The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the final report of the Task Force on Reorganization.

The meeting was called to order by Simmons at 3:15 p.m.

I. Announcements

Simmons reminded Senators that Uri Triesman will be on campus to talk on the faculty's role in promoting academic excellence in Math and Science courses. This lecture is co-sponsored by the Academic Senate.

II. Discussion Items

Report from the Task Force on Reorganization

Simmons introduced Fort to introduce the Task Force Report (TFR).

Fort indicated that the Task Force (TF) no longer exists and any changes that the Academic Senate deemed necessary should be directed to Baker.

Simmons told Senators that we are not able to amend the document before us but will be able to forward our comments and suggestions to Baker.

Lynn Jamieson, P.E., provided clarification on the role of Rec. Admin. as a major on the Cal Poly campus. Her comments paralleled a document that was given to all Senators. The report focused on four areas:

1. Academic focus of the program
2. Service to the University and Community
3. Reputation of the program in the industry
4. Accreditation and the status of the efforts to get accreditation for the Rec. Admin. program

Jamieson recommended that the Academic Senate not support the paragraph on page seven of the Report that deals with Rec. Admin.

Fairiani, L., Junior in Journalism, expressed her feelings that Journalism should remain in the School of CA&H. She questioned whether there were any real benefits to moving the program to the proposed School of Education and Applied Studies.

John Harris, NRM, pointed out what appears to be a change in the charge of the TF. Harris understood the original charge to be that of reorganization and not to propose program cuts. Harris questioned if the TF had exceeded its charge.

Morgantini, K., Senior, NRM, questioned phasing out the Environmental Services (ES) concentration. The student wanted to know what happens to the students that are presently enrolled in the ES concentration. The student suggested that ES remain a major and be housed along with the Forest Resources program.
Jim Railey, Dept. Head, P.E., spoke against the proposal to move Dance from P.E. to the Performing Arts. Railey pointed out that in the elementary schools and high schools Dance is taught by the P.E. teachers and if Dance is moved it would be difficult for the P.E. majors to get the Dance classes needed.

Kathy Ryan, Psychology, wanted to know what the distinction was between support areas and majors as they were addressed in the preamble of the TF report. How does one decide on when and if a support area becomes a major, and who makes those decisions?

Tom Fort responded to Ryan, indicating that one must consider what it will take to attract the best qualified faculty, what resources will be needed to set up a major, etc. Fort indicated that each situation must be made on a case-by-case basis.

Reg Gooden, Political Science, brought up the question about resource allocations as a result of reorganization. Will there be an effect on the enrollment quotas as a result of the proposed changes.

Fort in response to Gooden: said that as programs move the students and quotas will be moved with them.

Gooden: why reorganize? What is being gained by the proposed changes?

George Lewis, Math, said that moving Wildlife and Fisheries will put a strain on the Bio. Sci. Dept. The result will be a serious overstaffing problem.

Simmons in response to Lewis: It is his understanding that the admin. is prepared to support the department during the time it takes for the staffing and student numbers to balance.

Lloyd Lamouria, Ag. Engr., questioned if we are to act only on the TF report or if we are expected to also address the preamble of the report.

Fort in response to Lamouria: indicated that the preamble was his own thoughts and has not been voted on by the TF. The preamble was read and voted on by the TF.

Charlie Andrews, Accounting, asked if the preamble was approved by the TF. It not, it should be considered as a separate document.

Fort in response to Andrews: the preamble was not voted on by the TF, but again suggested we handle it as a package.

Les Bowker, Bio. Sci., asked if the TFR is accepted, how will it be implemented and what will the timetable be? How will the transfer of programs and resulting transfer of facilities be handled.

Barbara Weber, CD/HE, spoke in opposition to the TFR. She commented on the negative approach taken by the TF in their report on CD/HE. She feared this was the beginning of a slow process to eliminate the Home Ec. Dept. Statistics were provided as to the impact of the loss of Home Ec. to other departments on campus. Questioned why a successful program like Home Ec. should be singled out the TF.
Harris, NRM, was concerned about methodology. How does accreditation come into consideration for some programs and not considered in other cases. There appears to be some inconsistency in the amount of detail in which the TF reviewed each of the programs.

Susan Robbins, Journalism student, reported that the Student Council favored keeping Journ. in the School of CA&H.

Gooden, Pol. Sci, commented that the U.S. Constitution was considered as a whole with the preamble.

Fort said the preamble attempts to set a strategy or sharper focus for Cal Poly. Hopefully this will result in the campus being able to gain greater resources, more money, and more students.

There will be no changes that will affect programs that students are presently in at this time. Also, faculty should not expect positions to be lost due to any of the changes proposed.

Changes will always take place and we all realize that with any change there is normally a greater workload created in making those changes.

To accommodate the changes recommended a great number of resource questions will have to be answered. It is not expected that the time scale will be the same for all the changes proposed. Some changes will be easy and can be made very quickly, while other changes will require a greater period of time to bring about.

Concerning Journalism, this major covers a wide area of subjects and because of this broad application, it was felt that the major fit better into the new School of Education and Applied Studies.

As for the Environmental Services major, students who are currently enrolled will be allowed to complete their education under the curriculum they have enrolled in. ES could remain as a co-major with Forest Resources. There has been some consideration of blending the two concentrations.

As for Dance, all the people involved in teaching Dance would prefer to move to Performing Arts. The P.E. Dept. would prefer to keep Dance within their own program.

With the transfer of the Wildlife and Fisheries program to Bio. Sci., there will be a gradual change and there will be staffing support even with what will probably be an over-staffing situation.

With Home Economics, there have been efforts to get clarification on what is required by the accrediting body. Fort feels that accreditation will not be lost with the changes proposed. The proposed changes are not meant to eliminate faculty or programs. The TF felt there should be more focus in programs, in other words, avoid broad general programs.

Rec. Admin. was perceived by the TF as diffusing the focus of Cal Poly, but comments brought up by the faculty in Rec. Admin. warrant further consideration.

Relative to accreditation, it is important and we must consider the possible impact on accreditation of any actions that we take now and in the future.
Simmons: Materials on resource allocations will be circulated to all Senators. Also, the Executive Committee will attempt to develop a way to focus our debate for the second reading of this item. Simmons will attempt to get feedback from the faculty of departments that are being affected by the proposed reorganization.

Next meeting concerning reorganization will be on April 17, 1984 at 3:00 p.m. in UU 220.