

CALIFORNIA POLYFECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

San Luis Obispo, California 93407 ACADEMIC SENATE 805.756.1258

MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Tuesday, January 21, 2003 UU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

- I. Minutes: Approval of minutes for Academic Senate meetings of November 19 and December 3, 2002 (pp. 2-7).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
 - A. Memo from Spence on Academic Planning and Program Review (pp. 8-10).
 - B. Draft report *Intellectual Property, Fair Use, and the Unbundling of Ownership Rights* is now available for viewing at:

 http://www.calstate.eduJAcadSeniintellectual Property 111502.doc
 Before printing, please note this report is 127 pages long.

III. Reports:

- A. Academic Senate Chair:
- B. President's Office:
- C. Provost's Office:
- D. Statewide Senators:
- E. CFA Campus President:
- F. ASI Representatives:
- G. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda:

- V. Business Hem(s):
 - A. Curriculum Proposal for Master of Public Policy (MPP): Hannings, chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading, (pp. 11-13).
 - B. Resolution on Class Attendance (CAM 485.2): Breitenbach, chair of the Instruction Committee, first reading, (pp. 14-17).
 - C. Resolution on Budget Priorities: Foroohar, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading, (pp. 18-26).
 - D. Resolution on Including Unit 3 Employees in the Program to Pay for Parking with Pretax Dollars: Foroohar, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading, (p. 27).
- VI. Discussion Hem(s):
- VII. Adjournment:

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY San Luis Obispo, California 93407 ACADEMIC SENATE 805.756.1258

MINUTES OF The Academic Senate Tuesday, November 19, 2002 VU220, 3:00 to 5:00 pm

- I. Minutes: The minutes for the Senate Committee meeting of October 1 and October 29,2002 were approved without change.
- II. Communications and Announcements:

futroduction of John Ashbaugh from History as the part-time/lecturer faculty representative. A thank you to Jerry Hanley, Craig Schultz, and the folks at ITS for allowing the Academic Senate web site link on the Quick-finds drop-down menu list at the Cal Poly home page.

A quick poll on how many people use my My.CalPoly Portal revealed that only about 12 people at the Academic Senate meeting currently use it.

- A. Free Expression (Draft) Policy available for viewing at:
 - http://policy.calpoly.edu/capdraft/IOO/CAP180draft.htm (p.8). (Howard-Greene) Over the summer a group of folks including, staff, administrators, and student convened almost on a weekly basis to discuss campus policies related to free speech and have since then broadened that term to free expression to allow for both non-verbal and verbal forms of communication. Some incidents on campus last year called into question whether or not there was widespread understanding of the existing policies and also suggested that we needed to look at current and emerging policies in order to make sure that they reflected the current thinking of the campus community on the issue of free expression. As a result, a draft policy is now viewable on the web while it goes to committee and administrative and legal review. You are all invited to take a look at the policy and pass any comments to Dan Howard-Greene to share with the CAP committee. The policy emphasizes that Cal Poly has a responsibility to not only tolerate but actually facilitate, foster, and promote the robust exchange of contrasting views in an array of issues. At the same time, it emphasizes that certain rules, such a scheduling protocol, need to be followed in order to preserve the ability of the university to conduct its core education mission and also to provide security of public safety.
- B. Resolution on Support for Proposition 47 (AS-590-02/EC) approved by President Baker on October 18, 2002.
- e. Memo re "Jointly Sponsored Volume of Articles on Academic Technology in the CSU" (p.9).
- D. At the December 3, 2002 Academic Senate meeting, the following Trustees will be present to discuss educational issues affecting the state and the CSU: Roberta Achtenberg (Trustee), Debra Farar (Chair, Board of Trustees), Harold Goldwhite (Faculty Trustee). (Dingus) Be sure to attend the meeting. Senator Hood suggested sending discussion items to the Academic Senate office staff who will then forward them to the trustees.

III. Reports:

- A. Academic Senate Chair: None.
- B. President's Office: None.
- e. Provost's Office: (Dalton) The CSU has allocated funds for an additional 100 FfE students for this year which will help cover some of the cost associated with the fact that enrollment is above our original target. Cal Poly has received the first confirmation of the total enrollment

- target for next year which will be 17,100, an increase of 200 over what they are budgeting for us this year.
- D. Statewide Senators: (Foroohar) Members were elected to the faculty trustee nomination committee, which consists of seven members from different campuses. This committee will look at applications from those interested on becoming faculty trustees, and will send their recommendations to the full Senate by March. Two important resolutions were passed at the last meeting, including one dealing with an amendment to the CSU bylaws limiting the term of Executive Committee members to two consecutive years in the same position. The reason for passing this resolution is to allow more chances to more senators to get involved in the leadership of the Statewide Academic Senate. The other resolution, which resulted in a very long discussion, asks the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to reconsider the budget proposal approved on October 31, 2002. The reason for this resolution is that the approved budget does not consider major priorities, such as faculty salary and class size, mentioned in two resolutions passed last May on budget priority.
- E. CFA Campus President: None.
- F. ASI Representatives: (Schrupp) ASI is currently working on recruiting volunteers to serve on the civility task force by identifying students from as wide a range of colleges as possible.
- G. Other: None.
- IV. Consent Agenda: None.
- V. Business Items:
 - A. Agribusiness Department Curriculum Proposal: Hannings, Chair of the Curriculum Committee. Second reading. The procedure is for Senators to vote to agree or disagree with the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee recommends against changing the Math 118 or Math 221 listing in the catalog to Math 221. There was a clarification that the Curriculum Committee isn't opposed to the Math 221 requirement but does oppose requiring Math 221 without also requiring Math 118, which is a pre-requisite for Math 221. The Curriculum Committee considers this a classic example of a case of establishing hidden pre-requisites. Amspacher, representative for the Agribusiness department, mentioned that it is not their desire to up their Math requirement, but rather it is a desire to have the students be properly prepared and it's not a hidden pre-requisite situation. M/S/P to close debate. M/SIF to approve the Curriculum Committee's recommendation. therefore, the Agribusiness curriculum proposal stands as submitted with Math 221 as the only required course to be stipulated in the next catalog.
 - B. **College of Business Curriculum Proposal:** Item was withdrawn.
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
 - A. Myron Hood thanked everyone for all the cards and e-mails. He also mentioned that he has recovered and is doing well.
 - B. Del Dingus recognized each caucus chair and asked them to share something good and positive that has taken place within their college.
 - College of Agriculture Harris Last year the College of Agriculture students won eight national prizes at a very competitive level and would like to applaud the faculty and students for their investment and commitment to excellence.
 - College of Architecture and Environmental Design Reich For the first time in 25 years we are busy planning how to make our space that we work in a lot more usable by way of a college-wide committee working on spending Prop 47 money in a good way. One positive thing is that there are a number of younger people involved and interested in challenging some assumptions and continuing to press for real careful examination of all the issues and to make sure that they are current. The Architecture department hosted the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture,

which is the national faculty organization conference last weekend, brought 65 scholars from around the world, had many students involved, and published an excellent proceeding before the conference. There are some extra copies available for sale.

College of Business - Armstrong - A 6-month long strategic planning process, donated to the college, was completed. Ernst & Young conducted this \$100,000 program. We are anxious to roll out the various results from different aspect of that planning process into policies, procedures, and follow up.

College of Engineering - DeTurris - Our campus has the largest "Society of Women Engineers" student sections in the country, which won best student section award this year at the national competition. The college has 10 new faculty members this year. A \$5 million alumni donation will allow a senior project center to be built with construction beginning next year to be located in the parking lot outside the library. We expect a full accreditation from the Accreditation Board for Engineering (ABET) for next year.

College of Liberal Arts - Lynch - We exceeded the fund raising campaign for the year by \$1.7 million. The faculty and staff are undertaking a funding campaign for a children's center in Kabul and we encourage all to take part in that. There are 19 faculty tenure-track searches going on in the college for next year.

College of Science and Math - Brown - We had a large donation of the Unocal Pier last year, which will contribute to both students and faculty involvement across the college.

PCS - Montgomery - <u>Librarians</u> - We responded to AS!'s request to extend the hours of the library for the students at night and on the weekends. We are moving the current periodicals down to the first floor near the front of the library where a new room is now constructed but furniture has not arrived yet. We have received student fee money from several colleges for materials and resources. <u>Counselors</u> - They are working diligently to realize Baker's request to have students complete their degrees and senior projects on time. <u>Athletics</u> - The football coaches met with the players everyday to discuss how their academics are going and to keep them on track. The women's soccer coach was named Coach of the Conference and Coach of the Year.

VII. Meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.

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, December 3, 2002 00220, 3:00 to 5:00 pm

I. Minutes: None.

II. Communications and Announcements: None.

III. Reports: None.

N. Consent Agenda: None.

V. Business Items: None

VI. Discussion Item(s): Discussion with CSU Board of Trustees members DEBRA FARAR (Chair of the Board), HAROLD GOLDWHITE (Faculty Trustee), and President BAKER.

After some introductory remarks by Senate Chair Menon, the Trustees were invited to comment on the current budget situation. This was followed by several questions from Senators and other faculty present at this special session of the Senate. A summary of these discussions is recorded below:

<u>Farar</u> - At a meeting with Chancellor Reed and finance people on how to cut \$5 billion statewide it was determined that "everything is on the table" but nothing will happen until next year. At this time, we don't know in what direction we are headed except that there will be cuts.

<u>Goldwhite</u> - Constitutionally required programs would not get cut. Many campuses have ftrm contracts that are difficult to cut.

<u>Harris</u> - What do we do with extra Tidal Wave II students and no budget for remediation? <u>Goldwhite</u> - Some problems have no solution. The group of students in Tidal Wave II are different from students in the past. My personal view is that the quality of education in the CSU has declined over the past 20-25 years and based on standards and resources, the decline will continue. <u>Farar</u> - There has to be balance between quality and access and any strategies and decisions will be about access. "Access without quality scares me. But quality without access scares me even more."

<u>Igbal-</u> How can trustees explain the ever-increasing demands on the faculty for higher quality performance in the areas of research, teaching (higher enrollment and larger class sizes) and service with ever decreasing resources and undoubtedly low salaries? At the minimum, it is unfair to expect greater and higher quality output without increasing the inputs (resources) and competitive compensation.

Goldwhite - Agree with the second sentence. The Board of Trustees makes major decisions for the CSU but doesn't set the standards for faculty. We need to give the faculty the power to make decisions on standards. The faculty, not the trustees, have placed the demands on the faculty. We now demand a lot more from our faculty than in the past. We must have serious conversations with the Senates about these decisions and demands.

<u>Farar</u> - The CSU understands that faculty drives the quality of our institution. Chancellor Reed and the Board of Trustees want any available money to go to faculty compensation.

<u>Foroohar</u> - We need to emphasize not how small the budget is but the allocation of that budget, which is something we can do something about. The budget proposal that Reed brought to the Board and passed doesn't take into account priorities set by two previous resolutions, one deals with faculty salary and the other with class size. None of the two priorities are emphasized and we also ask; what about shared governance.

<u>Farar</u> - The breakdown with shared governance is that when things don't turn out, there is no explanation. The resolutions were given heavy consideration and maybe the manner in which the decision was reached wasn't communicated properly.

Foroohar - How much was assigned to the CMS program?

Farar - CMS was heavily discussed and consistently brought up, but it was not a solution. The budget reflects commitment to access. \$400 millions have been budgeted for CMS over the next seven years.

<u>Goldwhite</u> - The process of shared governance gets advice, consults, and decides. The Board of Trustees made a decision and when disagreements occur it has the obligation to explain. The position of the Academic Senate was forcefully brought forward.

<u>Hood</u> - The budget crunch should not be a surprise. Each campus needs to discuss what to do to make these cuts. On this campus, nothing has been planned. It's time to do something, we need direction and to set priorities. We need realistic priorities set from the Chancellor on down.

<u>Farar</u> - Some decisions will be handed down from the legislatures but depend on the Senates for resources.

<u>Laver</u> - Is the current situation scary enough to consider raising tuition?

Farar - Yes, but nothing has been decided.

<u>Hannings</u> - It might help us if Chancellor Reed made sympathetic comments.

Goldwhite - Reed in general speaks very positive of the faculty.

<u>Montgomery</u> – One of the biggest concerns is the ability of junior faculty to get housing - is there a way for the Board of Trustees to come up with some solutions?

<u>Farar</u> - Other programs for existing housing are being discussed for five campuses in the CSU system with Cal Poly being one of the five.

<u>Baker</u> - Housing is an issue across the entire state and we get a double whammy with salaries too low and housing too high.

Goldwhite - The Board of Trustees did put a line item for housing but it got chopped down.

<u>Stephens</u> - on the issue of health care – is the Board of Trustees doing anything to address accessible and affordable care?

<u>Goldwhite</u> - The faculty negotiations have not been too successful. We are aware of the problem but not much has been done and the legislature didn't get far.

<u>Greenwald</u> - If we are told that we have to cut budget and take on more students, this is not a favor to students if graduation takes six years due to class accessibility. The number of students admitted must have some correlation with the budget.

Farar - Absolutely.

Ashbaugh - Is it possible for an optional student fee, as it was done here to reduce class size.

<u>Goldwhite</u> - There was a lot of concern at the Board of Trustees for this campus when there was a fee increase. The danger of many fee increases is that it looks like general fees increase. Several campus' student-body are different, they are not willing to impose fee increases on themselves.

<u>Farar</u> - Many students came here for the renowned Architecture program and see the fee increase as an investment in their future but not all CSU students see it that way.

<u>Goldwhite</u> - The point is well taken. At a conference in Sacramento, we were criticized for not putting together a good plan for the next 10 years. We are "muddling thru"

<u>Harris</u> - We need a diverse faculty to accommodate a diverse student body. Muddling thru will kill us because we can't adjust to changes.

<u>Goldwhite</u> - A number of private universities are doing that which the CSU would like to do. We do have options but most of them are campus options. We have a great deal of autonomy in spending money. An increase of under-represented faculty is difficult where there is no community support for minorities.

<u>Lewis</u> - The "muddling thru" remarks are well taken as an example of no leadership.

<u>Greenwald</u> - We all see a crisis but no one is doing much about it. We should have a retreat of trustees, presidents, and others to brainstorm and come up with possible solutions, so that when a crisis does occur, we have at least thought about it.

Goldwhite - Good idea.

Farar - Good idea.

<u>Foroohar</u> - Some solutions are not expensive, for example, forgivable loans for doctorate students. <u>Baker</u> - There is a system wide program already in place. A problem with forgivable loans is that they are less effective since Proposition 209.

<u>Hood</u> - In the 90s the CSU "muddled thru," when student services were cut, and they really suffered. We can't afford to muddle again, we need to set priorities and try to achieve them.

Farar - It was a good idea to have us here for these discussions.

Goldwhite - We'll do it again.

Menon - We thank Trustees Farar and Goldwhite for having participated in this Senate discussion.

VII. Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory, Academic Senate



RECEIVE0

Office of the Chancellor

DEC = 0.7002

ACADEMIC SENATE

Date: December 16,2002

Code: AA 2002-55

To:

Members, Academic Council

From: DavidS.Spence

Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

Reply Requested By January 13.2003

Subject:

ANNUAL REPORTS FOR INCLUSION IN BOARD OF TRUSTEES AGENDA ITEM ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Review

Trustee policy requires each campus to review every academic program on a regular basis. For many years, we requested that campuses submit summaries of campus program reviewers for inclusion in the March Board of Trustees agenda item on academic planning and program review. After extensive consultation with the Executive Council, the Academic Council, and the Academic Senate CSU, we are acting to decrease workload burdens on the campuses and allow for greater campus flexibility. The requirement to review each academic program periodically-and the expectation that assessment of student learning will be a central feature of the review-will continue, though campuses might wish to extend the period between reviews, better to align program review schedules with WASC accreditation and other required review activities.

This opportunity for consolidating and reducing reporting requirements derives from the increasing focus on learning outcomes assessment across a wide range of reporting areas, including WASC and many specialized/professional accreditation protocols, CSU Cornerstones/Accountability reporting, and campus-based program reviews. We wish to encourage campuses through changes in Chancellor's Office reporting requirements to utilize the same learning outcomes results and procedures for preparing reports across all of these reporting areas. Accordingly, beginning with next year's round of program reviews, we will ask that such outcomes information be generated as part of the regular cycle of program review and be reported to the Chancellor's Office. Doing so for the programs reviewed in anyone year will also constitute the campus's report for the learning outcomes performance indicator in the annual accountability report. We also trust that the year-by-year accumulation of these outcome data will provide a solid foundation as the campus prepares for periodic regional and special program accreditation reviews.

Assuming that key elements of program review will inform the WASC self-study and accountability reporting, the Chancellor's Office will no longer collect summaries of program reviews for transmittal to the Board. However, if your campus has undertaken an extraordinary program review activity and wishes it to be mentioned in the agenda item on academic planning and program review, please let Dr. Jolayne Service know by January 13, 2003.

Members, Acadentic Council December 16, 2002 Page 2

on academic planning and program review, please let Dr. Jolayne Service know by January 13, 2003.

In subsequent years, we will be requesting two categories of information to be reported to the Chancellor's Office for each of the programs reviewed in the prior year:

- (1) Brief summary of the results of the assessments of student learning outcomes for the programs reviewed
- (2) Summary of changes in program requirements enacted or recommended.

Total Units Requiredfor a Baccalaureate Degree

In July 2000, the Board amended Title 5 of the *California Code of Regulations* to establish 120 semester units as the minimum that a campus may require for the awarding of a baccalaureate degree and to oblige campuses to maintain a monitoring system to ensure that justification is provided for all program requirements that extend the baccalaureate unit requirement beyond 120 units. The agenda item noted, "It is understood that **baccalaureate** unit requirements are to be reviewed on campuses by the faculty in the course of regularly scheduled program reviews." (Some campuses have chosen to accelerate program-by-program review of the total units required for a bachelor's degree,) Trustees have asked that a progress report be incorporated in the annual agenda item on academic planning and program review.

We ask that each campus count and report for all of its degree programs by January 13, 2003, the number of degree programs that fall into each of the following four categories:

- (1) Degree programs now requiring 120 semester units (180 quarter units) for the baccalaureate degree
- (2) Degree programs for which the total units required for a baccalaureate degree have been reviewed and reduced, but not to 120 semester units (180 quarter units)
- (3) Degree programs for which the total units required for a baccalaureate degree have been reviewed but not reduced
- (4) Degree programs for which the total units required for a baccalaureate degree have yet to be reviewed

Members, Academic Council December 16,2002 Page 3

WASC Visits in 200]:2002

If a WASC team visited the campus in 2001-2002, please provide by January 13, 2003, a summary of the major results and recommendations emerging from the visit. (This is also required by Trustee policy.) The summary should be approved by the President. If you have not already done so, please send a copy of the self-study, the complete report of the visiting team, and the letter from WASC affirming or reaffirming accreditation. It would be most helpful if the summaries were transmitted by electronic mail to jo@calstate.edu. (If they are sent as attachments, please specify the format in the body of the message.)

If there are questions about the reports requested, please call Dr. Service at (562) 951-4723.

Thank you for your cooperation.

cc: Presidents

Associate Vice Presidents, Academic Programs
Associate Vice PresidentslDeans, Graduate Studies
Associate Vice PresidentslDeans, Undergraduate Studies
Chairs, Campus Academic Senates
Chair, Academic Senate CSU
CSSA Liaison Office

Master of Public Policy (MPP)

Summary Statement of Proposed New Degree Program

1. Title of Proposed Program.

Master of Public Policy
Department Proposing to Offer the Program:
Political Science
Intended Date of Implementation: Fall 2003

2. Objectives of the Proposed Program.

The Master of Public Policy degree program (MPP) is professionally oriented, open to students who wish to pursue analytic careers in government and non-profit organizations or in organizations related to public policy regulations. The MPP is structured to prepare graduates with competence to function in a general context of policy, as well as in analysis. The core courses cover statistics, public policy, public policy analysis, quantitative methods, public finance, policy internship, and graduate seminar.

The MPP program is designed to meet the needs of those who have earned baccalaureate degrees in a variety of disciplines including, but not limited to, economics, history, political science, social sciences, psychology, city and regional planning, business administration, education, environmental studies, and natural resource management.

The program is two years in duration for students taking 8 or more units per term. The program consists of 55 approved units (not inclUding courses necessary to compensate for deficiencies). Because of the sequencing of courses, students admitted to the program are expected to begin study in the fall quarter. The degree culminates in the second year with a two-term seminar (POLS 590) where analytical projects will be undertaken. Both group reports and individual papers will be developed, presented, and discussed. The MPP program offers students opportunities to develop close working relationships with faculty. Self-directed study, tailored to student interest and ne'eds, is encouraged.

3. Anticipated Student Demand.

Minimally, we would start the program with 15 students, but could accommodate up to 25 students in the first year, especially if they come with some advanced graduate credit. We anticipate the maximum enrollment to be 50 students after 5 years. Realistically, we plan for 30 or two classes of 15 students each within the first two-year start-up. The program takes a student two years or six quarters to complete.

	Number of Students		
	at initiation	3 years after initiation	5 years <u>after initiation</u>
Number of Majors	15-25	30-50	40-60
Number of Graduates	O	20-40	40-60

4. Indicate the kind of resource assessment used by the campus in determining to place the program on the academic plan. If additional resources will be required, the summary should indicate the extent of university commitment to allocate them and evidence that campus

decision-making committees were aware of the sources of resource support when they endorsed the proposal.

A thorough assessment of resources was conducted by the Chair and Faculty of the Political Science Department and the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Resources will come from replacing the existing undergraduate concentration in public administration within the political science major with the master's program. The department experienced a number of retirements and hired four new faculty to teach policy courses at the graduate level in addition to undergraduate program support. Two tenured faculty will also work with the program and two lecturers presently provide courses. No additional staffing resources will be required, however one course of release time for coordination each quarter will need to be assigned to the program.

The Senate Curriculum Committee reviewed and recommended approval of the MPP proposal during Fall 2002 quarter.

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

A market survey for professionals in governmental and non-profit institutions was conducted Spring 1999 and a follow-up set of interviews with 21 agency heads was conducted Spring 2002. The program is attractive to mid-career individuals in government and nonprofits in the community. All noted the need for a program, since professionals must travel two hours or more to the San Francisco or Los Angeles areas for graduate and professional coursework related to their jobs. City and county agencies provide employees with opportunities for further study and provide additional compensation for those with advanced analytical competencies.

In annual exit surveys with undergraduates over the last twenty years, over half (50-53%) express an interest in pursuing a graduate degree program, and 25-30% have moderate to high interest in a policy related program. At present we have a mailing list of 40 persons awaiting the initiation of this program. Since the program is open to students of any major from this institution or others, we are confident that there will be a continued strong demand for the program. In the College of Liberal Arts alone there are over 400 graduates each year. MPP graduates traditionally have nearly 100% employment in the U.S.

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

The former undergraduate concentration in public administration and policy has been replaced by graduate level offerings for this new program and in support of other programs at Cal Poly, notably the Master of City and Regional Planning. The Department of Political Science provides support courses for both the undergraduate and graduate programs in City and Regional Planning. As the program matures, we would develop program links with other graduate programs at Cal Poly and would coordinate offerings. The course conversions reflect the kinds of offerings found in similar MPP programs and interdisciplinary programs at the graduate level that are directed at urban studies, public administration, and policy.

At the undergraduate level, introductory policy courses, and special seminars related to policy issues have replaced the former offerings. The internship program at the undergraduate level continues. The new graduate internships will be crafted in coordination with local agencies and organizations to focus on analytical skills.

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 which has potential value for students. If the new program does not appear to conform to the Trustee policy calling for "broadly based programs," provide rationale:

The Master of Public Policy is a commonly offered graduate program. Cal Poly has no current graduate program as are found in the other CSU campuses. Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo is affiliated with the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, an academic support organization for public policy study and research.

The MPP provides coursework relevant to analysis of public policies and planning.

8. Briefly describe how the new program fits with the campus and college strategic plans.

The College of Liberal Arts Strategic Plan (May 1998) supports the MPP Proposal. Likewise, it is supported by the university strategic plan that calls for an expansion of graduate programs with the policy program designated as a priority.

9. Provision for meeting accreditation requirements, where applicable.

The Department of Political Science is an affiliate institution of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, a support organization for public policy study and research. Some MPP programs are affiliated with the NASPAA, an accrediting agency for public administration and related management programs. However, many policy graduate programs are **not_and** NASPAA tends to think they are not ready to take on policy programs like ours at this time.

10. For graduate programs, how will the culminating experience be accomplished (thesis, project or comprehensive exam)?

A comprehensive oral exam will culminate the program. A faculty team of three will administer the exam where the student is expected to display work performed as part of a course of study and to present research projects undertaken.

Master of Public Policy

Graduate students must file a formal study plan with their major professor, graduate committee, department, college and university graduate studies office no later than the end of the quarter in which the 12th unit of approved courses is completed. The formal program of study must include a minimum of 55 units (at least 43 of which must be at the 500 level).

CORE COURSES (37 units)	
STAT 512 Statistical Methods	4
POLS 515 Public Policy	4
POLS 516 Public Finance	4
POLS 518 Public Policy Analysis	4
POLS 560 Quantitative Methods	5
POLS 586 Policy Internship	8
POLS 590 Graduate Seminar	8
ELECTIVES: To be selected with an academic advisor	18

55

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE of CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY San Luis Obispo, CA

AS- -03/

RESOLUTION ON CLASS ATTENDANCE (CAM 485.2)

1 2 3	WHEREAS,	The Class Attendance section (485.2) in the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM) has not been revised since June 1979; and	
4 5 6	WHEREAS,	This section missed work	n outlines the excusable reasons for allowing students to make up k; and
7 8 9 10	WHEREAS,	Activities (I	mention NCAA athletic competitions or Instructionally Related IRA)/competitions as excusable reasons to make up missed class work. y published, CAM Section 485.2 reads as follows:
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		485.2 To n	naintain uniformity, it is suggested that instructors consider the following usable" reasons for allowing students to make up missed work: Illness with a doctor's statement Serious illness or death of close relatives Active participation in university events (an instructor may require a statement from the adviser involved certifying that the student was actively participating in a recognized university event) Field trips Religious holidays Selective service and military reasons;
24 25		therefore, be	e it
26 27 28 29 30 31	RESOLVED:	Activities (I	lowing NCAA athletic competitions and Instructionally Related RA)/competitions be added as items G and H to Campus ive Manual section 485.2 as excusable reasons for missing class work: NCAA athletic competitions Instructionally Related Activities (IRA)/competitions

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee

Date: November 18, 2002 Revised: January 7,2003



califOrnia polytechnic state IJnivers IVI an IUIs obispo. california 93407

IRA's: Student-Funded Instructionally Related Activities

- Contacts
 - O Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs
 - Valene Mathews, Administrative Assistant, Office of Academic Programs
- · The Policy
 - o Executive Order 429 Instructionally Related Activities
 Fee
 - o Executive Order 740 Campus Fee Policy
 - o IRA Student Fee Referendum
- TheCriteria
 - o Criteria for Recognizing and Funding IRA's
- · The Programs
 - o Recognized IRA programs/activities
- · The Process
 - o Funding Allocation 02-03
 - Allocation Budget 02-03
 - Proposed Recognition of New Instructionally Related Activities 02-03
 - Sources & Uses 02-03
 - o Funding Allocation 01-02
- The Forms
 - o Call for Applications
 - o Proposal Form
 - o Budget Request Form

An instructionally Related ActiVity (IRA) is an "out-of-c1ass experience" that provides enrichment to the student and others. Funding for all IRA-recognized programs/activities are provided through student fees. All IRA programs/activities are partially sponsored by an academic Dean or department and are "integrally related" to a formal instructional offering; however, enrollment in an academic course is not a necessary condition for participating in an IRA.

The IRA Advisory Committee reviews recognition of new programs and all requests for funding. These are initiated through proposal submissions by faculty advisors and students, followed by review and recommendations from the College Deans, with advice from the appropriate College Student Council. Final recognition and funding recommendations are submitted by the IRA Advisory Committee to the President for approval.

For questions and concerns about this site contact <u>imdemers@calpolv.edu</u> Last modified January 6, 2003



Return to Cal Poly home page

Cal Poly Instructionaliy Related Activities 2002-2003

Program Description	IRA Program Coordinators/Contacts	Department Web Address
College of Agriculture		
Ag Judging - Dairy Cattle	Stan Henderson	Dairy Science
Ag JUdging - Dairy Products	Will Gillis	Dairy Science
Ag Judging - Flower	Virginia Walter	Environmental Horticultural
Ag Judging - Horse	Mike Lund	Animal Science
Ag JUdging - Livestock	Mike Hall	Animal Science
Ag Judging - Soils	Lynn E. Moody	Earth and Soil Sciences
American Institute of Floral Designers Convention & Design	Melinda Lynch	Environmental Horticultural
American Society for Horticultural Science Collegiate Judging	J. Wyatt Brown	Crop Science
Associated Landscape Contractors	Steve Angley	Environmental Horticultural
Food Science Scholastic Comp Team-1FT College Bowl	Brian Hampson	Food, Science and Nutrition
Horse Show Team	Mike Lund	Animal Science
Logging Team	Douglas Piirto	Natural Resources Management
National Ag Marketing Team (NAMA)	Phil Doub	Environmental Horticultural
Rodeo	Bret Black	College of Agriculture
Tractor Pull Team	Mark A. Zohns	BioResource & Ag Engineering
1/4 Scale Tractor	Kenneth Solomon	BioResource & Ag Engineering
College of Architecture and Environmental Engineering		
Construction Management - Student Competition	Jim Borland	Construction Management
NAHB Residential Construction Competition	Barbara J. Jackson	Construction Management
College of Business		
Business Plan Competition	Doug Cerf	College of Business
International Career Conference	Chris Carr	Accounting
MBA Association International Collegiate Business Policy Competition Team	David Peach	Management
MBA Industry Projects Program	Barry Floyd	Graduate Management

		Programs
College of Engineering		
American Society of Civil Engineers/Concrete & Steel Bridge Team	Eric Kasper	Civil & Environmental Engineering
Bike Team	Andrew Davol	Mechanical Engineering
FUTURETRUCK	Christopher Pascual	Mechanical Engineering
Programming Team	Phillip Nico	Computer Science
Society of Automotive Engineers	Michael lannce	Mechanical Engineering
Solar Car Club	Bill Clark	Mechanical Engineering
College of Liberal Arts		
Art Exhibits	Michael Barton Miller	Art and Design
Barbershop Quartet	Joe Stablein	Music
Byzantium: A Literary Annual	Kevin Clark	English
CPTV	John Campbell	Journalism
Dance/Orchesis	Maria Junco	Theatre and Dance
Debate	T.C. Winebrenner	Speech Communication
Drama	Pamela Malkin	Theatre and Dance
KCPR	John Campbell	Journalism
Liberal Studies & Arts and Teaching Project	Susan Duffy	Liberal Studies
Model United Nations	Craig Arceneaux	Political Science
Music - Chamber Orchestra	Clifton Swanson	Music
Music - Combined Choral	Thomas Davies	Music
Music - Jazz Band	Paul Rinzler	Music
Music - Wind Orchestra	William V. Johnson	Music
Shakespeare Press Museum	Tom Goglio	Graphic Communication
Student Affairs		
Community Relations - Service Learning	Stephan Lamb	Student Life & Leadership
Rose Float	Diana Cozzi	Associated Students, Inc.
Student Life and Learning - Cross Cultural Retreat	Mark Fabionar	Student Life & Leadership
University Center for Teacher Education		
Teaching & the Performing Arts (formerly YOPAC)	Susan McBride	University Center for Teacher Education

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE of CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY San Luis Obispo, CA

AS- -03/

RESOLUTION ON BUDGET PRIORITIES

1 2 3	WHEREAS,	The mission of the California State University is to provide the people of California with readily accessible and high quality education; and
5 4 5	WHEREAS,	To fulfill our mission we need to recruit and retain highly qualified faculty; and
6 7	WHEREAS,	Low compensation, high workload, and high cost of living are major obstacles to faculty recruitment and retention; and
8 9 10 11	WHEREAS,	The State of California is going through severe economic slowdown and extreme fiscal uncertainty, and funding outside the Partnership Funding Agreement is highly unlikely; therefore, be it
12 13 14 15 16	RESOLVED:	That the CSU administration honor the Short Term Budget Priorities (AS-2572-02/FGA, May 2-3, 2002) and the Priorities for Strategic Budget Planning (AS-2573-02/FGA, May 2-3,2002) approved by the CSU Academic Senate; and be it further
17 18 19 20 21	RESOLVEO:	That the CSU administration revise its budget proposal for 2003-2004 to provide for faculty compensation to achieve parity with comparison institutions as established and published by the California Post-Secondary Education Commission (CPEC); and be it further
22 23	RESOLVED:	That funding for faculty salary and staff salary be given priority status in the framework of the Partnership Funding Agreement and not as augmentation; and be it further
24 25 26 27	RESOLYEO:	That the CSU administration request specific funding in the Partnership Funding Agreement to begin the process of implementation of ACR 73; and be it further
28 29 30 31	RESOLVEO:	That the CSU administration request specific funding to begin the process of reducing the student-faculty ratio to the level typical before the state's fiscal crisis of the early 1990s; and be it further
32 33	RESOLVED:	That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Chancellor of the CSU and the CSU Board of Trustees.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and Academic Senate Budget & Long Range Planning Committee Date: Nov 18,2002

Partnership Funding Agreement Base Budget Calculation	
2002/03 Final General Fund Budget	\$2,680,280,000
Less: Lease Bond Payments and Deferred Maintenance Borrowing Debt Service Payments	(65,697,000)
Plus: Restore Fundingfor 2002103 One-Time Long-Term Need Reduction	43,000,000
Total, CSU 2003/04 Base Budget General Fund Support	\$2,657,583,000
Partnership Agreement	
4% Increase for General Operations (\$2,657,853, 000 x .04)	\$106,303,000
1% Increase for Long-Term Need (\$2,657,853, 000 x .01)	26,576,000
Full State Marginal Cost for 5% Enrollment Growth @ \$6,890 per FTES	110,633,000
State Marginal Cost Supplement for YRO Conversion	7,713,000
Partnership Revenue Agreement	
Revenue from Enrollment Growth	28,238,000
Revenue from YRO Conversions (@ 2002/03 marginal cost rate)	2,065,000
Buy Out Revenue from Increase in State University Fee Rates	16,294,000
SUBTOTAL, PARTNERSHIP REVENUE ESTIMATE 2003/04	\$297,822,000
2002/03 Unfunded Partnership Revenue	115,840,000
Total Sources of Funds	\$413,662,000
Use of Lunds	
Mandatory Costs Full-Year Cost of Faculty (Unit 3) Compensation Agreement (2.64% Increase)	\$29,920,000
Full-Year Cost of Non-Faculty Compensation Agreement (2.04% Increase)	1,917,000
Cost of Unit 6 2003/04 Compensation Agreement (2% Increase)	979,000
Health Benefits Rate Increase	26,203,000
Workers Compensation Increase	7,000,000
New Space	12,000,000
Total, Mandatory Costs	\$78,019,000
Enrollment Growth -16,057 FTES (5% Increase)	\$124,586,000
Enrollment Growth YRO Conversions,- 1,683 FTES	\$9,778,000
Financial Aid - New Enrollment Growth	\$9,413,000
Long-Term Need	. , ,
Technology-Network Equipment	\$10,000,000
Libraries	8,000,000
Deferred Maintenance	8,576,000
	\$26,576,000
Non-Faculty Compensation Adjustment for Parity with Faculty Agreement (2.46% Increase)	\$26,573,000
General Compensation Increase; 1% Increase for all employees (excludes Unit 6)	\$22,877,000
SUBTOTAL, 2003/04 PARTNERSHIP FUNDING AGREEMENT	\$297,822,000
Compensation (3% effective $Ju\{v \mid 1 = \$37 \text{ million Faculty}; \$32.6 \text{ million non-faculty} - excludes 1% Unit 6)$	\$69,609,000
ACR 73 First Year Cost Requirement	
Maintain Faculty Position Base	\$5,800,000
Marginal Cost Supplement for Enrollment Growth Faculty at Average New Hire Rate	16,791,000
SFR 18.0 to 1 First Year Phase In Cost	13,024,000
Total, First Year ACR 73 Cost Requirement	\$35,615,000
Off-Campus Centers (at \$750,000 per Center over 500 FTES)	\$2,250,000
High Cost Academic Programs (Nursing. Agriculture, Engineering, Computer and Bio Technology)	\$8,366,000
Total Use of Funds	\$413,662,000

ACADEMIC SENATE of THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2572-02jFGA May 2-3,2002

Short-Term CSU Budget Priorities for 2002-2003 and 2003-2004

RESOLVED: That in order to ensure that the California State University retain the ability to provide the people of California with readily accessible and high quality education in these times of high enrollment demand and extreme fiscal uncertainty, the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) endorse the following budget priorities and urge their use in potential adjustments to the 2002-2003 budget and the development of the CSU Trustees proposed budget for the 2003-2004 academic year:

- That the CSU receive full marginal cost funding for all students that it admits.
- That the full partnership agreement be honored, particularly those provisions addressing state funding of the CSU.
- That sufficient resources be provided to support both the necessary searches for and the salary levels required to attract and retain high quality faculty counselors and librarians.
- That support for CSU libraries be increased in order to begin restoring the cuts in human and information resources experienced during the late 1980s and early 1990s.
- That the CSU seek full funding to adjust CSU faculty salaries to achieve parity with comparison institutions as established and published by the California Post-Secondary Education Commission (CPEC).
- That budgets include funding to enable the CSU to begin reducing the current student-faculty and student tenure-track faculty ratios to levels typical before the fiscal crisis of the early 1990s, including (a) changing the formula for determining full-time equivalent graduate student enrollment from the current 15 units per term to 12 units and (b) revision of the marginal cost formula to reduce the specified student-faculty ratio to the average level of the 1980s; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these priorities be communicated by the Executive Committee to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and his staff to assure the greatest impact during the 2002 summer's decision making.

RATIONALE: The Academic Senate of the CSU recognizes that the state of California is entering a period of severe budgetary constraint and that the resources necessary to meet many of its needs will not be available for the near future. At the same time, however, the CSU is facing enrollment increases unprecedented in recent years. If the CSU is to accommodate this demand while at the same time continuing to provide all students with a quality education, it is necessary that certain minimum funding needs in areas of enrollment, faculty recruitment and retention, and library resources must be met. Without this support, the ability of the CSU to provide students a quality education is in jeopardy. Providing access to higher education without the ability to also provide a quality education ultimately serves no one, not the student, not the CSU, and not the people of California.

APPROVED - May 2-3, 2002

ACADEMIC SENATE of THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2573-02/FGA May 2-3, 2002

Priorities for Strategic Budget Planning

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) endorse the following budget priorities drawn from the report, *The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century*, adopted by the Academic Senate CSU in September 2001 to be used in the development of future CSU Trustee budgets:

- A. Seek full funding to adjust CSU faculty salaries to achieve parity with comparison institutions. Experience over the past decade strongly suggests that the only way to close the salary gap is to seek full funding for the established CPEC parity figure. Accordingly, we urge that the budget request funding for the full parity figure.
- B. Seek specific funding to begin the process of reducing the current student-faculty ratio to the level typical before the state's fiscal crisis of the early 1990s. We recommend that this be done in the following ways:
 - Request supplemental funding to define a full-time equivalent graduate student as one carrying 12 units rather than 15 with no overall increase in the student-faculty ratio.
 - Request that the marginal cost formula be revised to specify a student-faculty ratio of 18.2:1 rather than the current level of 18.9:1; a student-faculty ratio of 18.2 represents the average student-faculty ratio during the 1980s.
 - Seek specific funding for the purpose of reducing class size, to be apportioned to all the campuses.
- C. Seek funding to begin the process augmenting CSU library collections and restore library staffing. We suggest a specific budget supplement for this purpose, one designed, over time, to fully restore library staffing and to restore library budgets to at least their purchasing power of the early 1980s.
- D. Seek specific funding to establish incentives to attract new faculty members of the highest quality; hire additional tenure-track faculty and improve funding for searches and reduce the current proportion of lecturers. Toward this end, we recommend that the budget:

- Request that the marginal cost formula be revised to specify an
 entry-level salary equal to the average entry-level salary in the
 most recent academic year plus whatever salary increase has been
 approved for the coming academic year. This will go far toward
 ensuring that funds for increased enrollment will permit the
 hiring of new tenure-track faculty members rather than forcing
 reliance on less expensive lecturers.
- Seek specific funding for housing subsidies or subsidized housing for junior faculty members, including moving expenses for newly hired faculty members.
- E. Seek specific funding to remedy insufficiencies due to delayed maintenance and delayed purchasing during the early 1990s; bring state-of-the-art technology to more CSU classrooms; improve the current CSU physical plant to provide adequate facilities for existing programs and for growth.
- F. Seek specific funding to provide additional sabbaticals and other research support for CSU faculty and to reconfigure the CSU faculty workload so that a minimum of one-fifth may be devoted to faculty development (including research, scholarship, and creative activity). We recognize that this is potentially a costly project, but we urge that a beginning be made to address these needs in future budgets to address these needs, and that the CSU develop a long-term plan to accomplish this goal over the next five years.
- G. Seek specific funding to increase the number of secretarial/clerical staff and technical staff who provide services to faculty and students, and to improve staff wages and benefits to attract and retain the best quality staff in these positions: and be it further

RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Chancellor of the CSU, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, CSU, and his staff and the CSU Board of Trustees; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Executive Committee be directed to establish a process of advocating these priorities throughout both the summer and the traditional academic year.

RATIONALE: While the California State University (CSU) will be facing significant and immediate budget challenges as a result of constraints on state funding, it is nonetheless important that the CSU engage in broader strategic planning aimed at addressing the longer-term needs of the CSU. In September 2001, the Academic Senate of the California State University adopted The California State University at the Beginning of the 21't Century, a survey of the

experience of the CSU during the decade past and projections for the CSU in the decade to come. This report includes a series of budget recommendations that address the changes that will be necessary if the CSU is to meet the challenges of the next decade. The letter of transmittal for that document states, in part:

It was never our expectation that our recommendations for funding would be-or could be-immediately implemented, even in a period of budget surplus. It has always been our hope, however, that our analyses of the state of the CSU will inform future budget planning and that our recommendations for both policy and funding will define goals for the coming decade. We look forward to working cooperatively and collegially with the CSU faculty, administration, Trustees, and, as necessary, the legislature to develop these recommendations into concrete proposals that will permit the CSU not only to meet the challenges it now faces but also to serve better the people of California.

It was the intention of the Academic Senate CSU that the recommendations be implemented gradually, over the coming decade, as funding permits. Because these goals are intended to inform and guide long-term planning, it is, therefore, impossible to put a specific price either on a specific recommendation or on the entire set of recommendations. The cost will depend both on circumstances at the time when the recommendation is first implemented and on the length of time it takes to provide full funding for the recommendation. The Academic Senate CSU recognizes that the CSU is currently operating in a time of severe fiscal constraint. Nonetheless, it urges that, in preparing its budget proposals for fiscal year 2003-2004 and beyond, the CSU give priority to the recommendations in this resolution.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 73

RESOLUTION CHAPTER 121

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 73-Relative to the California State University.

[Filed with Secretary of State September 24, 2001.]

Legislative COUNSEL'S Digest

ACR 73, Strom-Martin. California State University,

This measure would urge the Trustees of the California State University to study its faculty hiring practices over the past decade in order to effectuate improvements in those practices. The measure would also urge the trustees, along with the Academic Senate of the California State University and the California Faculty Association, to jointly develop a plan to raise the percentage of tenured or tenure-track faculty to at least 75%, among other prescribed objectives, and would urge the California State University to provide a report to the Legislature by May 1,2002.

WHEREAS, The faculty of the California State University must comply with the highest standards of educational achievement, experience, and professional conduct, as exemplified by the advanced degrees, and other academic honors, that they have earned; and

WHEREAS, The appointment of fully qualified faculty members ensures that the students of the California State University receive instruction and guidance from individuals with the education. background, and experience to be recognized as experts in their fields of academic endeavor; and

WHEREAS, Tenured and tenure-track faculty bear the primary responsibility for student advising, program development and revision, and participation in shared governance; and

WHEREAS, Before tenure may be awarded to a member of the California State University faculty, that person must possess a record of demonstrated excellence in the performance of his or her professional duties; and

WHEREAS. Students enrolled at the California State University must be provided the full range of academic services by the most qualified faculty members that the university can employ; and

WHEREAS, While the assigned workload of faculty members in tenure and tenure-track appointments includes duties related to student advising, professional development, and the design of curricula, the Res. Ch. 121 -2-

assigned workload of faculty members in temporary appointments generally does not include those duties; and

WHEREAS, Appointments of faculty to tenured and tenure-track positions recognize a mutually beneficial relationship that contributes to the long-term development of the faculty member and the quality of the instructional program available to California State University students; and

WHEREAS, Tenured faculty of the California State University who have recently retired have often been replaced by faculty members in temporary appointments rather than by tenure-track faculty; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, the Senate thereof concurring, That the Legislature of the State of California urges the Trustees of the California State University to study its faculty hiring practices over the past decade in order to effectuate improvements in those practices; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature urges the Trustees of the California State University, the Academic Senate of the California State University, and the California Faculty Association to jointly develop a plan that will accomplish all of the following:

- (a) Raise the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty to at least 75 percent, with the unit of measurement to be developed jointly by the entities described in this resolved clause.
- (b) Provide that no lecturers currently employed by the university will lose their jobs as a result of implementing the plan.
- (c) Provide that qualified lecturers will be seriously considered for tenure-track positions.
- (d) Provide for the continued improvement of faculty diversity; and be it further

Resolved, That the California State University is urged to provide a report outlining the plans developed by the entities described in the previous resolved clause to the Legislature by May 1,2002; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the Trustees of the California State University, the Academic Senate of the California State University, and the California Faculty Association.

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE of CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY San Luis Obispo, CA

AS- -03/

RESOLUTION ON INCLUDING UNIT 3 EMPLOYEES IN THE PROGRAM TO PAY FOR PARKING WITH PRETAX DOLLARS

1	WHEREAS,	With the exception of Unit 3 employees, all employees of the California State
2		University who pay for parking through payroll deduction are permitted to pay
3		such fees with pretax dollars; and
4		
5	WHEREAS,	Permitting faculty to pay for parking through payroll deduction with pretax dollars
6		would benefit faculty at no cost to the California State University, and
7		
8	WHEREAS,	No convincing rationale has been offered for denying CSU faculty the opportunity
9		to pay for parking with pretax dollars; therefore, be it
10		
11	RESOLVED:	That The California State University (CSU) administration be urged to include
12		faculty in the program to pay for parking with pretax dollars.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee

Date: November 18, 2002 Revised: January 7, 2003