

Adopted: May 5, 1992

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California**

**AS-387-92/LRPC
RESOLUTION ON
REVIEW OF PROPOSAL FOR GRADUATE STUDIES AT CAL POLY**

RESOLVED: That the attached Review of Proposal for Graduate Studies at Cal Poly be accepted.

Proposed By: The
Academic Senate Long-
Range Planning Committee
Date: March 31, 1992
Revised: April 16, 1992

REVISED DRAFT

Long-Range Planning Committee
February 28, 1992

REVIEW OF PROPOSAL FOR GRADUATE STUDIES AT CAL POLY

The Long-Range Planning Committee (LRPC) reviewed the October 3, 1991 proposal initiated by the Graduate Studies Committee for Graduate Studies at Cal Poly. In making this review, they also referred to the 1989 Report of the Advisory Committee to Study Graduate Education in the CSU (Graduate Education in the California State University: Implementation Plan for Meeting Public Needs Consistent with Educational Priorities and the Recommendations on Graduate Education) approved by the Trustees at the September 11, 1991 meeting.

In general, the LRPC agreed with the Cal Poly proposal. Since Cal Poly is committed to a graduate program limited to 10 to ~~15~~ 20 percent of each graduating class, that program should be a quality program. Many of the current graduate programs need to be upgraded in order to satisfy the definition of quality stated in the Trustees' Implementation Plan. Current programs need to be reviewed critically to determine their quality and the requirements for improving them. The proposal from the Graduate Studies Committee has many good recommendations for doing this.

An extremely important point is that any change in the graduate programs at Cal Poly should not erode the funding support base for undergraduate studies, which remain the primary mission of the institution. Many items in the proposal, such as the statement on page five, "Graduate programs shall be allocated the resources necessary for their development and maintenance," are so general and may be interpreted in so many ways that resources could be pulled from undergraduate education and redirected to graduate programs. It seems unlikely that additional state funding will be available to the campus to augment funding for graduate programs. The LRPC recommends that additional funding for graduate studies at Cal Poly be sought from sources outside the general fund. This includes aggressive pursuit of funding for graduate fellowships. Both graduate and undergraduate programs require adequate funding and neither should suffer at the expense of the other.

The recommendation on page six, "that the key university-wide services supportive of graduate studies be focused in a single office in the line administration" was another area of concern to the LRPC. While all agree there should be a central office to contact for general information, this does not mean that ALL graduate studies support functions are best, conducted in a single office. The functions of admissions and record keeping are perhaps best handled by the centralized processing that now occurs. This allows the university to have specialists in the areas to keep abreast of campus, system-wide, state, and federal regulations regarding procedures, student records, and student rights. A separate graduate application form was recommended by the 1989 Advisory Committee report. This seems like a good idea. It might be possible to more clearly define graduate program roles for certain individuals within the current service offices. The single point of contact could be achieved within the current graduate studies structure since the information necessary is available in the SIS Plus system; however, the point of contact

should be highly visible and located in an area of normal student traffic. Graduate coordinators in each degree program need to work closely with department faculty to insure that master's candidates have been accepted by a faculty committee/advisor before enrolling in graduate courses.

The graduate programs at Cal Poly should adhere to most of the standards in the Trustees-approved Implementation Plan; however, there were some distinct areas of concern in this regard. Recommendation 1.a.3 calls for a core curriculum where appropriate. The appropriateness should be determined by the faculty involved with the program at the local campus level. Recommendations 2 and 5 should not detract from nor erode the funding base for undergraduate instruction. Dollars earmarked for graduate studies should be in addition to undergraduate support, not merely dollars shifted from undergraduate support to graduate support. These dollars should be real added dollars in the budget. Similarly, funds generated by graduate programs should NOT be allocated to undergraduate instruction (proposal, page 4), but rather used to maintain or improve graduate program quality. Recommendation 3 would require 70 percent of the course work in a program to be at the graduate level. This is a standard which is above what has been the national standard for graduate programs in the U.S. In addition, this would impose a hardship on low-enrollment graduate programs by increasing the need for graduate level courses, many of which would have less than break-even enrollment. The LRPC questions the system-wide implementation of this standard.

The concerns discussed here should be addressed by the Graduate Studies Committee before seeking final approval of the graduate studies proposal.

State of California
Memorandum

To: Charles T. Andrews, Chair
Academic Senate

Date: May 27, 1992

From: Warren J. Baker
President

File No.:

Copies: R. Koob
R. Lucas

Subject: Academic Senate Resolution on Review of Proposal for Graduate Studies
(AS-387-92/LRPC)

This will acknowledge your memo of May 12 with which you transmitted the subject resolution adopted by the Academic Senate on May 5. It is my understanding that the review was conducted at the request of the Graduate Studies Committee. Based upon the recommendation of Vice President Koob, I am pleased to approve the resolution and am forwarding the review by the Long Range Planning Committee to Vice President Koob and the Graduate Studies Committee for their consideration.