I. Minutes: Approval of Academic Senate minutes for meetings of January 22, February 12, and February 19, 2002 (pp. 2-8).

II. Communications and Announcements:

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office: [March 5] President Baker will be in attendance to discuss statewide issues and answer questions.
C. Provost’s Office:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. ASI Representatives:
G. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Name Change for Extended Studies: Parks, Dean for Extended Studies, second reading (pp. 9-16).
B. Resolution on Academic Integrity, Program Accountability, and 180 Units for Degree: Hannings, chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading (pp. 17-18).
C. Resolution on Process for Change of Major: Breitenbach, chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading (pp. 19-24).
D. Resolution on Proposed New Degree Program for Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership: Hannings, Chair of the Curriculum Committee/Konopak, Dean for UCTE, first reading (pp. 25-38). [The complete proposal is available in the Academic Senate office.]
E. Resolution on Name Change for Environmental Horticultural Science and Crop Science Departments: Doub, Chair of EHS and Crop Science Departments, first reading (pp. 39-45).
F. Resolution to Change the Bylaws of the Academic Senate Section III.B.8.(b), Executive Committee, first reading (p. 46).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
Preparatory: the meeting was opened at 3:10 PM

I. Minutes: The minutes for the Academic Senate meetings of October 30 and November 20, 2001 were approved without change.

II. Communications and Announcements: John Maxwell from Chemistry & Biochemistry was introduced as a new senator for the College of Science and Math and Barbara Franz from Modern Languages as the part-time lecturer representative.

President's Responses to Academic Senate Resolutions: includes responses from President Baker approving many resolutions that were submitted during the past year, including the resolutions on commencement and RTP. RTP is an action item, which is to be taken up by departments and colleges.

III. Reports:
   A. Chair: (Menon) President Baker was in attendance to brief us on the budget situation, which seems to be much better than we had anticipated. Curriculum Committee is working on the 180-units issues and will be coming to us with a recommendation. Budget and Long Range Planning Committee worked hard last quarter to formulate priorities and guidelines, which have already been accepted and received favorably by various levels of administration.
   B. President's Report: (Baker) The budget was a surprise, considering that we were expecting reductions in the budget for the 2002-2003 academic year, due to the shortfall in revenues expected at $12.5 billion. Instead of a reduction the budget was increased by $117 million and provides full funding for enrollment and 1% provision for compensation increases and also takes into account some health benefits premiums. Specifically for Cal Poly it means that we will have full funding for enrollment which will be about 200 less students for next year. Fee increases are independent from the budget since we do not have an allocation of funds that is adequate to meet the needs of the curriculum and the reason for that is that we have an unusually high percentage of high cost programs. We are over enrolled partly because we were under enrolled for two years in a row. Essentially we have said that it needs to be a three-way partnership if we are going to solve the problem of under funding. Our support comes from private funding, student fees, and additional funding from the legislature. The private funding is substantial but it does not come uniformly distributed across campus. Funds raised for the 2001 calendar year were $58 million, which is an all time record in the CSU system. The only students fees that are tolerable politically in Sacramento are those that students support themselves in referendum.
   C. Provost: None.
   D. Statewide Senator: None.
   E. CFA Report: (Fetzer) we have been in search of a fact finder. There is a general meeting tomorrow at 5pm at the Pavilion where all faculty are invited to attend and discuss responses to our current contract negotiations. (Foroohar) Finally, CFA has found a fact finder that is agreeable to both parties and hopes to start the one-month process soon.
   F. ASI Report: (Kipe) I'm glad to see that the commencement issue has come to a close and she will prepare a report for the Board of Directors so they can prepare a resolution and start
publicizing it to students. (Hunt) Last Wednesday the Board of Directors passed a resolution in response to the September 11 attacks and in support of tolerance for students of all religious backgrounds, ethnic backgrounds, etc, and also have a meeting with student leaders and Trustee Goldwhite immediately following this meeting.

G. Other Reports: CSU Trustee Harold Goldwhite
(Please logon to the Academic Senate site at "www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen" for full transcript.)

Introduction - Trustee Tsakopoulos could not be here today but I will try to get him here before the end of the academic year. I am a Professor of Chemistry at Cal State Los Angeles in my 40th year of services and have worked my way thru various level of faculty governance, was chair of campus senate, chair of statewide Academic Senate, and have been on the Board of Trustees for about three years. The most productive thing I can do is to listen.

Budget - President Baker presented a review of the current budget situation. Until the May revision of the Governor's budget, we will not really know where we are but in general, in the past the budget that the CSU has received has been extraordinarily close to the Governor's budget. The Board of Trustees will have, in addition to its regular meetings, a retreat in early March. This is a very interesting meeting because is relatively unstructured, there is a broad agenda and the Board for once gets to talk at a policy level about things that are important to the CSU.

Discussion with Senators

There is a constituency in Sacramento, lead by John Burton, which is philosophically opposed to high fees in California public higher education. They believe that public support of higher education is at a level where we do not need to increase student fees. The Board of Trustees has gone on record with its public policy and it says that the CSU should work towards a situation where the students bear 1/3 of the cost of education and the state pays 2/3.

The Chancellor and Board members have said publicly that there will not be an imposition. The CSU maintains that management has never imposed on the CFA or anyone. Essentially 100% of the money that comes to the CSU is spent on instruction. The problem is that as instruction becomes more complex, much of it takes place outside the confines of classroom-student interaction. There is an allegation that administration has grown out of control. President Baker gave a very interesting comment at a recent meeting of the Board of Trustees in which he suggested that the increase in administration on this campus has been almost exclusively in the area of development.

The process of the evaluation of the Chancellor, included a call for letters to be submitted to the chair of the Board. The process of analysis was as follows: all the letters were read directly by the chair and vice chair of the Board, then sent to an agency completely outside and independent of the CSU, which made them anonymous. There are quite a lot of letters in positive support of the Chancellor and not all from administrators. The data was presented to the Board of Trustees with a review by the chair of the Board. The Board then voted on a single question, which was whether we support the continuance of Charles Reed as Chancellor of the California State University. The Board voted unanimously in favor of that motion. The one area in which I am quite uneasy about my conduct and the conduct of the rest of the board is that we gave full control to the Chair and Vice Chair to write the letter that was to be released to the CSU community summarizing the actions of the Board. There were many questions raised of the Chancellor in the interactions with him and points made about future behaviors and target conducts and things to do. Those points, in turn, were reduced to a very short list of rather oblique comments in the letter that everyone saw. In my interaction with Chancellor Reed, most of the time I have heard nothing but supportive comments about both the quality and conduct of the faculty in this institution. Much of what we hear on those occasions when Charles Reed has been negative of the faculty is the result of his interpretation of bargaining and other interactions with the bargaining agent.
It was requested by Harvey Greenwald that the Board of Trustees evaluate how it looks at things of value such as thru-put and find a way to reward campuses and secondly that Trustees consider a balance between resources and enrollment. The Board of Trustees adopted a set of accountability measures and part of it was thru-put but at the request of the campuses. The Board of Trustees was not supposed to compare campuses or distribute resources based on any accountability measures. If students were to vote a fee increase by referendum and within current CSU policy, it is acceptable. Our fees are still so low, that we do not have the advantage of tapping into a number of federal programs that are fee support programs.

Goldwhite – Let me clarify that the majority of the comments about the Chancellor were not negative. However, the majority of comments from the faculty were negative. Many supportive comments came from administration and some faculty. The Board is committed as a group, to pay for performance and looking at their background, many of them come from private industry. I think that the majority of the Board of Trustee is supportive of some component of the compensation structure for all CSU employees being given for performance.

Recruitment and retention is significantly difficult for the CSU. Compensation and workload are very negative points that new and incoming faculty look at when they look at the CSU. I feel that the service step increases would cost the CSU very little and would be an enormous improvement for our beginning faculty. I have discussed this with the chair of the Board who felt that the cost was too much.

IV. Consent Agenda: None.

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Budget Principles and Strategies: Greenwald, Budget and Long Range Planning Interim Chair, first reading. This resolution provides the administration with a list of guidelines and recommendation should budget cuts take place and asks that faculty members be involved in making those decisions. M/S/P to move to a second reading.

VI. Discussion Items: None.

VII. Meeting adjourned 5:00PM

Submitted by:

Gladys Gregory,
Academic Senate
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE
805.756.1258

MINUTES OF
The Academic Senate
Tuesday, February 12, 2002
UU220, 3:00 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: none.

II. Communications and Announcements:

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: (Menon) Senator Harris’ request for the formation of a
      Conference Center and Faculty Club has been assigned to an Ad Hoc committee.
      The issue of adequacy of child care services available to staff and faculty has been
      forwarded to President Baker requesting the formation of a task force to address this
      issue. Vice Chancellor Dave Spence will be here on Thursday, February 14, at
      which time an informal session has been set up during University Hour in UU220
      for all faculty and PCS members. Please let Gladys Gregory in the Senate Office
      know if you will be attending.
   B. President's Office: None.
   C. Provost's Office: None.
   D. Statewide Senators: None.
   E. CFA Campus President: None.
   F. ASI Representatives: None.
   G. Other: Jacquelyn Kegley, Chair of the CSU Academic Senate on Shared
      Governance. Please logon to the Academic Senate web site at
      www.calpoly.edu/~acadscn (click on News and Documents) for PowerPoint
      presentation.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
   A. Resolution on Budget Principles and Strategies: Greenwald, for Budget & Long
      Range Planning Committee, second reading. This resolution provides the
      Administration with a list of guidelines and recommendations should budget cuts take
      place and asks that faculty members be involved in making those decisions. Senator
      DeTurris presented an amendment to the resolution in which she retains the positive
      points of the original resolution and side steps the negative points.
         • Hood offered the following friendly amendment to DeTurris resolution
            The University budgetary process should be open and University budgetary
            decisions should include participation and input from all constituencies.
Epstein offered the following friendly amendment to DeTurris resolution
The University budgetary process should be open and timely and University
budgetary decisions should include participation and input from all
constituencies, faculty, students, and staff.

Zingg offered the following friendly amendment to DeTurris resolution
The University budgetary process should be open and timely and University
budgetary decisions should include participation and input from all
constituencies.

M/S/P to adopt amended resolution.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:

Submitted by:

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE
805.756.1258

MINUTES OF
Academic Senate
Tuesday, February 19, 2002
UU220, 3:00 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: None.

II. Communications and Announcements: None.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: (Menon) many of us had a very productive visit with Vice Chancellor Dave Spence last week and he assured us that he will take back our comments and suggestions to Chancellor Reed.
B. President's Office: None.
C. Provost's Office: None.
D. Statewide Senators: None.
E. CFA Campus President: (Foroohar) the contract is in the last series of fact finding negotiations in Sacramento but got nowhere last week. Statistics were presented by the CSU that indicates that faculty workload is lower than the national average and that faculty is overpaid by 1% over CPEC.
F. ASI Representatives: None.
G. Other: Luanne Fose, Instructional Designer for ITS: presentation on "My Blackboard": Due to technical difficulties a live presentation was not available but instructions and a link to Blackboard are posted on the Academic Senate's web page www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen under Other Links. Blackboard allows Academic Senate members to continue discussions after the Senate meetings. Beginning spring quarter, all courses will have a core shell generated automatically but faculty will have the option of turning it off. Another option available is that students can be automatically enrolled in Blackboard. Blackboard has its own separate server. Faculty file space quotas have not been set at this time but is being requested that faculty encourage students to use the digital drop box for digital assignments in order to save space. Instructions for new changes will be send out to all faculty a couple of weeks before spring quarter.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
E. Resolution on Process for Change of Major: Breitenbach, chair of the Instruction Committee, first reading. This resolution offers a uniform process for students to change major. M/S/P to move to a second reading.
B. **Resolution on Distance Education Policy**: Hannings, chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading. This resolution proposes the adoption of “Distance Education Policy at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo” as the official policy for the newly accepted form of teaching.

A motion to delete the word “ideally” and to change the word should with must under contracting on page 5 of “Distance Education Policy”, presented by Foroohar failed. M/S/P to approve the following friendly amendment by Foroohar

**Intellectual Property Rights**. . .policies, and collective bargaining agreement. M/S/P to adopt the resolution.

C. **Curriculum Proposal for BS in Software Engineering**: Hannings, chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading. This resolution creates a new degree, which focuses more on engineering instead of computer science. This resolution addresses the issues of enrollment, library resources, and total number of units.

M/S/P to move to a second reading.

M/S/P to adopt the resolution.

D. **Resolution on Academic Integrity, Program Accountability, and 180 Units for Degree**: Hannings, chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading. This resolution requests that each program conduct a self-review of their curriculum and provide justification for a baccalaureate requiring more than 180 units. M/S/P to move to a second reading.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory

Academic Senate
WHEREAS, Extended Studies has requested its name be changed to the College of Continuing Studies to better reflect the program currently being offered; and

WHEREAS, The request for this name change has been approved by the Provost and Academic Deans Council; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the name of Extended Studies be changed to the College of Continuing Studies.

Proposed by: Extended Studies
Date: October 8, 2001
State of California  
Memorandum  

To:       Unny Menon, Chair  
         Academic Senate  

From:    Paul J. Zingg  
         Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  

Date:     October 8, 2001  

Copies:   Dennis Parks  

Subject: Name Change Request—Extended Studies  

Enclosed is a request from Dr. Dennis Parks, Dean of Extended Studies, to change the name of Extended Studies to the College of Continuing Studies.

I would appreciate it if the Academic Senate would review this request as soon as possible as there are a number of pending matters in Extended Studies awaiting this review. This name change request was favorably reviewed by the Academic Deans’ Council at its September 24 meeting.

Thank you, and should you have any questions regarding this issue, please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Parks directly.

Enclosures
Extended Studies is:
> A continuing education, lifelong learning, outreach, and public service unit of Cal Poly
> Primarily an academic credit unit; an average of 70% of all revenue (excluding conferences) is generated by courses and programs awarding academic credit
> A composite of programming functions implementing a strategic plan to extend Cal Poly's academic resources to the region and the state
> A place for innovation, discovery, and exploration
> An access point to Cal Poly for those normally excluded

Mission Statement – The mission of Extended Studies is to provide the highest quality educational activities and opportunities for the citizens of California, the nation, and the world. Extended Studies accomplishes this mission by expanding the intellectual resources of Cal Poly, furthering the University's outreach and public service mission, and providing lifelong learning opportunities to a variety of identified constituencies.

Vision Statement – By 2005, Extended Studies will be a comprehensive, multidisciplinary academic unit capable of meeting the lifelong learning needs of a global community through credit and non-credit programs offered through traditional and eLearning methodologies.

Extended Studies function is to:
> Develop academic programs in support of Cal Poly's mission
> Develop academic programs and services for traditional and non-traditional age students
> Provide lifelong learning opportunities to businesses, corporations, K-12 education, community organizations, and other constituencies
> Design, plan, and implement conferences, seminars, workshops for internal and external organizations
> Support program development efforts arising from Cal Poly's academic units
> Serve as a multidisciplinary unit where departments and units from all colleges can collaborate, share ideas, and develop new programs for traditional and non-traditional students

Extended Studies serves:
> About 10,000 people each year: 4,000 in courses and 6,000 through conferences
> Faculty, staff, and regularly matriculated students at Cal Poly
> The business, corporate, agricultural, governmental, and industrial sector
> K-12 educators
> Cal Poly alumni and friends
> Citizens of the Central Coast

In the future, Extended Studies will become a stronger academic unit as:
> Academic programs like Jump-Start, and summer quarter enhancements are coordinated through Extended Studies
> More people enroll through Open University
> New programs that serve a blended population (traditional age and non-traditional age students) are developed and support on-campus programs and activities.

> The University takes advantage of the CSU special session option to offer degrees and other programs.

> Academically sound non-credit programs for teachers, executives, and others seek approval to be offered as credit courses/programs (especially with the elimination of professional development credit).

Continuing Education Units at other CSU's:
> CSUSB - College of Extended Learning
> CSPU - College of the Extended University
> SDSU - College of Extended Studies
> CSUN - College of Extended Learning
> CSULB - University College and Extension Services
> SSU - School of Extended Education

Why Change the Name Now?
> Phase one of the reorganization is complete – Extended Education is now merged into Extended Studies.
> The time is right - Extended Studies is currently in a transitional stage as it seeks new ways to fulfill its mission and vision.
> The term "extended" is not widely recognized outside of higher education in general and in California specifically.
> The name Extended Studies is often confused with an Agricultural Extension Unit.
> Within Cal Poly, people still use various names to refer to the University's continuing education operation including Open University, EUPS, Extended Education.
> A strong and identifiable continuing education operation will help Cal Poly fulfill its state-wide mission and move to the next tier of national recognition.
> To enhance fundraising activities in support of college specific and university wide needs.

It was therefore recommended that Extended Studies change its name to:

The College of Continuing Studies
Q – Who is served by Extended Studies?
A - Extended Studies serves a variety of groups from traditional age students to working adults returning to campus for professional or personal development opportunities. A significant part of Extended Studies mission is to provide educational opportunities for individuals living in the greater San Luis Obispo area. Each year Extended Studies serves approximately 4,000 students in regular courses and 6,000 students through Conference Services.

Q – Why is Extended Studies seeking a name change?
A – Over the years, continuing education at Cal Poly has gone through many transitions. In 1994, Extended Education and Conference Services were pulled together to form a unit called Extended University Programs and Services. In late 1998, the unit’s name was changed to Extended Studies. During most of its existence, continuing education at Cal Poly has remained a small, almost cloistered operation. The full potential of a dynamic and robust continuing education program striving to help the institution fulfill its mission has never been realized. Today, as never before, education is a life-long pursuit. It is well documented that individuals must continuously renew and update the knowledge and skills learned when they were undergraduates. Changing the name to the "College of Continuing Studies" affirms Cal Poly's recognition that providing educational opportunities for alumni, the larger community of San Luis Obispo and the central coast, and the state is an important function of a nationally ranked institution of higher education.

Q – Why "College of Continuing Studies" and not "College of Extended Studies"?
A – The term continuing has long been associated with adult and life-long learning. While many names were suggested including "University College", "Centennial College", and "College of Life-long Learning", the name Continuing Studies best describes what the unit does. It provides individuals the opportunity to continue their learning. Also, the term extended when related to life-long learning activities does not have the same recognition as continuing and is often confused with agricultural extension units.
Q – Will changing the name to the College of Continuing Studies give it degree-granting rights?
A – No. If in the future the College of Continuing Studies desired to offer a degree program, it would have to be approved by all appropriate Cal Poly and external units and agencies.

Q- Won’t establishing a College of Continuing Studies dilute the mission of Cal Poly?
A – Many nationally ranked universities known for their strong undergraduate programs have extensive continuing education. Examples include: Harvard, Indiana University, University of Michigan – Ann Arbor, ULCA, UC Berkley, University of Virginia, MIT, and many others. Continuing education operations add to the institution by providing additional revenues for hiring faculty and faculty development, research and teaching opportunities, corporate and business partnership development, and community service. Cal Poly will always be a primarily undergraduate institution and the College of Continuing Studies will help fulfill this mission.

Q – What kinds of programs are offered by Extended Studies?
A – Extended Studies offers a wide and growing portfolio of programs. Most programs are designed for the older, working adult student. They range from individual courses on a specific subject to certificate programs. Programs are offered on both a credit and noncredit basis. Extended Studies publishes a quarterly catalog of its programs. In addition, programs are listed on its web site at www.extendedstudies.calpoly.edu

Q – Have other CSU campuses changed the names of their continuing education units?
A – CSU campuses that have already changed the name of their continuing education units to colleges or schools are:

- California State Polytechnic University, Pomona - College of the Extended University
- CSU, San Bernardino - College of Extended Learning
- San Diego State University - College of Extended Studies
- CSU, Northridge - College of Extended Learning
- San Francisco State University – College of Extended Learning
- CSU, Long Beach - University College and Extension Services
- Sonoma State University - School of Extended Education (SSU uses “school” for all its academic units)

Q – What will happen if the name is not changed?
A - Extended Studies seeks this name change because we believe it will significantly assist us in the development of new programs, in the building of partnerships with external client groups, and in advancement efforts. The term “college” is widely recognized as a unit within a university and therefore
individuals and organizations can more easily identify with a “College of Continuing Studies”. In addition, it will signify the new mission and vision of continuing education at Cal Poly.

Q – Who approves courses offered by Extended Studies?
A - Courses and programs offered fall into two categories: credit and noncredit. A proposal for a new course or program carrying regular or special session academic credit must be approved in the same way as a new course or program being proposed by any other unit. In the case of Extended Studies this includes the individual faculty member, the department, the college, the curriculum committee of the academic senate, the academic senate, the Office of the Provost, and the Office of the Dean, Extended Studies. Approved courses that are listed in the University catalog need only to be proposed by the individual faculty member and be approved by the academic department in order to be repeated. A course may be offered for a limited time as “X” course, but must be approved in the same manner as any other “X” course. Noncredit courses need approval by the Office of the Dean, Extended Studies. These policies and procedures are outlined in the Campus Administrative Policies document.

Q – Does Extended Studies currently offer any off-campus degree programs?
A – No.

Q -What is the Special Session Option?
A - This option is authorized by Title 5 and Executive Order 466. It permits the CSU campuses to offer series of courses or entire degree programs on a self-support basis. Special session programs must fit into one of these categories: 1) off-campus, 2) too expensive to operate with state dollars, 3) designed for a special or unique client group, or 4) be one for which state dollars are not appropriate or available, i.e., an out-of-state program or an impacted program. Special session students are considered regular university students and earn regular degrees. Special session degree programs must be approved in the same manner as any other degree program. Faculties teaching a special session program are compensated on an overload basis at the established CSU special session faculty compensation rate. At this time, Cal Poly does not offer any degree programs utilizing the special session option.

Q – Can a student who has been academically disqualified from Cal Poly continue to take classes through Extended Studies?
A – The same policies apply to students taking courses through Extended Studies as any other unit. If a student who has been academically disqualified attempts to register for courses through Open University, the student can do so only with the approval of the dean of the college where the student was enrolled. Extended Studies does not have the authority to enroll an academically disqualified student.
Q – How is Extended Studies funded?
A – Only about 2.8% ($77,000) of Extended Studies expenditure budget comes from state resources. This amount is in recognition of the work that Extended Studies does in support of state and university related activities. Extended Studies program revenues are assessed at the rate of approximately 12%. For 2001-2002, it is estimated that Extended Studies will return to the University approximately $62,000 from this assessment. Extended Studies will contribute directly to the individual colleges about $140,000 from Open University enrollments for the same budget period. Approximate annual distributions to colleges and/or departments that sponsor conferences and workshops is $130,000. In addition, about $555,000 is channeled annually through various university departments for services utilized by the Conference Services unit of Extended Studies.

Q – What is Open University?
A - Open University is a CSU program designed to allow non-matriculated students to enroll in regularly scheduled courses. It is offered as a community service on a space available basis only after matriculated students have been served. However, at Cal Poly, Open University is also used by matriculated students who desire to register for only one course because the University does not offer a per unit fee option to regular students. Students utilizing the Open University option register through Extended Studies.
WHEREAS, Title 5 (Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 2, Article 6. Undergraduate Degrees) of the California Code of Regulations requires a minimum of 180 quarter units for graduating with a Baccalaureate degree in the CSU, with the following exceptions:
1. section 40505. (Bachelor of Architecture Degree) “The total number of units required for the Bachelor of Architecture degree shall be distributed over a ten-semester (15 quarter) period or equivalent”
2. section 40507. (Bachelor of Landscape Architecture Degree) “The total number of units required for the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture degree shall be distributed over a ten-semester (15 quarter) period or equivalent” and

WHEREAS, Title 5 (Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 2, Article 6) of the California Code of Regulations also states that:
1. section 40501. (Bachelor of Science Degree) “The number of units for each curriculum shall be determined by each campus”; and
2. section 40508. (The Bachelor’s Degree: Total Units) “Each campus shall establish and maintain a monitoring system to ensure that justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond 120 [180 quarter] units”; and

WHEREAS, The Chancellor’s Office has asked that every campus either reduce each of its programs to 180 quarter units or have that program strongly justify why a higher number of units should be required; and

WHEREAS, Senate Resolution AS-234-87/CC approved by President Baker March 30, 1987 states that “…each major should strive…to include more than the minimum units of unrestricted electives” and documentation should be provided each curriculum cycle from programs requesting exemptions, and Senate Resolution AS-502-98/CC signed by President Baker on September 18, 1998 required that each program submit a self review to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee justifying the number of units in the degree and examining the possibility of increasing free electives; and
WHEREAS, It is the duty of the faculty of Cal Poly to educate its students so that they graduate as lifelong learners who are prepared to meet both the economic and societal challenges of a world that is becoming increasingly more culturally and technologically diverse; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That each all programs at Cal Poly offer a curriculum that allows its majors to be educated not only in the discipline but prepares them to be responsible citizens of the world; and be it further

RESOLVED: That all programs strive to reach attempt to meet the Title 5 minimum of 180 quarter units and to provide their students with a well rounded selection of courses which includes:
1. an adequate knowledge of the major as determined by the appropriate faculty, taking into account the recommendations of external, peer reviewers;
2. the General Education requirement;
3. a minimum of 8 units of non-restricted elective courses;
and be it further

RESOLVED: That all academic programs undertake a self-review and, by April 2, 2003, submit to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee via the respective college curriculum committee an academic plan (of one page or less) to reduce the baccalaureate unit requirement to 180 or provide justification for a baccalaureate unit requirement in excess of 180; and be it further

RESOLVED: That all areas of curriculum--major, support, and General Education--be examined in this review; and be it further

RESOLVED: That subsequent to April 2, 2003, each program's academic plan be incorporated in all academic program reviews, in all proposals for new academic programs, and in all catalog proposal submissions to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this process serve as Cal Poly's monitoring system to ensure justification for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate degree beyond the minimum 180 quarter units as required by Title 5.

Proposed by: Curriculum Committee
Date: January 28, 2002
Revised: February 4, 2002
WHEREAS, Cal Poly requires students to declare their major upon entrance; and
WHEREAS, Some departments/programs expect students to make progress towards their stated degree while attempting to change into their desired major; and
WHEREAS, Some change of major processes are unwieldy; and
WHEREAS, Some students may not gain acceptance into their desired major within a reasonable time period; therefore, be it
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopt the attached Process for Change of Major document.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: December 7, 2001
Revised: February 1, 2002
Revised: February 11, 2002
Revised: February 20, 2002
PROCESS FOR CHANGE OF MAJOR

Applies to matriculated undergraduate students at Cal Poly wishing to change major. The “target” major is the major to which a student wishes to change.

Minimum Requirements
An application for internal change of major will not be considered until/unless a student:
1) has completed at least one quarter at Cal Poly;
2) has a minimum of a 2.0 grade point average in the target major's prefix and/or support courses; and
3) is not presently on academic probation.

Consultation
Prior to applying for a change of major, students must consult with the department chair/head in the target major and are strongly advised to consult with at least one of the following:
1) Department chair/head in the current major
2) Faculty in the target major
3) Advising Center staff in the current major
4) Advising Center staff in the target major
5) Career Services staff

Process for Admitting Students to Target Major
Depending on the degree of impaction of the target major (i.e., the relationship between the number of applicants to the major and the number of places available), decisions on admitting students who wish to change major will be made by one or other of the following processes. Each major will publicize in advance which process it is using.
1) Applicants will be evaluated against published performance criteria. Those who meet the criteria will automatically be admitted to the major and will be so notified prior to the start of the next course registration period; OR
2) Applicants meeting published minimum performance criteria will be considered in a competitive process for acceptance into a limited number of available spaces in the major. One or two firm dates each year will be set for making and notifying students of admissions decisions; these dates will be announced in advance.

Performance Criteria
The performance criteria established by departments/programs for changing majors will be designed primarily to assess the student's likelihood of achieving success in the new major (taking into account the possibility that poor past performance at Cal Poly may in part reflect an inappropriate choice of major on entry). As far as possible, performance criteria for change of major:
1) will discourage students from seeking "backdoor" entry to a more impacted major by first applying to a less impacted (and more readily accessible) major, while
2) accepting a responsibility to treat existing Cal Poly students who are acting in good faith somewhat more favorably than those applying from the outside.

Time Needed to Meet Performance Criteria
Performance criteria should not impose an unreasonable burden on students; that is, a student who is in...
good standing and is academically prepared for the lower division courses needed to satisfy the criteria should be able to complete this coursework within two to three quarters.

Waiting Lists and Repeated Applications
Majors may not keep waiting lists of students who have been deemed admissible but whose entry into the major is being delayed pending space availability. Applicants will be admitted only if they can be accommodated promptly; others will be rejected. Denied students may re-apply at a later date but should be made clearly aware that they will not be given preference based on persistence (i.e., repeated applications).

Option for Reviewing Freshmen Students
When a freshman student applies to change major within the first three quarters after entering Cal Poly, the target major has the option, where feasible, of first considering the student on the basis of his/her academic MCA score, possibly combined with a specified Cal Poly grade point average, in lieu of employing other performance criteria. Feasibility may depend on whether the MCA scores for the originating and target majors are based on the same formula, and on the availability of relevant historical data. If this option is selected, the target major will:

1) Recalculate the academic MCA as if the student had applied to the target major on entry.
2) Compare with the academic MCA cut-off used to determine admissions for the fall quarter in which the student first enrolled (when the student first enrolled in winter, the comparison will be made with the admissions cut-off for the preceding fall; when the student first enrolled in summer, the comparison will be made with the admissions cut-off for the following fall).
3) Admit the student if his/her MCA exceeds this cut-off, there is space available within the target major, and (where applicable) the student meets the Cal Poly grade point average requirement prescribed by the target major.

A freshman student who is considered in this manner but fails to meet the criteria for admission based on MCA will still be subject to review under the target major’s normal process for change of major decisions.

Communications Regarding Satisfactory Progress in Current Major
The communications sent to students who are not meeting the requirements for making satisfactory progress within their current major should be constructive in tone while clearly indicating:

1) the nature of these requirements;
2) the potential consequences of failing to meet them; and
3) the "window of opportunity" that is available for students seeking to change major.
PROCESS FOR CHANGE OF MAJOR

Applies to matriculated undergraduate students at Cal Poly wishing to change major. The "target" major is the major to which a student wishes to change.

Minimum Requirements
1. An application for internal change of major into less-impacted majors will not be considered until/unless a student:
   • has completed at least one quarter at Cal Poly
   • has a minimum of a 2.0 grade point average in the "target" (i.e., the major to which the student wishes to change) major's prefix and/or support courses; and
   • is not presently on academic probation.

Consultation
2. Prior to applying for a change of major, students are strongly advised to consult with one of the following at least one of the following (one should be in the target major):
   • Department chair/head in the target major (i.e., the major to which the student wishes to change)
   • Department chair/head in the current major
   • Faculty in the target major
   • Advising Center staff in the current major
   • Advising Center staff in the target major
   • Career Services staff

Process for Admitting Students to Target Major
3. Departments/programs with heavily impacted majors will:
   • establish and publish each year
     • target numbers for admissions via change of major
     • a competitive process for making change of major decisions, and
     • one or two firm dates for making these decisions

   - OR

   • raise the minimum criteria for acceptance to a high enough standard that acceptance is possible at any time for all students who meet the criteria.

Depending on the degree of impaction of the target major (i.e., the relationship between the number of applicants to the major and the number of places available), decisions on admitting students who wish to change major will be made by one or other of the following processes. Each major will publicize in advance which process it is using.

1) Applicants will be evaluated against published performance criteria. Those who
meet the criteria will automatically be admitted to the major and will be so notified prior to the start of the next course registration period; OR

Applicants meeting published minimum performance criteria will be considered in a competitive process for acceptance into a limited number of available spaces in the major. One or two firm dates each year will be set for making and notifying students of admissions decisions; these dates will be announced in advance.

**Performance Criteria**

The performance criteria established by departments/programs for changing majors will be designed primarily to assess the student's likelihood of achieving success in the new major (taking into account the possibility that poor past performance at Cal Poly may in part reflect an inappropriate choice of major on entry). As far as possible, performance criteria for change of major:

- will discourage students from seeking "backdoor" entry to a more impacted major by first applying to a less impacted (and more readily accessible) major, while accepting a responsibility to treat existing Cal Poly students who are acting in good faith somewhat more favorably than those applying from the outside.

**Time Needed to Meet Performance Criteria**

It should be possible for most qualified students (i.e., those who are in good academic standing and are academically prepared for the lower division courses that are necessary to assess likelihood of success in the target major) to change their major within three quarters. This process is designed to maximize the probability that students meeting the target department's minimum performance criteria will be accepted within two quarters (at the end of the second quarter, a decision must be made on the acceptance or rejection of each change of major request). Performance criteria should not impose an unreasonable burden on students; that is, a student who is in good standing and is academically prepared for the lower division courses needed to satisfy the criteria should be able to complete this coursework within two to three quarters.

**Waiting Lists and Repeated Applications**

Majors may no longer not keep waiting lists of students who have been deemed admissible met-applicable performance criteria but whose entry into the major is being delayed pending space availability. Based on pre-set targets for internal transfers, these majors will hold regular competitions for admission and will give firm acceptance decisions only to those students who. Applicants will be admitted only if they can be accommodated promptly; others will be rejected. Denied students may re-apply at a later date but should be made clearly aware that they will not be given preference based on persistence (i.e., repeated applications).

**Option for Reviewing Freshmen Students**

When a freshman student applies to change major within the first three quarters after entering Cal Poly, the target major has the option, where feasible, of first considering the student on the basis of his/her using the academic MCA score, possibly combined
with a specified Cal Poly grade point average, for acceptance purposes *in lieu of*
employing other performance criteria. Feasibility may depend on whether the MCA
scores for the originating and target majors are based on the same formula, and on the
availability of relevant historical data. If this option is selected, the target major will:

- Recalculate the academic MCA as if the student had applied to the target major
  on entry.
- Compare with the academic MCA cut-off used to determine admissions for the
  fall quarter in which the student first enrolled (when the student first enrolled in
  winter, the comparison will be made with the admissions cut-off for the *preceding*
  fall; when the student first enrolled in summer, the comparison will be made with
  the admissions cut-off for the *following* fall).
- Allow the change if the student's Admit the student if his/her MCA exceeds this
  cut-off, there is space available within the target major, and (where applicable)
  the student meets the Cal Poly grade point average requirement prescribed by
  the target major.

A freshman student applying to change major within the first three quarters after
entering Cal-Poly, whose application is not accepted based on the above MCA scores
and Cal-Poly cumulative grade point average, or a student applying after the third
quarter has passed, or a transfer student from another institution, will be considered on
the basis of performance criteria pre-specified by the target major who is considered in
this manner but fails to meet the criteria for admission based on MCA will still be subject
to review under the target major's normal process for change of major decisions.

Communications Regarding Satisfactory Progress in Current Major

The communications sent to students who are not meeting the requirements for making
satisfactory progress within their current major should be constructive in tone while
clearly indicating:

- the nature of these requirements;
- the potential consequences of failing to meet them; and
- the "window of opportunity" that is available for students seeking to change
  major.
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-____-02/

RESOLUTION ON
PROPOSED NEW DEGREE PROGRAM FOR
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

WHEREAS, The faculty and Curriculum Committee of the University Center for Teacher Education (UCTE) have unanimously approved the attached Proposal for a Joint Doctoral Program between Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, and University of California, Santa Barbara; and

WHEREAS, The above approvals are contingent upon state funding; and

WHEREAS, The proposal has been approved by the Grevirtz Graduate School of Education at UC Santa Barbara and will soon be presented to its Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, The proposal has the support of the San Luis Obispo County Superintendent of Schools who participated in its creation and who will be an integral part of the program; and

WHEREAS, The proposal reflects Cal Poly’s “learn by doing” philosophy; and

WHEREAS, The proposal represents Cal Poly’s first joint doctoral program although there are at least 16 such programs in the CSU; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee recommends approval of the proposal contingent upon state funding; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached proposal for a joint Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership degree with University of California at Santa Barbara, contingent upon adequate state funding.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the University Center for Teacher Education
Date: January 31, 2002
Summary Statement of Proposed New Degree Program

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
A joint program between
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, and University of California, Santa Barbara

1. Title of Proposed Program.

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

2. Reason for Proposing the Program.

The purpose of the Doctor of Education degree program is to provide advanced graduate-level study of educational leadership concepts and their application to schools and school agencies. The program is deliberately designed as a collaborative endeavor among Cal Poly, UCSB, and school partners, blending theoretical and research perspectives with practice in the field. Students will study scholarly literature on leadership, acquire quantitative and qualitative research methodology skills, and engage in field-based research that explores authentic school-based issues and problems. The major goal of the program is to prepare a new generation of exemplary educational leaders who demonstrate the ability to:

1. Engage in scholarly research and effectively use extant data to make sound, data-driven decisions,
2. Critically examine current educational policies and practices from a variety of theoretical perspectives,
3. Formulate and implement effective leadership, managerial, and instructional approaches that will improve student achievement and organizational productivity, and
4. Engage in reflective praxis to assess personal and professional leadership effectiveness.

The program has several unique characteristics that make it particularly viable. First, California, despite a few large metropolitan districts, is a non-urban state. While most doctoral programs focus on urban education, this program will specialize in training leaders for mid-sized to rural school districts. Second, this tri-partite endeavor, linking research-oriented and practice-oriented universities with school partners, supports the establishment of new professional development districts (PDDs). These will serve as living laboratories for advancing the application of research and producing new knowledge needed by the field. Third, the program will be offered in the central region of California, a geographical area that currently supports only satellite doctoral programs from private institutions such as the University of Southern California. There is a great demand for doctoral-trained school administrators in the area, and this program will offer access to an affordable, practice-oriented doctoral degree.

3. Anticipated Student Demand.

Number of majors: at initiation--15; after three years--36; after five years--36
Number of graduates: after three years--15; after five years--36

4. Indicate the kind of resource assessment used in developing the program proposal. If additional resources will be required, the summary should indicate the extent of department and/or college commitment(s) to allocate them.

An analysis of faculty, classroom space, library, and computer resources has been completed. (1)
The Cal Poly educational administration program currently has two tenured professors; a third professor will be required to coordinate and teach in the new doctoral program (a search is now
underway). (2) Classroom space is sufficient; in addition to Cal Poly, courses will be offered at UCSB and at different school/district sites. (3) Additional library resources may be required as a complement to the UCSB holdings; these will be determined as new Cal Poly courses are offered in the second year of the program. (4) Computer resources are sufficient at present; the University Center for Teacher Education now has a new computer lab and SMART classroom, and there is access to distance education facilities on campus and at the SLO County Office of Education.

Funding to support the new faculty position and possible library holdings will come from two primary sources specified under the new CSU/UC agreement on joint doctoral programs: (1) a portion of funds allocated for program implementation ($2 million CSU), and (2) fees recovered from students enrolled in the program (based on the UC structure). Other sources may include the University Center for Teacher Education for program support and grants/contracts for research support.

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

Evidence of the need for graduates with educational doctorates stems from CSU’s recent statewide report and from Cal Poly’s local surveys. The CSU report emphasized the need for educational leaders who are grounded in relevant theory and research and who can approach problem solving on a practical, data-driven basis. The report cited CPEC in calling for more educators with doctoral-level expertise in assessment and more programs accessible to rural educators and underrepresented groups. Cal Poly surveyed several local constituent groups. Graduate students in the Educational Administration’s advanced credential and master’s programs expressed interest in pursuing an education doctoral degree that was accessible, affordable, and field-based. In addition, district and county superintendents were strongly supportive of such a program for their school and district administrators; this included the SLO County Superintendent representing the tri-county area (San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura). Further, the President of Cuesta Community College expressed an urgent need for access for community college leaders.

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

The new program is not a concentration or specialization to be converted.

7. If the new program is not commonly offered as a bachelor’s or master’s degree, provide compelling rationale explaining how the proposed subject area constitutes a coherent, integrated degree major that has potential value for students. If the new program does not appear to conform to the CSU Board of Trustee policy calling for “broadly based programs,” provide rationale.

The new program leads to a doctoral degree in educational leadership, which is a widely accepted graduate field of study at universities throughout the United States.

8. Briefly describe how the new program fits with the department/college/ university strategic plans.

The University Center for Teacher Education offers post-baccalaureate teaching/service/specialist credential programs and master's degree programs with specializations in related areas. Its mission is “to prepare educational leaders and foster collaborative programs within and beyond the university aimed at serving California’s diverse population,” and its strategic plan focuses on meeting the educational needs of the state through partnership endeavors. The new program is a
strong fit in that it extends the continuum of educator preparation to the doctoral level, broadens partnership opportunities with K-12, community colleges, and other universities, and serves the needs of the central region of California.

The new program also fits well with the university's mission and strategic plan. The university emphasizes "undergraduate, graduate, and post-baccalaureate professional and technical programs." In addition, the hallmark of Cal Poly is its learn by doing educational philosophy and its commitment to excellent programs that reinforce "classroom instruction with practical, 'hands-on' learning in the laboratory, the studio or out in the field." The proposed Doctor of Education degree provides a professional program necessary to the state and is grounded in a field-based approach that will prepare scholar practitioners.
Curriculum/Program Design for the Proposed Joint Doctorate in Education Leadership through Cal Poly and UCSB

Year 1--UCSB Courses Delivered at UCSB

**Fall:** Ed 242A (4) Organizational Theories, Ed 214A (4) Introductory Statistics, ED 221A (4) Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods

**Winter:** Ed 240A (4) Education Policy, Ed 214B (4) Inferential Statistics or ED 221B (4) Qualitative Interviewing

**Spring:** Ed 247A (4) Educational Leadership, ED 215B (4) Psychometrics or ED214C (4) Linear Models or ED221C (4) Observation and Small Group Analysis

**Summer:** Ed 223H (4) Leadership and Equal Educational Opportunity, ED 242C (4) Theories of Organizational Change and Development, ED 596 (2) Summer Institute, Comprehensive Exam

Year 2--Courses Delivered at Cal Poly or Field Location

**Fall:** ED 600 (4) Information Technology, ED 601 (4) Organizational and Management Issues

**Winter:** ED 602 (4) Policy, Equity, and Political Issues, ED 603 (4) Economics and Financial Issues

**Spring:** ED 604 (4) Leadership Issues in Learning Organizations

**Summer:** ED 605 (2) Summer Institute, dissertation proposal

Year 3--Research Application with Seminar Meetings at Both Campuses or Field Locations

**Fall:** ED 606A (3) Applied Dissertation Research and Writing Seminar (Introduction and Literature Review), defense of dissertation proposal

**Winter:** ED 606B (3) Applied Dissertation Research and Writing Seminar (Methodology)

**Spring:** ED 606C (3) Applied Dissertation Research and Writing Seminar (Findings and Discussion)

**Summer:** ED 606D (3) Applied Dissertation Research and Writing Seminar, defense of dissertation
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Proposal for a Joint Doctoral Program between
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo and University of California, Santa Barbara

Submitted to the
Cal Poly Academic Senate

Submitted by the
Education Leadership and Administration Program
University Center for Teacher Education

Winter Quarter, 2002

Note: This proposal falls under the new CSU/UC agreement (11/01) to offer joint doctoral programs. See www.calstate.edu/PA/oldnews/2001/EdD.shtml; www.ucop.edu/news/archives/2001/nov9art1.htm
PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

1. Doctor of Education Degree:

Doctoral degrees in the field of education are either Ph.D.s or Ed.D.s. Ph.D. programs generally emphasize theory and basic research in a specialized area of scholarship and prepare students to teach and/or conduct research in universities, other educational agencies, and research organizations. Ed.D. programs generally emphasize applied research for examining educational issues, policies, and practices and prepare students for leadership positions in K-12 and community colleges as well as faculty positions in teaching-oriented universities. Doctoral-granting universities across the nation (e.g., Columbia, University of Georgia, University of Texas) generally offer both degrees that follow these distinctions. An exception is Harvard; its School of Education has only the Ed.D.

In California, all nine UC campuses offer the Ph.D., while Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, and San Diego also have the Ed.D. In addition, large private institutions such as Stanford and USC offer both degrees, while smaller universities such as Asuza Pacific, La Verne, Pepperdine, University of the Pacific, and University of San Diego have only the Ed.D.

2. CSU Joint Doctoral Programs:

There is a long history of joint doctoral programs between CSU and UC/private California universities that covers nearly three decades.

Programs currently offered are (in alphabetical order):

*CSU Bakersfield and University of the Pacific: Ed.D. in Educational Administration
*CSU Fresno and UC Davis: Ed.D. in Educational Administration
*CSU Long Beach and Claremont Graduate School: Ph.D. in Engineering & Industrial Applied Mathematics
*CSU Los Angeles and UCLA: Ph.D. in Special Education
*San Diego State University with UC San Diego, University of San Diego, and other institutions on a variety of programs: 10 Ph.D.s in Biology, Chemistry, Clinical Psychology, Ecology, Education, Engineering, Geography, Communication Disorders, Math & Science Education, and Public Health; and 1 Ed.D. with specializations in Educational Administration, Educational Technology, and Teaching & Learning.
*San Francisco State and UC Berkeley: Ph.D. in Special Education.

In addition to Cal Poly and UC Santa Barbara, programs under discussion or development are:

CSU Hayward, San Francisco, and San Jose and UC Berkeley
CSU Northridge and UC Santa Barbara.

In 2001, the CSU sought the authority to also offer an independent Ed.D. so as to meet the increasing state demand for highly qualified professionals in K-12 and community college education. After long discussions with the UC involving California's master plan, this proposal was dropped and a new agreement between the systems on joint programs was established. The new agreement sets forth conditions by which the CSU and UC encourage, approve, and support joint programs, including funds for start-up costs and shared tuition/fee revenues based on the UC structure.
3. Purpose and Design of Program:

The purpose of the Doctor of Education degree program is to provide advanced graduate-level study of educational leadership concepts and their application to schools and school agencies. The program is deliberately designed as a collaborative endeavor among Cal Poly, UCSB, and school partners, blending theoretical and research perspectives with practice in the field. Students will study scholarly literature on leadership, acquire quantitative and qualitative research methodology skills, and engage in field-based research that explores authentic school-based issues and problems. The major goal of the program is to prepare a new generation of exemplary educational leaders who demonstrate the ability to:

1. conduct scholarly research and effectively use extant data to make sound, data-driven decisions,
2. critically examine current educational policies and practices from a variety of theoretical perspectives,
3. formulate and implement effective leadership, managerial, and instructional approaches that will improve student achievement and organizational productivity, and
4. engage in reflective praxis to assess personal and professional leadership effectiveness.

The program has several unique characteristics that make it particularly timely and relevant. First, California, despite a few large metropolitan districts, is a non-urban state. While most doctoral programs focus on urban education, this program will specialize in training leaders for mid-sized to rural school districts. Second, this tri-partite endeavor, linking research-oriented and practice-oriented universities with school partners, supports the establishment of new professional development districts (PDDs) in our local region. These will serve as living laboratories for advancing the application of research and producing new knowledge needed by the field. Third, the program will be offered in the central region of California, a geographical area that currently supports only satellite doctoral programs from private institutions such as the University of Southern California and the University of LaVerne.

4. Need for Program:

Recent evidence of the need for graduates with educational doctorates stems from CSU’s 2001 statewide report and from Cal Poly’s local surveys. First, the CSU report (www.calstate.edu/education/edreports/2108EddReport.pdf) emphasizes the need for educational leaders who are grounded in relevant theory and research and who can approach problem solving on a practical, data-driven basis. The report cited CPEC in calling for more educators with doctoral-level expertise in assessment and more programs accessible to rural educators and underrepresented groups. Second, as a follow-up to the statewide report, Cal Poly surveyed constituent groups in San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties, including K-12 county and district superintendents, school principals, and community college administrators. About one-third of those surveyed responded, and all were strongly supportive of such a program. The particular aspects cited by both K-12 and community college educators were the need for authentic field-based curricula, accessibility in the local region, and affordability as compared to options offered by private institutions. Third, SLO County Superintendent Julian Crocker, San Luis Coastal District Superintendent Steven Ladd, and Cuesta College President Marie Rosenwasser met with President Baker, Provost Zingg, and Dean Konopak to express interest in the program for their respective administrators and teachers and to encourage Cal Poly to move forward. Fourth, faculty in Educational Administration also surveyed current graduate students in their advanced credential and master's programs as possible candidates for such a program. All expressed interest in pursuing an education doctoral degree that was applied, accessible, and affordable. Finally, UCTE faculty have heard informally from several Cal Poly staff and faculty who...
have expressed professional interest in such a doctoral program and who may be viable candidates for admission.

In terms of demand and sustainability, both Cal Poly and UCSB faculty believe that there will be a large enrollment initially and that the number then will stabilize over time. At initiation, enrollment may be 12-15; after three years, enrollment may sustain at 8-10 per year. This is comparable to the existing joint doctoral program with CSU Fresno and UC Davis. That program has sustained new enrollment of 8-10 for over a decade; as of Fall 1999, 63 students were actively enrolled. In addition, local satellite programs such as through USC have drawn enrollments successfully from the local area.

5. Resources Assessment:

An analysis of faculty, classroom space, library, and computer resources has been completed. (1) The Cal Poly educational administration program currently has two tenured professors; at least one more professor will be required support the new doctoral program (a search is now underway). (2) Classroom space is sufficient; in addition to Cal Poly, courses will be offered at UCSB and at different school/district sites. (3) Additional library resources may be required as a complement the UCSB holdings; these will be determined as new Cal Poly courses are offered in the second year of the program. (4) Computer resources are sufficient at present; UCTE has a new computer lab and SMART classroom, and there is access to distance education facilities on campus and at the SLO County Office of Education.

Funding to support new faculty and possible library holdings will come from two primary sources specified under the new CSU/UC agreement on joint doctoral programs: (1) a portion of funds allocated for program implementation ($2 million CSU), and (2) fees recovered from students enrolled in the program, based on the UC structure. According to the CSU Chancellor and UC President, these funds are protected from statewide budget reductions and will be allocated through a Joint Board that serves to protect the collaborating universities. Other sources may include the University Center for Teacher Education for program support and grants/contracts for research support.

6. Alignment with UCTE and University Strategic Plans:

The University Center for Teacher Education offers post-baccalaureate teaching/service/specialist credential programs and master's degree programs with specializations in related areas. Its mission is "to prepare educational leaders and foster collaborative programs within and beyond the university aimed at serving California's diverse population," and its strategic plan focuses on meeting the educational needs of the state through partnership endeavors. The new program is a strong fit in that it extends the continuum of educator preparation to the doctoral level; broadens partnership opportunities with K-12, community colleges, and other universities; and serves the needs of the central region of California.

In addition, the program fits well with Cal Poly's mission and strategic plan. The University emphasizes "undergraduate, graduate, and post-baccalaureate professional and technical programs." In addition, the hallmark of Cal Poly is its learn by doing educational philosophy and its commitment to excellent programs that reinforce "classroom instruction with practical, 'hands-on' learning in the laboratory, the studio or out in the field." The proposed Doctor of Education degree provides a professional program necessary to the state and is grounded in a field-based approach that will prepare scholar practitioners.
7. Requirements for Admission, Registration and Enrollment in the Joint Doctoral Program:

All applicants wishing to pursue the Ph.D. Program at UCSB or the Ed.D. Joint Doctoral Program (JDP) between UCSB and Cal Poly State University San Luis Obispo will be held to the same admission standards. This will ensure that students in both programs are equally well qualified to undertake the rigorous programs of study leading to the respective degrees. Successful applicants to the joint doctoral program will have met the following criteria; however, the number of applicants will likely exceed the number of spaces available and meeting minimum degree and score requirements will not guarantee admission:

- Received a master’s degree or its equivalent from a regionally accredited university prior to the quarter for which they seek admission;
- Maintained an upper-division grade point average of 3.0 or above;
- Earned Graduate Record Exam (GRE) scores that indicate sufficient ability for successful doctoral study;
- Shared research and/or professional practice goals with program faculty;
- References indicating their ability to work productively with others;
- Writing and speaking ability appropriate for doctoral study;
- Completion of all application materials;
- Screening by a joint program admissions committee composed of faculty and staff from both universities.

8. Program of Study:

Students admitted to both the Ph.D. and Ed.D. Programs will undertake a common first-year academic program that cover fundamental issues in educational leadership, organizational theory, educational policy, and qualitative and quantitative research methods will be required of all students. During summer quarters between years one and two, students also will participate in a Summer Leadership Institute. In the second year of study, students will undertake specialized seminars and field-based practica in Information Technology Issues, Organizational and Management Issues, Policy, Equity, and Political Issues, Economics and Financial Issues, and Leadership Issues in Learning Organizations. Cooperatively enrolling at, paying their fees to, and completing one year and two quarters of coursework at either university will fulfill academic residency requirements. The expected completion time for the Ed.D. Program is three years from the date of matriculation with a maximum time limit of four and one-half years. On the following page a Sample Program Diagram describes the progression of a student’s three years of study and research.

9. Examinations:

- All students will participate in rigorous coursework that will include appropriate examinations, evaluations, and critiques by professors who teach each course.
- Students will successfully complete a Comprehensive Exam during the Summer Quarter at the conclusion of Year One of their Program in order to continue in Year Two.
- All students will prepare and successfully defend an applied personal dissertation proposal in the first quarter of Year Three. All dissertations will require each student to successfully defend their dissertation with a formal oral defense:
2.11 Sample Program Diagram

Year 1 - Courses Delivered at UCSB Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL UC Residency Fees Paid to UC</th>
<th>WINTER UC Residency Fees Paid to UC</th>
<th>SPRING UC Residency Fees Paid to UC</th>
<th>SUMMER UC Residency Fees Paid to UC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED 242A (4) Organizational Theories</td>
<td>-AND-</td>
<td>-AND-</td>
<td>ED 242C (4) Theories of Organizational Change and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-AND- ED 214A (4) Introductory Statistics</td>
<td>ED 214B (4) Inferential Statistics</td>
<td>-AND- ED 213B (4) Psychometrics</td>
<td>ED 596 (2) Summer Institute @ UCSB and PDD Research Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-AND- ED 221A (4) Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods</td>
<td>-OR- ED 221B (4) Qualitative Interviewing</td>
<td>-OR- ED 214C (4) Linear Models for Data Analysis</td>
<td>Comprehensive Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UC-Supervised Research in Professional Development Districts
Concurrent Enrollment at CSU (0 Unit Load - No CSU Fees)

Year 2 - Courses Delivered at Cal Poly Campus or Field Location TBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL CSU Residency Fees Paid to CSU</th>
<th>WINTER CSU Residency Fees Paid to CSU</th>
<th>SPRING CSU Residency Fees Paid to CSU</th>
<th>SUMMER CSU Residency Fees Paid to CSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED 600 (4) Information Technology Seminar and Practicum</td>
<td>ED 602 (4) Policy, Equity, and Political Issues Seminar and Practicum</td>
<td>ED 604 (4) Leadership Issues in Learning Organizations Seminar and Practicum</td>
<td>ED 605 (2) Summer Institute/Session @ Cal Poly and PDD Research Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSU-Supervised Research in Professional Development Districts
Concurrent Enrollment at UC (0 Unit Load - No UC Fees)

Year 3 - Research Application with Seminar Meetings at Both Campuses or Field Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL CSU Residency Fees Paid to CSU</th>
<th>WINTER CSU Residency Fees Paid to CSU</th>
<th>SPRING UC Residency Fees Paid to UC</th>
<th>SUMMER UC Residency Fees Paid to UC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction and Literature Review Chapters Due</td>
<td>Methodology Chapter Due</td>
<td>Findings and Discussion Chapters Due</td>
<td>Oral Defense During Summer Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint CSU/UC Supervised Research in PDD
Concurrent Enrollment at UC

Joint CSU/UC Supervised Research in PDD
Concurrent Enrollment at CSU
1. To examine and assess the quality of the applied dissertation and its relevance to educational practice;
2. To evaluate the ability of students to present their work in a scholarly manner;
3. To provide an opportunity to share the work with the campus communities.

10. Applied Dissertation:

For most candidates, the applied dissertation will flow from research work conducted, as part of a cohort work group, in Professional Development Districts (PDDs). These K12 or Community College districts, whose relationship with the JD program will be defined by Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), will, with program faculty, have identified areas of inquiry, which will serve as the basis of these research efforts. Within the context of this inquiry area, each candidate will develop an individual applied dissertation topic, which integrates theory and practice. There may be instances when an individual candidate’s career track is not compatible with assignment to a professional development district work group, such as a Cal Poly staff member. In such cases, accommodations will be made that allow the completion of an applied dissertation and which reflect the same standards as a PDD-based inquiry.

During the candidates first year in the program, they will attend an induction seminar during which they will be introduced to the concept, goals, objectives and expectations for field based research in PDDs. As the year progresses research projects will be selected and matched with work groups.

During the summer institute following the first year of the program, the work groups, or individual candidates area of inquiry will be defined, and time lines and areas of research will be identified.

During the second year of the program, students will not only be developing and refining their area of inquiry, they will also be using PDDs as "laboratories" for the five-seminar practica they will be enrolled in. This is an important link since it further immerses the candidate in the culture of the PDD and will therefore contribute to their applied dissertation work.

By the end of the second summer institute (between their 2nd and 3rd years) students will have selected a specific area of inquiry for their applied Dissertation. The proposal will reflect a clear theoretical framework, substantive collection of original data, critical analysis of the data, and direct and specific discussion of the implications of the findings derived from the data for educational practice. No later than the middle of the third year, students will have developed a formal proposal, consisting of the first three chapters, for their applied dissertation, and will schedule and oral defense. Successful students will be advance to candidacy.

The student dissertation committee will be composed of three-tenure track (CSU) or Ladder (UC) Faculty. One of these committee members will serve as chair (usually the candidates research advisor). Both campuses must be represented on the committee. Additional members, such as PPD staff, may serve on the committee with the same voting rights and responsibilities as faculty.

It is expected that students will complete their dissertations by the end of the third year. At that point, a formal oral defense will be scheduled. Assuming a satisfactory defense, candidates will submit the final manuscript for printing and binding, and two copies will be submitted to each of the campus libraries. The Ed.D. Degree will be awarded jointly by the UC and the CSU in the names of both cooperating institutions.
11. Teaching and Advisement:

Seminars and practica will be staffed by Tenure track (CSU), Ladder (UC) faculty, or adjunct faculty who possess similar academic and professional qualifications. There are currently 8 Ladder faculty at UCSB, two tenure-track faculty at Cal Poly, and one PDD adjunct faculty (Dr. Julian Crocker, San Luis Obispo County Superintendent of Schools), who will constitute the initial core faculty. Cal Poly's UCTE is now searching for a third faculty member and will need to hire one additional faculty member during the course of the first cohort. Teaching and advisement load and responsibility for Cal Poly faculty will mirror UC practice.

Students will select a program advisor during their first year of course work. Although the program advisor and the dissertation adviser may be different faculty members, it is expected that, in most case, they will be the same person. Advisors may be faculty members at either campus. (See applied dissertation narrative for a description of composition and roles of dissertation committee members.)

12. Program Assessment:

A Planning, Policy, and Evaluation Board will have oversight responsibility for the program. The board will consist of representatives or designees from the respective Campus president's offices, and the dean's offices, the chairs or coordinators of the Education Leadership programs from the two campuses, the Program co-directors (one from each campus) and the K-16 Liaison. Among this group's responsibilities, will be that of program evaluation. Evaluation components will include:

- Regular faculty review and feedback;
- School level program review;
- All evaluation procedures outlined by the UCSB Graduate Council and Cal Poly's academic Senate;
- Internal self-evaluation and annual written reports of progress submitted to respective Deans by co-directors. (These reports will be reviewed and forwarded to the Program Planning and Evaluation Board for review and recommendations.)

Every five years the Program Planning and Policy committee will conduct a comprehensive review; and direction, and goals of the program will be adjusted accordingly. It is also expected that evaluations by other agencies (e.g.: CPEC, WASC.) will also be conducted on a periodic basis.

13. Timeline for Approval and Implementation:

When the development team began the actual drafting of the proposal early in 2001, the goal was to admit the first cohort of students in Fall Quarter 2002. With that goal in mind and the encouragement of leadership on both campuses, the team has worked very hard to make this goal and timeline a reality. Encouragement and support for the program and the timeline came via development grants from both system administrations. Most recently, the agreement between the two systems to develop and support Joint Ed.D programs and expedite their approval has suggested that this initial timeline, while unlikely, may still be possible.

With this in mind the UCTE is now recruiting for a Program Director position (contingent upon program funding). However, in order for recruitment of students to take place and the minimum
infrastructure to be put in place, may be unrealistic to expect to admit students Fall 2002 unless the program is approved on campus and at the system level by mid-March 2002. While UC Santa Barbara and the UC system administration are moving very rapidly as are we, the development team recently concluded that admitting a cohort for Fall 2002 may not be achievable. After looking at alternatives such as mid-year admission, it was decided that Fall Quarter 2003 is the most workable target for the first cohort to begin taking coursework.

With the working target date likely to be Fall 2003, what follows is a draft implementation time-line:

**Fall 2002**
- Program approval and system for start-up funding costs;
- Appointment of JDP Co-Directors and support staff;
- Develop recruitment materials and beginning student recruitment;
- Begin process of identifying PDDs and drafting MOU language;
- Form Planning, Policy, and Evaluation Board

**Winter 2003**
- Work through administrative issues across the two campuses;
- Distribute recruitment materials, publicize program;
- Continue development of PDD program;
- Set up admissions screening committee;
- Confirm precise curriculum; identify faculty teaching coursework;
- Schedule Fall 2003 courses and locations;
- Work on details of Summer Leadership Institute.

**Spring 2003**
- Screen and interview applicants, and notify accepted candidates;
- Schedule and conduct meeting with successful applicants;
- Review progress with PPE Board;
- Meet with PDDs to begin process of identifying research issues;
- Complete preparations for Summer Leadership Institute.
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-__-02/

RESOLUTION ON
NAME CHANGE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HORTICULTURAL
SCIENCE AND CROP SCIENCE DEPARTMENTS

1. WHEREAS, The departments of Environmental Horticultural Science and Crop Science have merged; and

2. WHEREAS, The faculty and staff of these departments have requested the name of the newly formed department be changed to Horticulture and Crop Science Department to reflect this merger; and

3. WHEREAS, The request for this name change has been approved by the Interim Dean for the College of Agriculture (CAGR), the CAGR academic department heads and other members of the CAGR management staff, the Academic Senate CAGR caucus, and is pending approval by the Academic Deans’ Council; therefore be it

4. RESOLVED: That the departments of Environmental Horticultural Science and Crop Science be changed to Horticulture and Crop Science Department.

Proposed by: The Environmental Horticultural Science and Crop Science Departments
Date: February 1, 2002
Enclosed is a request from Dr. David Wehner, Interim Dean of the College of Agriculture, and supporting documentation, to support the name for the newly merged departments of Crop Science and Environmental Horticultural Science Departments. The proposed name will be the Horticulture and Crop Science Department.

I would appreciate it if the Academic Senate would review this request as soon as possible this quarter. I will be simultaneously having this request reviewed by the Academic Deans’ Council.

Thank you, and should you have any questions regarding this issue, please do not hesitate to contact Dean Wehner directly.

Enclosures
MEMORANDUM

To:       Paul Zingg  
           Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

From:    Dave Wehner  
           Interim Dean

Subject: Name for merged department

The academic department heads and the other members of the College of Agriculture management staff unanimously endorse the title "Horticulture and Crop Science Department" for the new department formed by the merger of the Crop Science and Environmental Horticultural Science Departments.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this matter.
To: David J. Wehner, Dean  
College of Agriculture

From: Phil Doub, Chair  
Horticulture and Crop Science Department

Subject: Name for merged department

The faculty and staff of Environmental Horticultural Science and Crop Science have selected *Horticulture and Crop Science* for the name of their newly merged department.

Attachment
State of California
Memorandum

To: Faculty of the Crop Science and Environmental Horticultural Science Departments

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Date: June 11, 2001

Subject: Merger of Crop Science and Environmental Horticultural Science Departments

For several years, the Crop Science and Environmental Horticultural Science Departments have considered the notion of a merger. Understandably, this notion raises several questions about administrative configuration, resources, curriculum, department name, and other matters. Both departments, however, have previously identified conditions and reasons that would merit their support of a merger. Most notably, these include steps to strengthen both programs that will better enable them to serve students and their respective segments of the California agriculture industry.

Upon the recommendation of Dean Jen, and consideration of the views expressed by the departments' faculty and leadership and a positive response to the notion of a merger by advisory council members of both departments, I am convinced that this merger should proceed. I am also convinced, based upon the comments of representatives of the departments' faculty, that the faculty of the departments will work together to ensure that the merger is successful and to realize the promise of greater service and mutual advantage that it holds.

Several reasons and factors underscore my conclusion. First, service to students. A merger can provide a “value-added” dimension to the education of our students who will be pursuing careers in plant agriculture, regardless of the particular industry focus of their undergraduate program. The increasingly integrated nature of plant agriculture demands a workforce that is broadly prepared in matters that affect the entire industry, as well as having depth in an area of specialization. There are overarching aspects of the entire industry -- e.g., post-harvest issues, bioinformatics, agricultural genetics, greenhouse
science, plant biotechnology — in which all students entering any phase of the industry will need expertise. Connecting the curricula and resources of CS and EHS, including expanded cross-industry dialogue, can address the integrated and common dimensions of the plant agriculture industry and better prepare our students to enter it. Moreover, students can benefit greatly from their participation in cooperative applied agricultural research between faculty members of both departments that a merged department would foster.

Second, service to industry. As we increasingly hear from industry, including from the advisory councils of both departments, plant agriculture needs the kind of workforce described above. Industry needs a workforce and future leadership that can see the big picture and synthesize particulars, even as it responds to the needs of specialties. The plant agriculture industry seeks a workforce that can move across specialty boundaries and understand and articulate common interests and needs in all arenas of operation — political, environmental, research, production, domestic and international marketing, etc.

Third, national prominence. In keeping with the strategic plan of the College, a merger offers an operational economy of scale that can stimulate the development of a "center of excellence" in plant agriculture. There is a stronger prospect of this occurring in a larger, integrated program of plant agriculture than what could be accomplished in smaller, separate divisions.

Fourth, increased funding support. The combined strengths of the alumni of both programs and support from industry can be tapped more successfully in a positive campaign that focuses on the benefits of the merger. An integrated approach to articulating needs and seeking funds to address them is much more likely to succeed than the splintered effort of small units. The College has an opportunity to attract leadership for the combined departments that can add a valuable dimension to helping raise private funds. Such leadership will have a stronger base to represent the contributions of the faculty and to articulate the rational for private support. Thus, the new department can make a bold statement about cutting-edge curricular design and responsiveness to industry through the merger. How the merger is announced is a key to external support, for it affords an extraordinary opportunity to generate support that should not be missed.

Fifth, one plus one can equal more than two. The benefits of unity include an integrated student outreach and recruitment effort, the stronger likelihood of recruiting a department chair to lead a substantial organization, resources for equipment investments, and the critical mass of faculty, students, and activity necessary to gain industry attention and support.

Needless to say, the success of a merger depends upon the commitments and mutual responsibilities of all parties to make it happen — department faculty and leadership, College and University leadership, and the plant agriculture industry. The Provost and Vice President for University Advancement, in particular, are prepared to assist this
merger in ways that they can and I have asked the Provost to work closely with Dean Jen, the interim leadership of the College (following the Dean's expected confirmation as Undersecretary of Agriculture), and the departmental leadership in order to ensure as smooth and prompt a merger as possible. Among the points the merger implementation should keep in mind are maintaining current degree programs and providing for additional others (e.g., viticulture), continuing the advisory councils in both Crop Science and Environmental Horticultural Science, and selecting a department name that recognizes its principal elements (e.g., Crop and Horticultural Sciences).

My support for this merger is not without a recognition that there are important issues to address from the two departments' perspectives. Their respective identities, industry relationships, financial accounts management, specialized facilities, and technical needs, for example, are matters that the merger will need to address. But the advantages of a merger are clear. I expect that both faculties will commit themselves to its success.

The greatest consequence of a successful merger — a nationally preeminent program in plant agriculture with strong emphasis areas and distinctive degree programs in Crop Science and Environmental Horticultural Science — will strengthen what we do for our students, the industry we serve, and our University. I look forward to what can be accomplished towards this goal. Accordingly, I am asking Dean Jen to consult with the Provost to appoint a merger committee before the end of this quarter and to charge that committee to plan the merger over the summer.
WHEREAS, Bylaws section III.B.8 of the Academic Senate provides for the election of a voting representative for part time academic employees to the Academic Senate; and

WHEREAS, During fall quarter, the Academic Senate solicits all part time academic employees for nominations to this position; and

WHEREAS, Often only one nomination is received; and

WHEREAS, Administering a full election process when only one nomination has been received requires an unnecessary expenditure of time and resources; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That when only one nomination has been received for the position of Academic Senate representative for part time academic employees, that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate be given the authority to appoint said nominee to the position; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Section III.B.8.(b) of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be changed as follows:

(b) After nominations have been received, election to this position shall be conducted. A runoff election, if needed, shall be conducted the week following the conclusion of the election. Said position shall be elected by vote of all University part time academic employees unless only one nomination to this position is received, in which case the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall have the authority to appoint said nominee to the position. A runoff election, if needed, shall be conducted the week following the conclusion of the election.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: December 11, 2001