I. Minutes: Approval of the March 9 and March 16, 1993 Academic Senate minutes (pp. 2-11).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
A. Academic Senate elections results for 1993-1994 (pp. 12-13).
B. Nominations are being received for the positions of Academic Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary for the 1993/94 term. Form attached (p. 14).

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair
B. President's Office
C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
D. Statewide Senators
E. CFA Campus President
F. ASI Representatives

IV. Consent Agenda:
A. Resolution on Department Name Change Request for Physical Education Department-Head, Department Head for Physical Education (pp. 15-16).
B. Resolution on the Selection of a Campus Representative to the Academic Council on International Programs-Terry, chair of the Personnel Policies Committee (pp. 17-19).
C. Resolution on Revision of Guidelines for Leave with Pay-Terry, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee (pp. 20-28).

V. Business Item(s):
A. Report of the Home Economics Discontinuance Committee, second reading (pp. 29-41). [PLEASE BRING YOUR COPY OF THIS REPORT WHICH WAS MAILED UNDER SEPARATE COVER].
B. Resolution on Academic Senate Recommendations for Accommodating Immediate Budget Reductions, second reading (pp. 42-43).
C. Cal Poly Strategic Plan: (1) Final Draft of the Academic Senate Faculty Response to the Strategic Plan (pp. 44-58); (2) Procedure for submitting Final Draft to the faculty for referendum.
D. GE&B course proposal for POLS/BIO/AG 371X-Vilkitis, co-chair of GE&B Committee, second reading (p. 59).
E. Resolution on Double Counting of General Education and Breadth Courses-Vilkitis, co-chair of GE&B Committee, second reading (pp. 60-61).
F. GE&B proposal for JOUR 318-Vilkitis, co-chair of the GE&B Committee, first reading (p. 62).
G. Resolution on Evaluation of College Deans or Equivalent Administrators-Terry, chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, first reading (pp. 63-66).
H. Resolution on Vote of Confidence for Administrators-Terry, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, first reading (pp. 67-72).

VI. Discussion Item(s):
Cal Poly Instructional Computing Strategic Plan-Mueller, chair of the Instructional Advisory Computing Committee (pp. 73-77).

VII. Adjournment:
ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERSHIP
1993-1994

(The individuals whose names are printed in bold type are newly-elected senators for the 1993-1995 term. The remaining individuals are continuing senators whose term ends in June 1994.)

### COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE (7 senators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Research Committee</th>
<th>UPLC</th>
<th>VACANCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amspacher, William</td>
<td>Plummer, William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermann, James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallock, Brent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannings, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalil, Hany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord, Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton, Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agribusiness</td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental Horticulture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science &amp; Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (5 senators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Research Committee</th>
<th>UPLC</th>
<th>VACANCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joines, Laura Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botwin, Michael Architectural Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, Harold Construction Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnquist, Carl Construction Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLEGE OF BUSINESS (5 senators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Business Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bertozzi, Dan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Charles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, Mary Beth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING (7 senators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Research Committee</th>
<th>UPLC</th>
<th>VACANCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LoCasico, James Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Jack Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connelly, John Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana, Charles Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacCarley, Carl EL/EE Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrobel-Sosa, Anny Materials Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winger, Donley EL/EE Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL/EE Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Research Committee</th>
<th>UPLC</th>
<th>VACANCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS (8 senators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forster, Ann</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampsey, John</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mott, Stephen</td>
<td>Graphic Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Clay</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englund, David</td>
<td>Psyc/Human Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetzer, Philip</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPorte, Mary</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell, Craig</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS (7 senators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowker, Leslie</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Andrea</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Ronald</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, Gayl</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goers, John</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hale, Thomas</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maksoudian, Leon</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Research Committee       |                              |
| UPLC                     |                              |
| VACANCY                  |                              |

## PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES (4 senators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Carolyn</td>
<td>Career Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller, Julia</td>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamble, Lynne</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynoso, Wendy</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Research Committee       |                              |
| VACANCY                  |                              |

## SCHOOL FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (1 senator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nulman, Dennis</td>
<td>STE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE (3 statewide senators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kersten, Timothy</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gooden, Reginald</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilkitis, James</td>
<td>NRM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California 93407  
ACADEMIC SENATE

NOMINATION FOR ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE  
1993-1994

I hereby nominate ____________________________ (please print)
for the following Academic Senate position:

Chair ________ Vice Chair ________ Secretary ________

__________________________
signatures of three tenured faculty members:
(nominators must also be current senators)

__________________________
__________________________
__________________________

CONSENT TO SERVE

If elected, I will serve as an Academic Senate officer for the 1993-1994 term.

__________________________
(Signature of nominee)

PLEASE CALL THE ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE (1258)  
TO ENSURE YOUR NOMINATION WAS RECEIVED
WHEREAS, The Physical Education Department requests that its department name be changed to PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND KINESIOLOGY DEPARTMENT; and

WHEREAS, The request for a department name change has been approved by the College of Science and Mathematics Council and the dean for the College of Science and Mathematics; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the name of the Physical Education Department be changed to the PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND KINESIOLOGY DEPARTMENT.

Proposed By: The Physical Education Department
Date: March 30, 1993
RATIONALE FOR CHANGING THE NAME OF THE DEPARTMENT FROM PHYSICAL EDUCATION TO PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND KINESIOLOGY

Over the years, Cal Poly's Physical Education program has evolved to reflect developments within the discipline. In its early history, the focus centered around teacher education as the sole professional application of its body of knowledge. The intended career of a major in Physical Education was to teach sports, exercise and dance in a K-12 environment. Current programs, however, reflect a scholarly discipline which encompasses a unique body of knowledge. Graduates are prepared in a broad continuum, including pedagogy, physiology, biomechanics, psychology, sociology, history, philosophy, rehabilitation and aesthetics.

The curricular trend in university programs currently is to offer various areas of specialization designed to prepare students for specific careers. Cal Poly offers courses of study in Teacher Education, Commercial/Corporate Fitness, Health, or in an individualized program based upon a student's specific interest. Since the term "Physical Education" has long been used to designate movement programs in a public school setting, that term should be retained to identify those programs in public schools. However, that title does not accurately describe the multi-faceted curriculum offered at Cal Poly. For that reason, a name change is in order; a name that more precisely describes the discipline, and at the same time, conveys to the university community and to the general public, the diverse nature of the field.

The name which has gained recognition and acceptance in the field of Physical Education, and which best reflects the nature of the department at Cal Poly is Kinesiology. Kinesiology, operationally defined, is the branch of learning which relates to the art and science of human movement in work, play, health, creative activity, and the responses to physical exertion. The term emphasizes the field's central focus, human movement, and it includes all relevant domains of human movement knowledge.

The trend to change the title of Physical Education started in 1971 when Simon Fraser University changed its name to the Department of Kinesiology. In 1972, the University of California at Los Angeles adopted the same title. Many other universities across the country and within the State have also changed the title of their programs to Kinesiology. Since this is the direction in which the discipline has moved, the time has come for the Physical Education Department at Cal Poly to add Kinesiology to the department name. The addition of Kinesiology more accurately describes the diverse nature of the program. It also reflects the progressive image that Cal Poly holds among other institutions in the field of Physical Education.
Background Statement: CAM 451.6 establishes procedures for the selection of a campus representative to the statewide Academic Council on International Programs. Specifically, CAM 451.6 provides that the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall submit the name of a nominee to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for its endorsement. In reality, for the last several years, the Academic Senate has actually been doing the solicitation for interested nominees and submitting a candidate to the Vice President's office. There appears to be no objection to the continuance of this practice. To avoid the confusion of past selections, CAM 451.6 should be amended to make it conform to the current practice which has evolved.

WHEREAS, CAM 451.6 provides a procedure for the selection of a campus representative to the statewide Academic Council on International Programs; and

WHEREAS, The procedure provided in CAM 451.6 has not been followed for the last several years; and

WHEREAS, The procedure which has evolved is acceptable to all concerned parties; and

WHEREAS, The initial nomination of a representative to the Academic Council on International Programs should originate in the Academic Senate; and

WHEREAS, The ultimate nominee will represent the campus and, hence, should be acceptable to the administration; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That CAM 451.6 be amended as indicated on the attached page.

Proposed by the Personnel Policies Committee
February 16, 1993
The Trustees of The California State University have authorized as part of their policy on The California State University International Programs the establishment of a statewide Academic Council on International Programs. The Academic Council on International Programs consists of one member from each college or university of the CSU system, selected in accordance with locally approved procedures.

Pursuant to the By-laws of the Academic Council on International Programs of the CSU, "Nominees must be either tenured, or tenure-track, members of the teaching faculty, or hold an academic/administrative appointment, and should have demonstrated their interest in international/intercultural education through personal participation in [such] activities..."

The following procedure governs the selection of Cal Poly's representative to the Council:

A. During the winter quarter in the final year of a current term of appointment, the Academic Senate office will conduct a campus-wide solicitation for persons interested in serving on the Academic Council on International Programs for the following three years. The criteria for membership on the ACIP will be publicized.

B. Each candidate shall submit a memo of interest with her/his vita to the Academic Senate office. These names will be brought to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for consideration and the selection of one candidate.

C. The name of the nominee chosen by the Executive Committee shall be transmitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs with a memo of endorsement.

D. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall transmit the name of the nominee and the Executive Committee's endorsement to the President.

E. In the event the President cannot endorse the nomination, the nomination shall be returned to the Executive Committee along with the reasons for non-endorsement. The Executive Committee shall then have the option to reaffirm its selection or to select another nominee from among the list of candidates brought to it in item B above.

F. The President shall transmit the name of the candidate to the Academic Council on International Programs.
Academic Council on International Programs

The Trustees of The California State University have authorized as a part of their policy on The California State University International Programs the establishment of a statewide Academic Council on International Programs. The Academic Council on International Programs consists of one member from each college or university of the CSU system, selected in accordance with locally approved procedures.

The following procedure governs the selection of Cal Poly's representative to the Council:

A. No later than February 1 in the final year of a current term of appointment, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, after consultation with the appropriate dean and department head, shall transmit to the Chairperson of the Academic Senate the nomination of a member of the University's faculty to serve on the Academic Council on International Programs for the following three academic years.

B. The chairperson of the Academic Senate shall present the nomination to the Senate's Executive Committee for consideration.

C. Following the Executive Committee's endorsement, the chairperson of the Academic Senate shall forward the nomination accompanied by the endorsing statement to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for transmittal to the University President.

D. In the event the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate fails to endorse the nomination, they shall return the nomination to the Vice President for Academic Affairs along with reasons for nonendorsement.

Research Activities (See also CAM 324.2, 542-544.)

The research activities of the university are encouraged and guided by the administration of the university and the Academic Senate. To give direction to this effort, the University Research Committee was established as a committee of the Academic Senate. The Research Committee directs its recommendations affecting university-wide policies and procedures to both the Academic Senate and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Director, Research Development, is responsible to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and is permanent secretary to the University Research Committee.

Research projects may include the following types of activities: community service research, institutional research, research in The California State University graduate programs, and individual faculty research.

Research projects must be compatible with appropriate rules and regulations of the State of California, Trustees of The California State University, Office of the Chancellor, and university administration. The university will not approve participation in research projects for government agencies or private industry which are "classified" or "secret" in nature. While there are many different interpretations and definitions of these two words, the basic underlying principle of this policy is that unless the university is free to make public in general terms the purpose and scope of a proposed research project it will not be approved or endorsed by the university.

Research activities should increase the effectiveness of instructional assignments.

Faculty members employed full time by the university during the academic year shall not undertake research projects for extra compensation during the same period of more than the equivalent of 1/4 the full-time load. (See CAM 324.2.)

Revised March, 1980
ALL CHANGES RECOMMENDED BY THIS RESOLUTION ARE REQUIRED BY THE UNIT
3 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Adopted:

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

Background Statement: The university Leave with Pay Guidelines was last revised in 1988. Since that time, a CFA/CSU contract has been ratified that has made de facto changes in the "rules" for such leaves. The University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) has for at least the past three years been operating on its own interpretation of these changed rules. For instance, the UPLC no longer ranks or otherwise prioritizes leave applications on a university-wide basis but merely recommends approval or denial of the leaves to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. This non-prioritization has come about at least in part because leaves are no longer "funded", and the colleges/departments must find the funds to replace faculty on leave, or otherwise modify course offerings, if leaves are granted. Such a situation makes it imperative that prioritization, and solutions to funding/staffing problems associated with a proposed leave, should occur primarily at the department level. The UPLC feels that all leave applications that are forwarded to a higher level with departmental endorsement, and are then recommended for approval on their merits by the Collegewide Professional Leave Committees (CPLC)/Library Professional Leave Committee (LPLC) and the deans, should be granted, and therefore the CPLC/LPLC also should not rank-order applications that it recommends for approval. The deans retain the right to recommend that a leave be deferred, but not denied, for budgetary reasons, or to recommend disapproval of a leave application on its merits. The major roles for the UPLC then become only: (1) to see that college/library and university guidelines have been followed in recommending approval or denial of a leave application; and (2) to "arbitrate" when the CPLC/LPLC and the dean's recommendations differ. Proposed revisions to the university Leave with Pay Guidelines have therefore been prepared by the UPLC and the Personnel Policies Committee. Approval of these revised guidelines will bring consistency to the leave-with-pay process at all levels of review.

AS-93/
RESOLUTION ON
REVISION OF UNIVERSITY LEAVE WITH PAY GUIDELINES

WHEREAS, The university Leave with Pay Guidelines have not been revised since 1988, and

WHEREAS, An MOU ratified since 1988 has made significant changes in the sabbatical leave process, particularly in the way such leaves are funded, and

WHEREAS, Prioritization of leave applications has now become primarily a department rather than college/library or university-wide responsibility as in the past; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached university Leave with Pay Guidelines be adopted.

Proposed By: The Personnel Policies Committee
March 30, 1993
LEAVE WITH PAY GUIDELINES

General Principles

A. Purpose:
Leaves of absence with pay may be granted faculty members for purposes of research, study, creative activity, service, or travel appropriate to one's their positions at the university.

B. Eligibility:
Full-time faculty unit employees shall be eligible for either a sabbatical leave or a difference-in-pay leave if he/she has served full time for six (6) years in the preceding seven (7) year period prior to before the leave and at least six (6) years after any previous sabbatical leave or difference-in-pay leave. (MOU 27.2 and 28.4)

2. All eligible faculty whose leave applications are judged to have merit by their departments and by their college/library professional leave committees, and which meet college and university criteria, should be granted leaves with pay. Recognizing that such leaves with pay, however meritorious, can have a negative impact on budget and staffing, leave applications shall be prioritized at the departmental level. It is also important, therefore, that the department head/chair's recommendations regarding a leave application state clearly whether the department has adequate resources to replace a faculty member, and whether such a leave, if approved, would cause an undue hardship on the department's ability to offer its program.

College-wide Professional Leave Committees (CPLC)

A. Membership:
One member shall be elected from each department by tenured and probationary faculty from that department. Eligible faculty for membership are tenured, not on the University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC), and not applying for a leave with pay.

Once elected, members of the committee serve two-year terms with one-half of the members being elected in even years and the other half in odd years each year.
B. Committee Chair:
1. The committee chair must be a member of the CPLC and shall be elected by the members of the CPLC.

2. The chair is responsible for forwarding the college procedures and criteria to the UPLC.

3. The chair is responsible for forwarding the applications and CPLC recommendations to the dean.

C. Committee Functions:
1. Review and/or recommend college leave with pay procedures and criteria.

2. Review all sabbatical and difference-in-pay leave applications and interview all applicants.

3. Sabbatical and difference-in-pay applications that do not meet established University and college guidelines should be given a negative recommendation.

4. Recommend a priority ranking to the dean of the applications based on college procedures and criteria.

5. The CPLC must clearly state in its report to the dean its reasons for recommending denial of an application.

Library Professional Leave Committee (LPLC)

A. Membership:
Eligible librarians for membership are tenured, not on the UPLC, and not applying for a leave with pay.

Once elected, members of the committee serve two-year terms with one-half of the members being elected in even years and the other half in odd years each year.

B. Committee Chair:
1. The committee chair must be a member of the LPLC and shall be elected by the members of the LPLC.

2. The chair is responsible for forwarding the library procedures and criteria to the UPLC.

3. The chair is responsible for forwarding the applications and LPLC recommendations to the dean of library services.
C. Committee Functions:
   1. Review and/or recommend library leave with pay procedures and criteria.
   2. Review all sabbatical and difference-in-pay leave applications and interview all applicants.
   3. Sabbatical and difference-in-pay applications that do not meet established University and library guidelines should be given a negative recommendation.
   4. Recommend a priority ranking to the dean of library services based on library procedures and criteria.
   5. The LPLC must clearly state in its report to the dean its reasons for recommending denial of any application.

University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC)

The UPLC shall be considered the Professional Leave Committee, as referenced in MOU 27.5.

A. Membership:
   1. One member shall be elected from each college and the library by tenured and probationary faculty unit employees from the college and library, respectively:
      a. Eligible faculty eligible for membership are tenured, not on a CPLC or the LPLC, and not applying for a leave with pay.
      b. The term of office of each elected member of the UPLC shall be two years.
      c. The representatives of the Colleges of Agriculture, Business, and Engineering shall be elected in the spring of odd-numbered calendar years.
      d. The representatives of the library and of the Colleges of Architecture and Environmental Design, Liberal Arts, and Science and Mathematics shall be elected in the spring of even-numbered years.

B. Committee Chair:
   1. The chair must be a member of the UPLC and shall be elected annually by the members of the UPLC.
   2. The chair shall be responsible for forwarding recommended UPLC procedures and criteria, leave with pay applications, and priority ranking to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
C. Functions:
1. Recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, after approval by the Academic Senate, changes in procedures and criteria and ranking for leave with pay applications.
2. Recommend changes in leave with pay application response deadlines to the Vice President for Academic Affairs after approval of the Academic Senate.
3. Review college/library leave with pay procedures and criteria for compliance with MOU and university guidelines. Recommended changes shall be directed to the appropriate administrator with a copy to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
4. Review all applications and the prioritization recommendations by college/library professional leave committees and deans to ensure compliance with approved guidelines and quality of applications; inform the Vice President for Academic Affairs of any apparent inequities in those rankings problems concerning those recommendations; and make its own recommendations based on its findings.
5. Make ad hoc recommendations concerning the filling of such unused sabbatical leave vacancies which occur after the initial awarding.

D. Criteria:
The UPLC shall evaluate each application for a leave with pay in accordance with the criteria established by and for the appropriate CPLC or LPLC.

E. General Characteristics:
The following general characteristics are expected in proposals for a leave with pay or with a sabbatical or difference-in-pay leave:
1. An abstract or summary of the proposal.
2. A detailed outline of the proposed plan of study, research, or creative activity.
3. Supporting documentation from universities, employers, or institutions that might be sponsoring the project (if appropriate).
4. Annotated literature search indicating the need for the project (if appropriate).
5. A statement of the benefits that will accrue to the university, to the candidate's profession, and/or to the students.
6. A statement of the probability of completion of the proposed project. This should include a statement of:
   a. The feasibility of the proposal;
   b. The applicant’s background in relation to the proposal;
   c. The amount of preparation for the leave as evidenced by advanced study or research (if appropriate).

7. A statement of the urgency of the proposed leave in terms of its benefit to the university.

8. A current resume or curriculum vitae.

F. Procedures:
1. Each member of the UPLC shall individually and separately review the professional leave applications, which shall be kept in the Faculty Affairs Office.

2. Each member of the UPLC shall make such notes as will be adequate to enable him/her to make comparative judgements on the relative merits of the applications for leaves with pay.

3. After each UPLC member has been allowed sufficient time to examine the professional leave applications, the UPLC shall meet in plenary session to discuss the relative merits of the proposals.

4. The UPLC shall adhere to established quotas by college (library), recommend approval of a minimum number of sabbatical leaves based on the number of faculty eligible MOU provisions.
   a. An initial target allocation of sabbatical leaves will be distributed to each college/library based on the proportion of eligible faculty in the respective area and with a minimum of at least one sabbatical leave in each college/library.
   
   eb. The number of sabbatical leaves allocated to the university recommended for approval will be distributed on an equitable basis among the colleges and the library.
   
   bc. Guidelines for distributing sabbatical leaves include an initial distribution of one professional leave to each college and the library, with the balance of the allocation to be distributed according to the ratio of eligible faculty members in the respective colleges and the library to the total eligible faculty in the university.
   
   The number approved will not be fewer than those granted in 1991-92, provided sufficient applications are submitted that meet college/library criteria (MOU 27.10b and d).
e. In the event sufficient applications are not received by any college or the library, the UPLC will recommend a redistribution of the unfilled leaves to the other colleges (and/or the library) after considering an equitable distribution in accord with the past practice.

d. In the event of actual university quota of fundable leaves is less than the projected quota initially used the UPLC shall compute the revised college quotas.

e. The UPLC shall annually review the rounding off of fractions of leaves allocated to the various colleges and the library and use this information to establish an equitable allocation pattern over a period of years.

5. The UPLC shall examine the college-wide rankings recommendations of the colleges/library to:
   a. Verify that proper college procedures and criteria were used for evaluation were used.
   b. Identify apparent inequities in college rankings problems concerning approval or denial because of failure to use follow proper procedures and/or criteria at the college/library level;
   c. Identify any apparent deficiencies of applications in one or more of the general characteristics enumerated in E.1-E.7 8 above.

6. If an application is found deficient in one or more of the general characteristics enumerated in E.1-E.7 8, or if additional information is desired by the committee, the chair of the UPLC shall request the information from the chair of the appropriate CPLC or from the LPLC.

   If the information requested is not provided, the UPLC shall include in its report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs a statement of the apparent deficiency.

7. If the UPLC determines that an apparent inequity problem exists in the rankings concerning the recommendations of a CPLC or the LPLC, or dean, the chair of the UPLC shall report the apparent ranking inequity problem to the appropriate dean of the appropriate college (or to the dean of library services) and to the chair of the appropriate CPLC (LPLC) CPLC/LPLC.

8. In a conference of three, the chair of the UPLC, the dean (dean of library services) and the chair of the CPLC (LPLC) the chair of the CPLC/LPLC and the dean shall either affirm the ranking recommendation of the CPLC (LPLC) CPLC/LPLC and/or dean or shall put forth agree upon a revised list recommendation.
9. The UPLC shall not provide an "a priori" university-wide ranking. Rather, it shall make ad-hoc recommendations concerning the filling of leaves with pay to fill such vacancies as may exist after the approval process has been completed.

a. If a faculty member granted a leave subsequently withdraws his/her application, the UPLC dean shall recommend another candidate after reconsidering the highest alternates on the priority lists submitted by the college (library) those whose applications were previously recommended for approval by the department and the CPLC/LPLC but were subsequently deferred, or denied based on campus program needs or for budgetary reasons.

b. If the vacancy cannot be filled from among the remaining applicants of the college (library) involved, the UPLC shall recommend candidate(s) after considering Item F.4.e. above. If there are no other applicants from the college/library where a vacancy exists, a candidate from one of the other colleges/library whose application was similarly deferred or denied may be considered by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

10. Requests by an applicant for a change from a difference-in-pay leave to a sabbatical leave may not be made after the professional leave applications have been forwarded to the UPLC (in early January).

11. Postponements from one academic year to a subsequent academic year shall not be authorized. This would allow the postponement of a leave from one quarter to another quarter within the same academic year, which is not uncommon and allows faculty some flexibility between the time of their initial application and the commencement of that leave. An applicant whose leave is approved for one or two quarters may reschedule his/her leave for a different time within the same academic year. This allows the faculty some flexibility between the time of their initial application and the commencement of that leave.

12. Deferral of an approved leave from one academic year to the next can only be authorized by a dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and usually only because of budget/staffing problems that might arise if the leave were granted in the academic year for which it was originally requested.
CALENDAR FOR PROCESSING PROFESSIONAL LEAVE APPLICATIONS

October 15  
Leave with pay eligibility lists, target allocations, are distributed and deadlines are announced distributed by the Faculty Affairs Office to the deans and department heads/chairs. Department heads/chairs, notify eligible employees of eligibility and deadlines.

November 1  
Candidates are responsible for submitting applications for leaves with pay to department heads.

November 9  
Applications are forwarded to CPLCs/LPLC via the deans with department head/chair's recommendations following consultation with the departmental faculty. The department shall provide a statement to the appropriate administrator and to the CPLC/LPLC regarding the quality of the proposed leave project and the possible effect on the curriculum and the operation resources of the department should the employee be granted a leave with pay (MOU 27.6 and 28.8)

November 15  
Applications are forwarded to the CPLCs/LPLC by the deans.

Wednesday of Fall Quarter Finals Week  
CPLCs and the LPLC shall complete their review of applications and interview all leave with pay candidates on or before this date.

Friday of Fall Quarter Finals Week  
Priority lists recommended by Recommendations of the CPLCs/LPLC are forwarded to the deans.

January 10  
Deans forward a copy of their recommendations and priority lists, the CPLCs/LPLC recommendations, department head/chair's recommendations, all applications, and a report of the criteria and procedures followed in the recommendation process to the UPLC via the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Jan 11/Feb 14  
UPLC reviews college/library procedures and criteria for compliance, reviews applications, and develops a priority ranking of all applicants forwards its Recommendations on priority are forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by February 14.

February 25  
The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies applicants of decision on applications. Such actions are subject to fiscal appropriations which are proposed for inclusion in the budget.

Feb 25/Mar 25  
UPLC recommends changes in college/library procedures and criteria to the Vice President for Academic Affairs with a copy to the appropriate dean. The UPLC recommends to the Chair of the Academic Senate and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs any changes in its procedures, criteria, or the "Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications."

Whenever one of the above dates falls on a weekend or academic holiday, that deadline is extended to the next regularly scheduled academic workday.
COMMENTS FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE HEARING OF THE REVIEW OF THE HOME ECONOMICS ACADEMIC PROGRAM

by

Robert D. Koob
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Mr. Chairman and members of the Academic Senate,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide information for your review of the Home Economics academic program. I'd like to review briefly the administrative role, my perception of the Senate's role, the history of the administrative action, and my view of options available to the Academic Senate.

The CSU Board of Trustees delegates to the President of Cal Poly responsibility and authority to make decisions on virtually all aspects of campus operation. In turn, the President delegates authority for individual aspects of the University to different elements of the campus. All resource allocation authority is delegated to the line structure of the University, subject to the approval of the President. The Academic Senate has been delegated, through its constitution, considerable curricular authority. There are few, if any, examples of curricular decisions that have not followed the will of the Academic Senate.

While it is common for fiscal structure to parallel curricular structure, there are enough examples where this is not true to demonstrate that the two are not inextricably tied. A good Cal Poly illustration is the Computer Engineering Program which is a joint effort between the Computer Science and EL/EE Departments. Other examples include programs without departments or allocated budgets such as Liberal Studies and Engineering Management. In a decision last Spring, the President accepted a recommendation of the Academic Deans' Council that funding for the Home Economics Department be phased out over a three-year period. It is important to distinguish between the funding issue, which is not part of this review, and the programmatic issue which is the subject of the matter before the Senate. Simply stated the programmatic issue is whether Cal Poly should continue to offer a Home Economics academic program and, if it were to be continued, what form that program might take.

The decision to phase out the Department of Home Economics has a context as well as specific issues. The context is the rest of the University and concerns about the welfare of the University as a whole. Cal Poly has dealt with extraordinary budget difficulty for at least two years, and it appears this will continue for at least one more year. Paramount to the University is that it retain programs it views critical to its
future, and that those programs be funded at a proper balance of people and support to assure their quality. Specific issues related to Home Economics are attached as Appendix A. Regardless of how one might view any single issue, taken together they lead to the conclusion that the general Home Economics Department was a less critical element in the future of Cal Poly than many of its other departments. In that sense, general Home Economics is following the path of mechanic arts that gave birth to the many Engineering professions, and general Agriculture that gave birth to many Agriculture disciplines. General Home Economics has already given rise to important new disciplines, several here at Cal Poly, more nationally, and the evolution from general to more specific is an undeniable national (and California) trend.

What remains is for the Academic Senate, should it choose to do so, to recommend which path into the future it feels is most appropriate for Cal Poly. Several paths are obvious although the choice among them is not. One choice is to allow the academic programs associated with the current Home Economics Department to phase out along with the Department’s funding. Another is to select components of the program that might be transferred to other departments for continuation, and finally, a third choice is to continue the general program, as presently constituted, in another arrangement. If the last choice is made, it would be extraordinarily useful to have a suggestion as to the source of funding for such a venture. The Department’s home College, Agriculture, of all the colleges, is most likely to have to send layoff notices for next year to probationary or tenured faculty and does not appear to have the resources to divert support for the current departmental arrangement.

I close with a comment about the process. From my view (see Appendix B), it would be preferable to make decisions about future funding affecting academic programs if there existed a well-debated body of opinion on which programs best fit the faculty’s view of the future of Cal Poly. Without that resource, it is much more difficult to assure that funding decisions, which clearly affect programs, are wisely made.
APPENDIX A

Elements and issues considered in the decision to phase out the Home Economics Department:

1. Although the program is authorized in Title 5, there is no provision in the California Administrative Code or other regulations requiring the University to offer Home Economics.

2. The Home Economics Department reported that its program could not be accredited by the American Home Economics Association unless it contains Nutrition and Child and Family Studies.

   In 1984, Nutrition was separated from Home Economics and became part of the Food Sciences Department.

   In 1984, Human Development was separated from Home Economics and became part of Psychology and Human Development. During the Spring 1991, Cal Poly's administration asked the Human Development faculty if they would like to return to the Home Economics Department. The Human Development faculty elected to remain in Psychology and Human Development.

   The concentration in Interior Design is currently accredited by the Foundation for Interior Design Education Research.

3. Although the Home Economics faculty is active in service to the Department, College, University and community, professional and creative/scholarly activities at the regional and national level have been modest.

   Of the five tenure-track faculty, two hold doctorates, three have master's degrees.

4. Much of the subject matter remaining in the department could be offered in other venues:

   Interior Design is often associated with programs other than Home Economics. After Home Economics, affiliation with Architecture is most common.

   Textiles and Foods programs are commonly available in Agricultural colleges.

   Merchandising and Consumer Affairs may be considered elements of business training.
5. After peaking in Fall 1989, applications declined steadily through Fall 1991.

6. At the time the decision to phase out the Home Economics Department was made, the Department was a member of a school that was being discontinued as well.

7. There existed reasonable opportunities for placing most faculty in the Department with other departments in the University.

8. The Department could be phased out in a manner which guaranteed degree completion to then enrolled students.

9. There existed other opportunities for Home Economics education within the CSU.

10. Failure to select some department or departments for phase out meant more layoffs in all other departments of the University as the only alternative to selection of some unit smaller than the whole University for layoff appears to be across-the-board layoffs. The latter alternative would be expected to reduce overall quality of instruction.

11. Reduction in personal services over the long term is the only alternative available to restore funding necessary for the support and operating services of the instructional program. Support budgets are disproportionately reduced in times of severe cutbacks. The cumulative effect of continuous reductions in support and operating services adversely impacts the instructional quality in all areas.
A brief history of the budget reduction decisions from a VP's perspective:

**For FY '92 (AY 1991/92):**

1. During the Fall of 1990, the administration requested of the Academic Senate program review information to aid in the budget decision making. The Academic Senate had no mechanism in place to comply with this request.

2. To demonstrate its sincerity in using faculty input in budget decision making, the administration requested the Senate appoint 7 members to an ad hoc task force. The President also appointed 7 faculty members. The task force began its work approximately the beginning of the 1991 Spring Quarter.

3. The ad hoc task force was charged with recommending cuts equivalent to the expected budget reduction in Instruction. The task force decided a program review was necessary to guide its deliberations and used a modified version of program review criteria found in the draft strategic plan. The task force assigned dollar reduction targets to each school and other units in Academic Affairs. Total reduction target for Academic Affairs was $6 million.

4. The Academic Deans' Council adopted the task force targets on a per school basis with one change (Athletics received 20% cut instead of 50%).

5. The President accepted the recommendation of Academic Deans' Council.

6. The Vice President for Academic Affairs assigned reductions to respective units and left the mechanism of achieving reductions to the discretion of deans and directors.

7. In late May of 1991, the Academic Senate Executive Committee heard the report of the task force from the Academic Vice President. It decides to develop program review as a standing University process.

8. Result: each unit met the assigned reduction, but the detail of reduction corresponded only roughly to the task force's rationale for assigning amount of reduction. The reduction to the School of Professional Studies was so severe (>30%), that the School was destabilized to the degree that the Academic Deans' Council, with the consent of the affected departments, reorganized SPS into the remaining schools.
For FY '93 (AY 1992/93):

1. During Fall 1991, the administration requested of the Academic Senate provide program review information to aid in budget decision making. It requested that the information be made available by early March 1992. The Academic Senate began work to develop a program review mechanism.

2. The Academic Deans' Council began the development of a plan to meet anticipated budget reduction for eventual reconciliation with whatever program input might come from the Senate. The Deans' plan included a set of Budget Change Proposals to be used to adjust school profiles, but they were not be program specific.

3. The Academic Senate indicated it would not be able to meet the March deadline for program information. The administration requested guidance as to some general expectations as to type of cuts to execute. The Senate took no position as a body, although three committees of the Senate recommended against an across-the-board approach.

4. In the Spring of 1992, the Vice President for Academic Affairs proposed school profile adjustments and proposed reduction targets to each school, making suggestions on some recommendations to meet reduction, and requested each school's response. The most dramatic recommendations included the phase out of Departments of Engineering Technology and Home Economics.

5. Counter proposals were not made, and the President accepted the recommendations of Academic Deans' Council.

6. The President requested the Academic Senate Program Review Committee to quickly conduct an overview of programs in the event that budget reductions should become more severe than projected. The Program Review Committee made the report by August 1. The Academic Senate took no action on the report.

7. Result: No two colleges received the same percentage reduction. Each college made the reduction as assigned. Again, details of the implementation were left to the individual deans. Colleges planning to phase out departments made temporary reductions in other areas in anticipation of recovering the savings as departments were reduced in size.

For FY '94 (AY 1993/94):

1. During the Fall of 1993, the administration requested of the Academic Senate program review information to aid in budget decision making. It requested that information be made available by early March 1993.
2. The Academic Senate Executive Committee undertook a comprehensive University budget review. Draft recommendations submitted to the Senate on March 9, were silent on academic program information.

3. The deans developed individual college plans to be shared with the Academic Deans' Council in late March. An early review by each dean with the Academic Vice President indicates considerably more consultation occurred within colleges than with prior plans. The deans of both colleges housing departments being phased out confirmed their intentions to continue on the plan. Each requested the President to notify the Chancellor's Office of intent to issue layoff notices to some fraction of identified unit.

4. The process continues.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Senate    DATE: March 22, 1993

FROM: Home Economics Department

SUBJECT: Response to Request for Accreditation Information

Attached is background on accreditation as requested at the March 9 Senate meeting. The information provides a chronology of events/correspondence, a list of AHEA concerns related to the final decision, and a summary of departmental accomplishments since accreditation review.

For your information, there are more than 300 home economics units offering baccalaureate degrees in the United States of which 73 are accredited by AHEA. While accredited status may be indicative of program quality, a number of prestigious programs throughout the United States have elected NOT to seek accreditation. Examples would be Cornell, Ohio State, Purdue, etc.

A provision of AB 81-5 clearly states that accreditation documentation should be included only for programs that are currently accredited. For that reason the Home Economics Department included appropriate information on FIDER accreditation ONLY which is the only current accreditation the department has.

If members of the Senate are still concerned about this issue, complete files (including AHEA old and new criteria) are available in the Home Economics Department Office for review. The Home Economics Department considers loss of accreditation as past history.
CHRONOLOGY

1977: Full ten year accreditation originally awarded.

11/21/83: Letter from Kinsey Green, Executive Director, AHEA, acknowledging receipt of interim report and response to proposed re-organization.

Acknowledges "evidence of progress made since granting accreditation."

Expresses "serious reservation regarding proposed reorganization...would result in a fragmentation of the unit...splintering of home economics subject matter areas can have serious repercussions on the integrative focus essential in the home economics professional preparation programs...grave concerns that 4 accreditation criteria cannot be met."

October, 1984: Letter to Joan McFadden, Executive Director, AHEA, from Harry Busselen, Dean, School of Professional Studies.

Notifies AHEA of the merger of Child and Family Development degree with Psychology and the Dietetics and Food Administration degree with Food Science.

Advises AHEA on: cross listing of foods and nutrition courses, foods faculty retained in Home Economics Department, and indications from the Provost of his commitment to retain accreditation through possible dual faculty appointments and other strategies.

November 2, 1984: Letter from Helen Grove, Director of Office of Professional Education, AHEA.

Requested "the California Polytechnic State University to show cause why the accreditation of its Child Development and Home Economics Department should not be revoked" (Note: error in department name in spite of being notified by the Dean of the department's "new" name).


July 15, 1985: Letter from Helen Grove, Director of Office of Professional Education, AHEA.

Reply to materials submitted in response to show-cause order.

"Home economics unit as now constituted is a significantly different unit from that accredited in 1977 and approved in the 1983 interim report."

Letter mandates self-study and site visit on a time-table that required submission of self-study and subsequent site visit one year earlier than normally scheduled.
(Note: notification letter dated July 15, 1985 specifying a complete self-study by March 1, 1986, contradictory to the normal one-year time period allowed for the preparation of self-study reports.)

September 20, 1985: Request from Barbara Weber to the Provost for full funding of Accreditation including document preparation, site visit, and consultant (which was and still is standard procedure in this discipline).

(Note: Provost funded $840 but denied request to fund the hiring of a consultant and all other expenses. All other costs were funded by the school/department).


(cost = $5,900; faculty co-authors = 519 hours).

November 6-10, 1986: Site Visit.

November, 1986-October, 1987 (11 months): Serious delay in preparation of report by team (should have been ready in 6-8 weeks); one team member (also Director for Office of Professional Education) fired; delay by AHEA jeopardized the department's time to respond to report of site team.

October 9, 1987: Letter of transmittal from Malcolm Wilson to the Director of Accreditation of AHEA, Carl Weddle.

Responded to report by the site visitation team; notes the department's concern on "large number of inaccuracies, misunderstandings, and inconsistencies in report".

October 29, 1987: Letter from Judy Bonner, Chair, Council for Professional Development, AHEA.

Provisional status granted for 2 years; strengths/weaknesses addressed. (See next section of this report.)

August 15, 1989: Letter from Barbara Weber to Virginia Caples, Chair, Council for Accreditation.

November 8, 1989: Letter from Karl Weddle, Director of Accreditation, AHEA.

Accreditation denied.

FINAL DECISION ON ACCREDITATION

The following items refer to the 1984 criteria that were still of concern to the Council for Accreditation at its October, 1989
meeting (Weddle letter, November 8, 1989).

1.2 (Mission & Goals)

While recognizing a revised Mission and Goals statement, the
council questioned the use/application of the statement for
planning and implementation purposes:

3.1 & 3.2 (Faculty)

The educational preparation and experience of faculty were
questioned as related to assigned teaching responsibilities.

6.3 (Curriculum)

Breadth and depth in content areas of specialization were thought
NOT to be documented in the progress report.

6.5 (Curriculum)

While recognizing course expected outcomes, AHEA expressed
concern over the absence of stated programmatic competencies.

6.7 (Curriculum)

AHEA indicated that NO documentation was presented regarding
curriculum review, i.e., how frequent, by whom, and how process
functions.

RESPONSE AND UPDATE

The following statements address the "deficiencies cited," clarify
inaccuracies, and identify progress made since the initial visit.

1.2 Mission and Goals

The Department Mission and Goals statement was most recently
reviewed and revised during the campus strategic planning
process. Progress has been made toward achieving several goals;
the availability of resources (faculty and funding) has delayed
further implementation.

3.1 & 3.2 Faculty

The Department has retired 2 Ph.D.'s, one of whom has continued
to teach part-time as a retired annuitant. In addition, 2
Ph.D.'s have been hired, tenured, and promoted. One position was
offered to another Ph.D. who would not accept because of the high
cost of housing/living in San Luis Obispo and noncompetitive
salary. That position was subsequently filled by a male with a
masters degree who was awarded a CSU forgivable loan and is
currently completing the Ph.D. at Ohio State University with
plans to return Fall, 1993.

The recognized terminal degree for interior design faculty is the masters degree. Interior design faculty hired since program review have had the terminal degree.

Based on a severe nationwide shortage of Ph.D.-qualified faculty in fashion merchandising, the school's Personnel Policies and Procedures were revised and approved by higher administration to allow appointment on tenure track (with promotion limited to associate level) of masters candidates with appropriate background of education and experience. One person was appointed under these provisions.

Two tenured faculty hired more than 25 years ago under previous criteria have been promoted to full professor since the site visit. In addition, four faculty members are recognized by AHEA as Certified Home Economists; one is a licensed architect and is NCIDQ certified; and the retired annuitant is a Certified Financial Planner.

Documentation in the Accreditation materials did present faculty teaching assignments (on AHEA Self Study Report Form 2).

6.3 Curriculum

The progress report (August, 1989) did include appropriate information regarding depth and breadth and verifies that the program had added 2 officially recognized concentrations since the Self Study Report in 1986.

6.5 Curriculum

Measurable objectives reflect anticipated competencies and were included on expanded course outlines accompanying the progress report. In addition, programmatic objectives were and continue to be listed on student advising sheets.

6.7 Curriculum

The department indicated the levels/process for formal curriculum review. However, we did not submit the university's timetable for providing curriculum revision materials and a detailed explanation of curriculum committee structures throughout the university.

UPDATE

Since the accreditation process, the department has:

1. Received full 6-year FIDER accreditation of the interior design program, one of only 3 in the CSU system.
2. Obtained CSU concentration status for interior design and
textiles and clothing merchandising (the two areas of
greatest student demand on this campus and nationwide),
continued to provide the curricular breadth expected by
AHEA, and utilized advising emphases (including courses from
other-departments) to permit students to focus their
academic programs to meet career objectives.

3. Obtained cross listing of 2 Human Development courses which
would help the department meet revised accreditation
standards.

4. Requested monetary support in 1991 for anticipated AHEA
reaccreditation expenses for the 93-94 academic year, in
addition to a request for funding for the FIDER site visit
in the Fall, 1994.

5. Maintained membership in the Agency Member Unit (AMU) at the
department’s expense and in spite of the loss of
accreditation; this membership is required of all programs
seeking/receiving accreditation.

6. Verified the competency of faculty through certifications
and licenses as appropriate and have attempted to increase
the numbers of terminal-degree faculty; however, budget
limitations have made this impossible.

7. Increased collaborations with faculty from other
departments.

8. Added state-of-the-art equipment and facilities.

9. Obtained additional endowment funding and scholarships.

10. Admitted students with higher qualifications, and increased
the number of male and ethnically diverse students.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the attached recommendations for accommodating immediate budget reductions; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached recommendations be forwarded to President Baker for his review and consideration.

Proposed By: Academic Senate Executive Committee
March 9, 1993
ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR ACCOMMODATING IMMEDIATE BUDGET REDUCTIONS

In planning for the expected 1993/94 budget shortfall, a 7.4+ percent overall reduction is anticipated for Cal Poly. In an effort to suggest ways of meeting this challenge, the following recommendations have been adopted by the Academic Senate. In proposing these recommendations, it is the concern of the Academic Senate that all efforts be made to maintain the integrity of classroom instruction at Cal Poly.

These recommendations are in addition to the reductions presently being identified by each divisional area of the university as necessary for meeting that area's portion of the across-the-board cuts.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Athletics: reduce state funding to Athletics by 50 percent.

2. Transportation Services: reduce state funding to Transportation Services by 100 percent.

3. University Relations and Development: reduce state funding to University Relations and Development by 100 percent.

4. Student Affairs:
   A. more student services to be fee-based;
   B. reduce the number of administrators in Student Affairs;

5. Administration: reduce the number of positions at the director's level and above with the exception of college deans.

6. Computing Services:
   We are concerned with the cost of central computing services provided by Information Services. We request that the IACC and IRMPPC report to the Academic on: (1) what are the essential computing functions on campus; and (2) recommend the most cost-effective ways of delivering those services.

7. Remedial Courses: remedial courses be offered through Extended Education.

8. Faculty Consultation: faculty to be consulted in each college on the question of total personnel costs versus O&E funds.
March 1, 1993

Final Draft

ACADEMIC SENATE RESPONSE TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN

Cal Poly's Strategic Plan was developed as a means to guide the university over the next several years. It establishes a direction for achieving the mission of the university by setting forth the goals and priorities which will direct its future planning, resource allocation, and decision making.

CAL POLY MISSION STATEMENT

Cal Poly's mission as a predominantly undergraduate, comprehensive, polytechnic university serving California is to discover, integrate, apply and transmit truth and knowledge in teaching while serving the needs of its constituencies.

Cal Poly achieves its mission by balancing theory and application, principle and practice, and through its special emphasis, reflected in the phrase "learn by doing."

As part of its mission, Cal Poly is dedicated to complete respect for human rights and the development of the full potential of each of its individual members, and pledges to serve all the peoples of California by educating its students to an exceptional level of social and professional awareness.

As a predominantly undergraduate, comprehensive, polytechnic university serving California, the mission of Cal Poly is to discover, integrate, articulate, and apply knowledge. This it does by emphasizing teaching; engaging in research; participating in the various communities with which it pursues common interests; and where appropriate, providing students with the unique experience of direct involvement with the actual challenges of their disciplines.

Cal Poly is dedicated to complete respect for human rights and the development of the full potential of each of its individual members. Cal Poly is committed to providing an environment where all share in the common responsibility to safeguard each other's rights, encourage a mutual concern for individual growth and appreciate the benefits of a diverse campus community.

1. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The purpose of academic programs at Cal Poly is to fulfill the university mission of pursuing and transmitting skill, knowledge and truth. Cal Poly's academic programs support the university's unique comprehensive, and polytechnic mission and should all be
assessed periodically to ensure that they meet student and societal needs. Cal Poly should provide the necessary resources to ensure the highest quality of service to its students to facilitate their progress throughout all phases of their educational careers.

Goals:

1.1 Consistent with the provisions of Title 5, Sections 40050 and 40051 of the California Code of Regulations, Cal Poly shall affirm its polytechnic orientation emphasizing undergraduate, graduate, and post-baccalaureate professional and technical programs, while providing equally high-quality programs in the arts, humanities, and natural, social and behavioral sciences that characterize a comprehensive, polytechnic university. These programs shall encourage students to be imaginative and assume leadership in the future.

1.1.1. Cal Poly shall ensure that 70 to 80 percent of each graduating class is in professionally or technically oriented programs that a significant majority of Cal Poly students are enrolled in professional or technical programs.

1.1.2. Cal Poly administration shall continue to seek necessary state resources to support a high-quality polytechnic university.

1.2 Cal Poly shall continue to admit and graduate the highest quality students possible.

1.3 Cal Poly shall may admit freshmen into majors, or schools colleges, or admit them into the university without declaring a major.

1.4 Cal Poly's general education program shall reflect the institution's polytechnic character and will provide means whereby graduates Cal Poly's general education will continue to maintain a technical component consistent with the university's character and will provide means whereby graduates:

- will have achieved the ability to think clearly, logically, and creatively; to find and critically examine information; to communicate in English orally and in writing; and to perform quantitative functions;

- will have acquired appreciable knowledge about their own bodies and minds, about how human society has developed and how it now functions, about the -
physical world in which they live, about the other forms of life with which they share that world, and about the cultural endeavors and legacies of their civilization;

will have come to an understanding and appreciation of the principles, methodologies, value systems, and thought processes employed in human inquiries.

1.4.1 Cal Poly's general education program shall provide alternatives by which undergraduates can complete the CSU mandated requirements for general education.

1.4.2 Cal Poly shall establish policy to facilitate general education transferability.

1.4.3 Cal Poly shall ensure its graduates will have acquired knowledge regarding technology, its importance to society, and its impacts on the natural systems.

1.5 Cal Poly shall support and develop high quality graduate postbaccalaureate programs that complement the mission of the university.

1.5.1 Cal Poly shall ensure that 10 to 20 percent of each graduating class is in graduate programs.

1.6 Cal Poly shall provide a campus environment where a strong commitment to teaching and learning exists, and all members of the campus community are motivated to work together in the pursuit of educational goals.

1.7 Cal Poly's instructional programs will vary in size depending on such factors as:

- relevance to mission
- quality of program, faculty, students, and staff
- support of the university's Educational Equity and Affirmative Action plans
- projected demand by students and employers
- overlaps with programs in other institutions, including the number and size of similar programs offered elsewhere in the state
- requirements of accreditation associations
- resource requirements (variety of faculty, staff, facilities, equipment, library resources).

1.8 Cal Poly's decisions about academic programs and administrative organizations shall be based on the
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educational needs of students and society and the efficient, and effective and appropriate use of resources within a program.

1.8.1 Cal Poly shall review these decisions regularly.

1.9 Cal Poly shall participate in self-supporting programs that offer educational opportunities for non-traditional, non-matriculated nontraditional, nonmatriculated students.

1.10 Cal Poly shall require for graduation successful completion of course work that focuses on the issues of gender and cultural pluralism.

1.10 Cal Poly shall ensure that the academic curriculum is appropriately infused with issues of gender and cultural and racial pluralism.

1.10.1 Cal Poly shall require for graduation, successful completion of course work that focuses on the issues of gender and cultural and racial pluralism.

1.10.2 Cal Poly shall ensure that the content of courses across the curriculum include relevant issues of gender and cultural and racial pluralism where appropriate.

2. FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP

The faculty shall be encouraged to be proficient and current in their disciplines as well as their teaching skills. Cal Poly shall continue to encourage faculty to belong to appropriate professional organizations. Cal Poly will provide the necessary support to ensure that faculty have the opportunity to achieve success in the scholarships identified below.

Faculty Professional Development

Excellence in teaching is the primary purpose of Cal Poly's faculty, and active participation in various types of scholarly activities is essential to meeting this goal. Cal Poly recognizes and endorses four types of scholarship as part of the expectations for faculty. A Carnegie Foundation report entitled Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate identifies these as the Scholarship of Teaching, the Scholarship of Discovery, the Scholarship of Integration, and the Scholarship of Application. Each of Cal Poly's faculty members must be active and proficient in the Scholarship of Teaching. While activity in the three remaining areas characterizes the career of
a faculty member, at any given time it is likely that one area will receive greater emphasis than the others.

The following thoughts extracted from the Carnegie Foundation report suit the mission of teaching and pursuing knowledge at Cal Poly particularly well. Cal Poly endorses the broad definitions of the four types of scholarship set forth in the Carnegie report. The following thoughts extracted from the Carnegie report summarize the mission of teaching and scholarship at Cal Poly.

The Scholarship of Teaching. As a scholarly enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows. Those who teach must be well-informed and steeped in the knowledge of their fields. But the work of the professor becomes consequential only as it is understood by others. Teaching is also a dynamic endeavor involving the analogies, metaphors, and images that build bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning. Teaching is also a dynamic endeavor which must bring students actively into the educational process.

Further, teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well. In the end, inspired teaching keeps scholarship alive. In the end, inspired teaching keeps scholarship alive and inspired scholarship keeps teaching alive. Without the teaching function, the continuity of knowledge will be broken and the store of human knowledge diminished.

2.1 Cal Poly shall continue to encourage its faculty members to be proficient and current in the subjects they teach.

2.2 Cal Poly shall continue to improve opportunities for each faculty member to be skilled in classroom or comparable modes of instruction and to have the most up-to-date means of information technology available.

2.2.1 Cal Poly shall continue to place particular emphasis upon teaching methods that require students to take an active role in their own learning.

2.3 Consistent with its expectations, Cal Poly shall continue to improve classroom space, classroom equipment, supplies, study space, computer equipment, communication and information technologies, books, periodicals, and other resources.
2.4 Cal Poly shall develop an on-going and effective program of conferences and workshops on teaching and use of information technology to ensure the highest possible quality of instruction across the campus.

The Scholarship of Discovery comes closest to what is meant when academics speak of "research." This scholarship contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge, but also to the intellectual climate of the University. Not just the outcomes, but the process, and especially the passion, give meaning to the effort. The probing mind of the researcher is a vital asset to Cal Poly, the state, and the world. Scholarly investigation and/or creative activity, in all the disciplines, is at the very heart of academic life, and the pursuit of knowledge must be assiduously cultivated and defended. Disciplined, investigative efforts within the University should be strengthened, not diminished. Those engaged in the Scholarship of Discovery shall ask: What is known and what is yet to be discovered?

The Scholarship of Integration involves the serious, disciplined work of interpreting, drawing together, and bringing new insight to bear on original research. This scholarship can involve doing research at the boundaries where fields of study converge, or it can involve the interpretation and fitting of one's own research—or the research of others—into larger intellectual patterns. Integration means making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating nonspecialists, too. Those engaged in the Scholarship of Integration shall ask: What do the research findings mean and is it possible to interpret what has been discovered in ways that provide a larger, more comprehensive understanding?

The Scholarship of Application involves using knowledge to solve problems. This scholarship is a dynamic process where new research discoveries are applied and where the applications themselves give rise to new intellectual understandings. This scholarly activity, which both applies and contributes to human knowledge, is particularly needed in a world in which huge, almost intractable problems call for the skills and insights of university faculties. Those engaged in the Scholarship of Application shall ask: How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems, and how can social, economic, and other problems define an agenda for scholarly investigation?

2.5 Consistent with its expectations, Cal Poly shall continue to improve its support for the Scholarships of Discovery, Integration, and Application. Such support
shall include but not be limited to assigned time, facilities, equipment, travel, and research assistance.

MOVE SECTION 2.6 TO SECTION 3: "STAFF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT AS GOAL 3.6.

2.6 Consistent with its expectations, Cal Poly shall encourage staff participation in the Scholarships of Discovery, Integration, and Application. Such staff support should include, but not be limited to, active involvement in projects and research.

2.7 In addition to a commitment to the Scholarship of Teaching, each Cal Poly faculty member shall demonstrate a continued involvement in one or more of the scholarships of Discovery, Integration, and Application.

2.8 Cal Poly's faculty evaluation process shall require evidence that each faculty member is engaged in one or more of the scholarships of Discovery, Integration, and Application in addition to the faculty member's involvement in the Scholarship of Teaching.

2.6 Cal Poly shall recognize and support professional activities to the disciplines (such as holding office, editing journals, reviewing books and participating in professional meetings) and service to the university and larger community (such as serving on committees and activity in community groups and activities.

3. STAFF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

Excellence in support of students and faculty is the primary goal of Cal Poly's staff, and participation in activities that lead to professional growth and achievement is essential to meeting this goal. Professional growth and achievement includes continuing education related to a staff member's current position as well as education and training for future careers. Professional growth and achievement may entail different activities for different staff members.

In a university, it is appropriate for all members of the campus community to have the opportunity to seek further learning.

3.1 Cal Poly's staff members shall have the opportunity to pursue additional education and training whether in pursuit of a degree, certification, or personal lifelong learning.
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Staff members must have available to them the tools necessary for professional growth and achievement. This shall include the opportunity to enhance skills in their current fields, to be exposed to recent developments in technology and information, and to acquire additional education.

An important part of professional growth and achievement, especially on a campus as relatively isolated as Cal Poly, is participation in professional organizations and opportunities to attend professional conferences.

3.2 Cal Poly's staff shall be encouraged to be proficient and current in their professions in order to provide the highest quality support to students, faculty, and the university at large. In support of this, Cal Poly shall continue to improve and update the work environment.

3.3 Cal Poly's staff shall be encouraged to belong to appropriate local, state, and national professional organizations.

3.4 Staff professional growth and achievement shall be recognized by the university.

3.5 Cal Poly shall institute revised performance evaluation standards that set fair and high standards for performance of staff members. These performance standards shall take into consideration the stated expectations for professional growth and achievement and recognize staff members who endeavor to meet those expectations.

3.6 Consistent with its expectations, Cal Poly shall encourage staff participation in the Scholarships of Discovery, Integration, and Application. Such staff support should include, but not be limited to, active involvement in projects and research.

4. STUDENT SATISFACTION

The experience of students on campus directly relates to their satisfaction and the prospect that they will persist with their academic programs to graduation. Student satisfaction at Cal Poly is enhanced by the ambiance of a small university setting, low student-faculty ratios, and the continuing commitment to provide a motivated, technologically current learning environment. The university must continue to support and promote student satisfaction through early affiliation with specific advising programs, respect for the rights of the individual,
access to student services, and opportunities to participate in activities that develop the whole person.

4.1 Cal Poly's administrative, academic, and student services programs shall promote student retention, success, and graduation in a timely manner.

4.2 Cal Poly's administrative processes affecting students shall be efficient, effective, and oriented toward service.

4.3 Cal Poly shall provide services, such as library and information services, computing, and audio-visual services, that improve the learning environment.

4.4 Cal Poly shall administer regularly a systematic survey of student attitudes toward academic, administrative, and support services.

4.4.1 Cal Poly shall establish and implement a thorough approach to investigating the reasons why students choose to discontinue study at Cal Poly.

4.5 Cal Poly shall provide a campus environment where the rights of each member of the university community are respected.

4.5.1 The Cal Poly community shall strive to be free of all forms of harassment.

4.5.2 Campus policies for handling harassment complaints will comply with state and federal law.

4.6 Cal Poly shall provide an environment in which social, co-curricular, and multi-cultural programs motivate students, faculty, and staff to work, participate, and socialize together.

5. DIVERSITY

Cultural diversity improves the quality of life and education for all members of the Cal Poly community. It enhances the educational and professional opportunities for all members of the student body, faculty, and staff, and enriches the social climate both on and off campus. The concept of cultural diversity assumes recognition and respect for differences in age, country of origin, creed, economic background, ethnicity, gender, physical ability, race, or sexual orientation. Objectives for achieving the educational equity reflected in diversity include programs for outreach, recruitment, retention, career planning, and graduation for students as well as programs for recruitment and retention of all Cal Poly employees. Emphasis is given to achieving parity for individuals from underrepresented groups in enrollment by having Cal Poly graduating classes reflect the
Diversity enhances the quality of life and education for all members of the Cal Poly community and enriches the social and professional climate both on and off campus. The concept of diversity assumes recognition and respect for differences in age, country of origin, creed, economic background, ethnicity, gender, physical ability, race, and sexual orientation. The development and maintenance of an integrated multicultural campus is the responsibility of all members of the Cal Poly community. Achieving educational equity within a diverse student body will require programs in outreach, recruitment, retention, career planning, and the promotion of timely graduation with special emphasis on reflecting the diversity among CSU eligible students within the state. Cal Poly commits to meeting the proportion of eligible underrepresented individuals by job category in appropriate recruiting areas. To achieve a truly integrated multicultural campus, members of the faculty, staff, and student body must participate in academic and cultural programs that promote the sensitivity, understanding, and appreciation necessary for the successful attainment of this ideal.

5.1 Cal Poly shall lead in creating a multicultural and multi-racial campus. All members of the Cal Poly community shall work cooperatively to achieve an integrated multicultural, multi-racial campus in which the educational and professional opportunities for the student body, faculty, and staff are enhanced.

5.2 Cal Poly shall strive to have the composition of the university community, regardless of institutional size, reflect closely the cultural diversity of California. The composition of the Cal Poly community shall reasonably reflect the cultural diversity of those Californians qualified for enrollment or employment at Cal Poly.

5.2.1 By the year 2000, Cal Poly's graduating classes shall reflect the ethnic and gender diversity of the high school graduating class five years previously. This diversity shall be distributed in reasonable proportions throughout the university's curricular and other programs.

5.2.2 Cal Poly shall continue to develop initiate or maintain programs to increase the number of
qualified student applicants, attract and retain students of high calibre, and increase the diversity of the student population in accordance with the campus enrollment management plan.

5.2.3.2 Cal Poly shall establish effective outreach programs to increase the number of qualified underrepresented students, faculty, and staff members and participate to the fullest extent possible in CSU programs for increasing faculty, staff, and student diversity. In addition, Cal Poly will have programs that promote the personal and professional success of underrepresented members of the university community.

5.3 Cal Poly shall create a campus environment that ensures equal opportunity for professional and personal success in all segments of the university community.

5.4 Cal Poly shall value diversity and promote mutual respect and interaction among all individuals. Cal Poly shall identify and support effective programs for educating Cal Poly faculty and staff members, students, and off-campus local constituencies in cultural diversity and for encouraging an integrated, diverse community within the university.

5.4.1 Cal Poly shall identify and support effective programs for educating Cal Poly faculty, staff, students, and off-campus constituencies in cultural diversity and for encouraging an integrated, diverse community within the university.

5.5 Cal Poly shall create academic and cultural programs to demonstrate to the campus and the community the contributions of culturally diverse groups.

5.6 Cal Poly shall participate to the fullest extent possible in CSU programs for increasing faculty and staff diversity.

6. GOVERNANCE AND COLLEGIALITY

Effective university governance depends on a shared sense of responsibility and commitment to the university's educational mission. Collegiality encourages the participation of all constituencies in the decision-making process and creates a work environment that builds cooperation, mutual respect, and high morale, and helps achieve the university's goals.
6.1 Cal Poly shall clearly identify, evaluate, and communicate its governance structure, including its agents and their roles and responsibilities, and adopt a structure that includes all constituencies.

6.1.1 Cal Poly's governance structure shall implement shared decision making. This involves fostering mutual respect and a set of values that regards the members of the various university constituencies as essential for the success of the academic enterprise.

6.2 Cal Poly shall regularly evaluate and modify its governance structure and the roles and responsibilities of the structure's elements, with particular attention to collegiality and the coupling of authority and responsibility.

6.3 Cal Poly shall understand clearly, evaluate and enhance its roles, relationships, and responsibilities with the CSU Board of Trustees and with the Chancellor's Office.

6.4 Cal Poly shall determine the role of other authoritative structures such as the California Postsecondary Education Commission, employee organizations, the governor's office, and the state legislature in its operations, and its responsibility to those structures.

7. INSTITUTIONAL SIZE

Constant improvement in quality is essential to Cal Poly's success in achieving its goals. To accomplish this, facilities frequently need to be altered or added. However, qualitative increases cannot be sustained without money, material, and people to nourish them, and growth beyond adequate resources leads to a deterioration of quality. The university must continually balance size and resources and must develop the additional resources that excellence requires.

7.1 Cal Poly shall continue its commitment to planned changes in institutional size.

7.1.1 Cal Poly shall not undertake any growth without adequate facilities and supporting resources.

7.1.2 Campus ambiance shall be improved by ensuring that new facilities are consistent with a master plan for the physical improvement of the campus.

7.2 Cal Poly shall explore alternative educational models and technologies to enhance the quality and quantity of the
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services it provides to its students and other constituencies, including business and industry.

7.2.1 Cal Poly shall consider alternatives to the university's current quarter system.

7.2.2 Cal Poly shall explore new technologies that offer the potential to increase the quality and quantity of the education and services it provides.

7.3 Cal Poly's planning for institutional size shall reinforce the campus' goals for quality and diversity.

7.4 Cal Poly shall continue to develop and expand auxiliary services such as the Cal Poly Foundation enterprises to enhance the quality and quantity of support services and programs delivered to the campus community.

7.5 Cal Poly shall consult with the City and County of San Luis Obispo and participate in public forums in planning for and mitigating the impact of changes in institutional size.

7.6 Cal Poly shall actively seek all appropriate sources of financial and material support, expanding its efforts to take advantage of untapped existing opportunities and to create new ones.

7.7 Cal Poly shall consider its human resources as part of any evaluation of resources--especially when considering the adequacy of resources to support increases in enrollment.

7.8 Cal Poly's physical environment and services shall continually be improved by creative planning that emphasizes a comprehensive, humanistic environmental awareness.

8. UNIVERSITY RELATIONS AND IMAGE

Cal Poly has a multitude of relationships with many and varied groups. Its image is similarly multifaceted, depending on the quality of each relationship. While Cal Poly's reputation is enviable, it is neither perfect nor permanent. Active, open, and honest relations are the foundation of a positive image and build understanding, lasting good will, and support for the university's programs and goals. Cal Poly should continue to build and maintain relations and an image that reflect the highest integrity and help the university achieve its goals.

8.1 Cal Poly shall continue to develop a comprehensive program of active relations with the university's various constituencies and audiences to ensure effective, efficient, positive and mutually satisfying relationships.
8.1.1 Cal Poly shall treat its personnel as full partners in the university's endeavors, fully recognizing the value and importance of both faculty and staff, and shall be guided by a commitment to fostering a community spirit on the campus.

8.1.2 Cal Poly shall ensure the coordination of its various relations programs.

8.1.3 Cal Poly shall ensure that all pertinent information about the university is effectively communicated to the university community, the general public, and to appropriate news media.

8.1.4 Cal Poly shall be a good neighbor and enhance the university's positive impact by emphasizing open communication with the city and county and addressing concerns of the local community.

8.1.5 Cal Poly shall strive to increase parent and alumni participation in campus life and activities in order to build a stronger base of support as well as pride and satisfaction among both current and former students.

8.1.6 Cal Poly shall consider business, industry, and private donors to be partners with the university, and shall strive to develop mutually satisfying relationships and a climate that will maintain and increase the level of support.

8.1.7 Cal Poly shall continue to evaluate and address changes in its relationship with the state government and other levels of government as appropriate.

8.2 Cal Poly shall strive to enhance the university's image among all of its audiences and constituent groups.

8.2.1 Cal Poly shall seek a clear understanding of the university's different audiences and the different attitudes and images they have regarding the university.

8.2.2 Cal Poly shall accurately reflect in its communications the university's mission and goals, a vision of its future, the quality of its human resources and programs, the realities of campus life, and a concern for the university's long-
standing reputation built on honesty and integrity.

8.3 Cal Poly shall publicize its strategic planning effort and its strategic goals immediately upon adoption of the Strategic Plan.
1. **PROPOSER'S NAME**
   Evans (POLS), Kaminaka (AG), Hellyer (AGB), Krejsa (BIO)

2. **PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT**
   several

3. **SUBMITTED FOR AREA** (include section, and subsection if applicable)
   D.4.b.

4. **THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR:**
   - [ ] New Course
   - [X] Change to an Existing GEB Course
   - [ ] Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB

5. **COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION** (follow catalog format)
   POLS/BIO/AG 371X : an interdisciplinary examination of global food production and distribution in a variety of cultural settings with an emphasis on the moral and ecological dimensions of food politics and the relationship between food and population. Taught by a team of instructors. 3 lectures.

6. **SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**
   Subcommittee D supports this specific proposal and encourages more interdisciplinary efforts in all GE areas. (Nov. 23, 1992)

7. **GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS**
   Endorsed by the GE&B Committee November 24, 1992.

8. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION**

---

*Academic Programs: 7/18/90*
Background Statement: The Evaluations Office staff has received conflicting questions and opinions regarding Cal Poly's policy on counting course units for more than one requirement in a curriculum. If a student completes a course listed as a major or support requirement that is also an acceptable General Education and Breadth course, that course will fulfill both the major or support requirement and the General Education and Breadth requirement. The Evaluations Office staff has asked the General Education and Breadth Committee to review this policy and verify that they are correctly interpreting the existing policy as stated in the 1992-94 Cal Poly Catalog.

AS-93/GE&BC
RESOLUTION ON DOUBLE COUNTING OF GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH COURSES

WHEREAS, The General Education and Breadth Statement in the Cal Poly Catalog states:

Except where expressly prohibited, courses taken to satisfy General Education and Breadth requirements may also simultaneously satisfy requirements in any other portion of the student's curriculum; and

WHEREAS, The areas in which double counting is "expressly prohibited" in the catalog are:

GEB C.3. Courses offered by the student's major department cannot be counted in the elective portion of Distribution Area C.

GEB D.4.b. Courses offered by the student's major department cannot be counted as satisfying the requirements of this group; and
RESOLUTION ON DOUBLE COUNTING OF
GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH COURSES
AS-__-93/GE&BC
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WHEREAS, Since the General Education and Breadth areas that are expressly prohibited are included in the Cal Poly General Education and Breadth policy, individual departments cannot prohibit a major or support course from also satisfying a General Education requirement; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That courses fulfilling major or support requirements that are also acceptable General Education and Breadth choices will be used to satisfy either major or support requirements and to satisfy General Education and Breadth requirements except as prohibited by catalog statements (GEB Areas C.3 and D.4.b); and be it further

RESOLVED: That a General Education and Breadth course will not be used to satisfy more than two requirements; i.e., major or support (including concentration) requirements and General Education and Breadth.

Proposed by: Academic Senate
General Education and Breadth Committee
Dated: November 10, 1992
1. **PROPOSER'S NAME**  
Nishan Havandjian & Clay Carter  

2. **PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT**  
Journalism  

3. **SUBMITTED FOR AREA** (include section, and subsection if applicable)  
C. 3. (note: submitted first for C.3 consideration and then in late Fall '92 for D consideration; no subsection identified)  

4. **THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR:**  
- [x] New Course  
- [ ] Change to an Existing GEB Course  
- [ ] Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB  

5. **COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION** (follow catalog format)  
**JOUR 318--MASS MEDIA IN SOCIETY.** 4 lecture hours, 4 units.  
An appreciation of the political, economic and cultural impact of newspapers, magazines, radio and television in democratic societies. Role of informed media consumers in shaping media and messages.  

6. **SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**  
Area C subcommittee recommends against JOUR 318 (1/3/92); too much overlap with ENGL/JOUR/SPC 385; contents not focused on arts and literature, but sociological issues; no prerequisites; problems with objective teaching.  
Course proposal revised a bit but again rejected by subcommittee C, 11/30/92; note re: rejections sent by Culver to Navandjian and he resubmits to Area D.  
Course proposal reviewed and rejected by Area D subcommittee (1/21/93) on the grounds that the course did not satisfy the guidelines to be in Area D.  

7. **GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS**  
On Jan. 28, the GE&B Committee again reviewed this course and the recommendations of the two area subcommittees. We agree with the subcommittee recommendations that JOUR 318 does not meet the criteria for inclusion into either distribution area; there is too much overlap with existing courses, the course has more of a sociological emphasis, rather than one on humanities (for C) and it does not address the nonwestern component required for (D). There are other problems as well.  

8. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION**
WHEREAS, the dean/equivalent administrator has primary responsibility for leadership of the college/equivalent academic unit in the allocation and utilization of financial resources, quality of academic programs, admission and dismissal of students, appointment, retention, tenure and promotion action, long-range direction of the college/equivalent academic unit, development of external financial resources and the representation of the college/equivalent academic unit both internal to the university and to external constituents; and

WHEREAS, the faculty of a college/equivalent academic unit are directly affected by the dean/equivalent administrator's performance in meeting these responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, the dean/equivalent administrator's evaluation by the faculty is utilized for the purpose of providing evaluative information to the dean/equivalent administrator and the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and

WHEREAS, each probationary and tenured faculty member, regardless of time base, including those persons in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP), has a professional responsibility to complete the evaluation form in order to provide useful and timely input to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and

WHEREAS, the Vice President for Academic Affairs evaluates the deans/equivalent administrators every three years; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: that the attached evaluation form be adopted for use by the faculty in evaluating the dean/equivalent administrator of each college/equivalent academic unit annually; and, be it further

Adopted:

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

AS-93/PPC
RESOLUTION ON
EVALUATION OF COLLEGE DEANS OR
EQUIVALENT ADMINISTRATORS
RESOLUTION ON EVALUATION OF COLLEGE DEANS OR EQUIVALENT ADMINISTRATORS
AS-93/PPC
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RESOLVED: That the Library may develop an evaluation form appropriate for its use subject to the approval of the Academic Senate and the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend that said evaluation results be a major part of the Vice President for Academic Affairs' evaluative consideration of each dean/equivalent administrator; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Vice President for Academic Affairs report to each college/equivalent academic unit's faculty the number and percentage of faculty in that college/equivalent academic unit that responded to the dean/equivalent administrator's evaluation and that a summary of the evaluation results be placed in the dean/equivalent administrator's personnel file.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
ANNUAL EVALUATION OF COLLEGE DEANS and EQUIVALENT ADMINISTRATORS

Faculty completion of this evaluation form is of utmost importance if it is to be given serious consideration by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in his evaluation of the dean/equivalent administrator. Good performance should be recognized and inadequate performance should be identified.

DEAN/EQUIVALENT ADMINISTRATOR: ________________________________

Please rate your dean/equivalent administrator's performance this academic year, using the scales provided for each item. Respond on the enclosed scantron form.

Scale: Outstanding = A, Good = B, Fair = C, Poor = D

1. Engages in effective strategic planning
2. Promotes improvements in goals, objectives, policies and procedures
3. Supports and recognizes professional development and accomplishments of faculty
4. Recognizes and rewards faculty service
5. Recognizes and rewards excellence in teaching
6. Recognizes and rewards effective student advising
7. Effectively advocates college/equivalent academic unit's positions and concerns to the university administration
8. Encourages and supports affirmative action and cultural diversity in recruiting and retention of high quality faculty, staff, and students
9. Demonstrates sensitivity to student needs in a multi-cultural educational environment
10. Fosters effective communications with alumni and community
11. Administrates established policy fairly
12. Adequately explains decisions which reverse or modify established college/department policy
13. Makes reasoned decisions in a timely manner
14. Plans and allocates budget resources openly and fairly
15. Provides faculty with periodic (at least annually) reports of the allocations and uses of funds
16. Actively seeks supplemental financial support for new and existing programs
17. Manages personnel relations effectively
18. Handles conflicts and differences diplomatically and effectively
19. Communicates effectively
20. Solicits input and consults with faculty when appropriate
21. Is willing to consider alternative points of view
22. Provides opportunities to make her/himself available to the faculty
23. How do you rate the dean/equivalent administrator overall
Please provide written comment in response to the following:

24a. Please describe any actions by your dean/equivalent administrator that you have been especially pleased with during the year:

24b. Please describe any actions by your dean/equivalent administrator that you have been especially displeased with during the year:

25. What suggestions do you have for how your dean/equivalent administrator could improve her/his functioning:
WHEREAS, At the present time there is no formal process for a Vote of Confidence for administrators at Cal Poly, and

WHEREAS, Such a process is appropriate for a university; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the following procedure be adopted by the Academic Senate:

PROCEDURE FOR VOTE OF CONFIDENCE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

1. If a Vote of Confidence for any administrator is to take place it should not be a regular periodic event but should be considered an extraordinary measure.

2. Campus-wide official petition forms will be created for the administration of a Vote of Confidence. The forms shall include spaces for printed names, signatures, and employee identification numbers.

3. It will be left to each department to establish its own policy about a Vote of Confidence for its chair/head.

4. The following procedure will be followed for college deans:

4.1 A petition signed by at least 25 percent of a college's tenured and tenure-track faculty is presented to the college caucus chair. Simultaneously, a notification of the petition is presented to the Chair of the Academic Senate.

4.2 Upon receipt of the petition, the caucus chair shall present it to the Chair of the Academic Senate in a timely manner.

4.3 Within five (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter), from the date the petition was presented to the college caucus chair, the Chair of the Academic Senate and the caucus chair will verify with the assistance of the Faculty Affairs Office that the
people who signed the petition constitute at least 25 percent of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the college.

4.4 The names of the people who signed the petition will be kept confidential by those who have access to it. The petition will be destroyed after the Vote of Confidence is conducted.

4.5 Within ten (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date of the petition verification, the Chair of the college caucus shall hold an open forum of tenured and tenure-track faculty for the purpose of allowing the dean to respond to the petition.

4.6 The Academic Senate Elections Committee shall conduct the Vote of Confidence within five (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date of the open forum. Those eligible to vote shall consist of the college's tenured and tenure-track faculty.

4.7 The results of the Vote of Confidence for a college dean will be distributed by the Chair of the Academic Senate to the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the dean, and the faculty of the college.

5. The following procedure will be followed for the President and vice presidents:

5.1 The process to administer a Vote of Confidence for the President or vice presidents can be initiated by one of the following two alternatives:

5.1.1 Alternative 1: A petition, signed by at least 10 percent of the constituency who are represented by the Academic Senate, is presented to the Chair of the Academic Senate.

5.1.1.1 The Chair of the Academic Senate presents the petition to the Academic Senate Executive Committee after the petition was handed to the Chair.

5.1.1.2 The Academic Senate Executive Committee will verify with the assistance of the Faculty Affairs Office that the people who signed the petition constitute at least 10 percent of the constituency represented by the Academic Senate.
5.1.1.3 The names of the people who signed the petition will be kept confidential by those who have access to it. The petition will be destroyed after the Vote of Confidence is conducted.

5.1.1.4 Within ten (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date the petition was presented to the Academic Senate Executive Committee, the Chair of the Academic Senate shall hold an open forum of the Academic Senate constituency for the purpose of allowing the President/Vice President to respond to the petition.

5.1.1.5 The Academic Senate Elections Committee shall conduct the Vote of Confidence within five (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date of the open forum. Those eligible to vote shall consist of the voting membership of the General Faculty as defined in Article I of the Constitution of the Faculty.

5.1.2 Alternative 2: A motion to administer a Vote of Confidence for the President or vice presidents is passed by the Academic Senate by simple majority.

5.1.2.1 Within ten (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date the Academic Senate passed the resolution to conduct a Vote of Confidence, the Chair of the Academic Senate shall hold an open forum of the Academic Senate constituency for the purpose of allowing the President/Vice President to respond to the vote.

5.2 The Academic Senate Elections Committee shall conduct the Vote of Confidence within five (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date of the open forum. Those eligible to vote shall consist of the voting membership of the General Faculty as defined in Article I of the Constitution of the Faculty.

5.3 The results of the Vote of Confidence for the President or vice presidents will be distributed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee to the President, the vice presidents, the college deans, all personnel
represented by the Academic Senate, and the Chancellor of The California State University system.

5.4 In the case of exceptional circumstances, the Academic Senate Executive Committee may modify the timelines, but not the procedures, provided in this document.

5.5 The Academic Senate Executive Committee may by a two-thirds vote enlarge upon the list of administrators affected by this resolution.

Proposed By: The Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
VOTE OF CONFIDENCE PETITION

I, the undersigned, request that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate initiate the procedure for a Vote of Confidence for ____________, as stated in C.A.M. __________. It is understood that the names of all of the petitioners will be confidential.

PRINT NAME

SIGNATURE

FACULTY I.D. #
(Social Security No.)

*****************************************************************

* Academic Senate Executive Committee only: *
* valid signature: ________ verified by: ________ *
*                             *
*****************************************************************

VOTE OF CONFIDENCE PETITION

I, the undersigned, request that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate initiate the procedure for a Vote of Confidence for ____________, as stated in C.A.M. __________. It is understood that the names of all of the petitioners will be confidential.

PRINT NAME

SIGNATURE

FACULTY I.D. #
(Social Security No.)

*****************************************************************

* Academic Senate Executive Committee only: *
* valid signature: ________ verified by: ________ *
*                             *
*****************************************************************
VOTE OF CONFIDENCE PETITION

We, the undersigned, request that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate initiate the procedure for a Vote of Confidence for ____________, ________________ as stated in C.A.M. __________. It is understood that the names of all of the undersigned will be confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINT NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>FACULTY I.D.#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the next decade, computing technology will provide us with even greater teaching, learning, and research opportunities than it has in the last. For most instructors and students, the computing revolution of the last decade was symbolized by desktop computers: isolated machines loaded with word-processors, spreadsheets, graphics and computation programs. This first revolution is not complete: many of our faculty and students still do not have easy access to such machines, or the opportunity to learn to use them fully.

But the next computer revolution already is underway. Instructional computing in the next decade will be symbolized not by isolated desktop machines, but by communication between those machines, among office and office, classroom and library, teacher and student, the campus and the world. The next revolution will be less about the technology of computation than about access to information, and ways of sharing information. Consequently, the next revolution will involve most members of the University community, not just those who have been the traditional users and beneficiaries of technology.

With planning, Cal Poly can not only participate in the next revolution in instructional computing, but help lead it, to the great advantage of our students and faculty. Our plan centers on four major goals:

**GOAL 1: NETWORK.** A networked instructional environment, based on universal email, shared information resources, and computerized classrooms.

**GOAL 2: ACCESS.** Easy access to workstations and networked information services.

**GOAL 3: SUPPORT.** Institutional support for faculty and student development of computer-based communication skills.

**GOAL 4: SIMPLICITY.** Simplified interfaces, procedures, and documentation.

We do not envision achieving these goals all at once. Instead, we intend to proceed deliberately, with a careful eye on changes in technology that may change our goals, and on vicissitudes in the economy that enables them. Still, we feel that we must begin proceeding now toward a networked instructional environment if we are to deliver the sort of education our students will need as we move into the next century.

Achieving these goals will require coordinated planning and implementation at the departmental, college and university levels. We envision that Academic Computing Services, subject to review by the Instructional Advisory Computing Committee, will be the entity that coordinates instructional computing planning throughout the University.

Discussion of each of our four goals follows.
GOAL 1: NETWORK. A networked instructional environment, based on universal email, shared information resources, and computerized classrooms.

We intend to work toward a networked instructional environment. In this environment, every instructor and every student, working alone at his or her office desk, or with others in any campus classroom, will have access not only to the powerful tools of the desktop, but also to the networked applications and information resources of the entire campus, and the world beyond.

We envision students and faculty accessing the University’s shared resources from network ports distributed throughout campus, in classrooms, laboratories, library facilities, and faculty offices. We envision them accessing shared resources from off-campus sites or residences. We envision every classroom being equipped with a large-screen display system into which instructors can plug their own portable computers, and through which they can display not only prepared lecture materials but also shared information resources.

We envision a University in which all faculty, staff, and students are connected through email. We envision vastly increased use of information services such as Cal Poly Network News (CPNN) and email, both to improve speed and convenience of communication and to save resources now devoted to paper and mail delivery. We envision that most written staff communication (memos, announcements, etc.) will occur electronically. We envision that many of the documents that pass between teachers and students (syllabi, “handouts,” even examinations) will become computer-based. We envision instructors recording, calculating, and storing grades, and submitting them to the registrar, through an electronic gradebook that links with enrollment rosters and other pertinent student records.

We envision not only plain-text documents flowing between desktops, but multimedia documents, including color graphics, sophisticated formatting, interactivity, hypertext, animation, sound, and video. We envision instructors and students increasingly competent not only in receiving and reading multimedia and hypertext documents but in producing them.

We envision increasingly more powerful library retrieval capacity, including full text and multimedia retrieval to the individual user’s desktop or to classroom display systems, with the ability to search and manipulate retrieved documents. We envision increasing desktop access to international journals, databases, reference works, and scholarly discussion groups.

Using these electronic resources, we intend to create a new methodology for doing research and for publishing it, for creating and delivering lectures, and for interacting with students, not replacing the techniques of the traditional classroom but enhancing them.
GOAL 2: ACCESS. Easy access to workstations and networked information services.

We envision a campus community in which adequate, connected workstations are accessible to every student, faculty member, and staff member. An adequate workstation is one capable of receiving, processing, and displaying multimedia, including color graphics, sound, and video. Over time, of course, the concept of what is adequate will change. For example, we expect adequate workstations to become increasingly portable.

Faculty should be provided workstations as part of the ordinary instructional equipment they need for their jobs. Students should enter the University with an adequate computer, and with software sufficient for participating in their majors and in the campus electronic community. The policy which requires students to own computers also must include provision for a financial program enabling students to purchase computers.

Connections between faculty and student workstations will depend on the campus network, which will require additional file and application servers, additional storage, and improved performance, if it is to handle both an increased population of users and continually improving quality. Moreover, the physical process of connecting to the network needs to be improved, both from on campus and from off campus. To improve connections on campus, broad band connections must be supplied to faculty offices, most of which have only serial connections now, and to classrooms, most of which are not connected at present, and to many more study sites throughout the campus. To improve connections from off campus, in the short run, more modems should be installed, but in the long run, broad band links through telephone service need to be established.

Computer labs will continue to be a feature of the campus, but their nature will change. Since all students and faculty already will have adequate workstations, computer labs will provide for advanced, specialized, or particularly expensive hardware and software needed for particular disciplines or tasks. Coordination and management of computer labs will increasingly fall under the purview of Academic Computing Services, rather than individual departments or schools, so as to avoid duplication of effort and enhance efficiency of use.
GOAL 3: SUPPORT. Institutional support for faculty and student development of computer-based communication skills.

Part of the revolution we envision entails the installation of hardware and software, but even more of it depends on motivating and training the members of the academic community. We envision that the responsibility for learning and teaching the skills necessary to use the new research, writing, and presentation tools will increasingly be recognized not as the special duties of a few instructors or a few academic departments, but as part of the regular duties of the majority of instructors and of all departments, across the curriculum. We will all be using computerized classrooms; we will all be communicating through email. But most faculty members do not have these skills now, and often the time and effort required by their other professional obligations prevent them from obtaining these skills.

The speed and scope of change in instructional methods promised by the new technology is unprecedented in educational history, and will require unequivocal institutional support. No graduate school yet teaches what we expect our faculty to achieve. For many of our colleagues, the initial learning curve will be dauntingly steep, and advantages of undertaking the task unclear. We cannot expect that faculty will be able to upgrade their instructional computing skills on the scale we envision without institutional assistance—not just through special grants or pilot programs but through regularized, ongoing, easily accessible mechanisms.

To meet the unprecedented need for motivation and training, we envision a clear institutional policy that encourages the individual faculty member to make the required investment of time and effort. This policy should provide incentives for faculty development, including, for example, release time or direct pay to implement training seminars for other faculty, and release time or direct pay to attend such seminars. This policy also should explicitly regard improvement of an instructor’s instructional computing skills as useful and appropriate professional development worthy of consideration during the retention, promotion, and tenure process.

Besides providing opportunity for basic training, the university should support innovative, advanced faculty projects—particularly those designed to enhance or improve the utility of new technologies within the teaching, learning, and research processes.
GOAL 4: SIMPLICITY. Simplified interfaces, procedures, and documentation.

The system must be simple and easy to use. Students, faculty and staff should have simple, intuitive, and uniform access and interfaces to information resources that enhance teaching and learning, research, professional development, and communication. They should have simple networked tools which allow them to work through the bureaucratic processes of the university, such as registration and grading, with a minimum of frustration.

We recognize that one of the most burdensome impediments to our plan for a networked campus is that not all current systems are “user-friendly,” and that the multiplicity of systems now on campus requires users to learn many different interfaces and command sets. To help remove that impediment, we envision a conscious, cooperative effort by administration, staff, and faculty to demystify computer use by discussing it and documenting it in plain English, not in jargon and acronyms. We envision a conscious, continuing effort by Information Systems personnel to simplify and standardize interfaces between people and machines. We envision an explicit policy of procurement and growth which holds consistency and ease of use to be as important as computing power.

To some experienced users this need to simplify language and interface may seem trivial, or of secondary importance, but it is not. Without it our effort to spread the advantages of instructional computing throughout the university will surely fail. Realizing, however, that complex technology will always present some difficulty, we envision a growing role for Academic Computing Services as an expert consultation service for faculty and students.
Creating a Curriculum for a Multi-Cultural Society

Hosted by MECHA of Cal Poly
Co-Sponsors: Office of Affirmative Action, Office of Academic Affairs, Psychology & Human Development, Biological Sciences Department, Student Academic Services, HCOP, Career Services, Speakers Forum, ASI President

Date: Wednesday, April 14, 1993
Time: 8:00 PM - 9:30 PM
Location: Chumash Auditorium, Cal Poly

Speaker: Dr. David E. Hayes-Bautista
Professor of Medicine and Director of the Center for the Study of Latino Health (CESLA) at UCLA

Dr. Hayes-Bautista's presentation will focus on the extensive research that he has done based on the demographic changes that are occurring in this state and how these changes are going to affect public policy and social services such as health and education. It is predicted that by the year 2010 the majority of the population of this state will be Mexican/Latino and Spanish speaking. Dr. Hayes-Bautista will offer some suggestions as to what the public institutions in this state need to do in order to properly serve this new California.

Debunking Immigration Myths
A recent study predicts that Latinos could have a stabilizing effect on southern California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population in L.A. County</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional households (two parents with children)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-birth-weight babies</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On welfare</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males in labor force</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy (in years)</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census, UCLA School of Medicine Center for the Study Latino Health, Black and White Exclude Hispanic Respondents
## Comparative Strength of Program in Terms of Graduation Rates

### Graduation Rates New FTF (Cumulative Total, 6+ Years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Home Ec</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Ranking with Other Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>(22 better, 33 worse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>(21 better, 34 worse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>(10 better, 45 worse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>(24 better, 30 worse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>(18 better, 36 worse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>(15 better, 39 worse)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduation Rates New Transfers (Cumulative Total, 6+ Years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Home Ec</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Ranking with Other Majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>(17 better, 36 worse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>(13 better, 40 worse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>(2 better, 52 worse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>(26 better, 24 worse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>(22 better, 26 worse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>(2 better, 51 worse)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data derived from *Student Persistence to Graduation* (Institutional Studies, 1992).
RESOLUTION ON PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE  
HOME ECONOMICS

WHEREAS, the program discontinuance committee was organized according to the procedures outlined in CAM; and

WHEREAS, the program discontinuance committee for Home Economics followed the outlined procedures and submitted a report (Home Economics Program Review) with more than just the required information, and

WHEREAS, the procedures outlined in CAM, for program discontinuance had a different purpose, ie. to deal with programs with insufficient student interest, and

WHEREAS, program reviews for improvement do not meet the needs of program discontinuance, be it

RESOLVED: that the report of the discontinuance committee be received; and be it further

RESOLVED: that an ad hoc committee be established by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to review and develop new guidelines, and evaluate committee makeup for program discontinuance; and be it further

RESOLVED: if the program is defunded, as scheduled, the Executive Committee immediately form a discontinuance committee to evaluate the value of the curriculum in the context of Cal Poly’s mission.

PROPOSED BY: College of Agriculture Caucus  
(Wesley Mueller, Chair)  
13 April 1993
WHEREAS, The Committee to Review the Discontinuance of the Home Economic Program has rendered its recommendation; and

WHEREAS, The Review Committee's recommendation is in accord with the guidelines stipulated in Administrative Bulletin 81-5 (November 13, 1981); and

WHEREAS, Those guidelines determining the procedure and the composition of the members of the committee reflect the concern of the time which was to address the problem of discontinuance due to a decline in student demand; and

WHEREAS, The current concern for discontinuance is engendered by other factors; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Academic Senate has repeatedly voiced its concern for establishing the criteria which would evaluate the quality of an academic program; and

WHEREAS, The Committee to Review the Discontinuance of the Home Economic Program did not directly address the issue of quality; and

WHEREAS, The nature of the Report and the composition of the
Committee leave the Cal Poly Academic Senate in a quandry as to the fundamental issue, which is, the quality of the program; therefore be it.

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate thank the Committee to Review the Discontinuance of the Home Economic Program for a report responsive to the procedures contained in AB 81-5; and be it further.

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate receive the Report; and be it further.

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate undertake the task of reaching consensus on what criteria should be attained in determining the academic quality of a program independent of other considerations such as student demand, employment potential, geographic availability, honorable mention in Title V, cost per student, gender distribution, and any other criteria which might be significant for purposes other than determining quality.

Submitted by Reg Gooden with the approval of a significant number of the CLA caucus members who happened to converge on their ways back to their offices in FOB West.
BACKGROUND

1) The governor's January proposed budget for 1993/94 called for a 4.5% reduction (from 1992/93) in General fund contributions to the CSU. When mandated costs increases and inflation are taken into account, the reduction is closer to 7% (of the general fund). The General Fund represents 80.6% of the campus budget for 1992/93. However, other reductions add another 0.7% so at this point in time the campus would experience an equivalent 7.7% ($6.978 million) reduction in the General Fund if the governor's currently proposed budget were enacted.

2) If both the proposed student fee increase of $480 for 1993/94 was enacted by the legislature and the reductions in point one above occur, the campus budget next year would be about the same as this year's. However, approximately a third of the $7.2 million increase in student fees for the campus would go to providing financial aid for students so about $4.8 million of the increase would be available for instruction and support of instruction. The result would be about a $2.1 million reduction in actual dollars in the total budget for the campus in 1993/94.

3) Now the bad news. No one has any idea at this time what the budget will look like for next year. However, PACBRA has been asked to recommend to the president how to allocate a $6.978 million reduction among the four basic entities of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Business Affairs and Information Systems.

PACBRA DELIBERATIONS

At an earlier meeting, PACBRA tentatively decided to target the colleges for a 5% budget reduction and make up the rest of the campus budget reduction target in the other units. This equates to a 5.4% reduction in the budget of Academic Affairs and a 12% reduction in Business Affairs, Student Affairs and Information Systems. The 5.4% reduction in the budget of Academic Affairs is accounted for by the fact that about 20% of Academic Affair's budget is not in the colleges. The library was to be exempted under this plan. At a subsequent meeting the four vice presidents reported to PACBRA what this plan meant to their operations. Following are highlight of their reports.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS and UNIVERSITY IN GENERAL - Bob Koob divided his presentation up into three areas. They are: A) management staff, B) athletics budget and C) colleges.

A. Management Staff
   1) A major reorganization is planned for the university (regardless of the budget).
   2) Three positions reporting directly to vice presidents will be eliminated.
   3) Three or four MPP positions at lower steps will be eliminated.
   4) Mike Suess is preparing data showing the history up to the present on all MPP positions. This will done for all (four) levels and will show both those filled and unfilled.

B. Athletics - At this time the Athletics Governing Board is looking at a 10% reduction.

C. Colleges (all remarks based on an assumed 5% reduction in college budgets)
   1) Agriculture - Only college anticipating tenure/tenure track (T/TT) layoff notices. Could effect up to 10 people but probably 5 or less.
   2) Architecture and Environmental Design - No layoff of T/TT faculty anticipated but reorganization of mg't. staff could produce up to 2 T/TT layoff notices.
3) Business - It would take a 10% budget reduction before T/TT layoff notice would be necessitated.

4) Engineering - Layoff notices have been sent to 4 faculty in Engr. Tech.. No more anticipated.

5) Liberal Arts - No T/TT layoff notices. Fairly deep lecture pool but not distributed equally across all programs. Since lecturers teach 15 WTU's and their salaries are relatively low, load on remaining faculty and GE and B course availability becomes a problem.

6) Science and Math - Supply budget would be cut to 1/4 of normal, all lecturers would be gone. Staff were cut heavily last year.

7) UCTE - Three positions are open due to early retirement. These will more than cover a 5% cut.

General for Colleges

1) Few if any staff cuts are anticipated in the colleges.

2) Without early retirement, layoffs at lower end of salary range will increase costs per student.

Academic Affairs Other - Enrollment Support Services and the College Farm would be cut 12%. The library is slated for no cut at this time based on a tentative agreement of PACBRA members.

STUDENT AFFAIRS - Deep cuts in some areas. Would impact some services for students seriously. Financial Aid Office's load is increasing substantially. Students will be paying an $84 health fee next year.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS - Cannot cut essential infrastructure including IBM 3090, software costs associated with OASIS, CAPTURE, the network and databases. Support for microcomputer labs would be reduced substantially affecting access.

BUSINESS AFFAIRS - Workload increasing in Human Resources, Fiscal Services. Facility Services hasn't gotten custodial and maintenance staff with new buildings. Are understaffed. Eight buildings would have to be closed. Can't reduce Public Safety, Budget Planning and Administration and Facilities Planning.

ACTION OF PACBRA AT APRIL 8, 1993 MEETING - After looking at the impact of the 12% cut on Student Affairs, Business Affairs and Information Systems, PACBRA voted 5 to 1, with one abstention, tentatively for a 7% reduction in the budgets of all operations including the colleges and the UCTE. The senate chair suggested that in this case we ought to reexamine whether or not to shield the Library from a reduction. PACBRA will also get a report from the four vice presidents on the effect of a 7% reaction on their operations at its April 15th meeting.

Executive Management is not targeted for any reduction in budget at this time. Its budget is about 1.1% of the total campus budget.