ACADEMIC SENATE
Academic Senate Agenda
January 18, 1994
UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

I. Minutes: Approval of the Academic Senate minutes for October 26, November 9, November 16, and November 30, 1993 (pp. 3-9).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
If you are interested in serving as Academic Senate Secretary-elect, please contact the Senate office (1258) as soon as possible. Assigned time is available for this position.

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:
V. Business Item(s):
A. Curriculum proposals-Morrobel-Sosa, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading (to be distributed).
B. Curriculum proposals (Crop Science, Ethnic Studies, NRM, and P.E. & Kinesiology, Social Sciences, and Ornamental Horticulture item IV.21)-Morrobel-Sosa, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading (pp. 10-24).
C. Resolution on Calendar-Academic Senate Executive Committee, first reading (p. 25).
D. Resolution on Calendar-Brown, Chair of the Instruction Committee, first reading (to be distributed).
E. Resolution on Department Name Change for the Industrial Engineering Department-Freeman, second reading (pp. 26-30).
G. Resolution on Faculty Input into Policy Changes-Greenwald, second reading (p. 80).
H. Resolution on Evaluation of College Deans or Equivalent Administrators-Terry, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, second reading (pp. 81-84).
I. Resolution on Vote of Confidence for Administrators-Terry, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, second reading (pp. 85-90).
J. Resolution on Cal Poly Instructional Computing Strategic Plan: A Networked Instructional Environment-Weatherford, Past Chair of the IACC, second reading (pp. 91-96).
K. Resolution on Definitions of Professional Programs, Technical Programs, and Significant Majority-Nulman, Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, second reading (p. 97).
L. Resolution on Modification of Resolutions AS-268-88/BC and AS-394-92/BC on Budget Information Reporting-Carnegie, Chair of the Budget Committee, second reading (pp. 98-100).

continued on page two ---->
M. Resolution on Department Name Change for Ornamental Horticulture-Hannings for the O.H. Department, first reading (pp. 101-105).

N. Resolution on Campus Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects-Gish, Director for Ethnic Studies, first reading (pp. 106-114).

O. Resolution on The Review of Telecommunications Course Offerings as New Courses-Dana/Nulman/Vilkitis, first reading (to be distributed).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
CROP SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP = Vice President Academic Affairs, AS = Academic Senate, CC = Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification, AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments), T = Tabled (see Committee Comments), D = Disapproved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. NEW COURSES
1. CRSC 201 Agricultural Chemical and Equipment Safety (1) 1 Lec CR/NC C2.
2. CRSC 402 Enterprise Project (1-4) supv C36 CR/NC. Repeatable to max of 4 units. (with CRSC 202 replaces CRSC 100).
3. FRSC 402 Enterprise Project (1-4) supv C36 CR/NC. Repeatable to max of 4 units. (with FRSC 202 replaces FRSC 100).
4. VGSC 402 Enterprise Project (1-4) supv C36 CR/NC. Repeatable to max of 4 units. (with VGSC 202 replaces VGSC 100).

II. DELETED COURSES
1. CRSC 110 Techniques of Application (3) 2 lec 1 lab C2/16.
2. CRSC 322 Crop Technology (4) 3 lec 1 lab C2/16.

III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES
1. CRSC 100 Enterprise Project (1-4) supv C36 to CRSC 202. Descr change. Prereq change.
2. FRSC 100 Enterprise Project (1-4) supv C36 to FRSC 202. Descr change. Prereq change.
3. VGSC 100 Enterprise Project (1-4) supv C36 to VGSC 202. Descr change. Prereq change.
4. VGSC 250 Home Vegetable Production (2) 1 lec 1 lab C2/16 to Vegetable Science for the Urban Gardener (3) 2 lec 1 lab. Descr change. MCF.

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES
B.S. CROP SCIENCE
1. Reduce total units required for B.S. Crop Science from 198 to 189
   Major:
2. Reduce major core units from 68 to 60.
3. DE CRSC 231 Commercial Seed Production and Conditioning (4).
4. DE CRSC 410 Crop Physiology (4).
6. DE adviser approved electives (16).
7. ADD the following agronomy/vegetable production choice:
8. **EITHER** agronomy courses to complete major:

9. CRSC 231 Commercial Seed Production (4)

10. CRSC 330 Pastures and Forages (4)

11. CRSC 421 Oil and Fiber Crops (4)

12. **OR** vegetable production courses to complete major:

13. CRSC 333 Greenhouse Vegetable Production (4)

14. VGSC 423 Advanced Vegetable Production (4)

15. VGSC 424 Vegetable Crop Management (4)

Support:

16. DE AGB 321 Farm Records (4).

17. DE BOT 223 Introductory Plant Taxonomy (4).

18. DE BOT 323 Plant Pathology (4).

19. DE CHEM 122 General Chemistry (4) (B.I.a.).


22. DE SS 221 Fertilizers and Plant Nutrition (4).

23. AD BIO, BOT, CHEM electives (8).

24. DE agricultural engineering elective (3).

25. DE Agribusiness elective (300--400 level) (3-4).

26. DE College of Agriculture elective (2).

27. ADD Adviser approved electives (28).

**B.S. FRUIT SCIENCE**

28. Reduce total units required for B.S. Fruit Science from 198 to 191

Major:

29. DE CRSC 304 Plant Breeding (4).

30. DE FRSC 100/VGSC 100/CRSC 100 Enterprise Project (3,3).

31. ADD FRSC 202 Enterprise Project (6).

32. ADD CRSC/FRSC 422 Tropical Crop, Fruit and Nut Production (4) (remove as choice with FRSC 331 Advanced Viticulture (4)).

Support:

33. DE AGB 321 Farm Records (4).

34. DE BOT 223 Introductory Plant Taxonomy (4).

35. DE BOT 323 Plant Pathology (4).

36. DE CHEM 122 General Chemistry (4) (B.I.a.).


38. DE CHEM 328 Biochemistry (4).

39. AD BIO, BOT, CHEM electives (8).

40. DE SS 221 Fertilizers and Plant Nutrition (4).

41. DE Agribusiness elective (300--400 level) (3-4).

42. DE College of Agriculture electives (6).

43. ADD Adviser approved electives (28).

Electives:

44. Reduce free elective units from 10 to 4.
B.S. PLANT PROTECTION SCIENCE
45. Reduce total units required for B.S. Plant Protection Science from 198 to 186.

Major:
46. ADD CRSC 304 Plant Breeding (4).
47. DE CRSC 327 Vertebrate Pest Management (4).
48. DE SS 221 Fertilizers (4).
49. DE ENT 220/326 Agricultural or General Entomology (4).
50. DE CHEM 436 Agricultural Chemicals (4).
51. Production Core Sequences: Increase units required from 12 to 16 for each core sequence.
52. Advanced Plant Protection electives: Reduce units from 15 to 12.

Support:
53. DE LIB 101 Library Instruction (1).
54. DE BOT 223 Plant Taxonomy (4).
55. Increase adviser approved electives from 6-8 to 10.

Free Electives:
56. Reduce total free electives from 15/12 to 9 units.

PLANT PROTECTION MINOR

Required courses:
57. ADD: Courses used to fulfill requirements of the major cannot also be counted for the minor. Advanced versions of the following courses may be substituted by production majors.
58. DE BOT 325 Plant Nematology (4).
59. ADD BOT 323 Plant Pathology or 324 Ornamental and Forest Pathology (4).
60. DE CRSC 327 Vertebrate Pest Management (4).
61. DE CRSC 405 Advanced Weed Science (4).
62. ADD CRSC Weed Control (4).
63. ADD CRSC Insect Pest Management (4).

Courses in area of emphasis:
Emphasis for Plant Production Majors (16)
64. DE ENT 220 Agricultural Entomology (4) or ENT 326 General Entomology (4).
65. DE BOT 323 Plant Pathology (4).
66. ADD BOT 322 Plant Physiology (4).
67. ADD BOT 325 Plant Nematology (4).
68. DE CRSC 221 Weed Control (4).
69. DE CRSC 311 Insect Pest Management (4).
70. ADD CRSC 327 Vertebrate Pest Management (4).
71. ADD CRSC 405 Advanced Weed Science (4).
72. ADD CRSC 410 Crop Physiology (4).
73. ADD CRSC 441 Biological Control of Insects (4).
74. ADD ZOO 335 General Entomology (4).
75. ADD CHEM 436 Agricultural Chemicals (4).
### Emphasis for Non-Plant Production Majors (16)

76. Change statement from: Select one course from BOT 323, CRSC 431, ENT 220, ENT 326 to: Select one course from above list under *Emphasis for Plant Production Majors*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.</th>
<th>CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ASCC approves a reduction in total units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ASCC encourages continued discussion regarding the intended reduction in free electives units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ETHNIC STUDIES

**1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VP =</strong> Vice President Academic Affairs. <strong>AS =</strong> Academic Senate. <strong>CC =</strong> Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Approved. A* = Approved pending technical modification.  
AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments).  
T = Tabled (see Committee Comments).  
D = Disapproved. W = Withdrawn by department/college

## I. NEW COURSES
1. ES 110 Introduction to Ethnic Studies (3) 3lec C2  
2. ES 200 Special Problems for Undergraduates (1-3) supv S36  
3. ES 230 Chicano/a Literature (3) 3lec C3  
4. ES 320 American Cultural Images (3) 3lec C2 (subtopics)  
5. ES 325 African American Women's Experiences (3) 3lec C2  
6. ES 350 Asian American and African American Environments (3) 3lec C2  
7. ES 400 Special Problems for Advanced Undergraduates (1-2) supv S36.

## II. DELETED COURSES
1. None

## III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES
1. ES 114 description change  
2. ES 210 Cultural Heritage to U.S. Cultural Heritage, descr change

## IV. CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

Add **ETHNIC STUDIES MINOR (27)**

- **Core Courses (12)**  
  - ES 110 Introduction to Ethnic Studies (3)  
  - ES 114 Racism and American Culture (3)  
  - ES 210 U.S. Cultural Heritage (3)  
  - ES 320 American Cultural Images (3)  
  - Adviser Approved Electives (15)

*At least 11 units must be upper division. Electives will reinforce and enhance students' understanding of issues of culture, race and gender.*

## V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

1. **---**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP = Vice President Academic Affairs, AS = Academic Senate, CC = Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = Tabled (see Committee Comments),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = Disapproved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## I. NEW COURSES

1. FNR 443 Watershed Erosion and Sedimentation (4) 3 lec 1 lab C4/16 MCF.
2. REC 110 Career Development and Planning in Recreation Administration (1) 1 act C3, CR/NC.
3. REC 317 Conventions and Meeting Management (3) 3 lec C2 MCF.

## II. DELETED COURSES

1. REC 102 Wilderness Ethics and Safety (3) 3 lec C2.
2. REC 245 Adaptive Aquatics in PE & Rec Admin (2)
3. REC 301 Outdoor Recreation Education (3)
4. REC 316 Commercial Rec Entrepreneurship (1)
5. REC 320 Processes in Therapeutic Recreation (4) 3 lec 1 act C2/13.
6. REC 323 Supervisory Roles in Recreation Administration (3) 3 lec C2.
7. REC 325 Recreation Therapy in Rehabilitation Settings (4) 4 sem C5.
8. REC 328 Aging and Leisure (3) 2 lec 1 act C2/11.
9. REC 329 Team Processes in Therapeutic Recreation (4) 3 lec 1 act C2/11.
10. REC 364 Commercial Recreation and Leisure Services (3)
11. REC 407 Adaptive Techniques in Therapeutic Recreation (4) 3 lec 1 lab C2/15.
12. REC 430/431 Therapeutic Recreation Internship (3/6) supv CR/NC.
13. REC 416 Physical Education and Recreation Facilities (3) 3 lec C2 MCF (Also listed as PE 416).

## III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

1. FNR 100 Forest Resources Enterprise Project (1-4) supv S36 CR/NC to FNR 220. Degree credit limit reduced from 12 to 8 units. Prereq change.
2. REC 252 Introduction to Therapeutic Recreation (4) to Leisure and Special Populations (3) 3 lec C2. Descr change.
3. REC 302 Experiential Education to Environmental Education. Descr change.
4. REC 310 Program Administration in Leisure Services (3) 3 lec to (4) 4 lec. Descr change.
5. REC 314 Travel and Tourism - Implications for Leisure (3) to Travel and Tourism Planning (4) Descr change.
IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES

B.S. FORESTRY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Forest Resources--Management Concentration

1. Increase units allowed for FNR 332/FNR 434/FNR 438 from 2 to 4.
2. Reduce restricted electives from 14 to 12.

B.S. RECREATION ADMINISTRATION

3. Reduce total number of units required from 198 to 186.

Major Courses:

4. Reduce total units required from 97 to 79
5. DE REC 102 Backcountry Ethics and Safety (3).
6. ADD REC 110 Career Development and Planning in Recreation Administration (1).
7. ADD REC 310 Program Administration in Leisure Services (4).
8. DE REC 323 Supervisory Roles in Recreation Administration (3).
9. DE REC 328 Aging and Leisure (3).
10. DE REC 364 Commercial Recreation and Leisure Services (3).
11. DE REC 416 Physical Education and Recreation Facilities (3).
12. DE REC 430, 431 Therapeutic Recreation Internship (6) (3).
13. ADD FNR 410/PH 337/LA 363 (3)
14. ADD MGT 314 Human Resources Management (4).
15. Move JOUR 312 Introduction to Public Relations (4) to Support area.
16. Move SOC 333 Social Research Methods (3) to Support area.
17. Change concentration total units from 36/33 to 28

Leisure Services Management Concentration

18. Change name to: Commercial/Tourism Management Concentration.
19. Reduce total units required from 36 to 28
20. Change required core units from: 25 to 11
21. Change restricted electives from: 9 to 17
22. DE MKTG 204 Elements of Marketing (4).
23. DE REC 301 Outdoor Recreation Education or REC 302 Outdoor Experiential Education (3).
24. DE REC 310 Program Admin. Leisure Services (3).
25. DE REC 312 Employee Services and Recreation (3).
26. DE REC 316 Commercial Recreation Entrepreneurship (1).
27. ADD REC 317 Convention and Meeting Management (3).
28. DE CSC elective (3).

Therapeutic Recreation Concentration (33).

29. Delete Therapeutic Recreation Concentration

Parks and Forest Recreation Concentration (28).
30. Add Parks and Forest Recreation Concentration (shared with B.S. Forestry and Natural Resources)

Adviser Approved Electives (28).

31. Add choice of concentration or 28 units of adviser approved electives

Support courses:

32. Reduce total units for Support area from 45 to 35.
33. DE BUS 101 The Business Enterprise (4).
34. DE CSC 120 Principles of Business Data Processing (4) (F.I.).
35. ADD CSC 113 Computers and Computing (3) (F.I.).
36. ADD ENGL 310 Corporate Communications (4).
37. Change ANT/BUS/ECON/GEOG/POLS/SOC elective (300--400 level) (D.4.b.) to specify GEOG 308 Global Geography (3) (D.4.b.).
38. ADD JOUR 312 Introduction to Public Relations (4).
39. DE PE 280 First Aid and CPR (3).
40. ADD FNR 300 or CSC 110/120/410
41. Change Mathematics elective (3) (B.2.) to STAT 212 Statistical Methods (3) (B.2.).
42. Change Life sciences elective to BOT 121 General Botany (4) (B.1.b.).
43. ADD Foreign language (4).

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS

1. FNR443 and REC317 should be offered as "experimental" courses
2. REC314 and REC464 need Expanded Course Outlines
PHYSICAL EDUCATION and KINESIOLOGY DEPARTMENT

1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP = Vice President Academic Affairs, AS = Academic Senate, CC = Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = Tabled (see Committee Comments),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = Disapproved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## I. NEW COURSES

1. PE 375 Athletic Coaching Theory (3) 3 lec C2 (replaces PE 312, PE 321, PE 322, PE 323, PE 325, PE 327, PE 344, PE 357).
2. PE 370 Coaching Practicum (2).
3. PE 419 Curriculum and Program Content in Elementary Physical Education (3) 2 lec 1 act C2/8 (replaces PE 422 Teaching Elementary Physical Education (4) 2 lec 2 act C2/8).
4. PE 421 Strategies for Teaching Physical Education (3) 2 lec 1 act C2/8.
5. PE 514 Health Education Planning (3) 3 sem C5 (replaces PE 512 Critical Health Issues (3) 3 sem C5).
6. PE 515 Communication and Behavior within a Health and Physical Education Setting (3) 3 sem C5 (replaces PE 512 Critical Health Issues (3) 3 sem C5).
7. PE 516 Management of Health Promotion in the Workplace (3) 3 sem C5.
8. PE 539 Observation and Analysis of Teaching Physical Education (3) 2 lec 1 lab C5/15.

## II. DELETED COURSES

1. PE 312 Coaching Aquatics (2) 1 lec 1 act C2/11.
2. PE 321 Coaching Football (2) 1 lec 1 act C2/11.
3. PE 322 Coaching Basketball (2) 1 lec 1 act C2/11.
4. PE 323 Coaching Baseball (2) 1 lec 1 act C2/11.
5. PE 325 Coaching Softball (2) 1 lec 1 act C2/11.
6. PE 327 Coaching Wrestling (2) 1 lec 1 act C2/11.
7. PE 344 Coaching Volleyball (2) 1 lec 1 act C2/11.
8. PE 161 Canoeing (1) 1 act C11.
9. PE 162 Windsurfing (1) 1 act C11.
11. PE 501 Administration of Adapted Physical Education Programs (3) 3 sem C5.
12. PE 512 Critical Health Issues (3) 3 sem C5.

## III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES

1. PE 270 Introduction to Physical Education to Orientation to Physical Education.
2. PE 310 Concepts in Physical Education (3) 3 lec C2 to Concepts in Elementary Physical Education (3) 2 lec 1 act C2/11.
4. PE 384 Water Safety Instructor (3) 2 lec 1 act C2/11 to 1 lec 2 act. Prereq change.
6. PE 422 Teaching Elementary Physical Education (4) 2 lec 2 act C2/8 to (2) 1 lec 1 act. Descr change; prereq change.
7. PE 423 Teaching Secondary Physical Education (4) 2 lec 2 act C2/8 to (3) 3 act. Descr change; prereq change.
8. PE 424 Organizing and Teaching Physical Education (4) 4 lec C5 to Organization and Implementation of a K-12 Physical Education Program (3) 3 lec. Prereq change.
9. PE 450 Lifestyle Management in the Workplace (3) 3 lec C2 to Lifestyle Management.
10. PE 461 Senior Project (3) supv C36 to (2) 2 lec C2. Descr change; prereq change.
11. PE 462 Senior Project (2) supv C36 to (1-3). Prereq change.

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES

B.S. PHYSICAL EDUCATION

1. Reduce total units required for B.S. Physical Education from 198 to 193-197.

Major:

2. Reduce total required from 94-103 to 92-96 units.
3. Reduce units required for PE 206–PE 229 Professional Activity/DANC 211 Dance Fundamentals from 10 to 8.
4. ADD PE 218 Aquatics (2).
5. DE PE 270 Introduction to Physical Education (2).

Concentrations:


Commercial and Corporate Fitness Concentration

7. Reduce total required from 40 to 39 units.
8. Change PE 439 Commercial/Corporate Fitness Internship (3) to include PE 485/PE 495 Cooperative Education Experience.
10. ADD PE 408 Exercise and Health Promotion for Senior Adults (3).

Health Education Concentration

11. DE BIO 301 Human Ecology (3).
12. DE HD 203 Family Development or SOC 306 Sociology of the Family (3).
13. DE PSY 317 Psychology of Stress (3).
14. DE PSY 330 Behavioral Effects of Psychoactive Drugs (DE as choice with PE 305 (2)).
15. DE SOC 344 Sociology of Poverty or GEOG 320 Geography of Hunger (3).
16. ADD ANT 401 Culture and Health (3).
17. ADD BIO 300 Biology of Cancer (2).
18. ADD FSN 310 Maternal and Child Nutrition (3).
19. ADD PE 450 Lifestyle Management (3).
20. ADD PE 451 Nutrition for Fitness and Sport (3).

Teaching Concentration

21. DE PE 440 Physical Education Practicum (1).
23. ADD PE 365 Athletic Coaching Theory (3).
24. ADD PE 419 Elementary Physical Education (3).
25. ADD PE 421 Strategies for Teaching Physical Education (3).

Pre-Physical Therapy Concentration
26. See separate proposal.

Support:
27. Increase total units from 35 to 36.
28. Change B.1.a. CHEM 121 Chemistry (4) to CHEM 121 General Chemistry or CHEM 127 General Chemistry (4).
29. DE STAT 130 Introduction to Statistical Reasoning or STAT 211 Elementary Probability and Statistics (B.2.) (3).
30. ADD STAT 217 Statistical Methods (B.2.) (4).

Electives:
31. Change electives from 8/13/9 to 9 units.

M.S. PHYSICAL EDUCATION

Required Courses:
32. Increase units for required courses from 6 to 19.
33. ADD PE 515 Behavior and Communication in a Health and Physical Education Setting (3).
34. ADD PE 522 Biomechanics (3).
35. ADD PE 525 Human Performance and Learning (3).
36. ADD PE 530 Advanced Physiology of Exercise (4).

Area of Emphasis:
37. Reduce units from 21 to 12 or 16.

Exercise and Health Promotion Emphasis
38. Change name from Wellness Management to Exercise and Health Promotion.
39. 16 units required.
40. ADD PE 514 Health Education Planning (3).
41. ADD PE 516 Management of Health Promotion in the Workplace (3).
42. DE PE 512 Critical Health Issues (3-9).
43. DE PE 530 Advanced Physiology of Exercise (4).

Human Movement and Sport Emphasis
44. 12 units required.
45. DE PE 501 Administration of Adapted Physical Education Programs (3).
46. DE PE 525 Human Performance and Learning (3).
47. ADD PE 539 Observation, Development and Analysis of Teaching Physical Education (3).

Electives:
48. Reduce units from 18 to 10 or 14.

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS
1. PE370 indicates no "mode of instruction"
2. PE270 should be CR/NCR; (orientation)
3. PE514, 515, 516, and 539 need Expanded Course Outlines with citations
4. PE462 has variable units
5. Department should consider reduction in total units to a fixed value, preferably 186 units.
Entire proposal tabled at the Academic Senate meeting of November 30, 1993 so additions could be reviewed by the Curriculum Committee.

SOCIAL SCIENCES DEPARTMENT

1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VP = Vice President Academic Affairs. AS = Academic Senate. CC = Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A = Approved. A* = Approved pending technical modification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T = Tabled (see Committee Comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D = Disapproved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. NEW COURSES
1. GEOG 360 Europe (3) 3 lec C2

II. DELETED COURSES
1. GEOG 320 Geography of Hunger (3) 3 lec C2.

III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES
1. None

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES

Major:
1. Reduce Major courses total from 94 to 85 units.
2. Reduce anthropology electives (300--400 level) from 9 to 6 units.
3. Reduce geography electives (300--400 level) from 9 to 6 units.
4. Reduce sociology electives (300--400 level) from 9 to 6 units.

Teaching Concentration:
5. Delete SOCS 424 (3) and add electives (3).

Free Electives:
6. Increase free electives from 14 to 23 units.

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS
1. GEOG360 - offer as "experimental" course. ASCC agrees with CLACC comments.
2. GEOG320 - fills unique need.
3. SOCS424 - awaiting confirmation from Credentials office.
4. 186 units total can be achieved with 12 units of free electives.
ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE DEPARTMENT
(Proposed change to Environmental Horticultural Science Department)

1994-96 CATALOG PROPOSALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP = Vice President Academic Affairs. AS = Academic Senate, CC = Curriculum Committee. A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification, AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments). T = Tabled (see Committee Comments). D = Disapproved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. NEW COURSES

1. OH 121 Fundamentals of Environmental Horticulture I (4) 3 lec 1 lab C2/16 MCF (replaces OH 131).
2. OH 122 Fundamentals of Environmental Horticulture II (4) 3 lec 1 lab C2/16 MCF (replaces OH 101, OH 132).
3. OH 123 Fundamentals of Environmental Horticulture III (2) 1 lec 1 lab C2/16 (replaces OH 133).
4. OH 124 Fundamentals of Environmental Horticulture IV (4) 3 lec 1 lab C2/16 (replaces OH 134).
5. OH 210 Enterprise Project I (2-4) supv C36 CR/NC (replaces OH 100).
6. OH 222 Abiotic Plant Problems (3) 2 lec 1 lab C2/16.
7. OH 225 Advanced Floristry (3) 1 lec 2 lab C2/16 MCF (replaces OH 235). 328, 329, 332.
8. OH 310 Enterprise Project II (2-4) supv C36 CR/NC (replaces OH 100).
9. OH 428 Plant Growth Regulators and Weed Control for Ornamental Plants (4) 3 lec 1 lab C2/16 (replaces OH 427).

II. DELETED COURSES

1. OH 100 Enterprise Project (1-4) supv C36 CR/NC (replaced by OH 210, OH 310).
2. OH 101 Principles of Landscape Drafting (3) 1 lec 2 lab C2/16 MCF (replaced by OH 122).
3. OH 131 Fundamentals of Ornamental Horticulture I (4) 3 lec 1 lab C2/16 MCF (replaced by OH 121).
4. OH 132 Fundamentals of Ornamental Horticulture II (3) 2 lec 1 lab C2/16 MCF (replaced by OH 122).
5. OH 133 Plant Propagation Fundamentals III (4) 3 lec 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by OH 124).
6. OH 134 Landscape Maintenance Fundamentals IV (3) 2 lec 1 lab C2/16 (replaced by OH 123).
7. OH 238 Landscape Plants I (3) 2 lec 1 lab C2/16.
8. OH 253 Stylized Western Design (3) 2 lec 1 lab C2/16 MCF (replaced by OH OH 225).
9. OH 308 Landscape Plants II (3) 2 lec 1 lab C2/16.
10. OH 328 Advanced Floral Design (4) 2 lec 2 lab C2/16 MCF (replaced by OH 225).
11. OH 329 Advanced Floral Design (4) 2 lec 2 lab C2/16 MCF (replaced by OH 225).
III. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES
1. OH 110 Orientation to Ornamental Horticulture (1) 1 act C13 CR/NC to Orientation to Environmental Horticultural Science 1 lab C16. Descr change.
2. OH 125 Commercial Floral Design Practices (3) 1 lec 2 lab C2/16 MCF to Beginning Floral Practices. Descr change.
3. OH 315 Advanced Plant Materials (4) 3 lec 1 lab C2/16 to (3) 3 lec C2 MCF. Descr change.
4. OH 340 Principles of Greenhouse Environment (5) 4 lec 1 lab C2/16 to (4) 3 lec 1 lab.
5. OH 425 Tissue Culture Propagation (2) 1 lec 1 lab C2/16 MCF to (3) 2 lec 1 lab.
6. OH 427 Disease and Pest Control Systems for Ornamental Plants (5) 4 lec 1 lab C2/16 to (4) 3 lec 1 lab. Descr change, prereq change.
7. OH 454 Ornamental Horticulture Irrigation Systems (4) 3 lec 2 lab C2/16 MCF to OH 221 Water Issues and Delivery Systems (3) 2 lec 1 lab. Descr change. MCF?

IV. CURRICULUM CHANGES
1. Reduce total units from 198 to 195.
   Major courses:
2. Increase total units from 70 to 72.
3. DE OH 101 Principles of Landscape Drafting (3).
4. ADD OH 121 Fundamentals of Environmental Horticulture I (4).
5. ADD OH 122 Fundamentals of Environmental Horticulture II (4).
6. ADD OH 123 Fundamentals of Environmental Horticulture III (2).
10. OH 134 Landscape Maintenance Fundamentals IV (3).
11. ADD OH 200 Special Problems for Undergraduates (1-4) or OH 210 Enterprise Project I (2-4) or OH 401 Field Studies in Ornamental Horticulture (1).
12. ADD OH 221 Water Issues and Delivery Systems (3).
13. ADD OH 222 Abiotic Plant Problems (3).
14. DE OH 301 Principles of Landscape Design (3).
15. DE OH 315 Advanced Plant Materials (4).
16. ADD Adviser approved electives (28).
   Concentrations:
17. DE Floriculture and Nursery Production Concentration (25).
18. DE Horticultural Sales and Services Concentration (25).
19. DE Landscape Industry Concentration (25).
ITEM IV.21 tabled at the Academic Senate meeting of November 30, 1993.

Support courses:
20. Reduce total units from 65 to 60/62.
21. ADD BIO 302 Human Genetics (3) or PHYS 104 Introductory Physics (4) or PSC 101 The Physical Environment: Matter and Energy (4)
23. ADD BUS 207 Business Law (4) as a choice with BUS 201 (3).
24. ADD SPAN 111 Elementary Hispanic Language and Culture (4).
25. DE CRSC/FRSC/VGSC elective (200-400 level) (4).
26. DE Science elective (selected with adviser approval) (4).

Electives:
27. Increase total free electives from 8 to 9 units.

V. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE COMMENTS
1. A reduction in total units can be accomplished by not increasing the advisory approved electives.
WHEREAS, The survey of the faculty by the Calendar Committee in Spring 1993 did not yield a consensus choice for an academic calendar; and

WHEREAS, A primary reason for making a change in the academic calendar is to force a review of the entire curriculum; and

WHEREAS, A Task Force on Curriculum and Calendar has just been formed to review and make recommendations to the Academic Senate on, among other things, the guiding principles that should be considered in making curricular decisions; and

WHEREAS, The results of an extensive review by the task force of the curriculum and the principles that should drive the curriculum could lead to significant suggested changes in the curriculum--some of which could have implications on the choice of academic calendar; and

WHEREAS, Any calendar change will have far-reaching implications on the curriculum; and

WHEREAS, The burden of making the changes in the curriculum that would be necessary to implement a calendar change would properly and necessarily fall to the faculty; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That any calendar change proposal be made only after the Task Force on Curriculum and Calendar completes its work and submits a report and recommendations to the Academic Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That any proposed change in the academic calendar be approved by the Academic Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That any proposed change in the academic calendar, once approved by the Academic Senate, then be submitted to a referendum of the General Faculty with approval being required before it is formally adopted as the academic calendar of the university.
Adopted:

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

AS-93/ RESOLUTION ON
DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE FOR THE
INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

WHEREAS, The Industrial Engineering Department requests that its department's name be changed to the INDUSTRIAL AND MANUFACTURING ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT; and

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

RESOLVED: That the name of the Industrial Engineering Department be changed to THE INDUSTRIAL AND MANUFACTURING ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT.

Proposed by: The Industrial Engineering Department
September 13, 1993
To: Jack Wilson, Chair  
   Academic Senate  

From: Robert D. Koob  
   Vice President for Academic Affairs  

Subject: DEPARTMENTAL NAME CHANGE REQUEST—INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING  

Attached is a request from the Industrial Engineering Department to change their department name to "Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering". I would appreciate your having the Academic Senate review this matter and make a recommendation as soon as possible.

Thanks for your assistance in this matter.

Attachment
MEMORANDUM

To: Robert D. Koob, Vice President
   Academic Affairs

Date: July 6, 1993

File: namechg.ie.dd

Copies: J. Freeman

From: Peter Y. Lee, Dean
      College of Engineering

Subject: REQUEST FOR DEPARTMENTAL NAME CHANGE

After consultation with the IE Department faculty and CENG department heads/chairs, the College of Engineering endorses the proposed name change of the Industrial Engineering Department to the Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering Department.

Please contact me should you have any questions.
MEMORANDUM

To: Peter Y. Lee, Dean
    College of Engineering
Date: June 8, 1993

From: H. J. Freeman, Chair
      Industrial Engineering

Re: Departmental Name Change Request

At the request and approval of all faculty in Industrial Engineering, we respectfully ask to have the Industrial Engineering Department’s name changed to Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering, to occur simultaneously with the final approval of the Manufacturing Engineering Program by CPEC. It is our understanding that this approval should occur this month.

We request the name change for the following reasons:

1) To clarify the identity of the Department to reflect both undergraduate programs offered.

2) To promote both programs with students and other constituencies.

3) To consolidate and unify the faculty and allow for better understanding of our mission by others.

Attached is a copy of the Policy and Procedure on Changes of Department Names that I received from Mary Whiteford. We are requesting this change under these guidelines.

We are really appreciative for all the support and encouragement we have received over the last two years in advancing the state of manufacturing engineering education at Cal Poly. The faculty are unanimous in believing that this has been a judicious and far-sighted move; we plan to insure that Cal Poly’s Manufacturing Engineering Program lives up to the reputation of the other fine programs at Cal Poly.

Peter, we especially thank you for the support that you and your staff have shown us.
POLICY AND PROCEDURE ON CHANGES OF DEPARTMENT NAMES

1. A department requesting a change of its name will send the request in writing to the Dean of the School, with an explanation of the reasons for the change.

2. The Dean will receive a recommendation on the request from the School Council, add his or her own recommendation, and send the request with the recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

3. The Vice President will ask for a recommendation on the proposed name change from the Academic Senate and from the Academic Deans' Council.

4. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will approve or disapprove the proposed name change after considering the recommendations of the School Council and the Dean of the affected School, the Academic Senate, and the Deans' Council.
WHEREAS,  The Academic Senate acknowledges receipt of the "1992-1993 Program Review and Improvement Committee Report of Findings and Recommendations"; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the "1992-1993 Program Review and Improvement Committee Report of Findings and Recommendations"; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the "1992-1993 Program Review and Improvement Committee Report of Findings and Recommendations" be submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Proposed by the Program Review and Improvement Committee
October 12, 1993
MEMORANDUM

Date: June 1, 1993

To: Academic Senate Executive Committee

From: Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee

Subject: Program Review Findings, Recommendations, and Responses

Please find attached the findings and recommendations of the committee and the responses provided by the various programs.

Copies of the complete university report should be placed in the University Library for public access. Each dean should receive the full university report, with a copy of the individual program reports going to the program administrator.

Charles T. Andrews

Glenn Irvin (nonvoting)

James Bermann

Dianne Long

Harvey Greenwald

Joseph Montecalvo

Robert Heidersbach

Charles Quinlan
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407  
1992-93 PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE  
REPORT OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee reviewed four graduate and nine undergraduate programs during the current academic year. The information used was gathered from each program, Institutional Studies, accreditation studies and reviews, catalog material, and other sources.

The Committee makes the following observations pertaining to the programs:

1. As stated in the 1992 report, in general, the curriculum contains too many units. However, it was noted during this cycle of reviews that programs are making efforts to reduce the number of required units for graduation. This effort is commended by the Committee.

2. Programs should require students to first take courses in the fundamental knowledge and skills before a program teaches the application of those fundamentals to its majors. Departments delivering courses in fundamental knowledge have an obligation to tailor courses specifically for departments they are servicing, if there is sufficient demand. This cooperation will avoid the problems of inefficiencies found in duplication of subject matter offerings.

3. During the Committee's reviews, there surfaced numerous courses in which students were earning an inordinate number of high grades. The finding of courses in which there were no grades below "C" occurred in both service courses and in a student's major courses. The Committee recommends that each dean and department identify such courses and review them for academic rigor.

4. Although little time has lapsed since the Committee recommended more integration of cultural pluralism and gender issues, we reiterate our recommendation that these topics be addressed, where appropriate, and so indicated in course descriptions.

5. In all appropriate instances, the committee has recommended the pursuit of accreditation where such accreditation is available. This is in keeping with Cal Poly and CSU policy.

6. The Committee continues to recommend more interdisciplinary efforts be made to improve course and program quality.
Criteria used to evaluate programs included:

1. Number of applications, number of acceptances, number of applicants accommodated, and number of first-time-students actually enrolled.

2. Student/Faculty ratio's by SCU taught.

3. Accreditation.

4. Time to graduation.

5. Grading trends/faculty awards.

6. Diversity, selectivity and quality of students, faculty positions generated vs. positions used, course duplication and overlap, student/faculty ratio, academic activity of the faculty, curriculum, and employment opportunities for graduates.
Findings:
2. Curriculum changes to become MS Psychology from MS Counseling were to drop two courses--computer science and statistics.
4. No clear reason why the program is labeled as a psychology program instead of a counseling program.
5. No documented outside evaluation by accrediting organizations or comparable groups.
6. Only one concentration, in Marriage, Family, and Child Counseling (MFCC).
7. Many masters-level CSU programs in MFCC are in counseling, not psychology.
8. Program does not require statistics or other quantitative training as a prerequisite. Other CSU MS Psychology programs require this background. (Fullerton, Fresno, Hayward, Sacramento).
9. Program does not require the Graduate Record Examination (GRE). Other CSU MS Psychology programs require the GRE, Miller Analogies Test, or similar tests.
10. Several faculty have generated funds through grants and/or research contracts.
11. Culminating thesis or examination required.
12. HD 450, Family Therapy and Crisis Intervention required of all graduate students. The current catalog shows no provision for how this requirement can be waived for students who used the same course for their bachelor's degree requirements.
13. STAT 512 is listed as a prerequisite for required PSY 574, Applied Psychological testing.
14. Department report claims that most student take five years to complete program.
15. Program does not track graduates.
16. Program claims library has inadequate holdings.
17. Program is one of only two graduate programs in the College of Liberal Arts.
18. Program is very faculty intensive, it requires approximately 2 1/2 faculty to teach 50 mostly part-time students who take low unit loads.

**Strengths:**

1. Provides training for licensure in Marriage, Family, and Child Counseling.
2. Several faculty are professionally active and have obtained research contracts and other external funding.
3. Program has high enrollment in the limited number of classes offered at the graduate level.
4. Thesis or comprehensive examination required of all students.

**Weaknesses:**

1. Excessive units when compared to other M.S. Psychology programs or to M.S. in Counseling programs at other CSU campuses.
2. Many faculty do not have formal training and/or backgrounds in psychology.
3. Program not accredited. Department report does not compare accreditation requirements with current program.
4. No background in quantitative methods required for entry into program.

**Recommendations:**

1. Consider renaming the program to "MS in Counseling" or restructuring the program as a more traditional psychology degree.
2. Reduce the total number of units required for the program.
3. Emphasize electronic access of information to overcome stated inadequacies in library holdings.
4. Seek accreditation of program as soon as possible.
5. Add Statistics 518 or similar quantitative methods course to MS Psychology curriculum. This is in compliance with university policy to have fundamentals of a subject taught by the department with the primary responsibility for that subject.
MEMORANDUM

Date:       June 17, 1993

To:         Charles Andrews, Co-Chair
             Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee

From:       Patrice Engle, Chair
             Psychology and Human Development Department
             Basil Fiorito, Coordinator
             M.S. Psychology Program

Re:         Documents Omitted from the Program Review Committee’s Final Report

Attached are documents submitted to the 1992/93 PR&IC by Basil Fiorito which were NOT included in the committee's final report. The only changes made to these documents are that the numbered items from the committee's draft-preliminary report to which these responses refer are included to make it more readable. Please have these documents distributed to all recipients of the committee's final report. The omission of these documents raises serious questions for Basil Fiorito which he intends to address in a separate memo.
Responses to Selected Items in
PR&IC Draft - Preliminary Report
M.S. in Psychology

Preparer: Basil Fiorito
Date: May 19, 1993

As program coordinator, I decided to respond to the committee's report on an item-by-item basis, selecting those items which I and program faculty felt were errors in fact or interpretation. Listed below are the numbered items in italics from the committee's report followed by my response.

Findings


In the 1992-94 catalog, the former Counseling program was renamed MS in Psychology to more accurately reflect its clinical/counseling psychological content, its administration by the Psychology and Human Development Department and its being taught by faculty, a majority of whom possess doctorates in psychology.

3. No clear reason why the program is labeled as a psychology program instead of a counseling program.

The MS is a clinical/counseling psychology program that prepares masters level clinicians to work with individuals, couples, children, families, and groups. It is taught by psychologists and faculty with related degrees in a Psychology and Human Development Department. I believe that qualifies it for the label of MS in Psychology.

6. Most master-level CSU programs in MFCC are in counseling, not psychology.

This is not true. An exhaustive search of the most recent CSU catalogs reveals that of the 19 terminal masters degrees fulfilling MFCC licensing requirements, 13 are MA or MS Psychology degrees. Only 6 are MA or MS Counseling degrees and these are offered by departments of Education, Education Psychology, Counselor Education, and Counseling. See attachment.
7. Program does not require statistics or other quantitative training as a prerequisite. Other CSU MS Psychology programs require this background. (Fullerton, Fresno, Hayward, Sacramento)

We'd like students to have had statistics in their undergraduate program, but we have pretty demanding entrance requirements now with six program prerequisites and a minimum GPA of 3.0. We don't want to make it unnecessarily difficult to enter the program, especially for applicants who are considering a mid-career change. We teach statistics to our graduate students as part of our research methods classes.

8. Program does not require the Graduate Record Examination (GRE). Other CSU MS Psychology programs require the GRE, Miller Analogies Test, or similar tests.

Faculty have looked into the value of requiring GRE and similar tests as an entrance requirement. We believe the literature does not show a significant correlation between such standardized tests and completion of masters degrees in psychology. The best single predictor of performance at the masters level is past grades. The program has a 3.0 minimum GPA which is higher than the 2.5 minimum GPA required by the university.

11. HD 450, Family Therapy and Crisis Intervention required of all graduate students. No provision for how this requirement can be waived for students who used the same course for their bachelor's degree requirements.

Graduate students who've taken HD 450 as undergraduates are required to substitute an advisor-approved 400 or 500 level course in their formal study plan. Routinely, this course is one of the additional MFCC required classes.

12. STAT 512 is prerequisite for required PSY 574, Applied Psychological Testing.

This STAT requirement should've been deleted as a course prerequisite to PSY 574. This is an applied class in which the emphasis is on administering tests and interpreting test results.

13. Department report claims that most students take five years to complete program.

That is the current situation as many of our students enroll part time while supporting themselves and their families. Faculty have implemented a number of changes which will reduce the time needed to graduate such as: reducing the number of units to complete the MS and MFCC Emphasis from 111 to 96-99,
establishing comprehensive exams as an alternative to thesis, and admitting more applicants who plan on being full-time students.

17. Demand for program is questionable. Some San Luis Obispo residents drive to Santa Barbara to take masters program in psychology at UCSB.

How is demand measured in this statement? Over the last two years we have had over twice as many qualified applicants as we've had admission slots. There are no other terminal masters degree programs offered by public universities between Los Angeles and San Jose and inland to Bakersfield. Our graduate interns are in high demand by local public agencies. Our graduates are on staff at many local clinical agencies and have established numerous private and group practices. The trend in mental health services is toward an increasing proportion being delivered by masters level clinicians as a cost-effective strategy. Demand for our graduates should only increase.

18. Program is very faculty intensive, it requires approximately 2 1/2 faculty to teach a small number of students (most students are part time and take low course loads).

Small in comparison to what? The MS seems to be a rather robust graduate program for this campus. We're admitting more students who plan to be full-time.

Strengths
1. Forms a good background for reconversion to MS in Counseling.

We disagree. The program is properly titled MS in Psychology. See items 1 and 3 under Findings.

Weaknesses
1. Excessive units when compared to other M.S. Psychology programs or to M.S. in Counseling programs at other CSU campuses. Report submitted by department is at variance with units listed in 92-94 catalog.

Program faculty are willing to revise the curriculum to reduce the number of required units. (See number 3 under recommendations). Six of the other CSU masters programs fulfilling educational requirements for MFCC licensure require 60 semester or 90 qtr units which is what our program requires (see attachment). Regarding the unit variance, there is an error in the catalog; the MS requires 90 qtr units.
2. Most faculty do not have formal training and/or backgrounds in psychology.

This recommendation reflects an inadequate examination of the program review document submitted earlier. Of the 13 names of MS instructors listed on page 7 of that document:
- 8 have doctoral degrees in psychology
- 5 are licensed psychologists, one of whom is also a licensed MFCC
- 1 is a licensed clinical social worker
- 1 is a licensed MFCC
- 1 is working on his licensure requirements in psychology
- 1 is a credentialed school psychologist

All of the faculty teaching clinical courses in the program also have extensive post-graduate training and experience. Faculty without clinical degrees teach the non-clinical classes appropriate to their education, experience, training. This is a highly qualified and experienced faculty.

4. No background in quantitative methods required for entry into program.

While we'd like it, we don't require it. This is a clinical/counseling degree and we teach the quantitative methods needed by our students. That instructor has taught statistics for psychologists at other universities. Students taking the current research methods classes are better prepared to conduct thesis-level research than at any other time in the history of the program.

Recommendations

1. Rename the program to "MS in Counseling," restructure the program as a true psychology degree, OR abandon the MS-level program as too demanding on limited faculty resources and have the College of Liberal Arts introduce a new Master of Social Work program.

Of the 19 CSU terminal masters degrees fulfilling MFCC licensing requirements, 13 are MS or MA Psychology degrees. The other six MS Counseling degrees are offered by Education, Education Psychology, Counselor Education, and Counseling departments. See attachment. We are a Psychology and Human Development Department offering a clinical/counseling psychology degree taught by psychologists and faculty with related degrees. The program title is appropriate, even if not as accurate as we'd like.
With the program revision that took effect with the 1992-94 catalog, faculty had requested a degree title of Counseling Psychology. The Chancellor's Office denied that and suggested we select psychology or counseling. We selected psychology because it reflects the content of the program, the faculty and the department. It also helps distinguish it from the MA in Education with a specialization in Guidance and Counseling.

2. If program remains as "MS in psychology," use faculty with formal training in psychology.

This recommendation reflects an inadequate review of the program document. See page 7 of the program document submitted earlier and item two under weaknesses herein.

3. Reduce the total number of units required for the program.

Faculty are seriously looking into reducing the total number of units required. This will take a major curriculum revision as we collapse and combine courses but we think it's a worthwhile endeavor in order to increase our graduation rate and shorten the time it takes students to complete the program.

I believe the committee needs to take into consideration that this department has only administered the MS program for three years. In the very first year the MS was in the department, faculty revised the curriculum to reduce the number of units students needed to take to complete the MS with the Emphasis in MFCC from 111+ to 96-99. This was done while most of us were rather unfamiliar with the program. With more experience administering it, we are now ready to reduce its units further.

One last factor that's relevant to our not having reduced the required number of units sooner, is that one instructor who was deeply involved in creating this program was told by Cal Poly administrators that in order to have a MS degree on this campus it had to be 90 units. As program coordinator, I recently checked into this with the Academic Programs office and that's not the case. The BBSE only requires a minimum of 72 quarter units and faculty will now explore ways to more closely approach that number.

4. Clearly show STAT 512 as required in the MS program.

STAT 512 is not required in the MS program. We will delete it as a prerequisite to PSY 574. We teach statistics as part of our research methods classes which were changed to two seminars and two activity classes to accommodate this added emphasis.
5. Seek accreditation of program as soon as possible.

Faculty discussed this earlier in the year and tentatively decided to seek accreditation. See attached memo to Charlie Crabb. However, in light of our even more recent decision to substantially revise the curriculum, we intend to delay this until we complete that process.

6. College of Liberal Arts should consider eliminating MS in Psychology program and starting a Master of Social Work program.

We disagree.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>MS Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>90 qtr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>MS Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>48 sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>MA Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>30 sem + MFCC classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>MS Counseling</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>90 qtr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>MS Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>48 sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>MS Counseling</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>48 sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>MA Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>60 sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>MS Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>49 sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>MS Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>73-86 qtr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>MA Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>30 sem + MFCC classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernadino</td>
<td>MS Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>78-82 qtr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>MS Counseling</td>
<td>Counselor Ed</td>
<td>60 sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>MS Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>48 sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>MS Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>48 sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>MS Psychology</td>
<td>Psych/HD</td>
<td>90 qtr + MFCC classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>MA Counseling</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>60 sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>MS Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>50 sem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: - 19 terminal degree programs offered at 17 CSU campuses
- 13 MA/MS Psychology in departments of Psychology, seven of which required 90 qtr. or 60 sem. units
- 6 MA/MS Counseling in departments of Education, Educational Psychology, Counselor Education, Counseling
MEMORANDUM

Date: April 23, 1993

To: A. Charles Crabb
Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Resources

From: Basil A. Fiorito, Interim Associate Dean
College of Liberal Arts

Re: Accreditation Expenses

Dean Sharp asked me to respond to your April 12 memo requesting estimates for accreditation expenses for CLA programs. I have contacted the departments listed below and summarized their responses which follow.

Art requests no accreditation funds.
The Art and Design Department explored the accrediting standards of their professional association and determined their program lacks a "goodness of fit" with the association's model. Given their program objectives faculty have decided it's best not to contort their program to try to conform to this model.

Journalism requests $700 for pre-accreditation visit travel expenses.
The Journalism Department plans to seek accreditation and estimates travel expenses in the $500-700 range for a pre-accreditation visit by Dr. Douglas Anderson, Director of the Walter Cronkite School of Journalism at Arizona State University. A copy of the department head's memo on accreditation was sent to you.

M.S. in Psychology requests no accreditation funds in 1993-94.
Program faculty reviewed the accreditation procedures for the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs and decided to initiate the self-study process required for accreditation with the intention of submitting a program evaluation document in 1994-95.

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 23, 1993

To: PR&IC Committee: C. Andrews, J. Bermann, H. Greenwald, R. Heidersbach, G. Irvin, D. Long, J. Montecalvo, C. Quinlan

From: Basil Fiorito, Coordinator
M.S. in Psychology

Re: Final Comments on Draft-Preliminary Report

With some time to reflect on my presentation to the committee on 5/20/93, I want to explicitly state what I hoped I conveyed in my discussion of the points cited and the recommendations made in your preliminary report on the M.S. Psychology program.

The M.S. in Psychology is a good program getting better. It is taught by well-qualified faculty with appropriate degrees who excel in classroom teaching. We select strong candidates from large, well-qualified applicant pools which over the last three years increasingly represent wider regions of the state and nation. We graduate highly qualified masters-level clinicians who enter a growing market for their services.

As a coordinator, I welcome constructive criticism of the program. In fact, the faculty who coordinate the program with me engage in a weekly discussion of ways to improve the program. I believe this effort is reflected in the substantive changes we've already made in the three short years we've administered the program, almost all of which the committee failed to note in its preliminary report. A brief summary of the more important changes would include:

- an increase in the number and diversity of faculty teaching in the program;
- an increase in the number of clinically-trained and licensed faculty;
- a decrease in the number of units required for the MS with the MFCC Emphasis (which approximately 95% of our students take) from 111 to 96-99;
- an increase in the frequency of course offerings;
- an improvement in the program's quantitative methods courses;
- the institution of comprehensive examinations as an alternative to thesis.

If time had permitted at our meeting and I had the presence of mind, I would have reported that two of our graduate students presented papers at the Western Psychological Association meeting held in Phoenix last April and have had two papers accepted for presentation at the American Psychological Association meeting to be held in Toronto in August. One of these students has been accepted into the University of Maryland's doctoral program in Counseling Psychology, one of the best in the nation. None of this could have been accomplished unless
the program, its faculty and students are as good as I have described above. While these students represent some of the best in our program, their work is indicative of the quality education all our students are provided. There are additional examples that I could cite to refute other program criticisms implied or stated by the committee, but I hope I have made clear the fact that this is a good program that will get better with time and the continued work of dedicated faculty.

To illustrate some of the improvements made by faculty that were identified through our own on-going program evaluation, I'd like to address the issue of the program's graduation rate and the length of time students take to graduate. This is the one genuine concern faculty have about the program that the committee raised in my presentation, but it's a concern the faculty recognized early-on and have implemented changes to address.

The program's rate of graduation is already improving (15 students successfully completed comprehensive examinations this year) and the length of time to graduate should decline as the reduction in units from 111 to 96/99 begins to take effect. Both of these curriculum changes were recently implemented with the 1992/94 catalog. Other changes faculty have made, such as admitting an increasing proportion of full-time students, will also shorten time to graduation, but the committee needs to realize that we have admitted only two currently enrolled classes in the less than three years we've had the program. It will take additional time for these and other program changes to be reflected in graduation rate and time to graduate statistics. Rather than dismiss the program as the committee did in its draft preliminary report, I'd ask the committee to give the faculty this time and to suggest additional ways to help us improve this program. Ultimately, isn't improvement the primary objective of the program review and improvement committee?

Speaking for program faculty, we recognize the benefits of three major points made in your draft preliminary report:

- further reduce the number of required units;
- seek accreditation;
- track our graduates.

I acknowledged these in our meeting and assured you we will accomplish them given the time to do so. Indeed, I believe the facts I brought to the committee's attention during our meeting demonstrate that we had already begun to plan for accreditation.

If you have questions about the program or anything I've presented, please feel free to contact me at x2674 or x2359.
1. This is the third year of existence for the EMP.
2. The program currently has 26 students but would like to expand to 50-60 students.
3. The average GMAT scores for their students is 600.
4. The program involves partnerships with industry. Presently these corporations are from California.
5. The program is accredited by the AACSB.
6. The program has been successful in generating significant non-state resources.
7. The program has identified weaknesses in academic support services.
8. There are only a few comparable programs in the country.
9. The program is seeking to broaden support to include possible support from the NSF.

Strengths:
1. The program is innovative.
2. The students in general are quite good.
3. The program has been successful in attracting a number of partner corporations.
4. The program has been able to generate significant non-state resources and continues to explore other avenues of support.

Weaknesses: None.

Recommendations:
1. They should consider the possibility of delivering their program both nationally and internationally.
2. They should seek out new technologies as well as other computerized capabilities. This might help deal with some of the weaknesses in academic support services.
MASTERS OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Findings:

1. The MBA program has been on campus since early 70's; first MBA awarded in 1971.

2. It is accredited (AACSB) (American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business) 1986, and reaccredited for 10 years (1993-2003). A new joint program is being proposed in conjunction with Architecture.

3. Acceptance into program is based on GMAT score of 530 & GPA of 3.0, with a minimum total of 1050, but the norm in this program is 1160 (GMAT + GPA x 200).

4. Fall enrollment (1992) in the MBA is 106 full time, 12 part time students.

5. Accepted to enrolled ratio ("91) is 93/58 (62%).

6. Average GMAT scores ('91)=538, ('92)=570, GPA ('91)3.15, ('92)3.10.

7. Graduate placement is not readily available.


9. A dual degree is offered in EMP (M.S. in Engr & MBA), and an MBA with specialization in Agribusiness.

10. MBA capstone course (GSB 562) is required for completion of program (including EMP); it has a 5 hour comprehensive written exam.

11. There is a planned MBA, joint with Architecture.

Strengths:

1. The program is accredited.

2. Entrance requirements have higher scores than similar MBA programs.

3. Placements of graduates seems adequate if it matches undergraduate placement, considering the job market.

4. The faculty is qualified, up-to-date and diversified.

5. The enrollment is steady.

Weaknesses:

1. There seems no source for job placement date of graduates.

Recommendations:

1. An instrument needs to be devised to track MBA graduates as to job orientations.
2. GSB 562 needs to be identified in the catalog as the comprehensive course and exam required for program completion. The comprehensive 5 hour exam given at the end of this course is the program comprehensive exam.
To:       Academic Senate Office
         via: Charlie Andrews

From:    Walter E. Rice, Director  
         Graduate Programs, College of Business

Subject: MBA Program Review

By means of this memo, I am informing you that I concur with the findings and recommendations of the Academic Senate Program Review Committee.
MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE IN ENGLISH

Findings:
1. The program centers on preparing graduates for the teaching profession, employment in business/government, writing, and further graduate work.
2. The program requires 48 quarter units, 36 are core. Core courses include literary research, critical analysis, applied linguistics, composition theory, authors, and American and British Literary Periods.
3. Fourteen 500-level courses are offered to students, some units may be taken at the 400 level.
4. Applicants with a baccalaureate in English and a 3.0 GPA are preferred.
5. Although the program is structured for 4-6 quarters, students seem to complete the program in three to four years.
6. The program does not address how the curriculum prepares teachers, business/government workers, or writers.

Strengths:
1. A large faculty is available to the program—all with PhDs.
2. Approximately 50 students matriculate through the program.
3. As an adjunct to the teacher credential program, this program provides opportunities for professional development to teachers in this geographic area.
4. A comprehensive exam is given as an exit requirement.

Weaknesses:
1. There is no available formal survey or follow-up on graduates.
2. There is no requirement for a GRE and exceptions to admission standards are not articulated in the catalog.
3. The program repeatedly states that the program is aimed at producing teachers. There is an unclear relationship between the graduate teaching assistant experience, the curriculum, and graduate careers.

Recommendations:
1. The program needs to determine its focus and align its curriculum accordingly.
2. Issues identified as weaknesses need to be addressed.
To: Charlie Andrews, Co-chair
    Program Review & Improvement Committee

From: Douglas Keese
    English Graduate Coordinator (Spring 1992-present)

    Grant Keetch
    Chair, English Department

    Nancy Luces (Geiger)
    Former English Graduate Coordinator

    David Kann
    Director of Writing Programs (oversees graduate instructors)

Re: Response to Preliminary Review of the English Graduate Program

(Please see the important concluding note at the end of these responses.)

Referring to the "1993 Program Review and Improvement Committee Draft Findings and Recommendations--May 6, 1993"
and to questions asked at our May 20, 1993 meeting:

Findings, 1.: Our program does not have a thesis option.

Findings, 5.: Most students complete our program in 3-4 years. We hold
students to a higher standard than most other CSU MA programs; we are the
only program in the system that still requires students to demonstrate their
ability to pass an extensive comprehensive exam in order to obtain the
degree (there is no "thesis option"). Students often take 2-3 quarters after
completion of their course work in order to study for this exam. We believe
that students who complete our program are more highly qualified, and the
higher GRE scores of these students seem to prove it (see response to
Weaknesses, 2, below).

Findings, 6.: Most public school districts' salary schedules allow
advancement by teachers through taking additional college credits beyond
the BA, and the schedules usually top out with the completion of an MA in
the teacher's subject area. Our program allows teachers an opportunity to
earn this degree by attending the university in the summer or in late afternoon and evening hours. The program's content includes in-depth study of literature and composition, the two primary areas of concern for high school teachers, and it provides background information on linguistics, a somewhat more specialized discipline than that found in a high school curriculum. In addition to the study of the subject matter per se, which is the primary focus of the MA, we also provide two elective classes in the pedagogy of writing and, to a lesser degree, the pedagogy of literature. Over the years, many, many area high school teachers have used our MA program as an in-service means to improve their knowledge of literature and thus to improve their teaching, and they have used the program to reach a higher rung on their salary schedules. Since school districts are all willing to pay people more money if they have earned an MA in their disciplines, the districts must see our program and similar programs as having some value.

Our in-service role for workers in government and industry is much, much smaller and, perhaps, less clear. We offer classes that help improve writing abilities, but since these classes are at the graduate level, they deal more in theory than in practice. They are more appropriate to managers, perhaps, who are interested in understanding and applying communication concepts. I must say that we could do more in this area to advertise our expertise in order to draw in a larger number of students who are already in the workplace. As it is now, these classes are primarily taken by graduate students who are looking forward to careers where technical writing or business communication are important components.

Strengths, 1.: Students may take additional course work to make up deficiencies in their knowledge, but all students must pass the comprehensive exam in order to receive the M.A. degree.

Weaknesses, 1.: We agree that this is a weakness. We are now investigating ways of keeping better track of our students and of getting their feedback to guide us in making improvements in our program. At the Spring 1993 English Council meeting (a meeting of the English graduate coordinators in the CSU system, along with English department chairs and writing program directors), we discovered that only one English MA program in the system has tried to keep track of its graduates, via an alumni newsletter. We are looking into whether this method has been successful or whether we should try other ways.

Weaknesses, 2.: We do not require the GRE because: A) we do not believe that it tests the depth of knowledge or the thinking and writing ability which we consider to be the main prerequisites to success in our program—these are better indicated by grade patterns, courses taken, letters of
recommendation, and a writing sample; B) applicants from underrepresented groups have repeatedly told us that they consider the GRE in the English subject area "ethnically biased" and that they will not consider applying to a program which requires the GRE—we are trying to encourage more students from underrepresented groups to enter our program, and this is already difficult given the predominantly unintegrated state of students and faculty at Cal Poly; C) GRE scores remain on student records for five years; low scores can handicap students who, after graduating with our MA, apply to enter Ph.D. programs—we prefer that our students take the GRE after completing our program, when their coursework and studying for our comprehensive exam have prepared them to get very high scores on the GRE.

True, "exceptions to admission standards are not articulated in the catalog," but this is in accord with the decision made some time ago by the university Graduate Studies Committee. The Graduate Coordinators on this committee decided that to include a long list of potential exceptions would be impractical and would encourage many deficient applicants to apply to program (a waste of their money). Also, our original report to you shows that we make only very few exceptions to the admissions policy outlined in the catalog.

Weaknesses, 3: In our report to you, we have claimed that the MA program produces teachers, but we may have created the impression that our program is the same as a teacher credentialing program. This isn't the case, of course. We have some classes in pedagogy—Apprenticeship in Teaching Literature or Linguistics at the College Level and Pedagogical Approaches to Composition—but our MA program's primary focus is to provide the intellectual, academic substance that is the primary subject matter for high school and junior college teachers. Or what might be more nearly the case in our literature and criticism courses, we teach our graduate students to read texts in depth, providing various critical methods as well as cultural contexts, so that they can understand the richness and variety of literature and apply these techniques to any works they need to treat in their own classrooms. In other words, what we teach current or prospective teachers is what they will teach in their classrooms, so the content of the MA classes—our curriculum—has a direct relationship to the teaching experience. And while I am sure these students learn a great deal about instructional method simply by observing their own teachers, the primary responsibility for instruction in pedagogy falls to the Center for Teacher Education, which is the credentialling agency on our campus.

Recommendations, 1: Nothing in this world is perfect, and I am sure that the statement of our focus for the MA program as well as the curriculum could be improved. But I am unable right now to see that we are unfocused
or that the curriculum needs much alignment when it comes to the primary purpose of the graduate degree. The bulk of our students are current or future high school and junior college English teachers or prospective Ph.D. candidates in this subject area. Our program clearly provides this largest number of students a full, deep experience in the study of language and literature.

For the relative handful of students whose goal is a profession involving technical communication, we provide a background that is responsible and comprehensive. Our program is coordinated with the Technical Writing Certificate program, so that students in our program who want expertise in the area of technical writing may choose this as an emphasis within the program. The same is true of the Teaching English as a Second Language Certificate program. These two certificate programs are coordinated with the English MA program, but also separate from it, allowing students in other disciplines and undergraduates to obtain the Technical Writing and TESOL certificates too (they do not have to be enrolled in the English MA program to obtain them).

Response to question asked about how we prepare our graduate instructors: English MA students interested in being considered for a graduate instructorship must successfully complete three classes: ENGL 399X (Tutor Training) which involves working concurrently in the Writing Lab, ENGL 505 (Composition Theory), and ENGL 506 (Composition Pedagogy). Students then apply for the position by March 1 of each academic year; each application must include three letters of recommendation, a current transcript, and a Personal Data Form. Following the completion of these requirements, the Director of Writing Programs, the Head of the Writing Skills Office, and the English Department Head meet to evaluate students' work in classes and in the Writing Lab. Students are then either assigned a graduate instructorship or asked to make up deficiencies, to observe and work with another composition instructor for the next quarter and continue working in the Writing Lab. All graduate instructors are monitored and reviewed periodically by more tenure-track faculty.

Response to question asked about the fact that grades given by graduate instructors in composition classes tend to be higher than grades given by tenure-track faculty in literature classes: In the Composition Theory and Composition Pedagogy classes which graduate students are required to take before becoming instructors, they learn several methods of teaching composition. Among the most popular and successful methods in widespread use today is the “peer group critique.” Using this approach, for each paper assigned the composition instructor has students do three drafts in groups, critiquing each other's work according to
guidelines outlined by the instructor and under that instructor's supervision; the fourth and final draft is then handed in to the instructor. This draft is corrected, but not graded, and returned to the student. Near the end of the quarter, students choose their two best papers, revise them further, and hand them in for a final grade.

This approach to teaching composition emphasizes the writing process--revision and invention. The resulting grades are inevitably higher overall with this method, but the method has been shown to work exceedingly well at achieving its goal: the improvement of student writing. Thus graduate instructors using this method in teaching their composition classes have been assigning higher grades overall than have tenure-track faculty in teaching literature classes, but these higher grades are the result of a successful method of teaching writing (which is very different from the teaching of literature).

IMPORTANT NOTE: In closing, we would like to thank the members of the Program Review and Improvement Committee for taking the time and trouble to review our program. None of the above responses is intended as a defense of our program. We are trying to explain why the program is set up as it is at present in the hope that our fuller explanation will help guide you in your review of our strengths and weaknesses. We welcome any and all suggestions for improvement that you may make, and want to take advantage of this opportunity to be reviewed by those who can see us from the outside (a position which is obviously much harder for us to occupy). If there is any further information which we can provide, please let us know.
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, ACCOUNTING, AND MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

Findings:
1. The Business Administration program was reaccredited in 1993.
2. The Business Administration, Accounting, and Management programs offer a wide variety of service courses to the University community.
3. The College of Business uses a student advising center.
4. The College of Business is selective in its admission policy.

Strengths:
1. Faculty are professionally active.
2. The programs effectively and efficiently use and employ resources.
3. The Business Administration program and College of Business are working with the Food Science and Nutrition Department and the College of Agriculture to develop a joint Cal Poly Center for Food Industry Excellence.

Weaknesses:
1. The Accounting Department has not sought accreditation.
2. The programs have unit requirements in excess of what is required and, therefore, should consider reducing their requirements to 186 units.

Recommendations:
1. The Accounting Department should seek accreditation.
2. The format of all submitted program materials should be consistent with Academic Senate policy and guidelines.
Findings:
1. The B.S. degree program in Chemistry is certified by the American Chemical Society.
2. The Department historically has offered upper division courses which serve specific subject interests for many departments such as Soil Science, Biological Sciences, Environmental and Materials Engineering, and Food Science and Nutrition.
3. The Department has obtained significant support from the chemical and allied industries.
4. Over 1/3 of the permanent faculty are involved in Interdisciplinary work.
5. Faculty members participate in START and SMART student advising programs.

Strengths:
1. The Department makes efficient use of available resources.
2. The Department has done an excellent job of providing lab experiences for students.
3. The faculty are professionally active and have been successful in obtaining external funding and programmatic support.
4. The Department is selective in the admission of majors.

Weakness:
1. Faculty workloads are increasing to over 39 WTUs per year. While this may be commendable in meeting University wide needs, it may negatively impact faculty professional development activities.

Recommendations:
1. If additional faculty resources are not available, explore possibility of obtaining help in selected courses from faculty in other department who may have formal degrees and experiences in Chemistry and Biochemistry.
2. If the above is possible, reconsider offering graduate-level Chemistry courses which may be integral to other M.S. degree programs.
Date: June 11, 1993

To: Charlie Andrews, Chair
   Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee

Copy: Phil Bailey, Dean
     College of Science and Math

From: John C. Maxwell, Chair
       Chemistry Department

Subject: Department Chair Response to 1992 Academic Program Review of Chemistry Department

Thank you for your careful evaluation of the Chemistry Department. It is essential that the Academic Senate take the responsibility for Program Review at this University. I appreciate your work on behalf of Cal Poly.

I believe the May 18 draft of your Findings and Recommendations is accurate and appropriate. I assure you that the Chemistry Department will capitalize on the strengths you identified and continue in its efforts to provide a quality program to the students of Cal Poly.

One Weakness was identified in your report:

"Faculty workloads are increasing to over 39 WTUs per year. While this may be commendable in meeting Universitywide needs, it may negatively impact faculty professional development activities."

No faculty member was asked to teach an overload: this was an attempt by well-meaning faculty members to allow students to proceed in some sort of normal fashion to graduation. In a short term situation, these actions are understandable. Now that it is clear that the financial troubles in the State of California are a long term problem, we have accepted the fact that the Chemistry Department does not have the resources to meet student demand. Accordingly, I have made faculty workload a priority issue during this past year. When one considers the long-term interests of Cal Poly's students, an appropriate faculty workload is essential.

There were two recommendations in your report:

1. If additional faculty resources are not available, explore possibility of obtaining help in selected courses from faculty in other departments who may have formal degrees and experiences in Chemistry and Biochemistry.

2. If the above is possible, reconsider offering graduate-level Chemistry courses which may be integral to other M.S. degree programs.

cont.
Starting Fall 1993, we will have three faculty members from the Physics Department teaching Chemistry courses. I will also have graduate students from the Biology and Materials Engineering Departments teaching lab courses. At least one faculty member from the College of Agriculture has informed me that he likely would be available for a Winter quarter assignment in Chemistry. I will continue in my efforts to bring a balance in student demand across the courses in this College. We will continue to be short staffed in Biochemistry unless we get a budget that would allow us to hire a lecturer in this field.

With regards to the second recommendation, the Chemistry Department will be pleased to continue to offer graduate level and senior level special topics courses. I am personally familiar with the interdisciplinary importance of these courses as I taught a Special Topics in Plant Biochemistry course upon my return from a sabbatical leave in 1989. Over one-third of the students were from programs outside this Department. I was proud of what we were able to accomplish that quarter.

I would be pleased to provide any additional information needed to complete this review cycle. I will be available on a semi-regular basis during the summer except for the last three weeks in July.
B.S. DEGREE IN COMPUTER ENGINEERING

Findings:
1. The CpE program has been on campus for five to six years.
2. The program, because it is jointly administered by the Computer Science Department and the Electronic Engineering/Electrical Engineering Department, is not directly assigned to either one for a "home."
3. Because the program is not "housed" in any particular specific place, the students may find it difficult to be allied with a distinct major.
4. The faculty members who teach primarily in this program are located in adjacent buildings on the campus.
5. Accreditation was delayed by ABET in Fall, 1991, because the program lacked "identity." This includes:
   a. lack of a specific line item budget.
   b. lack of a specific space set aside for the program.
   c. lack of a readily identifiable faculty for the program.
   d. no specific CpE-prefix courses.
   e. lack of a specific office for the program.
6. The program has, as of 30 Oct. 92, 226 students.
7. Applicants to the program as of Oct. 92 was 282, with 123 accommodated. (44%)
8. First time freshman SAT scores ave.=1085, 6th place out of 12 programs.
9. Average GPA, upper div/transfers=3.23, average GPA 1st time freshmen=3.72, 1st/12.

Strengths:
1. Good students are attracted to the program and seem to persist.
2. The curriculum is interdisciplinary in nature. graduates are in good demand.
3. The curriculum "task force" committee reports on May 18, 1993 to the Dean of Engineering, for a decision as to how to comply with ABET for accreditation and, how to meet the requirements of bringing the department together, professionally and physically. (reference: interview with Saul Goldberg, EL/EE Department Head, May 12, 1993)
4. New courses with CpE prefixes are being created from EL, EE, and CSc courses, as well as new courses being developed.
5. Faculty is well qualified and current. Equipment for
6. Two minorities are on the committee.
7. There is some tracking of graduates as to job placements.

Weaknesses:
1. There are no women on the faculty committee.
2. The program has not yet received much support from the faculty of the College of Engineering.
3. Accreditation needs to be secured. (A revisit by the accreditation team is scheduled Fall '94.)

Recommendations:
1. Allocate a position for the program co-ordinator to "pull" the program together.
2. Orient College faculty as the worth and place of the program in the University.
3. Develop guidelines, goals, and avenues to comply with accreditation requirements of ABET.
Memorandum

To: Jack D. Wilson, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Paul E. Rainey
Interim Associate Dean, CENG

Subject: CENG Comments to the Program Review Findings, Recommendations, and Responses for 1992-93

Computer Engineering

Recommendations:

1. Allocate a position for the program co-ordinator to "pull" the program together.

2. Orient College faculty as the worth and place of the program in the University.

3. Develop guidelines, goals, and avenues to comply with accreditation requirements of ABET.

CENG Response:

1. There is a CENG Computer Engineering Council which is responsible for curriculum and policy and a Computer Engineering Program Director who has 0.4 FTEF release time to administer the Computer Engineering program. Starting this fall, there will be a half-time secretarial position, adjoining program offices for the secretary and Program Director, and an independent annual budget assigned to this program.

2. This is being accomplished through the leadership of the CENG Dean. As one of the steps, the Dean established a Computer Engineering Task Force to formulate recommendations to help the Computer Engineering Program receive ABET accreditation and to enhance future cooperation between the CSC and EL/EE Departments. As the administration and resources of the program become more clear and the program receives ABET accreditation, there will be less controversy, and the academic worth of the program will be apparent.

3. The guidelines for ABET accreditation are published. The changes listed above in items 1 and 2 should enable the Computer Engineering Program to obtain ABET accreditation.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles T. Andrews, Chair
    Program Review & Improvement Committee

FROM: Zane C. Motteler, Coordinator, Computer Engineering

DATE: 24 May 1993

SUBJECT: Response to Review

1. Report of the CpE Task Force Committee

This report is now in the hands of the Dean of Engineering, Peter Lee. It is my understanding from oral reports by the Task Force that they are recommending some changes in governance in the departments of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science in order to facilitate obtaining accreditation. I have not personally seen the report, and the dean, of course, must act on its recommendations before they become final. With this caveat, I shall briefly summarize my understanding of the report. The recommendation will be that the departments coordinate the program via a three-person committee, consisting of the CpE coordinator as chairperson, and the department chairs of EE and CSC. Decisions affecting the CpE program will be shared by this committee. Under it, CpE will have its own committee structure for such purposes as curriculum, RPT, and the like. I believe the committee may also recommend that CpE have a separate budget and some separate space, at least on paper, thus helping to satisfy ABET’s concern about an identity for the program.

2. Accreditation Plans

The College of Engineering and the two departments concerned are committed to obtaining ABET accreditation for CpE as soon as possible. Current plans are to have the program evaluated the next time an ABET team comes to campus to review other engineering programs, which is Fall 1994. This would mean preparing materials and the required report during the coming academic year. Some faculty, myself included, are concerned about having a visit during a period in which budgets have been monotonically decreasing. Thus far our accredited programs have not been so severely damaged as to be non-accreditable (we have been highly successful in getting industry support for equipment, etc.). However, supplies and equipment budgets are way down and there is essentially no maintenance money. Likewise, current budget cuts seem ad hoc and unplanned. The main means for budget-cutting has been to leave vacated positions unfilled without regard to whether the areas covered by the departing individuals are still adequately covered. Nevertheless, an accreditation visit looks likely in 1994, and the program will have improved significantly by then in areas which were of concern to the last visiting team.
ECONOMICS

Findings:
1. For first time freshmen in Economics for the Fall of 1992, the average SAT scores were 1088 and the average GPA was 3.74. These compare to the College of Business averages of 1045 and 3.63 and the university averages of 1026 and 3.48.
2. For first time freshmen in Economics for the Fall of 1993, 87 applied, 21 were accepted, and 8 enrolled.
3. For 1991-92 the ratio SCU-FTEF was 416 which compares to the university average of 288.
4. For the Economics Department the average number of publications and the average dollar amount of grants obtained are comparable to the other programs in the College of Business.
5. The most recent data on the job employment of graduates of the Economics program indicates that many are employed in fields unrelated to economics.
6. The faculty consists of only one woman and one underrepresented minority. The department has attempted to address this problem.

Strengths:
1. The students in Economics are quite good with SAT scores and entering GPA's that are significantly above the university averages.
2. The admissions to the program are highly selective.
3. Nearly all of the faculty have had publications within the last several years.

Weaknesses:
1. The ratio SCU/FTEF is among the highest in the university.

Recommendations:
1. The department should continue to recruit women and underrepresented minorities for faculty positions.
2. The Economics Department should analyze the employment opportunities for its graduates.
3. The Economics Department should explore ways to reduce its SCU/FTEF ratio.
ENGINEERING SCIENCE

Findings:

1. Engineering Science is a flexible, interdisciplinary, non-ABET accredited B.S. degree program. Graduates find employment in traditional engineering fields or in areas of emerging technologies, or go on to graduate and professional schools. The flexibility allows students, with the help of an adviser, to tailor the program to individual needs.

2. Although the program has no official concentrations, elective units, up to 30, can be configured into various specializations such as engineering physics, biomedical engineering, geological engineering, ocean engineering, atmospheric science, biochemical engineering, modeling and simulation, computer integrated manufacturing, and engineering for extraterrestrial environments.

3. The program has no faculty or courses assigned directly to it; participating faculty members and courses are associated with departments throughout the engineering college.

4. Enrollment was stable at approximately 25 students from 1985 through 1989. In 1990, enrollment increased to 45 and has increased steadily since.

5. One similar program exists in the CSU, at San Jose State.

6. The average GPA of entering freshmen for the program in Fall 1992 was 3.45 compared to a university average of 3.48 and an average for CENG of 3.60. The average SAT of entering freshmen for the program in Fall 1992 was 1121 compared to a university average of 1026 and a CENG average of 1026. The average GPA for upper-division transfer students for the program in Fall 1992 was 3.49 compared to a university average of 3.03 and a CENG average of 3.12.

Strengths:

1. Program flexibility allows configuration to individual needs and interests and inclusion of new and emerging subjects.

Weaknesses:

1. There is no apparent rationale for the program to have 204 units since it is non-ABET accredited and the high unit requirement in the accredited engineering programs does not apply in this case.

Recommendations:

1. The requirement for 204 units should be examined for reduction while retaining or increasing program flexibility.
Memorandum

To: Jack D. Wilson, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Paul E. Rainey
Interim Associate Dean, CENG

Subject: CENG Comments to the Program Review Findings, Recommendations, and Responses for 1992-93

Recommendations: 1. The requirement for 204 units should be examined for reduction while retaining or increasing program flexibility.

CENG Response: The 1994-96 catalog proposal reviewed by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee for Engineering Science lists the total units as 197/198.
FOOD SCIENCE AND NUTRITION

Findings:

1. The Nutrition Science degree program is approved by the American Dietetic Association and was reapproved in 1992.

2. The Food Science program is a large and nationally approved by the Institute of Food Technologists.

3. There are 11 faculty in the department and over 500 students.

4. Of 45 applicants (all categories) for FDSC, 42 were accommodated. Of 169 applicants (all categories) for NSC, 119 were accommodated.

5. FDSC SAT scores for first-time freshmen are calculated at 914; NSCI's SAT scores average 961. Corresponding GPAs are 3.21 for FDSC and 3.49 for NSCI. Average College of Agriculture for Fall 1992 are calculated 3.2.

6. The FDSC program has strong support from the California Food Industry.

7. A high percentage of NSCI grads enter dietetic internships and graduate school.

8. Faculty have been nominated for outstanding teacher awards.

Strengths:

1. Faculty are professionally active and successful in obtaining external research funds.

2. The programs are recognized at state and national levels of the industry.

3. The program’s faculty and students are involved in interdisciplinary research activities.

4. The program has a strong advising component.

Weaknesses:

1. The enterprise project has curriculum weaknesses. The department is restructuring this course (FSN 100).

2. The department has been less selective than many programs in the university in terms of admissions. The faculty are developing a recruiting plan to correct this weakness.

Recommendation:

1. Issues identified as weaknesses will continue to need to be addressed.
GRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS

Findings:  
1. Production emphasis.
2. Considering graduate program with Business College.
3. Attempting to reflect ethnic diversity.
4. Notation made of society's need for words and pictures.
5. Senior Project closely monitored.

Strengths:  
1. Departmental goals directly support those of CPSU and the CSU.
2. Graduates are in great demand by the industry employers with nearly 100 percent placement.
3. The department is recognized as one of two major programs of its kind in the nation.
4. A faculty maintaining currency through consulting, research, and publishing.
5. Excellent state-of-the-art laboratories.
6. Active advisory board.
7. Continual private support by industry and alumni.
8. Faculty development is on-going and supported by industry and the department.
9. Academically well prepared students.
10. Excellent preparation for industry positions.
11. Three diverse specializations available within the curriculum.
12. Faculty are able to develop depth by teaching focused courses.
13. Faculty possess strong professional work experience in teaching specialty areas.
14. Significant strengths in printing and publishing management and technology.

Weaknesses:  
1. Low interdisciplinary activity; however, the forthcoming Graphic Communications minor may assist in eliminating this weakness.

Recommendations:  
1. Increase emphasis on principles and concepts.
2. Should emphasize the communications aspects of Graphic Communications.
MEMORANDUM
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

May 27, 1993

TO: Academic Senate Program Review
and Improvement Committee

FROM: Harvey Levenson, Department Head
Graphic Communication Department

SUBJECT: Review of Graphic Communication Department


After meeting with the committee on May 25, 1993 and after reviewing your report, I have the following response.

FINDINGS

Item 1: Over the past three to four curriculum cycles, the Graphic Communication Department has taken steps to eliminate a production emphasis. Evidence of this is a reduction in the ratio of laboratory to lecture classes. Curriculum reform over the past eight years shows that some classes previously requiring three three-hour laboratories now require only one three-hour laboratory. Some other classes previously requiring two three-hour laboratories have been reduced to one three-hour laboratory. However, the nature of print manufacturing requires our students to have a detailed theoretical knowledge of printing production concepts. The industry expects Cal Poly Graphic Communication graduates to be knowledgeable in traditional and modern applications including computers and electronics, telecommunications, laser applications, electronic publishing, integrated systems, and procedures for managing such technologies.

Item 2: The Graphic Communication Department and College of Business has completed a feasibility study and draft curriculum for a graduate program. However, further development is postponed until a permanent Business College dean is in place.

WEAKNESSES

Item 1: The low interdisciplinary activity will be rectified with the implementation of the Graphic Communication minor. This program is presently working through the various approval stages with implementation planned for Fall, 1994. The minor, requiring no additional Graphic Communication resources, is designed for departments having 25 or more free elective units. This will enable students to complete the minor without prolonging their stay at the university. In addition, the department presently has an F.1. GE&B course pending final senate approval.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Item 1: Curriculum reform over the past eight years shows that the department has been working regularly to focus on principles, concepts, and theories as opposed to production skills. This is reflected in the reduced ratio of laboratories to lectures, and in course descriptions and course guides.

Item 2: The recommendation to emphasize the communications aspects of graphic communication over and above what we already do will be a topic of faculty discussion.

A FINAL NOTATION

The committee requested that I briefly address the professional career track that Graphic Communication graduates take when entering the industry. The committee was uncertain of the "window of opportunity" for Graphic Communication students.

Most students enter management with aspirations of reaching high positions of responsibility and authority in middle and upper management. This is true regardless of the students' concentration while in the department. Some graduates will take positions in product development or design technology. However, the majority will begin their career in marketing and sales, customer service, estimating, production control and related areas. On an increasing basis, graduates of the department are reaching executive positions with major corporations in the graphic communication field. A few of many examples that can be cited are:

Jack Hubbs
Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer
American Signature Corporation
(Also formerly president of Jeffries Banknote Company and president of Charles P. Young Company)

Robert Leveque
Vice President, Magazine Division
R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co.
(The largest commercial printing company in the United States)

Jeff Miller
Vice President of Marketing
MAN Roland Corporation
(A major printing press manufacturing company)

Roger Ynostroza
Managing Editor
Graphic Arts Monthly
(The industry's leading graphic arts publication)
PHYSICS

Findings:

1. The Department prepared an excellent program review report.

2. The program balances small enrollments in upper-division courses for their majors against larger enrollments in service and GE&B courses.

3. Cost per SCU is $333, the middle range on campus, and this is accomplished in a lab-intensive program.

4. SCU/FTEF ratio is 302, upper 1/3 in the university.

5. For Fall 1992, the average GPA for incoming freshmen in the physics program was 3.71 compared to a university average of 3.48. The average GPA for upper-division transfer students was 3.64 compared to a university average of 3.03.

6. For Fall 1992, the average SAT score for incoming freshmen in the physics program was 1178 compared to a university average of 1026.

7. Although the department does not have a formal tracking system for its graduates, it does have a good understanding of what happens to the department’s students as they transfer in and out, graduate, and go on to professional and graduate schools and employment.

8. Constructing budgets have reduced equipment acquisition and repair to an intolerably low level.

9. The department has been active in pursuing grants to fund research.

10. The faculty actively attends professional conferences, but only a few individuals make professional presentations or publish the results of scholarly investigations.

Strengths:

1. The department has a very healthy attitude about its role in teacher education and in preparing individuals to teach science.

2. The program has a very clear understanding of its mission and its constituencies.

3. Senior projects are carefully supervised and have a high rate of completion.

4. All majors are assigned to a faculty adviser.

5. The department maintains a strong interaction between faculty members and students.
Weaknesses:

1. The department budgets for equipment acquisition and maintenance have fallen below acceptable levels.

2. A few department members are active in research, pursuing research and program grants, and presenting the results of their investigations at conferences and through publication, but this type of professional activity is not pursued throughout the department.

Recommendations:

1. Although the department has been active in pursuing grants to support research, this is limited to a few faculty members. A larger percentage of the faculty should be involved in investigations of their own and pursue funding to support such professional activity.

2. The department faculty should engage in more professional activity involving one of the four types of scholarship outlined in the Cal Poly Strategic Plan.

3. The faculty should pursue external funding for acquisition and support of equipment.

4. The department should formalize a system to track its students and graduates.
This is a brief response to your Draft Report which I received May 18, 1993. We appreciate your complimentary and positive Findings and listed Strengths in the Draft Report. With regard to the Weaknesses and Recommendations mentioned, I would like to point out that our department has been generating far more external money through University Assigned Time and OSF Released Time paid for out of grants received than any other department in our College. I am confident that more of our faculty will be pursuing funding to support more widespread professional activity and purchase of equipment as each year goes by. Finally, with respect to your very last Recommendation, we have already begun more thorough tracking of our majors and graduates in our department office, and will work toward a more formalized system for this.

Thank you very much,
SOIL SCIENCE

Findings:

1. A review of the department mission statement, and what is actually occurring in the activities conducted by the department, it appears the department is accomplishing most if not all of the mission statement.

2. Based upon the information provided, it appears the Soil Science Department program has attained substantial recognition in the United States. The faculty have been invited to various universities to present the program and to assist other programs in their curriculum development and updating. In 1993 the program was awarded national recognition for its curriculum.

3. The department provides service to other programs in the university as well as to the College of Agriculture. Soil Science 121 is a requirement in Landscape Architecture, Ecology and Systematic Biology, Agricultural Engineering, Animal Science, Ornamental Horticulture, Crops Science, Agricultural Education, Agribusiness and Forestry and Natural Resources.

4. Review of other programs in the university revealed there are additional courses in Soil Science which would appear to be appropriate for students in these programs. Current users mainly only use the basic course SS 121, Introductory Soil Science. Some specific courses which might be of benefit to students in other programs are:

   SS 202, Soil and Water Conservation - Crops Science
   SS 331, Soil Morphology - Applicable to several programs, especially in crops and Environmental areas
   SS 422, Soil Microbiology - Ecology and Systematic Biology
   SS 423, Soil and Water Chemistry - Agricultural Engineering (Irrigation)
   SS 432, Soil Physics - Agricultural Engineering (Irrigation)
   SS 440, Forest and Range Soils - Animal Science (Beef, Dairy, and Sheep production)
   SS 433, Land Use Planning - City and Regional Planning

5. This program is one which is frequently found combined with other related programs at other institutions. In 1992, the Program Review and Improvement Committee recommended some consolidation be made. At that time it was suggested Soil Science, Crop Science, and Ornamental Horticulture be combined. No action has occurred on this recommendation.

6. There is increasing demand by students for the program. It has grown from approximately 45 in 1986 to about 140
for 1992/93. Further, there is increasing demand for graduates of the program. In addition, a sampling of grades reported indicates there is a high standard of performance expected. This department, overall, utilizes the full grade range in evaluating student performance.

7. The faculty are professionally active in professional organizations, research, and acquiring outside funding. While maintaining their professional growth and development, the faculty, in general, are teaching in excess of 12 units per quarter on average.

8. The average SAT for the College for Fall 1992 was 926 compared to 958 for those entering Soil Science. This placed Soil Science in fourth highest position in SAT's within the College. The first-time-freshman GPA for the College was 3.20 compared to 3.26 for those entering Soil Science.

9. There were 31 applicants to the Soil Science Department for Fall 1992. Of the 30 applicants accommodated, 18 actually enrolled.

10. Due to budget reductions the department has lost all lab tech support and the department secretary has been reduced from .75 to .50 of a position. These reductions make it necessary for faculty to devote time to setting up labs, preparing chemical solutions, general maintenance of labs and equipment, and the clerical functions of ordering supplies, chemicals and equipment.

11. Approximately 20% of new students for 1993-94 are minority, as a result of directed recruitment efforts of the Department.

STRENGTHS:

1. The efforts and accomplishments of the department are in accord with the mission statement of the department.

2. Based upon the awards received, the department has attained national recognition for its curriculum.

3. The department is providing service to other programs in the University.

4. It appears all courses have rigorous standards and are rigorously graded.

5. There is increasing demand for the program, as reflected in its increased applications over the past few years. This demand has not been addressed by lowering entrance criteria; the SAT's for this department are above the college average.

6. The faculty are very active in professional growth and development activities.

WEAKNESSES:

1. The loss of support personnel is a weakness in so far as being able to maintain a high quality program and utilization of faculty time.

2. The department's accommodation of almost 100% of the applicants does not indicate a selective process for new students. Although only 18 of the 30 applicants accommodated actually enrolled (60%), this constituted self-selection or elimination, rather than high standards
RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Work with other departments to increase utilization of courses appropriate to other programs.

2. Reduce the number of wtu's so no person is doing more than 12 wtu per quarter, or on average during the academic year. This may require less teaching of courses with prefixes other than Soil Science. This recommendation is also predicated upon the ability of the faculty to maintain their fine professional growth and development record, while delivering a quality education.

3. Give serious consideration to being more selective in the number of students accommodated.

4. Given the faculty are teaching in areas other than Soil Science and the budget situation which has affected support positions, very serious consideration should be given to the 1992 recommendation calling for this department to be combined with other department(s). Such action would address, in part, the budget situation increase utilization of Soil Science courses appropriate to other programs, and provide intellectual stimuli for all parties involved.
Adopted:

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

AS–-93/
RESOLUTION ON
FACULTY INPUT INTO POLICY CHANGES

Background Statement: On June 24, 1993, a significant change in the campus parking policy was announced in the Cal Poly Report. The effective date for this change was July 1, 1993. This change was made with little or no consultation with the faculty and was announced at a time when few faculty were on campus. Furthermore, the time between the announcement and the implementation of the policy change was so short as to discourage input from appropriate groups.

WHEREAS, Too often decisions have been made with little or no faculty, staff, or student input; and

WHEREAS, The time between the announcement and the implementation of new policies or policy changes should be sufficient to allow for adequate input from affected constituencies on the campus; and

WHEREAS, The announcement of new policies or policy changes should be made at a time when a significant number of people are on campus; and

WHEREAS, Such decision making erodes the trust between the administration and faculty, staff, and students; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That faculty, staff, and students have a right to provide input into all appropriate items affecting them; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That except for emergency circumstances, no new policies or policy changes shall take effect less than 30 days from the announcement of the new policies or policy changes; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That except for emergency circumstances, no new policies or changes in policies shall be announced during the Summer Quarter or at a time when classes are not in session.

Proposed by Harvey Greenwald
September 15, 1993
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

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

AS- -93/PPC
RESOLUTION ON
EVALUATION OF COLLEGE DEANS OR EQUIVALENT ADMINISTRATORS

Adopted:
RESOLUTION ON EVALUATION OF COLLEGE DEANS
OR EQUIVALENT ADMINISTRATORS
AS- -93/PPC
Page Two

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 carefully
considered by the Vice President for Academic
Affairs in her/his 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
Revised November 9, 1993
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, Not Applicable=E, Not Observable=F

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

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

AS- -93/
RESOLUTION ON
VOTE OF CONFIDENCE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

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>
<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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****************************************************************
* Academic Senate Executive Committee only: *
* total valid signatures: ________ verified by: ________ *
*****************************************************************
WHEREAS, The Instructional Advisory Computing Committee (IACC) has been asked to write a strategic plan to address instructional computing and information needs in the future; and

WHEREAS, The IACC has consulted with various interested faculty and staff on the contents of the strategic plan; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse and support, in concept, the IACC "Cal Poly Instructional Computing Strategic Plan: A Networked Instructional Environment."

Proposed by the Instructional Advisory Computing Committee
April 27, 1993
Cal Poly Instructional Computing Strategic Plan:  
A Networked Instructional Environment

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 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, data bases, 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.
WHEREAS, Cal Poly is a comprehensive polytechnic university; and

WHEREAS, The "Academic Senate Response to the Cal Poly Strategic Plan" has been approved by the faculty; and

WHEREAS, The "Academic Senate Response to the Cal Poly Strategic Plan" states that, "Cal Poly shall ensure that a significant majority of Cal Poly students are enrolled in professional or technical programs"; and

WHEREAS, The character of the university, the distribution of human and fiscal resources and support services are dependent on the students enrolled in academic programs; and

WHEREAS, The university's long-range planning is influenced by the balance among students enrolled as majors in academic programs; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the definition for "professional programs" shall be: Inclusion in Title 5, Section 40051 and either recognition of the program by a specialized accreditation agency or a program leading to a registration, credentialing or certification process requiring a baccalaureate degree, or both; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the definition for "technical programs" shall be: Programs pursuing the application of knowledge derived from theoretical models of life science, physical sciences, and mathematics to create, develop, and utilize solutions to practical problems; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the phrase "significant majority" be interpreted so that the balance between the number of student majors in technical/professional and nontechnical/professional programs at Cal Poly shall remain as it was during the period AY1988-AY1992, allowing for a similar range of variation as occurred during those five years.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee
November 2, 1993
WHEREAS, On November 3, 1992, Resolution AS-394-92/BC, "Resolution on Modification of Resolution AS-268-88/BC Entitled 'Resolution on Budget Information Reporting..." was adopted by the Academic Senate and subsequently approved by President Baker for implementation; and

WHEREAS, The guidelines of this resolution set forth the type of information to be distributed to the university community; and

WHEREAS, Due to the recent changes in budget allocation, the nature of these reports needs to be changed; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Budget Committee has recommended a less extensive budget reporting format; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached sample format for budget reporting (Attachment A) replace Report I (Attachment B) required by Resolution AS-394-92/BC.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Budget Committee
November 2, 1993
## Academic Affairs FY 94 Base Budget Calculations - FINAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Initial Base Budget from FY 93</th>
<th>Revised FY 94 Base Budget (1+2)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Permanent Budget Reduction as a % of Base</th>
<th>Final FY 94 Base Budget (3+5)</th>
<th>Salary Savings Obligation (approx 1.6%)</th>
<th>Campus Contingency Obligation (approx 1.2%)</th>
<th>Remaining Annuity Obligation</th>
<th>Supplimental Allocations (See Note)</th>
<th>Budget Available for Expenditure (7+8+9+10+11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>CAGR</td>
<td>10,873,000</td>
<td>1,232,000</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>(240,000)</td>
<td>10,878,800</td>
<td>(720,025)</td>
<td>(221)</td>
<td>78,869</td>
<td>10,568,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>6,816,000</td>
<td>6,948,700</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>(151,500)</td>
<td>6,797,200</td>
<td>(78,763)</td>
<td>(134)</td>
<td>41,016</td>
<td>6,650,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBUS</td>
<td>6,355,000</td>
<td>6,425,000</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>(140,000)</td>
<td>6,285,000</td>
<td>(100,264)</td>
<td>(37,471)</td>
<td>39,824</td>
<td>6,114,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>13,076,000</td>
<td>13,050,400</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>(284,500)</td>
<td>12,765,900</td>
<td>(203,652)</td>
<td>(113,749)</td>
<td>73,333</td>
<td>12,373,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>15,321,000</td>
<td>15,136,400</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>(337,500)</td>
<td>14,803,500</td>
<td>(241,486)</td>
<td>(70,762)</td>
<td>110,419</td>
<td>14,759,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>13,265,000</td>
<td>13,265,000</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>(289,000)</td>
<td>12,976,000</td>
<td>(207,004)</td>
<td>(150,399)</td>
<td>48,166</td>
<td>12,666,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCTE</td>
<td>1,924,000</td>
<td>1,831,500</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td>1,791,500</td>
<td>(28,579)</td>
<td>(20,764)</td>
<td>9,852</td>
<td>1,752,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>67,730,000</td>
<td>68,021,300</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>(1,482,500)</td>
<td>66,538,800</td>
<td>(771,222)</td>
<td>(222,277)</td>
<td>401,479</td>
<td>64,885,298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instructional Support

| Athletecs  | 1,232,000                      | 0                               | 1,232,000       | 0.00                                      | (54,000)                     | 1,178,000                               | (13,654)                                | (19,306)                         | 30,597                                | 1,156,845                                |
| Library    | 4,838,000                      | 0                               | 4,838,000       | 0.00                                      | 0                           | 4,838,000                               | (117,171)                               | (56,075)                         | 15,686                                | 4,680,440                                |
| ILE/SWS    | 72,000                        | 68,000                          | 140,000         | 0.00                                      | (3,000)                     | 137,000                                 | (2,186)                                 | (1,568)                          | 276                                   | 133,503                                  |
| AA Admin.  | 1,249,000                      | 22,500                          | 1,271,500       | 0.02                                      | (28,000)                    | 1,243,500                               | (19,837)                                | (14,413)                         | 5,517                                 | 1,214,767                                |
| AA Other   | 1,819,000                      | 479,400                         | 2,298,400       | 0.03                                      | (51,000)                    | 2,247,400                               | (35,852)                                | (26,049)                         | (109,206)                             | 2,076,293                                |
| Sub-Total  | 9,210,000                      | 569,900                         | 9,779,900       | 0.05                                      | (136,000)                   | 9,643,900                               | (193,859)                               | (19,306)                         | (57,130)                              | 9,261,847                                |
| AA Total   | 76,940,000                     | 881,200                         | 77,811,200      | 1.00                                      | (1,618,500)                 | 76,192,700                              | (1,255,321)                              | (883,000)                        | (241,583)                             | 344,349                                  | 74,147,145                                |

1. Initial budget based on actions taken during FY 93.
2. Required or negotiated changes to base budgets.
3. Sum of column 1 and column 2.
4. The percent of the total that each line represents.
5. Permanent budget reduction assessed to each unit.
6. Budget reduction as a percentage of the total in column 3.
7. Final FY 94 budget after permanent reduction (Column 3 minus column 5).
8. Salary savings obligation for each unit (based on approximately 1.6% of column 7).
9. Campus contingency obligation for each unit (based on approximately 1.2% of column 7).
10. Remaining annuity obligation each unit is responsible for FY 94.
11. Supplemental allocations include telephone, postage, faculty promotion costs, and department head/chair stipends.
12. Budget available for expenditure based on the final FY 94 budget minus the various obligations plus supplemental allocations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adopted:

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

AS- -93/
RESOLUTION ON
DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE FOR THE
ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Background statement: During the first program review process it was suggested to the Ornamental Horticulture Department that the department name was possibly out-of-date and no longer representative of the true nature of the industry or curriculum. Since that time the department has been discussing a name change in consultation with its industry advisory council, the Dean for the College of Agriculture, and other programs in the college. As a result of these discussions, the following recommendation is submitted.

WHEREAS, The term "environmental horticulture" has become the identifiable name of the industry that the Ornamental Horticulture Department serves; and

WHEREAS, What was once the Ornamental Horticulture industry in California has developed and matured into a 12 billion dollar environmental service industry which is a necessary part of the everyday life of many people; and

WHEREAS, Other Ornamental Horticulture departments in the country have adopted the term "environmental horticulture" to better identify the current direction of what is called the "Green Industry"; and

WHEREAS, The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language defines horticulture as "the science or art of cultivating plants"; and

WHEREAS, The professional society for horticulturists is the American Society for Horticultural Science (which is also a professional society for faculty in the Fruit Science, Crop Science, and Vegetable Science programs at Cal Poly); and

WHEREAS, The Ornamental Horticulture Department, with the enthusiastic concurrence of the industry it serves, feels that the name Environmental Horticultural Science more accurately reflects the nature of its program; and

WHEREAS, The request for this name change has been approved by the College of Agriculture Council and the Dean for the College of Agriculture; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the name of the Ornamental Horticulture Department be changed to the ENVIRONMENTAL HORTICULTURAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT.

Proposed by: The Ornamental Horticulture Department
December 7, 1993
To: Jack Wilson, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Robert D. Koob  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: DEPARTMENTAL NAME CHANGE REQUEST—ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE

Date: November 18, 1993
File No.:
Copies: Glenn Irvin  
Joseph Jen  
Steve Angley

Attached is a request from the Ornamental Horticulture Department to change their department name to "Environmental Horticultural Science". I would appreciate your having the Academic Senate review this matter and make a recommendation as soon as possible.

Thanks for your assistance in this matter.

Attachment.
TO: Dr. Robert D. Koob, Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Dr. Joseph J. Jen, Dean
College of Agriculture

cc: Mr. Steve Angley
Dr. Walter R. Mark

SUBJECT: ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE

The Ornamental Horticulture Department has requested that its name be changed from "Ornamental Horticulture" to "Environmental Horticultural Science." The rationale supporting this request is expressed in Steve Angley's memorandum dated November 3, 1993 (see attached).

The College of Agriculture Department Heads' Council is in full support of this department name change. We now submit this request to you for approval.

Attachment

Approved: __________________________
Robert D. Koob
November 3, 1993

TO: Joseph J. Jen, Dean
   College of Agriculture

FROM: Stephen F. Angley, Interim Department Head
      Ornamental Horticulture

SUBJECT: Department Name Change

At the request of and with the support of our Advisory Council and all faculty in the Ornamental Horticulture Department, we request that the Ornamental Horticulture Department name be changed to Environmental Horticultural Science. We would like this to occur as soon as possible.

We request the name change for the following reasons:

1. To clarify and reflect the department's association with industry, which has moved to the name environmental horticulture.

2. To promote our program better to students and constituents.

3. To promote the fact that our program is based strongly in the sciences, we feel it should be reflected in our name.

Attached is a copy of the name change proposal submitted by our department with our curriculum packet for 1994-96, which has been approved by the CAGR Curriculum Committee.

We are excited about the name change and feel it will make us more recognizable and feel strongly that it will greatly enhance our recruiting efforts.

Attachment
Department Name Change Proposal

ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE
To
ENVIRONMENTAL HORTICULTURAL SCIENCE

The department name change is planned in order to more correctly identify our department’s emphasis. The term environmental horticulture has become the identifiable name of the industry our department serves. What was once the Ornamental Horticulture industry has developed and matured into a major environmental service industry. It has become a necessary part of our everyday life and environment.

Our program is based strongly in the sciences, which should also be reflected in our name. We also feel it is appropriate, since many other department names contain the word science.

In addition, our Departmental Advisory Council strongly recommends our name change to Environmental Horticultural Science. They feel, as do we, that the new name will keep us current with the industry as it is today and will have an even greater impact in the future.

We would like this change to be effective as soon as possible.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the attached Draft Campus Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects.
To: Jack Wilson, Chair  
Academic Senate  

From: Robert D. Koob  
Vice President for Academic Affairs  

Subject: Draft Campus Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects  

Date: October 28, 1993  
File No.:  
Copies: Robert Gish  

Earlier this year, the Chancellor’s Office requested that each campus have in place a policy on the repatriation of Native American objects. With that directive, I asked Dr. Robert Gish, Director of Ethnic Studies, to investigate whether or not Cal Poly had an inventory of Native American skeletal materials and associated funerary objects, and to take the lead in developing a draft policy statement on this subject for the campus.

Enclosed is the draft policy developed by Dr. Gish, along with the background material from the Chancellor’s Office. I would appreciate your having the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate review this document this quarter. Questions can be answered by Dr. Gish. Thanks for your assistance in this matter.

Enclosures
August 21, 1993

TO: Robert Koob
FROM: Bob Gish
REF: Native American Burial Remains, Associated and Unassociated Funerary Objects, Sacred Objects and Cultural Patrimony. Cal Poly Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects
COPY: Bonnie Tuohy, Robert L. Hoover

In compliance with the request from Chancellor Munitz, here is the draft policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects here at Cal Poly, SLO. This policy is proposed in conjunction with the recommendations of Professor Robert L. Hoover, Social Science Department.

Since the request for me to investigate the status of such objects on our campus originated from you, and since this proposed policy would seem to need some formal institutional adoption or approval, I submit the attached policy proposal to you.

Please feel free to discuss this proposed policy with me and with Professor Hoover.

CHRONOLOGY: (November 1993 established as deadline by Chancellor’s office)

Feb. 1993 request to CSU presidents from Chancellor
March, 1993 request to Gish received to oversee Cal Poly policy
April 8, 1993 letter from Gish to Dean Helen Roberts stating no such objects held by Cal Poly
May 7, 1993 status report to VP Academic Affairs from Interim Senior Vice Chancellor
Aug. 20, 1993 Gish sends Cal Poly draft policy report to VP Koob
Policy on Native American Skeletal Materials and Associated Funerary Objects

It is the policy of the California State University system to make a sincere effort to be responsive to the concerns of Federally recognized Native American communities and at the same time exercise responsible stewardship of archaeological collections under their supervision. It is also CSU policy that each campus develop its own procedures in dealing with requests for the repatriation of human skeletal materials and associated funerary artifacts.

As a public university in the CSU system which receives Federal funds, it is important that Cal Poly adhere to all applicable Federal laws, such as the Native American Graves Protection Act of 1990. All applicable state and local laws should also be followed, insofar as they do not conflict with Federal laws.

As an academic institution, Cal Poly is committed to procedures for repatriation that require due process and protect the rights of all parties regarding this issue.

It is NOT the policy of Cal Poly to possess or maintain Native American human skeletal material from archaeological sources. Cal Poly does not possess, nor has it ever possessed any such material. Cal Poly does not anticipate obtaining or holding any such material in the future.

Cal Poly does not possess or has it ever possessed funerary artifacts from archaeological sources. Cal Poly does not have the storage facilities to house such collections in accordance with the standards set by the Secretary of the Interior.

Cal Poly maintains a small teaching collection of artifacts, most of them collected from the surface of the ground. This collection does not include any human skeletal material or funerary artifacts and, therefore, is not subject to consideration for repatriation. Should such an eventuality occur, the following procedure shall be followed in accordance with Public Resources code:

A. Cal Poly will conduct an inventory of all its anthropological resources (archaeological, ethnographic, and physical). The anthropology faculty shall be responsible for keeping this inventory current.

B. Requests for repatriation by Federally recognized Native American groups shall be submitted directly to the University Academic Vice President and Provost in documentary form. Such requests should include evidence of cultural affinity to the materials being claimed.
1. Requests will be considered first to determine whether the claim is being made for Native American skeletal materials and funerary artifacts. If the inventory indicates that they are not in this category, they will not be subject to repatriation.

2. If the items claimed do consist of Native American skeletal materials and associated funerary artifacts, a three-person faculty/administrative committee shall be convened, consisting of an archaeologist, a Native American, and a biologist or a physical anthropologist with knowledge of human anatomy. The committee will review the request.

   a. The committee shall make a determination for or against repatriation based solely on whether the claimant has provided reasonable documentary evidence of cultural affinity to the material requested, using the principle of legal rules of evidence. If such a case has been reasonably established, repatriation will occur as soon as possible at the convenience of the claimant.

   b. If there are conflicting claims, the campus committee shall determine which group has best established closest cultural affinity to the material claimed, based on the documentation and rules of evidence.
Memorandum

Date: February 10, 1993

To: Presidents

From: Barry Munitz, Chancellor

Subject: Native American Burial Remains, Associated and Unassociated Funerary Objects, Sacred Objects and Cultural Patrimony

In March of 1990, the CSU provided the California Native Heritage Commission with a preliminary report on the status of campus policy and inventories regarding Native American burial remains. Since then, Federal and State laws have been enacted that require all universities to 1) prepare an inventory of these items, 2) notify the most likely descendant groups, and 3) return the remains, funerary objects, and other sacred objects, if requested to do so. According to the Federal law, institutions must complete an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects by November of 1995, and must complete a summary of unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, and cultural patrimony by November of 1993. Definitions and requirements are contained in the attached copy of Public Law 101-601. Proposed Federal regulations are slated to appear in the Federal Register within the next few months.

Following enactment of the Federal law, the Chancellor delegated to the campus presidents the responsibility for developing and implementing campus policy regarding collections of Native American burial remains and grave artifacts, and for negotiation of agreements with Native American communities on repatriation of these remains and artifacts.

We are now in the process of bringing our 1990 report up to date to reflect current policy statements and the status of inventory and repatriation for each of the campuses. Without this information, it is difficult to evaluate our position in meeting the requirements of the Federal and State laws.

We therefore ask that you provide the following information for your campus:

1. Does your campus have any Native American burial remains or associated funerary objects? Does your campus have any unassociated funerary objects, sacred objects, or cultural patrimony?
2. Please submit a copy of your current campus policy regarding Native American burial remains and objects. If you have not yet developed a policy, please submit the timeline and expected date of completion for the policy.

   Note: A campus having no such items need not develop a policy, but should ensure that campus personnel comply fully with all relevant federal and state laws, including Public Resources Code 5097.98, in any new excavations or acquisitions.

3. What is the status of your campus inventory of these items? Please provide a brief description of the remains, artifacts, or collections that are included in your inventory. If the inventory is not complete, what is the timeline and expected completion date for the inventory?

4. Has your campus returned any human remains or objects to Native American communities? Please provide a brief description of the items, the name of the Native American community, and the date returned.

Send your response to the attention of Dr. Helen Roberts, State University Dean, Academic Affairs/Research and Development, CSU Office of the Chancellor, 400 Golden Shore, Suite 132, Long Beach, California 90802-4275, by April 1, 1993. Questions may be directed to Dr. Roberts at (310) 985-2607. For questions about the Federal law or to receive a copy of the proposed regulations, contact Dr. Tim McKeown, Archaeological Assistance Division, National Park Service, at (202) 343-1142. For questions about the California law or identification of California Indian descendant groups, contact Mr. Larry Myers, Executive Secretary of the California Native Heritage Commission at (916) 653-4082.


Distribution:

Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
Members, Native American Advisory Committee
Date: November 16, 1990

To: Presidents

From: Ellis E. McCune
Acting Chancellor

Subject: Native American Burial Remains and Associated Grave Artifacts

In September of 1989, the executive secretary of the California Native American Heritage Commission wrote to this office requesting information regarding CSU collections of Native American remains and associated grave artifacts and the status of our policy on this matter. We asked the vice presidents for academic affairs to provide this information for the campuses, and in March of 1990, we sent the attached status report to the Native American Heritage Commission.

There is existing federal legislation which requires the Smithsonian Institution to return Indian skeletal remains and burial artifacts to the most likely descendant group, and a second federal law has been introduced that would require all museums to return Indian remains, sacred and ceremonial objects, and religious objects to their groups of origin.

We have also been following Assembly Bill 2577 which passed the California Legislature this year but was vetoed by the Governor. AB 2577, introduced by Assembly Member Katz, would require public and private agencies and persons who possess Native American remains or associated grave artifacts to compile and forward to the Native American Heritage Commission a copy of their archaeological record or other specific information concerning the remains, and to return the remains to the most likely descendents if requested. The probability is that Assembly Member Katz will reintroduce this bill in the next session.

The California Native Heritage Commission is the legislatively established state agency responsible for identifying and inventorying sacred lands, burial sites, and sacred objects in order to preserve the cultural and religious heritage of California. The Native Heritage Commission's responsibilities and authority are described in Health and Safety Code 7050.5 and Public Resources Code 5097.94.
The President of each CSU campus is delegated the responsibility for developing and implementing campus policy regarding collections of Native American skeletal remains and associated grave artifacts. The campus president is also delegated the authority and responsibility for negotiation of agreements with Native American communities and the California Native American Heritage Commission regarding repatriation of campus collections of Native American skeletal remains and associated grave artifacts.

Many universities and museums across the country are developing policy and procedures for the repatriation of Native American remains. Stanford University has established a policy which has been provided as an example by the Native American Heritage Commission. CSU, Chico has just completed development of their university policy, and the University of California convened a committee which has studied the issues and made a series of recommendations to the President's Office. Although the Smithsonian Institution has not yet finalized its internal policy and procedures, the requirements of the federal legislation (attached) are very explicit.

We recommend that you take the following steps to ensure that your campus is in full compliance with state and federal law on this matter:

1. Consult with appropriate Native American communities and constituencies.

2. Develop and/or review campus policy regarding collections of Native American skeletal remains and associated grave artifacts.

3. Develop and/or review written procedures to guide campus and community groups in handling requests for repatriation of collections.

4. Communicate campus policy and procedures to the faculty, the community, and the California Native American Heritage Commission.

5. Continue inventory and analysis of Native American burial remains and associated grave artifacts as policy deliberations proceed.

A campus having no Native American burial remains or associated grave artifacts need not develop a policy or procedures, but should ensure that campus personnel comply fully with Public Resources Code 5097.98 in any new excavations or acquisitions.

Attached for your information are copies of: 1) the federal legislation requiring the Smithsonian Institution to repatriate Native American remains, 2) AB 2577, the Katz bill (as amended) which passed the California legislature before being vetoed by the Governor, 3) Stanford University's policy regarding repatriation, 4) CSU, Chico's policy regarding repatriation, 5) recommendations of the University of California committee, 6) status report submitted by CSU to the Native American Heritage Commission, 7) Health and Safety Code 7050 and 8) Public Resources Code 5097.

enclosures
WHEREAS, Cal Poly is one of four CSU universities funded on a year-round calendar thus an academic calendar needs to be designed for 12-month periods; and

WHEREAS, The proposed academic calendar consisting of three equal 15-week terms including final examinations meets all five criteria defined by interested parties; and

WHEREAS, *Carnegie unit time can be met by having 14 weeks of instruction with class times increased to 55-minutes each; and

WHEREAS, The results of a survey reported in April 1993, indicated that 60 percent of faculty wanted some changes in the calendaring system; and

WHEREAS, There are significant curriculum-related features:

1. A more flexible learning environment can be developed allowing for a higher level of evaluation and appreciation of knowledge;
2. The increased teaching periods and length of trimester will provide time for more continuity in teaching concepts and ideas, thus there will be less fragmentation of topics;
3. The increased teaching periods and length of trimester will provide more time for senior project which is especially valuable for empirical research and experimentation;
4. Fewer and longer courses will be taken by students which should provide for synthesis and application of subject matter which is beneficial to the learning process;
5. The proposal could facilitate curricular revisions which could address such problems as (a) general education and breadth content, structure, and scheduling [according to a recent survey, this is the most significant problem in the slow throughput at Cal Poly], (b) programs with low numbers of elective classes, (c) excessive overloading of required support and core classes, and (d) lack of adequate staffing; and

WHEREAS, There are significant features beneficial to students:

1. The proposal could facilitate easier articulation for transfer;
2. There will be fewer final examinations, registration, etc.;
3. The proposal will provide a longer period of time for new/transfer students to adjust to Cal Poly;
4. The proposal could facilitate easier coordination with school districts for student-teacher assignments;
5. There will be a greater period of time for students to regain studies in a class after an illness or personal problem;
6. There will be more time to form and develop student-teacher mentor relationships;
7. There will be more time to form and develop study and cooperative learning groups;
8. Finishing the first trimester of the year will provide for easier entrance into summer employment;
9. More meaningful midterm grades will be given;
10. There will be more time for participation in student/cultural affairs;
11. The extra time in class will allow for analysis and synthesis, not just knowledge gathering;
12. There will be more time to review class material;
13. There will be less pressure to choose research topic/term paper subjects in a hurried uninformed way;
14. There will be more time for substantive library and laboratory investigation;
15. In terms of proportion there will be less time spent in taking exams and more in learning;
16. There will be significant reduction in "red tape" concerning add, drop, schedules, grades, etc.;
17. Class content is the same in all three trimesters;
18. The summer trimester will be more efficient in as much as students will be able to earn a semester's worth of credit as opposed to the current practice where they earn a quarter's worth of credit;
19. This proposal provides for year-round operations allowing students to complete a full academic year of instruction in 33 weeks or less;
20. The proposal still allows students to qualify for full financial aid; and

WHEREAS, There are significant features beneficial to faculty:
1. The extended term length over quarters will provide faculty with more preparation time;
2. More preparation time may facilitate a greater variety of instructional methods and strategies;
3. The condensed teaching time may allow for more time for professional development activities;
4. The proposal would give faculty additional time to pursue research and/or other professional development activities;
5. The trimester calendar is more aligned to other colleges and universities thus more opportunities may be available for sabbaticals and collaborative research, etc.;
6. The increased length of the trimester will automatically increase the length of the most commonly used one-quarter sabbatical by four to six weeks;
7. There may be a reduction in stress brought on by the intensity and demands of the current quarter system;
8. All instructional terms are equal thus course outlines remain constant;
9. There will be more time available to get to know and mentor students;
10. There will be more time proportionately spent on teaching and less time on testing;
11. There will be more time to develop ideas in class and allow students to analyze and synthesize information;
12. This proposal provides for year-round operations allowing faculty to complete a full academic year of instruction in 33 weeks or less;
13. Faculty would teach two of the three trimesters;
14. Extra compensation will be paid to faculty who teach a third trimester;
15. Terms of equal duration will permit faculty to revise curriculum into a single new format;
16. Impact on labs will be minimal; and
WHEREAS, there are significant features beneficial to administration:
1. The proposal provides for three equal and well-defined instructional periods;
2. Experience at other universities indicates that there will be lower fixed overheads regarding registration, scheduling, academic records, etc.;
3. Unit values will be compatible with other institutions thus easing articulation and speed of throughput for transfers;
4. There will be more lead time which can provide for more current/updated schedules;
5. The proposal acknowledges the need of facilities management to maintain a two-week break period between terms in order to perform necessary maintenance on campus; and

WHEREAS, there are significant features which need to be assured prior to the beginning of the change process:
1. Adjustments will be made so that progress of current students will be maintained;
2. Monies will be available/obtained by the President to finance and support administrative and faculty time and hire external contractors to address the multitude of factors inherent in a change of calendar;
3. All significant parties will be involved in the planning of these changes (the committee has contacted many parties for their ideas and opinions);
4. Adequate time will be given to plan for and implement the myriad of changes (institutions who have changed their calendaring system indicate that at least three years are required to plan for the change); therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That appropriate actions be initiated immediately to facilitate implementation of a tri-term calendar no later than Fall Quarter, 1997.

[Carnegie unit: A quantification of student academic learning. 1 semester unit represents how much time a typical student is expected to devote to learning in 1 week of full-time undergraduate study (at least 40-45 hours including class time and preparation). Thus, a 6-week summer session might, if full-time, equate to 6 units. An alternative norm is 1 unit for 3 hours of student work per week (e.g., 1 hour of lecture and 2 hours of study or 3 hours of laboratory) for 10 weeks a quarter or 15 weeks a semester. A full-time undergraduate student program should normally be 14-16 units and, if full-time, no less than 12 units. (Western Association of Higher Education)]

Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
January 18, 1994