Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:11 pm.

I. Minutes: M. Botwin moved (2nd by T. Bailey) to approve the minutes. The motion passed.

II. Communications and Announcements: none

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair: J. Wilson stated that it is possible that there will be layoffs at the end of the year. 58 faculty positions and 48 staff positions are presently in danger. Not all those positions are presently filled. Of the 58 faculty positions, there are only ten or less tenure-track faculty that are in jeopardy. They would be given one year notice. No lay-off decisions will be made until the early summer. Wilson introduced the representative from the Staff Council, Rosemary Bouker.

B. & C. Vice President R. Koob reported the Charter Campus Task Force has been meeting in February and early March. They prepared a report—and sent it to the Chancellor—that stated it was a good idea to continue exploring the concept of a charter campus. Two aspects should be explored: 1) how a charter might replace present regulations, and 2) how to deal with policies that are presently prescribed by existing law. It is unclear whether or not Cal Poly would be exempted from HEERA (the Higher Education Employee Relations Act) or from collective bargaining agreements. It would take at least two years before a charter could begin operation.

D. R. Gooden reported on discussions at the CSU Statewide Academic Senate regarding a shift from student "fees" to "tuition." The consensus was that if we do not address the decline in funding we will either eliminate quality—in which case access is irrelevant—or we reduce access in order to maintain quality. The statewide senate had discussed how to split the funding responsibilities and what percentage of actual costs should be shouldered by the student. Many national institutions have the student pay one-third of actual costs. The statewide senate expressed concern over what financial commitment the legislature would offer and what commitment they would make to student financial aid. Kersten felt that the legislature could not be relied upon for a consistent funding level which makes it even more urgent for us to pursue alternate funding sources. Kersten stated we have to assure that there is adequate financial aid available to students as they are forced to assume more and more of the cost of their education. He also mentioned the Committee for Higher Education in the State Assembly that had recently offered ideas for a revised master plan. Apparently, the response to the suggestions was so overwhelmingly negative that they have decided not to extend their discussion paper. They pulled the abolition of tenure off the table. Kersten expressed appreciation to those of us who had called Sacramento and provided them with a "wake-up call."

Amy Porter asked for an explanation as to the difference between "fees" and "tuition." Kersten explained that there is no substantive difference. Last year's increase in "fees" went directly to instruction which ended any nominal difference that there might have been between "fees" and "tuition." Gooden added that historically California had been committed to low-cost higher education which meant we called the assessment to "fees." Kersten observed that we have
been having the students pay about 15% of the cost of their education. If we boost that percentage up to 33% as is presently proposed, then that is major change.

J. Vilkitis stated that the Faculty Affairs Committee had offered ten resolutions, of which he mentioned four or five. They were concerned with such things as the further erosion of quality in the CSU system, technology-mediated learning (previously DELTA), issues concerning a possible campus at Fort Ord, charter campuses, and a tongue-in-cheek resolution concerning the location of a 21st CSU campus on a toxic waste dump. He also addressed the request made by Mike Botwin at the last meeting that the Faculty Affairs Committee examine position utilization. Their findings will be brought back to the senate. In addition, the General Education and Breadth Committee met and there was a recommendation of the CSU History Council on general education requirements in behavior and social sciences. They recommended that courses meeting graduation requirements in United States history, constitution, and American ideals should not also meet the general education requirement in behavioral and social sciences.

E. J. Conway stated that the CFA Board approved a new general manager for CFA, Jerry Bledsoe. Conway expressed his confidence in Bledsoe observing he is a qualified and trained faculty member. Presently, CFA and Bledsoe are pursuing an extension of the present contract for at least a year. He also announced that April 27 is lobby day in Sacramento.

IV. Consent Agenda: passed without dissent.

V. Business Items:

James Vilkitis moved that the agenda be reconfigured to follow the order: A., F., G., D., B., and then C. The motion passed.

A. GE&B course proposal for STAT 217X. Vilkitis observed that STAT 217X was a trade-off with STAT 211 and thus would require no additional resources. Roxy Peck answered several questions. C. Dana moved (2nd by T. Bailey) that the course be approved. The motion passed.

F. Report of the Home Economics Discontinuance Committee. J. Wilson summarized the background of the discontinuance procedures on campus. In 1981 the discontinuance and review policies were drawn up. At that time those procedures were prescribed there were no pressing concerns with the budget. The procedures now seem somewhat clumsy and awkward. Last year the administration decided to defund Home Economics. Early this year we formed a Discontinuance Committee that made the report that we now have. Presently we have several options available to us. For instance, we can: 1) vote to approve the recommendations that the committee proposes on p. 184 of their report; 2) vote not to approve those recommendation; 3) recommend continuance of the program with funding; 4) recommend continuance of the program without funding (i.e., keep it on the books but not provide any money); 5) recommend discontinuance and the disbanding of all aspects of the program; or 6) recommend discontinuance of certain aspects of the program but assign some aspects to other areas on campus.

Barbara Weber, the Head of the Home Economics Department, then gave a brief explanation of her views and fielded questions from the floor. She stated it was ironic that twenty-three years ago she had been assigned to a subcommittee that developed lay-off procedures since previously there was no mention of the issue in the campus manual. She has had over two decades of senate experience and the last time she sat before this body she was the Vice Chair. She pondered whether the senators should be given an open-book test using the Home Economics Discontinuance Report and she asked rhetorically if those who had left that report had memorized it. Several senators then commented that they had not received a copy. A sheet was distributed for those requesting a copy.
When Koob was first hired, she was pleased since he had experience in strategic planning. The budget situation worsened, and he had the foresight to realize that part of this planning process would probably have to be speeded up. Some method might be needed to develop to evaluate quality of programs. He appointed the fourteen-member committee [the Program Review Committee]. That committee met many long hours with the charge to evaluate programs across the campus under very harried circumstances. In that process Home Economics ranked clearly in the top half. For that reason it was a devastating shock to Home Ec to hear last spring that they had been selected for oblivion. She reminded the senate that the Vice President has said more than once that the faculty has responsibility for the curriculum at the university—which includes what programs are here as well as what courses are taught in those programs. A-1-5 states that if there is a shortage of funds, one way to address it is to go to program review and move to discontinue. Nowhere does it say that the order is to be reversed—where the President would announce that a program is to be eliminated and then we'll go through a process of review of the quality of the program. She felt it was an abuse of faculty rights. She also felt that gender of faculty was not considered [in the President's decision]. The faculty is presently approximately 16% female, and the elimination of Home Economics would further reduce that ratio. Similar arguments could be made regarding the gender ratio of the student body. "Any number of things seem to have been either misinterpreted or ignored." One thing she has heard over and over—as if they were vaccinated with the same needle—is the statement "Home Economics is no longer needed because young women can now enroll in the non-traditional areas of science and engineering." If that were true, enrollments in Home Ec would be going down and they would have a disinterested clientele. That is not the case. Cal Poly has the only impacted Home Ec program in the CSU system. With respect to the name of the department, they elected to keep the title "Home Economics" since Title 5 mentioned it specifically by that name with respect to the unique nature of Cal Poly. The department has enjoyed its experiences in the College of Agriculture. She stated that the department has responded to all of the criteria as prescribed in 81-5 and further urged that evaluation [of the program's quality] be divorced from funding issues.

Reg Gooden said he was troubled with the procedures for discontinuance—including the selection of the committee—one of the stated concerns for the need to discontinue is the decline in student demand. He stated the committee is composed primarily of members of the affected department or school: the problem, then, that the Academic Senate faces is how to deal with the issue of quality and an apparent credibility problem. "I therefore would like to see the extended course outlines [under the Home Economics rubric] since I am going to have to make a decision in terms of quality." Addressing Gooden's concerns, B. Weber stated extended course outlines were available in her office. "Anybody else who would like to see course outlines, just come down. They're all there."

Myron Hood then spoke: he was on the committee and was not a member of the Home Ec Department. He expressed displeasure with the procedure for discontinuance and urged the Senate to revise it. He testified to the credibility of the report and expressed the view that a committee comprised of people outside of the Home Ec Department would have arrived at the same decision. As a member of the SLO School Board, he stated that four-fifths of the local applicants for Home Ec jobs come from Cal Poly. It is an important area for students at risk. There are more and more openings for Home Ec and Agriculture teachers in the public schools.

John Harris was pleased with the efficiency of the department. "The only thing I saw in the entire document which I wish you would address is dealing with accreditation and loss of that . . . . That is the only spot I see in the whole document." Weber then reminded the Senate that the Interior Design concentration is fully accredited by the Foundation for Interior Design Education Research (FIDER). There are very few accredited programs in the state. Those who graduate from a FIDER accredited program can apply for licensure after only two years of work experience—as opposed to six years for the other applicants.
"The other accreditation was lost a number of years ago as a result of the spin-off of two of our degree programs in the previous 'reorganization' of the university. And that put us in violation of the criteria that were in effect at that time by the American Home Economics Association. The common body of knowledge that still drives the accreditation process ... was no longer applicable as far as our department was concerned because we were missing two of the major parts: the nutrition component and the child and family component—and we were lacking curricular control over those sections. It didn't take long. They were here almost instantly, and they came with a vengeance. The on-site review committee were negative from the time they walked into Malcolm Wilson's door to the time they left campus because they were determined that they were going to punish California somehow. And they actually did. They put our department on probation. They did the same thing to Sacramento, Fresno, Northridge, and to Long Beach. Ultimately three of us lost our accreditation. Chico's [department] is now gone, and Long Beach and Northridge were able to pull back out of it . . . . However, in some ways that's been a blessing in disguise for us since we were able then to strengthen the parts of our program that are the most heavily demanded by the students, and that is Interior Design program and the Textiles and Clothing Merchandising Program." She also observed some Home Ec programs, such as Cornell and Ohio State, are not accredited.

J. Vilkitis felt it was late in the game to introduce "quality" as a criterion. Also, Vilkitis had served on the 14-member review committee previously referred to, and he felt that Home Economics had [adequately] addressed the issue of quality.

C. Dana observed that the [AHEA] report that had denied accreditation to Cal Poly was not included in the report of the Discontinuance Committee—"which raised many red flags with me. I would like to see it . . . . I request that you distribute that report to other members of the Senate also." B. Weber responded. "We tried to do a five-year time block on it. Even though I know it says we officially lost it in '89, that was just a paper exercise that finally arrived on campus at that time. But we essentially lost it within a year or two years after those two degree programs spun off, and we were put on provisional status. There was nothing we could do to reconfigure our program to be in compliance. So we did not include the report in here because it's no longer pertinent. It simply isn't pertinent because it doesn't apply to us at this point. We've done a lot of thinking in the meantime. If we had stayed accredited, however, the document would be in here because there would be yearly updates, and we could have provided the Senate with yearly updates . . . . So we felt that to go back and dredge up something that happened eight or nine years ago, even though it took longer for the final decision to get here, was ludicrous. It doesn't apply to us, and we are not accredited anymore." C. Dana then interjected, "You are not accredited, and the suspicion there is that you are not accreditable under Home Economics—and that is what raises the red flags." She then responded that the criteria have changed some and that there is more flexibility now. "There is a lot of change within our own accrediting agency, but I can't show you all that at this point. You understand what I'm saying." Dana: "I'm not sure why you can't show me the new accreditation criteria and the old report. One thing I'm looking at is that . . . accreditation reports—even though they reject accreditation—can actually support the department in the way they say you're not accredited. They say 'You have not been accredited for the following reasons.' I'm hoping to see that in those reports and that's why I still encourage you to give us those reports." C. Andrews concurred, stating "Barbara, I'm afraid the accreditation issue is alive—painfully alive. It's been repeated over and over that this is one of the reasons that this decision [to discontinue] has been made. So today I took the opportunity to go through the file of your accreditation situation. I previously obtained a copy of the 1984 file report of the Task Force to Study Reorganization of the University. And your department was explicitly singled out in that report. The Task Force believes that rapid social and technological change makes such a general program no longer appropriate for Cal Poly. The Task Force calls on Home Economics faculty to narrow their objectives in order to concentrate their resources on a more definite focus." Going through the accreditation file I found a similar reference on that issue of focus. In
1987 there was a letter from the AHEA that set forth what criteria they were concerned about. They had acknowledged earlier [in] April, 1984, that they were concerned about the changes that were being made in the location of Human Development and Food Science. Three years later, 1987, those were not the concerns that were expressed in a letter to President Baker. They had different concerns. This is at the time that you were, I believe, getting ready. This is when you received 'provisional accreditation is granted for two years to units that meet most accreditation criteria and show evidence that full compliance can be achieved within a two-year period.' I have the November 1989 report from AHEA signed by Carl Wheedle [?], Director of Accreditation. In the '87 advance notice letter and in the '89 letter where your university is advised that you have lost accreditation there has been no mention of the location of Human Development, Child Development, or Food and Nutrition. The criteria that are cited and the deficiencies in those criteria that are cited are far different from who's teaching what subject. I would prefer not to distribute this or read it. But I think there is notice served that there are problems with Home Economics since 1984."

B. Weber felt we cannot go through all of the details today. She also reiterated her view that the disputed report was filled with errors—and she felt the report did not properly assess the department as it is presently configured. It is not applicable to the current flexible criteria.

J. Murphy observed that the beginning of the "spiral downward" was 1984, the year that two components of the Home Ec Department were moved to Agriculture. He asked if there was potential for a reuniting of those elements now that Home Ec itself has also moved to the College of Agriculture. Weber responded that only part of the original Home Ec program is in Agriculture: Psychology and Human Development is in the College of Liberal Arts. She also explained that Home Ec had no plans to reunite with Food Science. She also questioned the contention that there was a downward spiral.

W. Reynoso observed that it would be constructive if the Senate had information as to which of the programs university-wide have been denied accreditation in the last ten years.

Gooden then queried Weber with respect to the stated strengths in Textiles and Interior Design. He wondered why only 13% of the Teacher's Ed concentration is in that area since it is supposed to be an area of strength. B. Weber responded that to receive a certificate in Home Economics one must be proficient in all areas. Most students are in the Textiles and Interior Design concentrations. Teacher Ed is small but is "a power house because they have all the parts." Sara Lord expanded on that view. In Teacher Ed, they have to understand all of the components as a unified whole. There is a common misunderstanding as to what is Home Economics. Just as a brain surgeon must go to general medical school before specializing in brain surgery, so someone in Interior Design or Textiles must understand the breadth of Home Economics. This gives them flexibility and perspective.

W. Reynoso was curious what happened with California Education Code Section 90404. Weber responded that it makes Cal Poly different.

D. Peach stated he did not see balance in the discontinuance report. "I don't know what to do with it . . . . I don't have enough data in the report to make any objective conclusions." J. Murphy agreed, stating that we don't get to see both sides of the coin. J. Vilkitis then asked them whether they were questioning the process itself. Peach responded that they did comply with the provisions of 81-5, but he nevertheless did not feel that he had been provided a balanced document.

R. Gooden stated he was in a quandary because he would have to judge the quality of the program and—although it was not the committee's fault—the way the committee was chosen and the way things played out, quality was never directly addressed. Weber stated that the success of graduates is the best measure of quality. L. Burgunder reminded the Senate that we have a continual problem since we do not have program review per se, but
instead program review for improvement—not discontinuance. M. Botwin added that we received 150 pages more [supporting Home Economics] in the Discontinuance Committee report than we received from the Administration when they decided to defund the program. P. Fetzer observed it would be to the Home Ec Department's advantage to present its strongest arguments and urged that they present them in a condensed form. S. Lord said that Home Ec had been reviewed by a committee of non-Home Ec faculty members [in apparent reference to the 14-member Program Review Committee two years ago] and that they gave a positive assessment of the program. R. Gooden replied that the criteria for evaluation was cost effectiveness (the cost per student) and job demand—both of which are tangential to the quality of a program. Vilkitis stated that today we are examining cost effectiveness since it is the fiscal crisis that is driving the discontinuance process.

Ron Brown returned to the issue of accreditation articulating that he would personally like to see the accreditation report. If the report was flawed in some way, he would like to hear from Home Economics as to how it was flawed—but he would like to see the report in any case. L. Gamble did not understand why Home Economics was selected for discontinuance in the first place. J. Harris echoed her sentiments and asked if Koob would tell the Senate why it chose to defund Home Economics. He would like the Academic Vice President to supply the rationale and criteria for their defunding. Koob said he would be glad to get that to us. Reynoso concurred.

* C. Russell moved (2nd by C. Dana) that the Senate request from the Administration the reasons why they chose to discontinue Home Economics and also request a copy of the accreditation report along with whatever accompanying response that Home Economics would like to offer. D. Peach offered the friendly amendment (which was accepted) that Home Economics be asked whether or not they even want to seek accreditation and if so, what would be the approximate cost of achieving accreditation. W. Reynoso offered a friendly amendment (which was accepted by Russell) that we request information regarding: 1) how many programs within the last ten years at Cal Poly have been denied accreditation, and 2) how many programs exist in a discipline where there is an accrediting agency and they have chosen not to seek accreditation. T. Bailey offered another friendly amendment (which was accepted) that we ask Home Economics for information regarding the current criteria for seeking accreditation. R. Gooden asked that we be provided with the criteria used by the fourteen-member Program Review Committee. The motion as amended passed.

VII. Adjournment: the meeting was adjourned at 4:48.

Craig H. Russell, Secretary of Academic Senate

March 31, 1993
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