*Reassert role of faculty governance
- Increase flexibility for change of majors within CAED
- Decrease penalties for attrition
- Recognize professional colleges differently from other colleges
- Funding/teaching load/tracking change of major
- Faculty WTU system
- Credit for interdisciplinary classes
- Recognition for studio/lab instruction
- Recognize number of class preps
- Recognize new courses
- City needs more affordable housing and more diversity
- University can improve support for faculty – housing, child care, spouse, etc.
- Stronger engagement with professions
- More specified endowed faculty – tied to a visible project, tangible
- Alumni outreach programs/career days

4. How could technology help to achieve goals and/or improve business processes in this area?

- Funding for better websites
- Need a dedicated web master and people to put together content
- Two way video conferencing with high schools and practitioners
- Need support for technology like podcasting, blackboard, etc.
- Problem with “top down” implementation of technology
- Lack of a support infrastructure
- Increase level of personal contact with P-12 students
- Do a better job of tracking alums

# Access to Excellence Meeting

## Domain 2 Notes

February 6<sup>th</sup> , 2007

### DOMAIN #2

#### ED SALIKLIS – FACULTY REP

We discussed ideas about reaching out to P-12 students. We all agreed that outreach to a broad audience of potential Cal Poly students is an important and worthwhile goal.

We discussed several ways of capturing the imagination of young students. One means of doing this is to tie in young person's sensitivity to environmental concerns, with CAED's concern for green design and with the multi-disciplinary nature of the impact of building and landscape design.

Another means of enticing a more diverse racial, ethnic and socio-economic population may be to focus on first generation of students. This is valid because: certain majors seem to be more attractive to first generation of students. We propose to target schools as early as elementary school to let the kids know about the opportunities of the various majors offered at Cal Poly, in particular those taught at the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. A good way of doing this is to:

- Send a group of students to junior high school to share their experience and knowledge about each discipline
- Tie into professional organizations to connect with junior and high schools to share their experience and knowledge about each discipline
- Make a concerted effort to educate our students about the various disciplines
- Need to start with the clear public information of what each of disciplines is about

How to do this?

- Disseminate our message through videos, user friendly and contemporary designed web pages,
- Describe the interdisciplinary approaches of our designs
- Initiate scholarship awards through private donors (help them complete their application forms)
- Make a concerted efforts to call conditionally accepted applicants as any outreach strategy will help the success rate of hesitant applicants to commit)

We also discussed how can we better prepare incoming students such that they would have a set of skills needed to succeed at the CAED?

How to do this?

- Articulate what each course offerings are about
- develop summer (with tuition) and week-end (tuition free) programs/workshops to expose students to all disciplines at the CAED (build on the successful summer workshops architecture has conducted for the last 25 years) and share with them what is at the core of our teaching and learning objectives, it's about disseminating information)
- To have students be successful in their academic career is to have them be enthusiastic about their major
- Can each CAED department's set up additional screening processes to look more closely at applicants?

Access to higher education must be more inclusive. We suggest:

- Have various professional associations participate in the above endeavors (BEEP, AIA, ASLA, ASCE among others). Tap into what they have already done.
- Get CAED clubs involved and become sponsors of video/brochures/coloring books, and organize school visits. Materials could be the topic of a student competition/charette. Similarly, can students get course credit for any of these activities such as running a weekend camp?
- Redesign of the EDES 101 class so that first year students have some team based projects, so that they see faculty across various disciplines, so they get really excited about a career post CAED

We ended our discussion with some brainstorming:

- Can the fifth year project be more multi-disciplinary, can it use multiple advisors from various departments?
- Can we get alumni more involved in our courses, in the fifth year design process?
- Can the first year at CAED be really, truly a common year (no breakout special classes for various departments)
- Can alumni do some mentoring of our students in their professional offices?

# Access to Excellence Meeting

## Domain 3 Notes

February 6<sup>th</sup> , 2007

Domain #3: Fulfilling Commitments to Multiple Stakeholders

Attendees: \*\*Domain representative at University level

Name	Department	Phone	email
Phil Barlow	CM	6-2797	plbarlow@calpoly.edu
Al Estes	ARCE	6-1314	aces@calpoly.edu
**Jonathan Reich	ARCH	6-1351	jreich@calpoly.edu
William Siembieda	CRP	6-1315	wsiembie@calpoly.edu
Michael Lucas	ARCH	6-1790	wlucas@calpoly.edu

Issues discussed:

- CSU campuses are unique and their differences should be accommodated
- There is a general decline in the public funding of education
  - Cal Poly has demonstrated excellence
  - Cal Poly offers a number of programs that are high cost
- Should we be serving our constituencies or should we be out in front guiding them?
- Cal Poly has a number of different stakeholders from the other CSU colleges
  - Accreditation boards
  - Technological and engineering oriented industry
  - Licensure boards
- Business has to become a greater participant in the process
- Cal Poly should consider a model of becoming a corporation separate from the CSU system (similar to Univ. of Virginia)
- Polytechnics serve the entire State of California while most CSUs serve a specific region
- Cal Poly needs administrative and curricular flexibility
- CSU should be able to charge appropriately for high cost programs.
- CSU system needs more polytechnic universities – the high standards for admission indicate a demand
- California needs more math, scientists and engineers, again indicating a demand.
- There should be a model for transferring the proven excellence at Cal Poly (small classes, labs, physical models, student-faculty interaction) to the new polytechnic campuses
- CSU system needs to better advertise their resource needs and the benefits they provide to the citizens of California (perhaps a documentary that shows on PBS)
- Need a CSU marketing campaign as part of the strategic plan
- Cal Poly is appealing more to industry to meet our needs. We need more flexibility in the bureaucratic rules on gifts and external funding, especially in the areas of employees and space.

# Access to Excellence Meeting

## Domain 4 Notes

February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2007

### **Domain 4: Ensuring Success in Student Learning**

Present: Margarita Hill/LA, Robert Arens/Arch, Walt Bremer/LA, Don Choi/Arch, Adrienne Greve/CRP, Abe Lynn/ArcE, Cameron Man/LA

Facilitated by: Walt Bremer/LA

Faculty representative: Don Choi/Arch

#### **PHASE 1 – DISCUSSION AND BRAINSTORMING**

Abe Lynn started the dialog by providing the following, developed by the ArcE faculty with regard to Domain 4:

Proposition: Student success in learning is enhanced by adequate preparation prior to entering a four-year institution. Some students appear to be admitted with inadequate preparation and may thus contribute to poor retention.

Action: Clearly articulate the minimum requirements for success in academic programs. Identify ways in which students may “catch up” to meet those requirements.

Some ideas: Do not admit students who do not meet the minimum requirements. Suggest community college attendance with a guarantee of admittance to a four-year institution when minimum requirements are met. Provide support for departments to aid student success in the first years of a four-year program.

Don Choi suggested there needs to be support for under-represented groups as they enter Cal Poly. They are not as well prepared; we need to reach out and support these groups. There needs to be greater support for diversity.

Abe Lynn contributed the following:

Proposition: Well-informed faculty and students create a greater environment for success.

Action: Require all programs to have regular and required student advising.

Some ideas: Create a set of university-wide minimum requirements for department-level student advising programs that involve all full-time faculty.

Don Choi suggested that students need to have a better idea about what they're getting into as far as their choice of major is concerned. We need to provide better information about the major and the profession to prospective students; do more career counseling. Another suggestion is that we do more to facilitate transfers within the CAED, given that a lot of students come in not really sure of what they want to major in.

Cameron Man observed that students here are very California-centric; there is a remarkable similarity in their education and thinking processes. He suggested that we need to get a wider geographic diversity of students -- students from across the country.

Margarita Hill suggested we need to do a better job of tracking student success beyond their time here. One way to measure student success is their employability – where they are working and whether or not they have licensure. One measure might be the length of time it takes for them to get licensure. Also, graduate school attendance should be tracked.

Adrienne Greve suggested there should be greater access to graduates by undergraduates.

Don Choi observed that Architecture does not have a required internship program. Students in their 4<sup>th</sup> year in the Architecture curriculum seem to do either foreign study or work in an office; it is difficult for students to do both.

Abe Lynn contributed the following:

Proposition: Course access is paramount to student success.

Action: Allocate the proper resources required to provide the courses required for timely graduation.

Some ideas: Advancement campaigns need to be refocused towards augmenting the actual operational costs of running programs. The Chancellor's Office needs to make concerted efforts at informing state government of the real impact on student success of the reduced funding levels of the past five years.

Don Choi observed that we need to get adequate space. The University is not able to provide the lecture space that is needed.

He also observed that there needs to be a mechanism for identifying students with an aptitude for, say, architecture. There needs to be a way to identify a student's professional aptitudes.

Margarita Hill suggested that emphasis needs to be placed on an outcomes-based curriculum/learning and assessment.

Abe Lynn contributed the following:

Proposition. Student success in learning is enhanced through the use of high quality instructional facilities and the latest technologies. Much of the campus is in need of major maintenance and renovation.

Action: Resources should be allocated for major renovation of existing buildings and laboratories.

Some ideas: A state-funded master plan that funds backlog maintenance and repair and forecasts future renovations, an advancement initiative that names classrooms / labs after major donors, raise tuition.

Cameron Man noted that the library resources need to be upgraded. Don Choi added that our CAED librarian has indicated that our holdings are quite dated. We are going to be going through the hiring process for a CAED librarian again this year. We need someone with knowledge in all of the CAED disciplines.

Robert Arens suggested that we need to put forth and coordinate community-based / service-based learning, and facilitate and support this.

Margarita Hill suggested that we utilize the summer quarter as a way to provide students with year-round instruction. We need a *real* summer quarter.

Abe Lynn contributed the following:

Proposition: Students learn better when they interact effectively with faculty members. Such interaction is only possible when class sizes are relatively small.

Action: Maintain a commitment to small classes and resist the temptation to increase class sizes for budgetary purposes.

Some ideas: Hire more full-time faculty members, hold enrollments at a level that can be supported by current faculty, increase emphasis on privately funded endowed chairs.

Margarita Hill suggested that faculty be provided with release time to do student advising and that appropriate recognition be given to the amount of time this takes on the part of the faculty.

Abe Lynn commented that departments vary in the way that student advising is handled. ArcE has the requirement that every faculty member does advising. With this approach, certainly the quality of advising varies – the 20-second approach vs. those who really take the time with the students. Cameron Man observed that, if everyone advises, everyone has to know the curriculum. Robert Arens observed that Architecture relies so much on part-time faculty to cover classes that advising would unduly burden the smaller number of full-time faculty.

Don Choi suggested that a stronger sense of community within the department should be encouraged.

Margarita Hill suggested that the university do more to encourage creative thinking, critical thinking, and analytical thinking.

Robert Arens noted that we are failing to keep abreast of technology change. College-based fees are being used to cover faculty salaries, and there are no funds for equipment, etc.

Margarita Hill suggested that we focus on active learning / learner-centered learning. Active / learner-centered modes of teaching should be promoted.

Robert Arens noted that there are institutional stumbling blocks to interdisciplinary teaching; more needs to be done to encourage/facilitate Interdisciplinary learning/teaching. Cameron Man agreed; students need to have contact with other disciplines. Don Choi noted that a lot of faculty are willing to teach like that but there are administrative roadblocks. WTU's, space, scheduling are all barriers. Interdisciplinary courses tend to be elective courses, rather than fulfilling course requirements. Margarita Hill added that it is important to have departmental buy-in for equivalent courses in other disciplines to cover required courses in a student's major.

Robert Arens raised a question about how can we streamline our assessment process? This is a key issue for a professional program; comes up as part of continued accreditation. Cameron suggested that portfolios/projects be digitized, that this contributes to student learning and a knowledge base; students can go in and learn from the past.

## **PHASE 2 – BULLET POINT SUMMARY OF ABOVE DISCUSSION**

- Adequate preparation prior to entering Cal Poly; ensure minimum requirements met
- Support for diversity; also students beyond Cal Poly State University
- Student advising – recognize the effort involved
- Career counseling
- Facilitate CAED transfers
- Track student success – employability/licensure, graduate school
- Access to graduates by undergraduates

- Formal internship and foreign study
- Course access
- Adequate space – lab / lecture; adequate computer facilities
- Identify student professional aptitudes
- Outcomes-based (curriculum) learning and assessment; student portfolios (digital)
- Renovation of instructional facilities
- Expand library resources
- Coordinate service / project-based learning – facilitate and support
- Utilize *real* summer quarter
- Match student numbers with courses type and delivery
- Encourage departmental community
- University encouragement of creative, analytical, critical thinking – and sustainability
- Keeping abreast of technological change
- Promote active / learning-centered modes of teaching
- Encourage / facilitate (e.g., flexible loading, curriculum, space / scheduling) interdisciplinary learning / teaching

### **PHASE 3 – SYNTHESIS: PROPOSITIONS, ACTIONS AND IDEAS**

From the above discussion, some general themes emerged:

- Outcomes-Based Learning.
- Communities of learning
- Resources

Proposition: Student success is facilitated through outcomes-based learning

Actions and Ideas:

- Develop course-level outcomes and assessment, including formative assessments.
- Develop and assess program level outcomes, using systematic process and strategies.
- Implement student tracking from entry, through curriculum, and into career.
- Provide systematic academic and career advising
- University commitment to creative, critical analytical thinking; sustainable, environmental, global thought

Proposition: Student learning is enhanced through participation in communities of learning

Actions and Ideas:

- Coordinate and support service / project-based and active learning, to extend student learning beyond traditional boundaries.
- Encourage and facilitate interdisciplinary learning / teaching through flexible loading, flexible curriculum, and adequate space and creative scheduling.
- Promote involvement of / connections among peer, professional and alumni groups into communities of learning.
- Allocate resources to provide the advising and mentoring necessary for student development.

Proposition: Adequate resources are necessary for student learning

Actions and Ideas:

- Access to courses should match the number of students and fit with curriculum flow.
- Provide state-of-the-art teaching and learning environment

# Access to Excellence Meeting

## Domain 5 Notes

February 6<sup>th</sup> , 2007

### MINUTES FOR DOMAIN 5

**Attendance:** Organizer- Craig Baltimore - ARCE - cbaltimo@calpoly.edu  
Representative - Chris Yip - Arch - cyip@calpoly.edu  
Participant - Umut Toker - CRP - utoker@calpoly.edu  
Participant - Kathy Lehmkuhl - CRP - klehmkuh@calpoly.edu  
Participant - Gary Clay - Arch - gclay@calpoly.edu  
Participant - Omar Faruque - Land. Arch. - ofaruque@calpoly.edu  
Participant - Mike Boswell - CRP - mboswell@calpoly.edu  
Recorder - Tessa Pinkin - CRP - tpinkin@calpoly.edu

Chris Yip has been nominated to be the Domain 5 representatives at the following Access to Excellence meetings...

Monday, February 19, 2007 from 1:00 to 2:00 p.m.  
Thursday, February 22, 2007 from 11:00 to 12:00 a.m.

### Summary of Group Discussion:

**Proposition**- How do we define student success? We need a better determinant of student success.

**Action** - Provide a clear definition of student success and determine what contribution faculty should be providing in order to foster that success. Get away from faculty quality being judged solely on inadequate student surveys.

**Ideas**- Look at the recent surveys to determine what could be changed or updated. Create a tracking system for students, possibly one year and five years after graduation. Look at what the faculty should be providing in order to assist in student success and also how students themselves contribute to their own success.

---

**Proposition** - Valuing faculty and staff has a direct correlation to the amount of financial return they are receiving.

**Action**- Low wages need to be reexamined and compared to other universities pay schedules to determine what type of financial increases could be implemented. A top rank university should have top rank salary, not bottom ranked salaries

**Ideas**- Incorporate an immediate salary increase for all existing staff and faculty. Salary increases based on being top rank in peer salary group.

**Proposition-** Provide more grant support in order increase the quality of faculty and the courses offered. The demands of grant development are too high for current resources.

**Action-** Money is being lost in the administrative process and the benefits of the administrative functions need to be examined and restructured.

**Idea-** Allow the grant fund overhead charges to come directly to the department, or a significant portion. Invest more into development of scholarly endeavors which includes support scholarship of teaching.

---

**Proposition-** Open up the communication barriers that have been put up between staff, students, and faculty.

**Action-** Provide an environment for interaction of staff and faculty, which will foster input to central administrators, however central admin. needs to articulate goals.

**Idea-** The solution seems economic driven such as providing a quality lounge environment for faculty and staff to get together on their free time. Create more panels and forums for discussion topics will simply be another task to do.

---

**Proposition-** University administration and faculty teaching restrictions are too ridged. We need more flexibility for teaching. The administrative processes need to be reexamined.

**Action-** Drop the structure of interlocking rules. Allow some movement in the ridged university policies.

**Ideas-** Create department sovereignty. The performance and process driven university idea needs to be more flexible and to allow for more teaching freedom.

---

**Proposition-** Staff and faculty loads need to be Capped! Currently more and more "stuff" is coming down to the departments that was done by administration in the past. There is an overload that has been created by adding more components to the engine with expectations of high performance still being pushed.

**Action-** When administration mandates additional responsibilities to an existing position, additional hours (personnel), dollars, and equipment shall accompany the mandate.

**Idea-** Allow staff to use flex time to accomplish tasks. It shall be recognized that teaching eleven units is okay.

The following ideas were passed out, but not discussed.

**Proposition:** Faculty excellence in the CSU environment is enhanced by some faculty member research. Research should not come at the expense of quality teaching (CSU charter is not in research), but faculty members who are doing research are staying current in their field, are bringing the most recent innovations into the classroom, and are being role models for life-long learning. There is currently little financial incentive for a department to support faculty research. Other faculty members have to cover the teaching load and the department receives no compensation.

**Action:** Provide some incentives for departments to embrace research

**Some ideas:** Provide a portion of the University overhead directly to the sponsoring department.

---

**Proposition:** The primary focus of a Polytechnic University should be on application and integration of knowledge into education and society, not traditional research. The charter of the system shall be followed.

**Action:** While traditional research activities should not be excluded from Cal Poly, we should emphasize our strengths. Cal Poly should focus on the application and integration of knowledge, rather than competing with the UC system for NSF grant funding.

**Ideas:** Focus on applied research, teaching related research, and research with a direct application that partners with industry.

---

**Proposition:** The presence of a masters program does not ensure research opportunities. The university should revise the current labor model to enable and encourage discovery.

**Action:** If the university would like individuals to teach and research, the university needs to adopt another labor model. Consider a  $\frac{1}{4}$  to  $\frac{1}{3}$  teaching load and the remaining time allocated for service and discovery or research.

**Idea:** Provide adequate funding to hire additional faculty

---

**Proposition:** The presence of a masters program does not guarantee research opportunities. The university should create opportunities to foster research.

**Action:** If the university would like individuals to conduct research, the university needs to provide adequate, functional, and operational equipment and adequate technical support staff to operate and maintain the facilities

**Idea:** Provide adequate funding to maintain, operate, and purchase appropriate testing equipment and technicians

---

**Proposition:** The primary focus of the CSU system IS on teaching.

**Action:** Focus efforts of administration and faculty on effective teaching.

**Ideas:** Modify the RPT process from the current SCHOLAR / teacher model to the TEACHER / scholar model, enhance / require teacher training programs, initiate teaching credential process for CSU faculty.

---

**Proposition:** A high quality, dedicated faculty/staff is necessary for students to be successful. In a competitive environment where people have other opportunities, a university must offer competitive salaries to attract and retain quality people

**Action:** Increase current salaries to a level commensurate with other universities in a similar cost of living location.

**Some ideas:** Use the ASCE/Oklahoma State salary guidelines with a location factor in determining faculty salaries, correlate salaries with disciplinary expertise to account for equivalent opportunity costs in the marketplace, raise tuition, and provide no-interest loans for housing that are forgivable after a certain number of years of service.

# Access to Excellence Meeting

## Domain 6 Notes

### Domain 6 Discussions

#### **Now and in the Future: Campus Identity**

##### Participants

Vicente del Rio, CRP  
Zeljka Howard, CRP  
Tom Jones, Dean  
Karen Lange, Arch  
Mike Montoya, CM  
James Mwangi, ARCE  
Cornelius Nuworsoo, CRP

Delegate to University Level Domain 6 meeting: **Cornelius Nuworsoo**

##### Summary of Discussions:

#### **PROPOSITION 1:**

Science and technical programs and polytechnic education are critical to the success of the leadership of California in a complex global world, but these are typically more expensive to operate than traditional undergraduate programs.

**Action:** Modify state education funding models to adequately fund and encourage growth of technical and professional education programs. Recognize the additional costs of starting, expanding, and sustaining graduate programs.

**Ideas:** Cal Poly administration should advocate for additional funding for higher cost technology driven programs and professional graduate programs at the CSU level. CSU Trustees should request more funding from the State. Combine efforts with departments and colleges at other colleges so as to fund and expand successful technical and professional programs at all CSU campuses. State funding should recognize that learn-by-doing and lab classes need lower student/faculty ratios and will consequently be more expensive than traditional lecture classes.

#### **PROPOSITION 2:**

The unique character of individual CSU campuses has evolved and distinguished many of the campuses as a whole, or distinguished particular programs at campuses. At the same time, the consideration of all campuses as one entity by the State and the bargaining units result in negative impacts at campuses with distinguishing characteristics and programs (e.g. different challenges regarding cost of local cost of living, impacted programs, faculty retention, working conditions, and comparable private sector salaries).

**Action:** Recognize and support the individual campus distinguishing characteristics and programs in resourced allocations and policy considerations.

**Ideas:** The polytechnic campuses were created to serve a larger area than the commuter regions of the other CSU campuses. Work to support the unique identity and programs of polytechnic lab-based education. Work towards competitive working conditions and salaries to faculty.

### **PROPOSITION 3:**

Distance learning provides a means for reaching students at off-campus locations. The University and college should engage in more distant learning courses that increase access, heighten visibility, and aid in the formation of partnerships with industry and other institutions.

**Action:** Explore and fund teaching initiatives that support communication and partnerships with other entities off campus while still promoting student interaction.

**Ideas:** Solicit and support additional ideas about distant learning and fund those which are consistent with the mission of the college and University. Fund upgrades to equipment and technology to enhance engagement in a wide spectrum of communities. Support faculty innovation in developing new programs.

### **PROPOSITION 4:**

Technical programs such as those in the CAED and engineering require currency in digital tools and technologies. Library resources (state-of-the-art collections, subscriptions, personnel, data systems, web-access, etc.) are fundamental to maintain the quality of education in technical programs.

**Action:** Provide sufficient funding for libraries, and particularly for technical support and training for faculty and staff to maintain currency in literature, information, and technology. Broaden access for students to digital tools.

### **PROPOSITION 5:**

Our students will need to be in civic and professional leadership in addressing sustainability challenges. Polytechnic universities and their professional programs in particular can make substantial contributions to filling the need for students equipped to address global resource and urban development challenges.

**Action:** Support and expand the work of our faculty and students who are engaged in community based projects, senior projects, undergraduate and graduate research, and faculty research that are addressing sustainability challenges. Define the mission of the CSU as a whole and the polytechnic campuses in particular as a knowledge and information resource and generator of applicable solutions.