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

AS-356-91/LRPC
RESOLUTION ON
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

WHEREAS, The Oversight Strategic Planning Committee and Academic Planning Committee for Cal Poly are developing the mission statement and goals and objectives for the campus; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee was charged with developing academic program review criteria in conjunction with the work of these committees; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached report on academic program data collection procedures be accepted for use as a working document.

Proposed By: Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee
March 11, 1991
ACADEMIC PROGRAM DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

I. Overview of the Program

A. Describe your program.

B. State the mission of your program and relate it to the Cal Poly Mission.

C. Give the goals and objectives of your program and relate them to the goals and objectives of Cal Poly.

D. Give a brief list of the strengths and weaknesses of your program.

II. Program Demand

A. For each of the last five years, give the following data:
   1. Number of applicants, accommodated students and enrolled students; list as new freshmen, transfers and total.
   2. Give the ratio of applicants to accommodated students.
   3. Give the ratio of accommodated students to enrolled students
   4. Number of majors.
   5. Number of graduates.
   6. Number of students in concentrations, minors or certificate programs.

B. List the percent of your majors that are graduating each year.

C. Explain any trends or anomalies seen in the data given above.

III. Course Demand

A. For each of the last five years, give the following data, list courses by mode and level:
   1. Number of courses and number of students enrolled per course.
   2. Number of major courses (a major course is one in which the majority of the students in the course are majors of the program) and number of students in major courses.
   3. Number of non-major courses (a non-major course is one which is not a major course) and number of students in non-major courses.

B. What percent of your courses are major courses? Comment.

C. Explain any trends or anomalies in the data given above.
IV. Curriculum Quality

A. Explain the structure of your curriculum including course sequencing. Give examples of schedules that an entering student would follow to graduate from your program. Consider both freshmen and transfer students.

B. List all courses that have been added or deleted from your program in the last five years.

C. Describe the following features of your program:
   1. Uniqueness, particularly within the CSU system. Compare your program demand with that of other similar CSU programs (Cf. II.A.2).
   2. Currency. (In what ways does your program reflect current curricular trends?)
   3. Quality. Define "quality" for your program and give evidence of how it is attained.
   4. Give a summary of student evaluations and other material that gives opinions of your curriculum.

V. Teaching Staff

A. List all teaching staff of your program and give the highest degree attained. Classify as full-time, part-time, graduate student or other, and list by rank.

B. Give the average teaching load of all members of your teaching staff for each of the last five years. Classify as in V.A.

C. List for the last five years all publications, grants, research efforts and other professional activities of your teaching staff.

D. Comment on any trends or anomalies in the above data.

VI. Other Staff

A. List all other staff and their position in your program.

B. List for the last five years all professional activities of these staff members.

VII. Student-Teacher Ratios

A. For each of the last five years, list your FTES/FTEF and the number of majors/FTEF.

B. For each of the last five years, give the number of faculty positions generated by your program.

D. Comment on any trends or anomalies in the above data.
VIII. Costs and Revenues of Your Program

A. List for each of the last five years the following budget and revenue information:
   1. Personal services (faculty, staff, student assistants, etc.).
   2. Operating expense (including faculty recruitment, telephone, etc.).
   3. Equipment (regular and replacement).
   4. Any other significant program expenses not accounted for within your program accounts (e.g. library, computer, audio visual, etc.).
   5. List any nonstate revenue your program has received.

B. Compute the total cost to the state of your program for each of the last five years. Also compute the total cost to the state per FTES and the total cost to the state per major.

C. Explain any significant difference between the amount budgeted and the actual expenditures.

D. Comment on any trends or anomalies in the above data.

IX. Alumni Data

A. For each of the last five years, give any data that you have on the employment and/or graduate school enrollment of students graduating from your program.

B. For each of the last five years list your graduates by ethnicity and gender.

C. Give any data that you have that demonstrates a need for graduates of your program. Be as specific as possible.

X. Other Criteria

A. Accreditation
   1. List any outside accreditation that your program has.
   2. If your program has no such accreditation, please explain

B. For each of the last five years list the ethnicity and gender of the students, faculty and support staff of your program. Explain how this data complies with the Educational Equity Plan of Cal Poly.

C. State how your program is contributing to the GE&B Program of Cal Poly? List faculty involvement (in terms of number and FTEF) and class enrollments.

D. Describe how your program interrelates with other programs at Cal Poly.

E. Describe the student advising and counseling services that your program offers.

F. List any honor societies and other student clubs in which your program is involved.
State of California

Memorandum

To: Jim Murphy, Chair
   Academic Senate

Date: May 3, 1991

File No.: 

From: Warren J. Baker
   President

Copies: R. Koob

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT APRIL 16 MEETING

This will acknowledge your memo of April 29 with which you forwarded five resolutions adopted by the Academic Senate at its April 16 meeting.

Resolution AS-352-91/EX was in response to the Statewide Academic Senate resolution relating to ROTC programs. I accept this resolution and will be guided by its contents.

Resolution AS-353-91/C&BC proposes a change in the Senate Constitution relating to Professional Consultative Services Representation and I understand that this proposal, along with others, will be brought to the general faculty for approval at a later date.

Resolution AS-354-91/C&BC relates to the Bylaws and internal operations of the Senate and requires no further action on my part.

The two remaining resolutions (AS-355-91/GE&BC, relating to General Education Curriculum Substitution, and AS-356-91/LRPC, dealing with Academic Program Review Procedures) have been forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for review.
State of California

Memorandum

To: Charles Andrews, Chair  
Academic Senate  

Date: July 11, 1991  

From: Warren J. Baker  
President  

Copies: R. Koob  
G. Irvin  

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT APRIL 16, 1991  
MEETING AS-355-91/GE&BC AND AS356-91/LRPC

This is the final response to James Murphy's memorandum of April 29 regarding the above cited resolutions which were adopted at the April 16, 1991 meeting.

Regarding Resolution AS-355-91/GE&BC, based upon the recommendations of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, I am accepting the recommendation of the Senate for the revision of the General Education Curriculum Substitution form. The format recommended will be developed and utilized as soon as feasible. However, I will point out there was concern expressed by the Academic Deans' Council over the lack of a dean's signature in the approval/signature process on this revised format. In the event problems occur with this new format, it may be necessary to revise the approval process again in the future.

I am also approving Senate Resolution AS-256-91/LRPC. As you are aware, the Academic Program Review Procedures have already been utilized in the recent Academic Program Evaluation Task Force review conducted this past Spring Quarter.
This is the final response to James Murphy's memorandum of April 29 regarding the above cited resolutions which were adopted at the April 16, 1991 meeting.

Regarding Resolution AS-355-91/GE&BC, based upon the recommendations of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, I am accepting the recommendation of the Senate for the revision of the General Education Curriculum Substitution form. The format recommended will be developed and utilized as soon as feasible. However, I will point out there was concern expressed by the Academic Deans' Council over the lack of a dean's signature in the approval/signature process on this revised format. In the event problems occur with this new format, it may be necessary to revise the approval process again in the future.

I am also approving Senate Resolution AS-356-91/LRPC. As you are aware, the Academic Program Review Procedures have already been utilized in the recent Academic Program Evaluation Task Force review conducted this past Spring Quarter.
This is the final response to your memorandum of April 29 regarding the above cited resolutions which were adopted at the April 16, 1991 meeting.

Regarding Resolution AS-355-91/GE&BC, I am accepting the recommendation of the Senate for the revision of the General Education Curriculum Substitution form. The format recommended will be developed and utilized as soon as feasible. However, I will point out there was concern expressed by the Academic Deans' Council over the lack of a dean's signature in the approval/signature process on this revised format. In the event problems occur with this new format, it may be necessary to revise the approval process again in the future.

I am also approving Senate Resolution AS-356-91/LRPC. As you are aware, the Academic Program Review Procedures have already been utilized in the recent Academic Program Evaluation Task Force review conducted this past Spring Quarter.