Meeting of the Academic Senate
Tuesday, April 29, 1997
UU220, 3-5:00pm

I. Minutes:

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost’s Office:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. Staff Council representative:
G. ASI representatives:
H. IACC representative:
I. Athletics Governing Board representative:
J. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda:
Revisions to AS-459-96/LRPC, Resolution to Approve Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program: Approval of the Academic Senate Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee revisions to this document in response to President Baker’s conditional approval of the resolution (pp. 2-10).

V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Campus Policy on Rights to Intellectual Property Created by Faculty, Students, and Staff: Walch, Chair of the Intellectual Property Rights Committee, first reading (pp. 6-18 of your April 8, 1997 agenda).
B. Resolution on Credit/No Credit Grading: Keesey, chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading (pp. 11-12).
C. Resolution on the Restructuring of the Academic Senate Library Committee: Greenwald, facilitator for the Library Ad Hoc Committee, second reading (p. 13).
D. Resolution on Censure of Administration: Devore, academic senator, second reading (pp. 14-15).

VI. Discussion Item(s):
The Cal Poly Plan: continuing discussion.

VII. Adjournment:
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program be forwarded to the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs for approval and implementation.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee
February 15, 1996
Revised May 21, 1996
POLICY AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR DISCONTINUANCE OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Many CSU campuses, including Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, may find it necessary to reduce faculty, support staff, and administrative positions due to enrollment declines or financial support reductions. When financial support is reduced, the discontinuance of programs or departments sometimes emerges as the alternative which does the least harm to the quality of remaining programs. Program and department discontinuance are valid ways of responding to reductions in resources; however, program discontinuance can and must be accomplished with minimal impact. Program discontinuance decisions must be made in a reasoned way which will minimize damage to the institution university and to the majority of their programs. The process should be based on the fact that the university is a community with a responsibility for the well being and interest of students, faculty, staff, and alumni.

The following procedures have been developed in response to EP&R 79-10, January 26, 1979, Chancellor Dumke to Presidents, "Interim Policy for the Discontinuance of Academic Programs," and EP&R 80-45, June 12, 1980, Vice Chancellor Sheriffs to Presidents, "Clarification of Interim Policy for Discontinuance of Academic Programs." These documents outline general procedures for program discontinuance and request that campuses submit local discontinuance procedures.

I. PROCEDURES

A. Initiation of a discontinuance proposal

A proposal to discontinue an academic program will ordinarily be the result of regular program review but a request for special review discontinuance may be initiated at any time by any of the following:

- a majority of the tenured and tenure track faculty of the affected department(s)
- the dean of any of the colleges involved in the program
- the Provost for the university
- the President for the university

The proposal shall clearly indicate that the proposed discontinuance is to be permanent. The proposal shall be submitted to the Provost for review.

B. Review of a discontinuance proposal

The Provost will review the proposal for discontinuance and accept or reject the proposal or begin the discontinuance process within three calendar weeks. If the request for review is approved, the discontinuance procedure is to begin, a discontinuance review committee will be appointed within the next three calendar weeks after approval, to conduct a review in accordance with the procedures outlined in this document and make recommendations to the Provost as required by the CSU Chancellor’s Office.

C. Appointment of a discontinuance review committee

The discontinuance review committee will consist of two groups appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Senate.
The first group will include six persons (one nonvoting):

1. a nonvoting representative from the Academic Programs office (nonvoting), nominated by the Provost;
2. two members of the deans Council representing colleges not involved in the program and nominated by the Chair of the Academic Senate;
3. one student not involved in the program, nominated by the ASI President;
4. two faculty representatives from colleges not involved in the program, nominated by the Chair of the Academic Senate; and
5. a staff representative not involved in the program, nominated by the Provost.

The second group will include at least five persons:

1. the dean(s) of the college(s) involved in the program [or a representative nominated by the deans(s)];
2. the chairs/head of departments or the coordinators of areas involved in the program;
3. one student involved in the program, nominated by the ASI President;
4. faculty representatives involved in the program nominated by the tenured and tenure track faculty involved in the program. There will be at least one faculty from each program involved if there is more than one program being reviewed;
5. a staff representative involved in the program, nominated by the chairs/head of departments or the coordinators of areas involved in the program;
6. at least one graduate of the program nominated by the faculty involved in the program.

D. Recommendations from the discontinuance review committee

The ultimate decision to discontinue a program rests with the Chancellor's Office. The purpose of the discontinuance review committee is to create a report for the President and Provost on the merits or lack of merit strengths and weaknesses of the program under review. If there is no opposition to the proposed discontinuance within the committee, the proposal will be forwarded to the Provost, with a report indicating that there is no opposition. If any of the committee members oppose the discontinuance, the discontinuance review committee will generate a report, using the following two step process.

In the first step, each group will elect its own chair and create a document describing the strengths and weaknesses of the program under review, and a justification of why the program should or should not be terminated/discontinued. The documents must be generated within sixteen weeks after the committee has been appointed. The merits of the program shall be assessed using the elements described in Sections II and III below, and in the Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines. If appropriate, the documents shall include what remedies could be taken to address weaknesses, including a precise statement of goals and a time table to reach those goals.

The chair of each group shall make the its document available to all faculty the Cal Poly faculty members community for comments for four weeks. A written request for comments must be sent to all the faculty and staff directly affected by the potential discontinuance at the start of the period for comments. The two groups will review the comments and revise their document as appropriate.

In the second step, immediately following the four weeks of comments, the two groups will exchange documents and provide a written critique of the arguments presented in the document from the other group within six weeks.

The two groups will then select five voting representatives who will then merge into a single group, with the nonvoting representative from the Academic Programs office as chair. Within four weeks, the group will elect a chair and jointly discuss and amend the documents produced. The final version of the two analyses, with the comments from the other groups critiques of the arguments presented, and with all the information deemed relevant, shall be bound in a single document (which,
at this point, should have a format similar to what is produced by the state analyst to assist voters). A tally of how many committee members voting representatives are in favor or against discontinuance shall be part of the final document sent to the Provost, the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate for their review and recommendation.

E. Final decision on discontinuance of the program
The Provost, the Academic Deans’ Council, and the Academic Senate will forward their recommendations to the President within six weeks, and the President will make the final recommendation to the Chancellor’s Office.

II. CONSIDERATIONS IN PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE REVIEW

Considerations for program discontinuance will be similar to those for initiation of new programs. In addition to the program review criteria, the elements that will be considered in a final recommendation must also include, but will not be limited to:

1. the university Strategic Plan and Mission statement;
2. the effectiveness of the program to meet the identified needs in meeting its goals and objectives;
3. The existence of programs within the CSU which could enroll students in this program;
4. a three-year history of student enrollment, a projection of future student enrollment, and the existence of similar programs within the CSU;
5. a three-year history of the student-faculty ratio, and the total cost per FTEF and per FTES for the program at Cal Poly and at other institutions offering comparable similar programs;
6. the effects of enrollment shifts on other instructional areas at Cal Poly;
7. the current or expected statewide or regional demand for graduates of the program;
8. the contributions of the program to the general education and breadth of students;
9. the effects of discontinuance on facilities;
10. the financial effects of discontinuance, including an estimate of the yearly costs or savings for the three years following discontinuance;
11. the effects on faculty and staff, including a description of what career opportunities within the CSU will offer them: agreements to transfer to other departments or to may be available; i.e., opportunities for temporary or permanent appointments at Cal Poly or visiting appointments in other branches of the CSU, retraining, etc.;
12. the impact of discontinuance on student demand.

III. INFORMATION FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE REVIEW

The information considered during the evaluation of an academic program for discontinuance will contain all the information that is needed for the creation of a new program. In addition, the information will include but will not be limited to:

A. The most recently completed Review of Existing Degree Programs with current statistical update;
B. The most recent accreditation report, if a program is accredited or approved. If the accreditation is over six years old, or if there is no accrediting body for the program; a review of the program by a panel of professionals outside the CSU with no contractual association with Cal Poly can be substituted for the accreditation report, provided the review has been completed within the last six years. The review shall contain all the elements included in an accreditation report;
C. If not contained in A or B:
   1. FTEF required each quarter for the past three years
   2. special resources and facilities required
   3. number of students expected to graduate in each of the next three years;
D. Conclusions and recommendations of the project team on Academic Programs, contained in the most recent edition of Academic Program and Resource Planning in The California State University.

**TIME TABLE FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE**

**Initial step**
1. Proposal to discontinue an academic program received by the Provost.

**Three calendar weeks after receipt of the proposal**
2. The Provost accepts or rejects the proposal.

**Three calendar weeks after acceptance of the proposal**
3. Discontinuance review committee appointed.

**Within sixteen weeks after appointment of the discontinuance review committee**
4. Initial report: Each of the two groups from the program discontinuance review committee produce their report and exchange it for the report from the other group.

**Within four weeks after the initial reports have been exchanged**
5. Period of comments: Each of the two groups from the program discontinuance review committee solicit comments on the reports from the university at large.

**Within six weeks after the end of the period of comments**
6. Critique of the initial reports: Each of the two groups from the program discontinuance review committee produce a critique of the findings produced by the other group.

**Within four weeks after the critique of reports have been produced**
7. Final report: The two groups from the program discontinuance review committee jointly discuss and amend, if necessary, the final document and send it to the Provost, the Academic Deans’ Council, and the Academic Senate.

**Within four weeks after the critique of reports have been sent**
8. Recommendations: The Provost, the Academic Deans’ Council, and the Academic Senate make recommendations to the President.

**NOTE:** A calendar week is five working days. Calendar weeks exclude summer breaks quarter and the breaks between quarters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of the proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review by the Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of the committee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First step of the review</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of comments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second step of the review</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final document drafted</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review by upper levels</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final comments to the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total time</td>
<td>42 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is in response to the above subject Academic Senate resolution. The following are a number of initial observations of this Resolution. However, based upon the complexities involved, further administrative review by the Academic Deans’ Council, Faculty Affairs, and University Legal Counsel must be conducted. This review will begin this Fall Quarter.

General Comments:

Throughout the document, references to the Vice President for Academic Affairs should be revised to refer to the Chief Academic Officer.

References to "school" should be revised to refer to colleges or other appropriate units.

Department "heads" should be revised to "chairs/heads."

The process and information required by this policy should be consistent with the resolutions on external program review, the information required for program and course proposals, and the requirements of the Program Review and Improvement Committee.

Specific Comments:

Opening paragraph, sentence 2: as proposed, there is only one condition for discontinuance—reduction of financial support. There could be others, some of them voluntary, such as loss of student enrollments. As an example, in the past, this policy was used to discontinue the master's degree in Chemistry at the request of the Department.
I. Procedures

A. Initiation of a discontinuance proposal. This section states that a proposal to discontinue an academic program will ordinarily be the result of a regular program review. However, the opening paragraphs propose that discontinuance will occur only when there is a reduction of financial support.

The first bulleted item differentiates programs and departments, and requires a vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in those departments to instigate a special review. This may result in procedural difficulties if a program includes more than one department.

B. "will review the proposal for discontinuance" revise to "will review the proposal for special review."

C. The first group: 2: Two members of the Deans Council. The Deans Council's membership includes individuals who are not college deans. If the membership of this committee is intended to include college deans specifically, then please revise accordingly.

The second group: "Faculty representatives involved in the program,"--something has been omitted from this statement. Should it be item 4?

Last sentence in this section: revise to read: "There will be at least one faculty member from each program involved if more than one program is being reviewed." However, this requirement could make the memberships of these committees very complex. It is not merely a case of adding faculty members, but affects Items 1, 2, and 3 as well if the programs include more than one department and college.

D. Recommendations from the committee:

First sentence: "merits or lack of merit," revised to "strengths and weaknesses."

Paragraph 2, sentence 1: "terminated," revise to "discontinued."

Paragraph 3: it is not clear who "all faculty members" in Sentence One refers to--all faculty members on the committees? Or in the affected programs/departments? Or in the University? Item 5 of the timetable suggests this may be all faculty members in the University.

Last paragraph in item D:

Sentence 1: the "eleven members" could be considerably larger given the conditions for membership set forth in Item C.
Sentence 2: it is not clear who the "other groups" are.

Reference to the document produced by the State Analyst: this is desirable, but perhaps not achievable. The State Analyst is a disinterested party; the document called for in this paragraph will not be produced by disinterested parties.

The process set forth in this paragraph may be workable, but it is not certain that the two groups can produce the report called for, or that it would not result in unnecessary bitterness and acrimony that could be avoided by having the two reports forwarded to the Chief Academic Officer, who will then have them reviewed according to the proposed procedure.

II. Considerations in Program Discontinuance Review

Item 2: "program to meet the identified needs," revise to: "program in meeting its goals and objectives."

Item 4: FTEF and FTES data from comparable programs in other institutions might be difficult to obtain. Further, it might be problematic if the programs are not identical.

Item 5: "sifts," revise to "changes."

III. Information for Program Discontinuance Review

B. Sentence 1, revise to: "The most recent report of external review, if a program is accredited or approved."

A "panel of professionals outside the CSU." This condition needs to be consistent with the requirements for external program review, which may include reviewers from CSU institutions.

1. FTEF "required." It is not clear what "required" means in this context.

Time Table for Program Discontinuance

Item 6: "produce a critique of the arguments," revise to "produces a critique of the findings."

Item 8: as the title to the items suggests, the Academic Senate would make "recommendations" to the President, not "a recommendation."

I would appreciate the Senate's review and comments to the above suggestions.
WHEREAS, This resolution pertains to courses that are normally graded, not to CR/NC-only
courses; and

WHEREAS, This resolution refers to undergraduate students only, not to graduate students; and

WHEREAS, The number of courses a student may elect to take CR/NC should be kept to a
minimum; and

WHEREAS, Students should have the option of taking a limited number of courses CR/NC; and

WHEREAS, Some balance must be found between limiting the number of courses that may be
taken CR/NC and allowing students to enroll in a small number of such courses for the
reasons outlined above; and

WHEREAS, Some departments (or equivalent unit) may approve of their majors taking a major or
support course CR/NC, or a GEB course CR/NC, while some departments would not
approve, and individual departments should properly have the right, and be allowed to
retain the flexibility, to make this decision; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That students be permitted to take a maximum of 16 units of courses CR/NC in accord
with the following specifications:

* no more than 4 units CR/NC in major or support courses, subject to approval
  by the student’s major department or equivalent unit;

* no more than 4 units CR/NC in GEB courses, subject to approval by the
  student’s major department or equivalent unit;

* no more than 8 8-16 units CR/NC in free electives, where applicable, and/or in
  extra units beyond the degree requirements. That is, 8-16 units, depending on
how many of the maximum total of 16 units CR/NC have not been already
used in major/support courses or GEB courses.

Rationale: The number of courses a student may elect to take CR/NC should be
kept to a minimum, for reasons that include the following: It is generally
recognized, as evidenced in testimony from recipients of Cal Poly's Distinguished
Teaching Award (e.g., memo from Dr. Snetsinger dated 10 Nov. 1996), that students
who enroll in a course CR/NC often do not take such courses as seriously as their
graded courses, working toward a lower standard and consequently learning less in
CR/NC courses; as Drs. Greenwald and Hampsey have stated, "Those involved in
teaching GEB courses have complained that the students who take GEB classes CR/NC are often working for a C-. The data from Tom Zuur supports this contention. There were 40 percent more A’s and B’s among all students than among CR/NC students. There were 40 percent fewer D’s and F’s among all students than among [CR/NC] students. The result is a pronounced downward shift of grades among CR/NC classes" (memo dated 10 Oct. 1996);

Senate Resolution AS-464-96 abolishing the option of taking GEB classes CR/NC was passed in a near-unanimous vote by the Academic Senate in Spring 1996 and approved by President Baker in Fall 1996;

Students at Cal Poly cannot elect to take major or support courses CR/NC because these courses are considered vital to their education, and GEB courses cannot be taken CR/NC because they are considered equally vital to students’ education; as President Baker has stated, this resolution "particularly underscores the status of GEB as a partner with the major programs at the University" (memo dated 9 Dec. 1996); as Dr. Zingg has stated, General Education should not be seen as a "second class citizen" in the curriculum (ASI Board of Directors minutes dated 6 Nov. 1996); as Drs. Greenwald and Hampsey have stated, "The implied message that GEB classes are somehow less important is one that teachers of GEB classes find objectionable. If we want to consider Cal Poly a premier institution, then GEB must be taken seriously" (memo dated 10 Oct. 1996);

Prospective employers have been known to disapprove of CR/NC courses on transcripts, which may adversely affect students’ ability to obtain jobs;

Graduate school admissions boards have been known to disapprove of CR/NC courses on transcripts, with some graduate schools refusing to accept CR/NC courses for credit, and other schools automatically converting CR’s to C’s or F’s.

Students should have the option of taking a limited number of courses CR/NC, for reasons that include the following: Students may explore unfamiliar areas of the curriculum or enroll in challenging courses without undue risk to their grade point average; President Baker has encouraged the Senate "to protect both the exploratory purpose of Cr/NC grading and the principle of curricular choice through free electives" (memo dated 25 Sept. 1996);

Students may take a higher course load during certain quarters in order to move more quickly toward graduation;

Transfer students who have taken some courses CR/NC elsewhere may have an easier time making the transition to Cal Poly and thus move more quickly toward graduation.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
February 27, 1997
Revised April 8, 1997
Revised April 22, 1997
Background Statement: During the winter of 1996, an Ad Hoc Library Committee was created with the charge to investigate the following questions:

1. Should the Library Committee be a Senate or university-wide committee?
2. What should the membership of the committee be?
3. What should the committee's responsibilities be?

The following resolution represents the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Library Committee.

WHEREAS: The Library serves the needs of a broad range of groups including faculty, undergraduate students, graduate students, staff, administration, and members of the community; and

WHEREAS, The Library is increasingly involved with and affected by technology; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be amended as follows:

6. Library Committee
   a. Membership
      The ex officio members of the Library Committee shall be the Dean of Library Services, the Provost or designee, and an ASI representative two undergraduate students, two graduate students, a staff representative at-large, a staff representative from the library, a community representative, and a representative from the IACC. In addition, the Library Committee shall provide a representative to the IACC.
   b. Responsibilities
      The Library Committee shall act as a fact-finding body and consult with the Academic Senate, the Library, and the administration on matters dealing with library affairs and policy. The committee shall report to the Academic Senate. The duties of the Library Committee are threefold:
      1. to actively monitor faculty campus concerns about university library resources, policy, and services;
      2. to work with the dean of the library in developing library policies which meet the needs of faculty, staff, and students; and
      3. to advise and consult with the university administration about: (a) the state of the Library's resources, services, and policies, and (b) the university commitment necessary to assure that the library adequately serves the teaching, research, and public service missions of the university.

Proposed by the Ad Hoc Library Committee
March 20, 1997
Revised April 22, 1997
Adopted:

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

AS-97/
RESOLUTION ON
CENSURE OF ADMINISTRATION

WHEREAS, The amount of money provided for PSSI’s and salary increases in general recent years has been grossly woefully inadequate relative to the demonstrated accomplishments of the Cal Poly faculty, causing salaries to fall further and further behind those of faculty at comparable institutions; and

WHEREAS, President Baker, in concert with the Provost and college deans, deviated substantially from the recommendations for awarding PSSI’s made by the various college committees and the university-wide committee, thus pouding another stake into the heart of collegiality; and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Munitz and the Board of Trustees seem much more concerned with executive compensation levels than with closing the salary gap between the CSU faculty and faculty teaching at comparable institutions; and

WHEREAS, the university administration seems totally oblivious to the precipitous decline in faculty morale as a result of the foregoing actions and policies; therefore, be it

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees, CSU administration, and Cal Poly administration have neither spoken out in favor of nor worked toward improvements in faculty compensation, choosing instead to focus on the “problem” of executive compensation; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly administration decided to give multiple-step PSSI’s to a small minority of faculty, thereby ignoring many others who had been recommended by college and university-wide committees and thus creating indefensible inequities among faculty; and

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees, CSU administration, and Cal Poly administration seem oblivious to the discontent with PSSI’s and decline in faculty morale as a result of inadequate compensation, increased workload, and decreased availability of resources; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate censure the campus and statewide CSU and Cal Poly administrations for their arrogance and blatant lack of concern for faculty welfare, and for their pursuit of policies harmful to the that undermine faculty morale and threaten the continued excellence of Cal Poly’s academic programs, and, be it further
RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate request immediate and vigorous action from the administration and Trustees on a plan to raise faculty compensation to at least the average level for faculty at institutions in our comparison group; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate request prompt reconsideration by the CSU administration of the PSSI program and a restructuring to ensure that meritorious accomplishments can be recognized without subverting collegiality or creating gross inequities.

Proposed by Jay Devore (CSM)
March 4, 1997
Revised April 22, 1997