I. Minutes: Approval of the February 12, 1991 Academic Senate minutes (pp. 2-4).

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

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. CSEA Campus President
   G. ASI Representatives

IV. Consent Agenda:
   A. Resolution on Summer Meetings of the Academic Senate Executive Committee—DeMers, Chair of the Constitution & Bylaws Committee (p. 5).
   B. Resolution on Curriculum Committee Meetings—DeMers, Chair of the Constitution & Bylaws Committee (p. 6).

V. Business Item(s):
   B. Curriculum Proposal for M.S. Mechanical Engineering—Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading (p. 8).
   C. Curriculum Proposal for Dairy Products Technology Specialization, M.S. Agriculture—Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading (p. 9).
   D. Curriculum Proposal for Water Science Minor—Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading (p. 10).
   E. Resolution on GE&B Curriculum Substitution—Burgunder, Chair of the GE&B Committee, first reading (pp. 11-13).
   F. Resolution on Professional Consultative Services Representation in the Academic Senate—DeMers, Chair of the Constitution & Bylaws Committee, first reading (pp. 14-16).
   G. Resolution to Support the Academic Senate CSU Resolution on "CSU Policy on Non-Discrimination and ROTC Programs," first reading (pp. 17-19).
   H. Curriculum Proposal for Master of Business Administration Program, Program Philosophy and Objectives—Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading (pp. 20-24).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
WHEREAS, BYLAW V.A. of the Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws mandates that the Academic Senate Executive Committee hold regular monthly meetings during the summer; and

WHEREAS, There generally is not sufficient business to call monthly meetings; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That V.A. of the Academic Senate Bylaws be changed as follows:

V. SUMMER OPERATION

A. MEETINGS

During the summer quarter, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall hold regular monthly meetings meet as needed and shall act in place of the full Senate.

Proposed By: Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws Committee
February 19, 1991
WHEREAS,

Article VII.I.3.b. of the Academic Senate Bylaws currently states that the Curriculum Committee is to meet Tuesdays and Thursdays from 3-6pm to consider curriculum proposals; and

WHEREAS,

This day/time requirement poses an undue hardship for the committee since it requires that 11 individuals must schedule their classes around this 3-6pm time frame; and

WHEREAS,

More flexible wording would reduce this hardship; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Article III.I.3.b. of the Academic Senate Bylaws be changed as follows:

b. **Responsibilities**
   The Curriculum Committee shall be responsible for recommendations regarding academic master planning and curriculum. Members will be expected to meet quarterly as needed. Tuesdays and Thursdays from 3-6pm, during those months of winter and spring quarters that the committee is considering curriculum proposals. The chair shall be responsible for the coordination of the curriculum review with the Vice President for Academic Affairs' office.

Proposed By: The Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws Committee
February 19, 1991
CERTIFICATE FOR TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (TESL)

ENGLISH, SPEECH COMMUNICATION, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES DEPARTMENTS
School of Liberal Arts

Date: Jan. 14, 1991

1992-94 CATALOG PROPOSALS

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

I. CURRICULUM

Required Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 290</td>
<td>Introduction to Linguistics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 390</td>
<td>Modern English Grammar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ENGL 392</td>
<td>Topics in Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**ENGL 496</td>
<td>Introduction to Teaching English as a Second</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language/Dialect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***ENGL 497</td>
<td>Methods in Teaching English as a Second Language</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(with Practicum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC 316</td>
<td>Cross-Cultural Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 333</td>
<td>Language and Culture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Course title change from Contemporary Grammar and Composition.
** Course title will be changed to Theories of Second Language Acquisition if ENGL 497 is approved.
*** New course to be developed for certificate program.

II. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

The Curriculum Committee recommends this certificate program because we feel it meets a current and future educational need. Particular attention should be paid to future hiring in the area of linguistics.
M.S. in Mechanical Engineering

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
School of Engineering

Date: January 28, 1991

1992-94 CATALOG PROPOSALS

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

I. CURRICULUM

Core Courses
ME 599 Design Project (Thesis) (2)(2)(5) or
9 units of approved technical electives and
comprehensive exam
Approved courses chosen from MATH, STAT, or CSC (8)

Adviser approved Mechanical Engineering electives

ME 502 Stress Analysis (4)
ME 517 Advanced Vibrations (4)

ME 531 Acoustics and Noise Control (3)
ME 541 Advanced Thermodynamics (4)
ME 542 Dynamics & Thermodynamics of Compressible
Flow (4)

ME 551 Mechanical Systems Analysis (4)
ME 552 Conductive Heat Transfer (3)
ME 553 Convective Heat Transfer (3)
ME 554 Computational Heat Transfer (3)

Approved technical electives

II. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

M.S. in Mechanical Engineering

This submission is essentially a change in title and format from an M.S. in Engineering
with a Specialization in Mechanical Engineering to an M.S. in Mechanical Engineering.

A concern of the Curriculum Committee which applies to all graduate programs, not
just this one, is a guideline as to the size and scope of graduate programs at Cal Poly.
We are reviewing at least four graduate program proposals in this cycle and have
questioned the standards of “success” for graduate programs. It is the consensus of
our committee that a minimum “critical mass” is needed to sustain a program in terms of
the numbers of graduate students enrolled and the variety of courses offered.
Determining those numbers is not a function of our committee. However, in reviewing
proposals we have questioned the small numbers of students in existing programs as
well as the clientele in existing graduate courses offered in programs with a small
number of graduate students. We believe that this critical mass of students and courses
is necessary in order to maintain the quality of the graduate level of instruction and to
allow those students enough interactions with their peers, and challenges to their
intellects, so as to enhance their experiences. In other words, we know we offer
undergraduate programs of the highest quality when compared to other institutions.
Can we be sure that our graduate programs can say the same.
**DAIRY PRODUCTS TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIZATION, M.S. AGRICULTURE**

School of Agriculture

1992-94 CATALOG PROPOSALS

Date: May 10, 1990

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

I. CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Courses</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG 599 Thesis (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS 501 Scientific Investigation (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSN 581 Graduate Seminar (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required in the specialization</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPT 401 Physical and Chemical Properties of Dairy Products (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPT 402 Quality Assurance and Control of Dairy Products (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPT 433 Dairy Plant Management and Equipment (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPT 522 Bioseparation Processes in Dairy Product Technology (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restricted Electives</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400-500 level courses approved by the student's graduate committee. At least 8 units must be at the 500 level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

M.S. in Agriculture with a Specialization in Dairy Products Technology

It should be noted that no new courses are proposed for this degree program and that the physical facilities already exist and are currently under expansion.

The Curriculum Committee had some questions concerning an adequate number of available 500-level courses to complete this program. This issue has been addressed by the department.
**WATER SCIENCE MINOR**  
*School of Agriculture*

**1992-94 CATALOG PROPOSALS**

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

---

### I. CURRICULUM

**Base Core**
- AE 340 Irrigation Water Management (4)
- SS 121 Introductory Soil Science (4)
- NRM 408 Water Resource Law and Policy (3)

Select one emphasis area:  

**Irrigation Emphasis (13)**
- AE 131 Agricultural Surveying (2)
- AE 405 Fertigation (1)
- AE 435 Drainage (3)
- AE 440 Agricultural Irrigation Systems (4)
- AE 492 Pumps and Pump Drives (3)

**Watershed Management Emphasis (16)**
- FOR 440 Watershed Management (3)
- FOR 441 Forest and Range Hydrology (3)
- FOR 442 Watershed Protection (2)
- NRM 304 Ecology of Resource Areas (4)
- SS 440 Forest and Range Soils (4)

---

### II. COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Adopted:

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

AS- 91/
RESOLUTION ON
GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM SUBSTITUTION

WHEREAS, The General Education and Breadth (GE&B) curriculum at Cal Poly has been thoughtfully and comprehensively developed within the guidelines of EO 338 and EO 342; and

WHEREAS, Deviations from the GE&B program are sometimes necessitated on a case-by-case basis; and

WHEREAS, Substitutions for courses within the GE&B program should be allowed only if they are consistent with the spirit of the general education and breadth policy; and

WHEREAS, The faculty within the department offering a GE&B course has the greatest amount of expertise to evaluate the adequacy and consistency of a course requested to be substituted for that GE&B course; and

WHEREAS, A student's advisor best understands the student's particular circumstances leading to the GE&B curriculum substitution request; and

WHEREAS, The current form used for GE&B curriculum substitutions establishes a de facto policy which minimizes the input from the department offering the GE&B course requested for substitution; and

WHEREAS, The current form used for GE&B curriculum substitutions is overly confusing and burdensome for the student; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached form be used for all curriculum substitution petitions involving courses in the General Education and Breadth column.

Proposed by the Academic Senate General Education and Breadth Committee (8-0)
January 31, 1991
PETITION: SUBSTITUTION FOR COURSES IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION BREADTH COLUMN
See Reverse for Instructions on Use and Completion of Form

I REQUEST APPROVAL TO SUBSTITUTE:
COURSE PREFIX AND NO: ____________________ COURSE TITLE: ____________________ UNITS: ____________

TAKEN AT (OR TO BE TAKEN AT): __________________________ (Name of College or University)

FOR CAL POLY GENERAL EDUCATION BREADTH REQUIREMENT:
COURSE PREFIX AND NO: ____________________ COURSE TITLE: ____________________ UNITS: ____________

REASON FOR SUBSTITUTION:

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

HAS REPLACEMENT COURSE ALREADY BEEN COMPLETED? YES____ NO____
(Please attach course description if replacement course not taken at Cal Poly)

I ACKNOWLEDGE THAT APPROVAL MAY NOT ALTER PREREQUISITES FOR FUTURE COURSES IN MY MAJOR NOR CHANGE THE NUMBER OF UNITS REQUIRED FOR MY GRADUATION OR RESIDENCE.

Student's Signature ___________________ Date: ____________

OBTAIN SIGNATURES 1, 2 and 3 IN THE ORDER LISTED, AND THEN RETURN FORM TO THE EVALUATIONS OFFICE:
1. Evaluations Office, Administration Bldg. 218
   If this request is approved, will the student meet the General Education Breadth regulations as listed in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Does Not Meet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cal Poly catalog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Date: ____________

Comments:
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

2. I DO____DO NOT____RECOMMEND APPROVAL
   Department Chair of Department Offering General Education Breadth Course

3. I DO____DO NOT____RECOMMEND APPROVAL
   Student Advisor

I DO____DO NOT____APPROVE
   Vice President for Academic Affairs

Copies: Original-Records Office Copy-Student Copy-Major Department Copy- G.E. Department
SUBSTITUTION PETITION FOR COURSES IN THE
GENERAL EDUCATION BREADTH COLUMN

Explanation on Use of Form and Processing of Request

A. This form should be used to request substitution for only those Cal Poly courses listed in the General Education Breadth column of the curriculum sheet.

B. If the replacement course being used is not a Cal Poly course, attach a course description or outline to the request, if at all possible. The Cal Poly Library maintains a national catalog microfiche collection and has a microfiche reader-printer available.

C. After obtaining the form at the Records Office, Administration Bldg. room 222, please fill out the student portion (above the dotted line) and leave the form for action by the Evaluations Office in one of the following two ways:

1) Leave it at the Evaluations Office front desk, Administration Bldg. room 218, between 11 A.M. and 1 P.M.

2) Deposit it in the Records Office drop box from which it will be retrieved by Evaluations staff.

NOTE: In either of the above situations, the form may be picked up from the Evaluations Office starting the following workday between 11 A.M. and 1 P.M. Should this time frame be impossible for you, please contact the Evaluations Office by telephone, (805) 756-2396.

D. After the form is picked up from the Evaluations Office, obtain signatures 2 (Department Chair of Department Offering the GEB course) and 3 (student advisor). These signatures must be obtained in the order listed.

E. Return the form to the Evaluations Office between 11 A.M. and 1 P.M., or to the Records Office drop box any time.

F. Evaluations Office staff will forward the form to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs for final review.

G. When recommendation on the request is finalized, student and departmental copies will be distributed by the Evaluations Office.
Adopted:

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

Background Statement: Section III.1.b. of the Academic Senate Constitution identifies what members of Professional Consultative Services (PCS) shall be represented by the Academic Senate. This description is outdated and makes the selection of who is represented a somewhat arbitrary one. It is also difficult to determine if librarians constitute a separate constituency, in which case, librarians would vote for librarians and the remainder of PCS would vote for those other than librarians.

AS- -91/
RESOLUTION ON
PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES
REPRESENTATION IN THE ACADEMIC SENATE

WHEREAS, The current description of Professional Consultative Services (PCS) is outdated; and

WHEREAS, The current description makes the selection of PCS representation in the Academic Senate an arbitrary one; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Constitution is ambiguous relative to librarians being a separate constituency within PCS; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Article III.1.b. of the Academic Senate Constitution be changed as follows:

The following designated personnel in Professional Consultative Services (excepting directors) shall be represented in the Academic Senate by the formula of one senator per each fifteen members, or major fraction thereof. This formula is applied separately to each of the following two categories:

(1) Librarians and Audiovisual (class codes 2913, 2914, 2919, 2920, 2926, 2927); and
(2) Counselors, Physicians, and Student Affairs Officers; Student Services Professionals (SSP's) I-, II-, and III-academically related; SSP's III and IV; Cooperative Education lecturers; health educators; and physicians (class codes 2341, 2342, 2358, 3070, 3071, 3072, 3073, 3074, 3075, 3084, 3085, 3086, 3087, 3088, 3089, 7737, 7738, 7739, 7741, 7742, and 8147).

Proposed by the Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws Committee
February 19, 1991
State of California

Memorandum

To: Academic Senate

Date: January 31, 1991

File No.:

Copies:

From: Gerald DeMers, "
Chair, Constitution and Bylaws Committee

Subject: Professional Consultative Service Representation in the Academic Senate

The following information clarifies the reasoning for determining which class code designations were appropriate to Professional Consultative Services (PCS) for inclusion in Academic Senate representation:

Criteria: (1) advanced degree, (2) academic advising and/or counseling, (3) teaching assignments, and (4) maintenance of the traditional PCS categories—counselors, librarians, physicians, and SSP's.

Included in PCS:
counselors, librarians, SSP's I-, II-, and III-academically related, SSP's III, SSP's IV, Cooperative Education lecturers, health educators, and physicians (class codes 2341, 2342, 2358, 2913, 2914, 2919, 2920, 2926, 2927, 3070, 3071, 3072, 3073, 3074, 3075, 3084, 3085, 3086, 3087, 3088, 3089, 7737, 7738, 7739, 7741, 7742, and 8147).

The following designations were not considered appropriate for PCS inclusion for the following reasons:

Exclude from PCS:
veterinarians (contracted position), health recreation technicians (contracted position), SSP's I and II (only requires bachelor's degree or its equivalency), Extended Education specialists (only requires bachelor's degree or its equivalency), and placement interviewers (no degree requirements).

The remaining classifications reviewed were in the area of health services. The only positions which appeared appropriate for inclusion in PCS were physicians and health educators because they met the criteria noted above. The remaining categories were excluded because: (1) no educational requirements were required although a license is required; (2) individuals in these positions are not
involved with students academically; (3) they do not hold teaching assignments, and (4) they are not in a traditional PCS classification. These include lab technicians, health therapists, pharmacists, radiology technicians, sanitarians, nutritionists, clinical aids, and nurses.

Based on these criteria, the following resolution is respectfully submitted to the Academic Senate:
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, support Academic Senate CSU resolution AS-1939-90/AA on "CSU Policy on Non-Discrimination and ROTC Programs" (attached).

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Executive Committee
January 29, 1991
WHEREAS, Discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is a violation of basic human rights; and

WHEREAS, California State University campuses maintain relations and contracts with the United States Department of Defense whereby Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) programs are taught on various campuses; and

WHEREAS, The United States Department of Defense's policy and regulations exclude homosexuals from military ranks; and

WHEREAS, There is scholarly evidence that the policy of discrimination by the military on the basis of sexual orientation is a policy based on prejudice and is not beneficial to the national defense; and

WHEREAS, It is a violation of CSU policy for the CSU system, or any part of it, to discriminate in employment or access on the basis of sexual orientation; and

WHEREAS, The CSU makes vigorous efforts to create campus climates free of bigotry and prejudice; and

WHEREAS, The Department of Defense policy and practice of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation is inimical to the values of the university; and

WHEREAS, Allowing academic credit for ROTC courses and awarding faculty status to instructors who teach in these programs facilitates such discrimination by lending institutional support and respectability to the Department of Defense's policy of discrimination; and
WHEREAS, In May, 1990 the Academic Senate CSU called upon the Department of Defense to end its discriminatory policy based on sexual orientation (AS-1939-90/AA); and

WHEREAS, In May, 1990 the Academic Senate CSU urged the campus senates to consider action if the military's policy discrimination against homosexuals was not rescinded by January 1, 1991; and

WHEREAS, In June, 1990 the Chair of the Academic Senate CSU received a reply from a Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Department of Defense, which stated: "Accordingly, we [the Department of Defense] do not plan to reassess the Department's policy on homosexuality."; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the campus senates and campus presidents to enact the following policies:

(a) ROTC programs shall not be allowed to enroll any additional students;

(b) students already enrolled in ROTC programs be allowed to complete the program;

(c) all contracts with the United States military regarding the offering of ROTC programs at the University be terminated, not be renewed, or be allowed to expire;

and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to enact statewide procedures to ensure that its non-discrimination policy for all students, in all campus programs throughout the system, be observed; and be it further

RESOLVED: That should the Department of Defense alter its discriminatory policy regarding homosexuals, the Academic Senate CSU urge that campus policies regarding ROTC be modified accordingly.
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
Master of Business Administration Program
Program Philosophy and Objectives

The MBA program that is offered at Cal Poly is designed to prepare students to enter successful business management positions of high responsibility in all phases of business. The program is based on the recognition that future business leaders must function in an environment: (a) that is placing more importance on technology, (b) that is facing more globalization in markets and organizations, and (c) that is placing increasing importance on societal factors such as pollution, equal-rights, ethical behavior, and corporate citizenship.

Every effort is made to ensure that the Cal Poly MBA student is prepared for a productive and competitive future in a rapidly changing global business environment. The MBA program provides students with concepts and principles of business management which make rapid adjustments to new conditions possible. Ethical and international business issues are specifically addressed in many of the MBA courses. The first year of the MBA program offers students an integrated understanding of the concepts and tools of the various business disciplines and their application. The courses offered contain material that is commonly referred to as the core of business knowledge. This first year provides a collaborative learning environment in which future business managers can acquire basic knowledge and skills in all business disciplines.

The second year of the MBA program is structured on the belief that people learn best when their past experiences and training can be made an integral part of the learning process. A major feature of the second year of the program is flexibility which makes it possible to tailor the learning process to fit individual goals and needs. For this reason, the second year of the program consists primarily of elective courses. Various sequences of elective courses are offered to allow students to specialize in particular fields. Students are also permitted to develop their own sequence of elective courses. Second-year elective courses and sequences provide MBA students with the training that they will need to be competitive in the job market and to be successful in their careers. In this sense, the second-year offerings are driven by market forces. Elective course offerings are evaluated frequently to ensure that they are up to date and that they continue to meet the needs and demands of the MBA students and their future employers.

Cal Poly strives to have a student body that has a variety of undergraduate backgrounds and that reflects the diverse California population. Diversity in students enhances the MBA program by providing the opportunity to share ideas and values with others who approach issues differently. MBA students are currently entering the program from a broad range of undergraduate disciplines, many of the entering students already have other graduate degrees, and most have several years of work experience.

Because Cal Poly has strong and highly respected programs in agriculture and engineering, the School of Business is in a unique position to offer special programs to certain qualified students. One of the programs is the Agribusiness Specialization. The School of Business and the School of Agriculture jointly offer an elective Agribusiness Specialty within the MBA program. The second special program that is offered is a Engineering Management Joint Degree Program. This program is offered jointly by the School of Business and the School of Engineering and focuses on management of technology issues.
The MBA program provides an applied context in which students can acquire the necessary analytical, interpersonal and technical skills that prepares them for decision-making in all areas of business. An action-oriented approach to functional business understanding which emphasizes analysis, implementation, communication, and interpersonal skills is an integral part of the Cal Poly tradition of "learning by doing." This approach is one of the distinctive features of the MBA program at Cal Poly. Teaching methods used in the MBA program include lectures and seminars, case studies, field studies, computer laboratories and simulations, internships, co-ops, and independent work.

The primary learning objectives of the MBA program are: (a) to provide students with a broad-based understanding of fundamental concepts, principles, and practices in multiple business disciplines, (b) to instill in students an integrated understanding of business dynamics for effective responses to the changing global business environment, (c) to help the students acquire skills in formulating, analyzing, and implementing significant business decisions, and (d) to develop in students the skills that are necessary to work with other people in effective organizations in a changing global business environment. These objectives are meant to provide every student who completes the MBA program at Cal Poly with the knowledge and skills that are essential for them to perform effectively as business managers.
### First Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL</strong></td>
<td>GSB 511 Fin Actg</td>
<td>GSB 511 Fin Actg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 512 Fnd of Quant Anyl</td>
<td><strong>GSB 512 Quant Anyl</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 513 Org &amp; Mgmt</td>
<td>GSB 513 Org Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 514 Legal Asps of Mgt</td>
<td>GSB 514 Bus, Gvt &amp; Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WINTER</strong></td>
<td>GSB 521 Actg for Mgt Plng</td>
<td>GSB 521 Mgrl Actg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 522 Quant Bus Anyl I</td>
<td>GSB 522 Mgt Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 523 Mgrl Econ</td>
<td>GSB 523 Mgrl Econ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 524 Mktg Mgmt</td>
<td>GSB 524 Mktg Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
<td>GSB 531 Mgrl Finance</td>
<td>GSB 531 Mgrl Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 532 Quant Bus Anyl II</td>
<td>GSB 532 Inform Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 533 Agg Econ Anyl &amp; Pol</td>
<td>GSB 533 Agg Econ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 534 Operations Mgmt</td>
<td>GSB 534 Prod &amp; Oper Mgmt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL</strong></td>
<td>GSB 541 Org Behavior</td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 542 Mkt Research</td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 543 Info Systems</td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WINTER</strong></td>
<td>GSB 551 Mgt in Intl Env</td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 552 Fin Anyl &amp; Plng</td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
<td>GSB 561 Bus, Gvt &amp; Society</td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 562 Bus Strategy &amp; Pol</td>
<td>GSB 562 Bus Strategy &amp; Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
<td>GSB __ Elective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Students are encouraged to challenge first-year GSB courses based on their previous course work.

**Based on individual knowledge in quantitative analysis, the MBA Advisor might require that students take GSB 502, Foundations for Quantitative Analysis, as a prerequisite for GSB 512, Quantitative Analysis.

***During the second year, students must choose one of the following:

- GSB 578 Management in an International Environment (4)
- GSB 588 International Financial Management (4)
- MKTG 401 International Marketing (4)
- ECON 401 International Trade (4)
- BUS 490 Legal Environment of International Business (4)
- AGB 563 International Agriculture Trade and Market Development (4)

As a policy, MBA students will not be permitted to take more than two classes at the 400 level.
### CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

**MBA Program with Agribusiness Specialization Skeleton**

"Current" vs "Proposed"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year*</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL</strong></td>
<td>GSB 511 Fin Actg</td>
<td>GSB 511 Fin Actg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 512 Fnd of Quant Anyl</td>
<td><strong>GSB 512 Quant Anyl</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 513 Org &amp; Mgmt</td>
<td>GSB 513 Org Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGB 524 Agbus Mgrl Leadership</td>
<td>AGB 514 Agbus Mgrl Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WINTER</strong></td>
<td>GSB 521 Actg for Mgt Plng</td>
<td>GSB 521 Mgrl Actg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 522 Quant Bus Anyl I</td>
<td>GSB 522 Mgt Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 523 Mgrl Econ</td>
<td>GSB 523 Mgrl Econ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 524 Mktg Mgmt</td>
<td>GSB 524 Mktg Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
<td>GSB 531 Mgrl Finance</td>
<td>GSB 531 Mgrl Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 532 Quant Bus Anyl II</td>
<td>GSB 532 Inform Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 533 Agg Econ Anyl &amp; Pol</td>
<td>GSB 533 Agg Econ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGB 553 Ag Policy &amp; Prgm Anyl</td>
<td>GSB 534 Operations Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Second Year | | |
|-------------| | |
| **FALL**    | GSB 541 Org Behavior | GSB ___ Elective |
|             | GSB 542 Mkt Research | GSB ___ Elective |
|             | GSB 543 Info Systems | AGB 543 Ag Policy & Prgm Anyl |
|             | GSB 514 Legal Aspects | GSB 514 Bus, Gvt, & Society |
| **WINTER**  | AGB 554 Mgt Price Risk in Ag | AGB 554 Mgt Price Risk in Ag |
|             | GSB 552 Fin Anyl & Plng | AGB 539 Internship |
|             | AGB 539 Internship | AGB 555 Tech & Econ Chngs in Ag |
|             | AGB Elective | GSB ___ Elective |
| **SPRING**  | GSB 561 Bus, Gvt & Society | GSB 562 Bus Strategy & Pol |
|             | GSB 562 Bus Strategy & Pol | AGB 563 Intnl Ag Trade & Mkt Dev |
|             | GSB 534 Operations Management | GSB ___ Elective |
|             | AGB 563 Ag Trade & Mkt Dev | GSB ___ Elective |

*Students are encouraged to challenge first-year GSB courses based on their previous course work.*

**Based on individual knowledge in quantitative analysis, the MBA Advisor might require that students would take GSB 502, Foundations for Quantitative Analysis, as prerequisite for GSB 512, Quantitative Analysis.**

As a policy, MBA students will not be permitted to take more than two classes at the 400 level.
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
Joint Degree Curriculum for MBA/MS in Engineering with  
Specialization in Engineering Management  
"Current" vs "Proposed"

### First Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL</strong></td>
<td>GSB 511 Fin Actg</td>
<td>GSB 511 Fin Actg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 513 Org &amp; Mgmt</td>
<td>GSB 513 Org Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 514 Legal Aspects</td>
<td>GSB 514 Bus, Gvt &amp; Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Technical Elective</strong></td>
<td><strong>Technical Elective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WINTER</strong></td>
<td>GSB 521 Actg for Mgt Plng</td>
<td>GSB 521 Mgrl Actg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 523 Mgrl Econ</td>
<td>GSB 522 Mgrl Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 524 Mktg Mgmt</td>
<td>GSB 523 Mgrl Econ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IE 557 Tech Assessment &amp; Plng</td>
<td>IE 557 Tech Assessment &amp; Plng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
<td>GSB 531 Mgrl Finance</td>
<td>GSB 531 Mgrl Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 532 Quant Bus Anyl II</td>
<td>GSB 532 Inform Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 533 Agg Econ Anyl &amp; Pol</td>
<td>GSB 533 Agg Econ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 534 Operations Mgmt</td>
<td>GSB 534 Prod &amp; Oper Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMER</strong></td>
<td>GSB 598 Internship</td>
<td>GSB 598 Internship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second Year***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL</strong></td>
<td>GSB 541 Org Behavior</td>
<td><strong>GSB or Technical Elective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 542 Mkt Research</td>
<td>GSB Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 543 Info Systems</td>
<td><strong>Technical Elective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IE 545 Adv Topics in Simulation</td>
<td>IE 545 Adv Topics in Simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WINTER</strong></td>
<td>GSB 551 Mgt in Intl Env</td>
<td>GSB Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 552 Fin Anyl &amp; Plng</td>
<td>GSB 524 Mktg Mgmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IE 555 Computer-Integrated Mfg</td>
<td>IE 555 Computer-Integrated Mfg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IE 558 Engnr Decision Making</td>
<td>IE 558 Engnr Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
<td>GSB 561 Bus, Gvt &amp; Society</td>
<td>GSB Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB 562 Bus Strategy &amp; Pol</td>
<td>GSB 562 Bus Strategy &amp; Pol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IE 556 Technological Project Mgt</td>
<td>IE 556 Technological Prj Mgt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Technical Elective</strong></td>
<td><strong>Technical Elective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMER</strong>**</td>
<td>GSB Elective</td>
<td>GSB Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSB Elective</td>
<td>GSB Elective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SEE FOOTNOTES ON NEXT PAGE*
REVISIONS TO ACADEMIC SENATE CSU RESOLUTION
NO. AS-1980-91/AA

(see page 19, March 5, 1991 Academic Senate agenda)

Add as second Resolved clause:

That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, and the campus presidents to use the moral force of their office to cause the Congress to abandon the Department of Defense's discriminatory policy against homosexuals; and be it further

Change fourth Resolved clause to read:

That should the Department of Defense alter end its discriminatory policy regarding homosexuals, the Academic Senate CSU urge that campus policies regarding ROTC be modified accordingly.

Add Attachments 1 and 2 to resolution.
Gay GIs Told, Serve Now, Face Discharge Later

By WADE LAMBERT

Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

The first full-scale war to begin since the emergence of an active gay-rights movement is raising sensitive new issues for the military and for homosexuals facing service in the Persian Gulf. Gay veterans groups and gay-rights attorneys claim the military in recent weeks has relaxed its ban on homosexuals because of the war—but still plans to throw them out after the fighting is over.

Although the Pentagon insists that no change in policy has occurred, at least 11 gay and lesbian reservists across the country were cleared by their commanders to serve in the Persian Gulf after stating their sexual orientation, the lawyers and gay veterans said.

But these reservists, who informed their commanders that they are gay and want to serve in the Gulf, also were told that discharge proceedings will be begun against them after they return from the war, according to the lawyers. About half of the reservists have since been sent to the Persian Gulf, the lawyers said.

If the military is, indeed, allowing gays to serve during the war, those who return may be able to raise strong legal challenges to the military's longstanding policy of excluding them, some lawyers said.

The Pentagon bans from active duty and the reserves anyone who is homosexual. The ban applies to people who have engaged in homosexual conduct as well as to people who have homosexual desires. Although gay veterans in recent years have increasingly challenged the ban in court, it has been upheld. The military says the ban is necessary to maintain discipline and good morale among the troops, and that enlisted homosexuals are more susceptible to being blackmailed.

The issue surfaced anew during the past three weeks as gay groups began receiving calls from reservists. "Commanders in general have said, 'Well, it doesn't matter, you can go anyway,'" said Sandra Lowe, an attorney with Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, a national gay-rights legal group, which has represented gays challenging the military ban. "Now that there's a war on, they're willing to let people go over."

Gay-rights attorneys say the recent laxity of some commanders in allowing homosexuals to be sent to the Gulf resulted from the military's "stop loss" policy, which allows commanders to delay the discharge of people whose services are needed. But William Caldwell, a Pentagon spokesman, said the stop-loss policy "has nothing to do with gays being in, or with putting them out of, the military. . . . Manpower needs have nothing to do with retaining gays."

Mr. Caldwell said the decision to begin processing a gay-discharge case is left to the unit commander. Based on the situation, the unit commander can decide whether to begin discharge proceedings immediately or to wait, he said. Homosexuality "is incompatible with military service," the spokesman added.

In only one case has a gay soldier won reinstatement—openly gay Vietnam war- veteran Perry Watkins, of Tacoma, Wash., whom the Army ousted after 16 years of service. From the start of his enlistment, Mr. Watkins informed the military that he was gay. The Supreme Court last year stood up appeals court decision that the Army didn't have the right to discharge Mr. Watkins since it had repeatedly allowed him to re-enlist even though it knew he was gay.

The Watkins case, however, left the general ban intact and applied only to his specific circumstances, in which the appeals court found that the military's conduct was egregious.

Kate Dyer, an assistant to Gerry Studds, an openly gay Democratic U.S. congressman from Massachusetts, said she has looked into the recent case of Donna Lynn Jackson, a lesbian in the reserves at Fort Ord, Calif., who informed her commander that she was gay just days before her scheduled deployment. "Her commander interpreted stop-loss to apply to gay discharges," Ms. Dyer said. "He said he just didn't have time to deal with that, and they would take her with them."

When Ms. Jackson sought a promise from officials higher up that she wouldn't be discharged later, however, she was told that she would be kicked out after she returned from the Gulf, Ms. Dyer said.

After Ms. Jackson went public with her case, the military gave her an honorable discharge.

Gay GIs Told, Serve in Gulf Now, But Face Discharge After the War

The first full-scale war to begin since the emergence of an active gay-rights movement is raising sensitive new issues for the military and for homosexuals facing service in the Persian Gulf. Gay veterans groups and gay-rights attorneys claim the military in recent weeks has relaxed its ban on homosexuals because of the war—but still plans to throw them out after the fighting is over.

Although the Pentagon insists that no change in policy has occurred, at least 11 gay and lesbian reservists across the country were cleared by their commanders to serve in the Persian Gulf after stating their sexual orientation, the lawyers and gay veterans said.

But these reservists, who informed their commanders that they are gay and want to serve in the Gulf, also were told that discharge proceedings will be begun against them after they return from the war, according to the lawyers. About half of the reservists have since been sent to the Persian Gulf, the lawyers said.

If the military is, indeed, allowing gays to serve during the war, those who return may be able to raise strong legal challenges to the military's longstanding policy of excluding them, some lawyers said.

The Pentagon bans from active duty and the reserves anyone who is homosexual. The ban applies to people who have engaged in homosexual conduct as well as to people who have homosexual desires. Although gay veterans in recent years have increasingly challenged the ban in court, it has been upheld. The military says the ban is necessary to maintain discipline and good morale among the troops, and that enlisted homosexuals are more susceptible to being blackmailed.

The issue surfaced anew during the past three weeks as gay groups began receiving calls from reservists. "Commanders in general have said, 'Well, it doesn't matter, you can go anyway,'" said Sandra Lowe, an attorney with Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, a national gay-rights legal group, which has represented gays challenging the military ban. "Now that there's a war on, they're willing to let people go over."

Gay-rights attorneys say the recent laxity of some commanders in allowing homosexuals to be sent to the Gulf resulted from the military's "stop loss" policy, which allows commanders to delay the discharge of people whose services are needed. But William Caldwell, a Pentagon spokesman, said the stop-loss policy "has nothing to do with gays being in, or with putting them out of, the military. . . . Manpower needs have nothing to do with retaining gays."

Mr. Caldwell said the decision to begin processing a gay-discharge case is left to the unit commander. Based on the situation, the unit commander can decide whether to begin discharge proceedings immediately or to wait, he said. Homosexuality "is incompatible with military service," the spokesman added.

In only one case has a gay soldier won reinstatement—openly gay Vietnam war-veteran Perry Watkins, of Tacoma, Wash., whom the Army ousted after 16 years of service. From the start of his enlistment, Mr. Watkins informed the military that he was gay. The Supreme Court last year stood up appeals court decision that the Army didn't have the right to discharge Mr. Watkins since it had repeatedly allowed him to re-enlist even though it knew he was gay.

The Watkins case, however, left the general ban intact and applied only to his specific circumstances, in which the appeals court found that the military's conduct was egregious.

Kate Dyer, an assistant to Gerry Studds, an openly gay Democratic U.S. congressman from Massachusetts, said she has looked into the recent case of Donna Lynn Jackson, a lesbian in the reserves at Fort Ord, Calif., who informed her commander that she was gay just days before her scheduled deployment. "Her commander interpreted stop-loss to apply to gay discharges," Ms. Dyer said. "He said he just didn't have time to deal with that, and they would take her with them."

When Ms. Jackson sought a promise from officials higher up that she wouldn't be discharged later, however, she was told that she would be kicked out after she returned from the Gulf, Ms. Dyer said.

After Ms. Jackson went public with her case, the military gave her an honorable discharge.
Universities Protest ROTC Ban on Homosexuals

Two hundred students and faculty members met at a national conference on the campus of the University of Minneapolis in November to coordinate efforts to oppose what they view as discriminatory ROTC policies. Under current Department of Defense regulations, gay and lesbian students are not eligible to enroll in ROTC programs or apply for the substantial scholarships such programs provide. ROTC provides the military with about 70 percent of its officers.

Over one hundred universities and colleges currently have published rules that prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation. The conflict between campus rules and ROTC traditions has led faculty and administrations at several dozen institutions to protest DOD policy and to call for a change. In May, the heads of the leading higher education associations sent a joint letter to Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney urging him to reverse the defense department's policy of banning homosexuals from the military.

Faculties have voted to cancel contracts with ROTC at several institutions, including MIT, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of Minnesota. At others the faculty has developed less severe sanctions, including denial of credit for ROTC courses and of faculty status for ROTC instructors.

In Madison and Minneapolis, university presidents and boards of regents have lobbied Congress and the DOD for a change in policy. Both Harvard and Yale have decided not to revive campus ROTC programs, while MIT trustees agreed in November to phase out all ROTC classes by 1998 if there is no change.

University of Wisconsin Professor Michael Olneck (educational policy studies), who heads the university task force on discriminatory policies by the ROTC and is involved in national efforts by faculty to change the policy, says he discovered at the Minnesota conference that there are "many campuses where there's activity on this issue. Efforts are getting under way." He emphasizes that the faculty members' protest of ROTC policies is not an attack on the military per se. "The present policy is so offensive to the commitments of a university that people in the middle of the road, people on the left, on the right, they can all agree on this issue. It offends anyone who cares about civil rights."
Report to the Academic Senate

Tuesday, March 5th, 1991

We are all aware that next year's budget is bringing major problems to all campuses, and that discussions of how to handle the situation on this campus have been underway for some time. These problems are of mutual concern to the faculty and staff. Since the staff we represent are an integral part of the campus community it would appear only logical that their elected representatives be included in these deliberations which affect their livelihood, and indeed their very lives, as well as affecting the level of support provided to the academic programs on this campus. But, despite repeated requests to the Administration, we have been deliberately excluded.

As a result of this attitude, there have already been cases of Unfair Labor Practices reported to the union. Such as calling a meeting to ask the staff to "voluntarily" reduce their working hours and salaries.

We have requested that these infractions cease immediately, and called for a cooperative working relationship. Additionally, we continue to ask for Union representation on all relevant committees.

The staff and faculty have always worked together in support of our academic programs, it important that we continue to work together to ensure that there is no denigration of these programs.
Date: March 1, 1991
To: ACADEMIC SENATE
From: Perk Hardeman
Subject: Threat to Retirement Fund: Reduction of the State's Contribution by $156 million

The Governor plans to seek the introduction of legislation "...to increase the actuarily assumed yield on investments (YOI) from the current rate of 8.5 to 9.5 percent, and permanently change the amortization period for actuarial gains to five years. According to the Department of Finance, these two adjustments would reduce the State retirement contribution costs by approximately $156 million General Fund."

This reduction of employer contributions to the retirement fund is designed to help solve the State's deficit, but it is a serious threat to the retirement fund and to all present and future retirees. The intent is to conceal the reduction by assuming on paper that the yield on investments will be larger than it will probably be in actuality.

The PERS Board is apparently refusing to go along with this idea. In effect, it has been asked to "front" for the Governor and Legislature. The apparent next step will be legislation. Some years ago we beat back such legislation by flooding the Governor and members of the State Senate and Assembly with letters.

The Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association has already begun its letter-writing campaign. A similar campaign by the faculty will be of immeasurable help. Interested people should be encouraged to write the Governor and their legislators.

Letters should oppose either indirect (as above) or direct inroads on the retirement fund. Each letter writer should phrase the message in her or his own words. Form letters are less effective than those that have the appearance of individuality and spontaneity.

Impairing the retirement fund damages employee morale and future recruitment.

Even though legislation has not been introduced (to our knowledge), the intent has been stated and letters now may help to dissuade people from putting their names on such a bill.
I. Mission of the program.
   A. Describe your program.
   B. State the mission of your program and relate it to the Cal Poly Mission.
   C. Give the goals and objectives of your program and relate them to the goals and objectives of Cal Poly.

II. Program demand
   A. For each of the last five years, give the following data:
      1. Number of applicants, accommodated students and enrolled students; list as new freshmen, transfers and total
      2. Give the ratio of applicants to accommodated students
      3. Give the ratio of accommodated students to enrolled students
      4. Number of majors
      5. Number of graduates
   B. Explain any trends or anomalies seen in the data given above.
   C. What percent of your majors are graduating each year? Explain.

III. Program demand by all students
   A. For each of the last five years, give the following data: (List courses by mode and level)
      1. Number of courses offered (this means number of distinct courses).
      2. Number of students enrolled per course.
      3. Number of support courses (a support course is one in which the majority of the students in the course are nonmajors of the program).
      4. Number of students in support courses.
      5. Number of major courses (a major course is one which is not a support course).
      6. Number of students in major courses.
      7. Number of students in concentrations, minors or certificate programs.
   B. Explain any trends or anomalies seen in the data given above.
   C. What percent of your courses are major courses? Comment.

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

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

C. Describe the following features of your program:
   1. Uniqueness (particularly within the CSU system)
   2. Currency (In what ways does your program reflect current curricular trends?)
   3. Quality

D. Give a summary of student evaluations and other material that gives opinions of your curriculum.

V. Teaching Staff

A. List all teaching members of your program and give their qualifications. Classify as full time, part-time, graduate student and other.

B. Give the teaching load of all members of the teaching staff for the last five years; explain any trends or anomalies.

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

D. Discuss any trends in the professional activities of your teaching staff.

VI. Other staff

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

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

VII. Student/teacher ratios

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

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

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

VIII. Costs and Revenues of your program.
A. List for each of the last five years the following budgetary information:
   1. Personnel costs
   2. Operating expenses budget
   3. Equipment budget
   4. Travel and recruitment budget
   5. Any other significant program expenses (e.g. library, computer, audio visual, student assistance)

B. For each of the last five years give the total cost to the state of operating your program. If this total differs from the sum of the numbers given in A1 - A5 above, please explain.

C. Compute the total cost per student credit unit in the program and the total cost per graduate using the data given above.

D. List any facilities that are unique to your program.

E. List any nonstate revenues has your program produced in each of the last five years.

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

IX. Alumni data
   A. Give any data that you have on the employment and/or graduate school enrollment of the graduates of your program over the last several years.
   B. For each of the last five years list your graduates by ethnicity and gender.
   C. Give any data that you have that demonstrates a need for graduates of your program. Be as specific as you can.

X. Other Criteria
   A. Accreditation.
      1. What outside accreditation does your program have?
      2. If you don't have accreditation by recognized organization, please explain.

   B. For each of the last five years, list the ethnicity and gender of the students and personnel of your program. Explain any trends or anomalies in view of the Educational Equity Program of Cal Poly.

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

   D. Describe how your program interrelates with other programs at Cal Poly.
E. Describe the student advising and counselling services that your program offers.

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

XI. Summary

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

B. Give any other information that you feel helps describe the value of your program to Cal Poly.
1991-92 CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY BUDGET SHORTFALL

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of the California State University recognizes the dire financial situation facing the State of California for the 1991-92 fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, The state's fiscal problems have caused the Governor to propose a 1991-92 CSU budget approximately $400 million below that recommended by the CSU Trustees; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate CSU deplores the adverse consequences on educational quality and access caused by the severe and sudden budget reductions proposed for the California State University in 1991-92; and

WHEREAS, The CSU administration has presented the Academic Senate with a first draft of proposals to meet a projected budget shortfall of $400 million or more; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate CSU is deeply concerned with the negative impact that these budget cuts will have on the faculty, who are the core of the academy; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate CSU wishes to establish a set of principles to provide guidance and advice in dealing with any budget shortfalls; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge that support for the faculty in their mission of educating students be of paramount concern in determining budget priorities and that the following principles guide decision-making on any proposals to deal with inadequate CSU budget support:

1. Policy decisions should guide any budget cuts.

2. Predictable long-term and short-term consequences of budget cuts should be explicitly and openly considered.

3. Both the quality of education and access to that education are central priorities for the CSU, but quality must be maintained for access to have value.

4. CSU campuses should be permitted maximum flexibility using shared governance mechanisms in implementing any specific or unallocated cuts.
5. The quality and integrity of the instructional programs on campuses should be protected.

6. No permanent changes in the student faculty ratio should be mandated.

7. Budget decisions must protect the credibility and integrity of the CSU in recruiting and retaining faculty.

8. All programs administered by a campus should be subject to review and evaluation through mechanisms of shared governance and subject to adjustment by the campus;

and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU provide the following advice to the CSU administration and to the Board of Trustees on the CSU administration proposals presented:

1. The Academic Senate CSU accepts the framework of the proposals presented on 2/28/91 as a means of addressing the anticipated substantial budget shortfalls.

2. While recognizing the unfortunate need of an increase in student fees, the Senate takes no position on the appropriate level of fees to be implemented in 1991-92;

3. When reductions in staff and faculty positions are required, the campuses should bear the responsibility for fairly implementing the reductions in consonance with the principles enunciated in this resolution.

4. An exception should be obtained from the normal budget language requirement for payback when enrollment drops by more than two percent below budgeted enrollment; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge that the CSU Board of Trustees make all 1991-92 lottery funds available to the campuses to use in dealing with any 1991-92 unallocated reductions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge all those in the CSU community to join it in seeking state fiscal reform to prevent continued deterioration in, and to provide restoration of, educational quality and access provided by the CSU.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY - March 1, 1991
March 1, 1991

The California State University
1991/92 Budget (General Fund)

Board of Trustees Request (amended) $2,061,902,016
1991/92 Governor's Proposed Budget $1,659,427,000
Shortfall $ 402,475,016

I. Actions reflected in the 1991/92 Governor's Budget

$ (millions)

a. No funding for new programs or program improvements (Program Change Proposals) $ 35.4

b. No salary increases for faculty (4.1%) or staff (5.0%). Although the Trustees have made a commitment to pursue funding of the CPEC salary lag figure for faculty, it is prudent to plan the budget on the assumption that no increase will be provided. $ 88.8

c. No restoration of budget reduction associated with Section 3.80 of 1990/91 Budget Act. $ 30.2

d. Increase in State University fee ($156 for residents), tuition ($1210 for non-residents), and reimbursements. This represents a 20% increase in student fees over 1990/91 levels. $ 49.8

e. No recognition of program maintenance/improvement proposals (Instructional Equipment Replacement, -$12.5M; Computing Support, -$22.7M; Communications, -$7.1M; Enhanced staffing for off-campus centers, -$0.7M) $ 43.0

f. No recognition of inflation as reflected by price increases $ 10.0

SUBTOTAL $257.2M
II. Additional Actions Needed to Address the Shortfall

Several of the actions proposed for consideration will require adjustments in existing Board policies and/or bargaining agent contracts.

Also, items (d) and (e) are based on the premise of an early retirement incentive program. A request has been submitted to the Governor's staff for the issuance of an appropriate Executive Order authorizing such a program for the CSU.

a. Reduce instructional equipment replacement budget to a level about 40% of Trustee's request (based on approved formulas); $3.0

b. Make permanent reductions in the system's total non-faculty workforce of approximately 864 positions. Reduction to take place through a combination of early retirement, attrition, and layoffs as necessary. Special care will be exercised in administering these reductions to protect efforts to achieve a more diverse workforce and student body. $34.5

c. Reduce the cost of faculty positions through a combination of early retirement, attrition, and/or layoffs as necessary. We estimate that approximately 420 faculty positions will be vacated temporarily. The total savings will depend on the length of time the positions are kept vacant. The $4.4 million assumes that the vacated positions will be filled at entry levels beginning with the onset of the 1991/92 academic year. $4.4

d. Seek the agreement of the bargaining representatives for an 11 month deferral of merit salary adjustments for faculty, non-faculty, and administration. $21.0

e. Eliminate funding for sabbatical leave replacements. (229 positions) $9.0
f. Maintain campus student-faculty ratios at 1990/91 levels by suspending distribution of faculty positions generated by application of "mode/level" analysis. These positions (57.0 faculty and 15.9 related staff) would have enriched the student-faculty ratios on certain campuses. $2.6

g. Eliminate from the system budget faculty positions generated by enrollment increases (over 1990/91 levels) projected in amended 1991/92 Trustees budget. We estimate 330 faculty positions and approximately 12 department chair/associate dean positions will be reduced by this action. $15.1

h. Reduce programs in "systemwide provisions" that will have minimal effect on access. $2.5

i. Use of available unexpended balances from 1990/91. $2.0

j. Increase campus and system offices mandated savings targets (unallocated reductions). These savings can be achieved through further program reductions or discontinuations, further personnel cutbacks including additional layoffs, or use of lottery funds. Current savings requirements for the campuses and system offices are estimated at $106.1 million; the addition of $51.2 brings the total to $157.3 million. $51.2

**SUBTOTAL** $145.3M

**SHORTFALL** $402.5M

NOTE: The combined impact of the above reductions to the CSU budget will be to reduce significantly enrollments in 1991/92. Trustee policy as enunciated in Title 5, Section 40650 requires that admissions be limited to the number of students for whom facilities and staff are available. The Chancellor working with and through the Presidents will need to make sure that the provisions of this section and the enrollment priorities of the Legislature and the Trustees are adhered to while maximizing access to the CSU.
CFA/CSU TENTATIVE AGREEMENTS
February 15, 1991

* CFA and CSU have not yet signed the tentative agreements listed below, but they have been verbally agreed upon. Before the official CFA ratification process is begun, final signed drafts and contract language will be completed.

**SALARY**

1) It is agreed to modify the contract's interaction with the CPEC methodology so as to set the annual faculty pay raise at the level necessary to achieve the functional equivalent of the 75th percentile of CPEC comparative institutions (instead of the current median placement). The specific method of accomplishing this is to be determined.

2) It is agreed that in each year of the contract faculty raises will be the amount identified in 1) above and payable July 1 contingent upon state appropriation of new salary dollars to fund said raises. If insufficient funding is received to pay these raises, the Parties will meet and confer on the distribution of available funds.

3) It is agreed that CSU will pay 1991-92 faculty MSA's and will express said agreement in writing in the form of a non-contractual side letter. Further discussions between the Parties on the status of the 1991-92 CSU budget will consider the ultimate disposition of MSA's for 1991-92.

4) It is agreed that the hiatus in the operation of the MPPP will continue for the duration of the contract.

5) It is agreed that the Parties will work cooperatively in Sacramento to accomplish any changes of policy or statute which are necessary to allow the Parties to determine the expenditure of appropriated compensation dollars without outside interference.

**BENEFITS**

1) It is agreed that faculty will be provided with a disability income program at the same benefit level provided management effective July 1, 1991.

2) It is agreed that faculty will be provided with improved dental insurance benefits (PMI and Delta Dental) at the same level as those provided management effective July 1, 1991.

3) It is agreed that faculty will be provided with AD&D insurance at the same level provided management effective July 1, 1991.
4) Funding for the three new benefits will be subject to renegotiation at the conclusion of the contract.

5) It was agreed that faculty should be provided with improved employee assistance programs contingent upon the receipt of new funding from the State.

6) It was agreed that new employees should have access to an alternative to the PERS retirement program. To implement this program, a joint committee will be formed to handle such matters as establishment of bidding specifications, review of bids, and selection of carriers for the program.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT —

1) It is agreed that sabbatical leaves will be provided for all faculty as they become eligible (subject to normal proposal approval procedures);

2) It is agreed that current sabbatical leave replacement money (including the $1-million referenced in the present contract) will be made available for deficit reduction;

3) It is agreed that faculty remaining in a department will not be placed in an overload situation due to the granting of sabbatical leaves;

4) It is agreed that tuition remission will be provided for faculty, spouse, and dependents (tenure track, and temporaries with more than six years of service) on a space available basis, contingent on DOF agreement that such a program is cost free.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/NO DISCRIMINATION —

1) It is agreed that the Parties will establish a joint state committee to develop and assess AA plans and programs.

2) It is agreed that the MOU will contain a no discrimination clause enforceable through provisions of the contract grievance procedure.

3) It is agreed that a new affirmative action hiring and retention incentive program will be created and funded in the amount of up to $2-million per year. Under this program, the Administration upon recommendation of the department may offer non-tenured women, minority, and disabled faculty in under represented departments salary supplements (not attributable to the base) for the purpose of recruiting them to or retaining them in CSU employment. The supplements will be paid for a maximum of 6 years or until tenure is reached. The joint state committee will be provided with an annual accounting of the funds utilized under this program.
LECTURERS --

1) It is agreed that the Parties will continue discussions intended to design and implement a new system of lecturer employment in the CSU including both temporary and secure employment. A target date will be set for completion of talks.

2) It is agreed that incumbent lecturers with six or more years of CSU service by July 1, 1991 will be reappointed for the duration of the Agreement. The appointments will be for two years with the second year contingent upon a satisfactory evaluation pursuant to present contract procedures. The time base of this appointment will also be governed by current contract language. Should the need for layoffs arise among this group of faculty, Article 38 will be used.

WORKLOAD --

1) It is agreed that a joint committee to revise existing workload weighting formulae will be created. The first task of the committee will be to review formulae relating to supervision and work performed by faculty not affected by the workload reallocation process described below. The agreement of both CFA and CSU will be required before formula changes are made, and a target date will be set for the completion of this process.

2) It is agreed that faculty workload will be redefined to accomplished a one unit (on average per year) reduction of teaching load and a one unit (on average per year) increase in the instructionally-related load. This change will apply only to tenure track faculty whose current teaching load is measured through the use of all formulae except the "S" factors.

3) Campus implementation of reduced teaching will be handled by the traditional interaction of administration and faculty governance mechanisms utilizing the principle of equity to the degree possible.

4) It is agreed that librarian assignment language of the contract will be modified to require that the full range of such assignments be recognized in the librarian's scheduled work week.

5) The Parties will execute a side letter expressing their intention to continue the workload reallocation process into a third and fourth year culminating in a 9 WTU teaching load and a 6 WTU instructionally related load.

Duration --

1) It is agreed that a two year duration is appropriate.