

PLEASE NOTE THIS MEETING IS ON A THURSDAY IN UU 219

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

Academic Senate Executive Committee
Thursday, April 17, 1997
UU 219, 3:00-5:00pm

- I. Minutes: none.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Provost's Office:
 - D. Statewide Senators:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. Staff Council representative:
 - G. ASI representatives:
 - H. IACC representative:
 - I. Athletics Governing Board representative:
 - J. Other:
 - K. **John McCutcheon: report on Athletics (pp. 2-5).**
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Resolution to Approve Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program, AS-459-96/LRPC:** Executive Committee approval of revisions made to this document by the Budget Committee in response to President Baker's conditional approval of this resolution (pp. 6-14).

4:00 TIME CERTAIN

 - B. **Provost's recommendations for GEB Director and committee membership.**
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
 - Cornerstones Project.**
- VII. Adjournment:

M e m o r a n d u m**To:** Harvey Greenwald, Chair Academic Senate**Date:** March 7, 1997**From:** Thomas L. Zuur, Registrar
Office of Academic Records**Copies:** P. Zingg
E. Kennedy
J. McCutcheon
M. Wenzel
Allison Cone**Subject:** Report of Academic Probation Trends for Student Athletes - '97**Background**

In the Spring of '96, you requested information on the number of student athletes on academic probation. A copy of that initial report is attached. As a follow-up to that report, you requested a review be completed re: the status of our student athletes as of Spring 97.

Findings

- Whereas last year our largest outlier, the Men's Basketball program was reported at 53.3% (8 of 15) on Academic Probation (AP), that program currently stands at 20% (3 of 15).
- Men's Basketball has now dropped below Football (34.3%), Women's Soccer (25.9%), and Men's Soccer (25%) as the programs having the highest percentage of student athletes on AP.
- It is noteworthy, that Women's Soccer went from 2 of 30 students (6.7%) to 7 of 27 (25.9%).
- Also worthy of note, is Women's Volleyball with no students on academic probation.
- The men have an AP rate of 22.9% (70 of 306), and the women 13.3% (21 of 158).

Overall, 8 programs showed improvement while 5 now have more student athletes on AP. We had 96 out of 454 (21%) student athletes on AP in the first review; this year we show 91 of 464 (19.6%) on AP. Please see the attached sheet for specific program data.

If you have any questions about this report, please call me @ 6016 or email me @ TZUUR.

STUDENT ATHELETES ON ACADEMIC PROBATION 1996-97

SPORT (Men's)	TOTAL	ON AP	%	SPORT (Women's)	TOTAL	ON AP	%
Baseball	39	5	12.8%	Basketball	14	3	21.4%
Basketball	15	3	20%	Soccer	27	7	25.9%
Football	99	34	34.3%	Softball	17	1	5.8%
Soccer	28	7	25%	Swimming	32	3	9.3%
Swimming	23	3	13%	Tennis	13	2	15.3%
Tennis	11	2	18.1%	Track/Cross Country	41	5	12.1%
Track/Cross Country	60	11	18.3%	Volleyball	14	0	---
TOTAL	306	70	22.9%		158	21	13.3%
COMBINED TOTAL	464	91					

COMPARISONS BETWEEN 1995-96 WITH 1996/97

SPORT	TOTAL 95-96	TOTAL 96-97	ON AP 95-96	ON AP 96-97	% 95-96	% 96-97
Baseball (Men's)	40	39	6	5	15%	12.8%
Basketball (Mens')	15	15	8	3	53.33%	20%
Basketball (Women's)	12	14	2	3	16.67%	21.4%
Football	95	99	29	34	30.53%	34.3%
Soccer (Men's)	28	28	8	7	28.57%	25%
Soccer (Women's)	30	27	2	7	6.67%	25.9%
Swimming (Men's)	27	23	5	3	18.52%	13%
Swimming (Women's)	33	32	3	3	9.09%	9.3%
Tennis (Men's)	12	11	3	2	25%	18.1%
Tennis (Women's)	11	13	0	2	0%	15.3%
Track/Cross Country (Men's)	51	60	7	11	13.72%	18.3%
Track/Cross Country (Women's)	32	41	6	5	18.75%	12.1%
Softball (Women's)	20	17	4	1	20%	5.8%
Volleyball (Women's)	14	14	3	0	21.43%	0%

TO: Harvey Greenwald,
Academic Senate Chair

FROM: Thomas L. Zuur, Registrar

Date: May 3, 1996

Copies: Paul Zingg
Euel Kennedy
John McCutcheon

SUBJ: REPORT OF ACADEMIC PROBATION TRENDS OF STUDENT ATHLETES

Background

Because the official statistical reporting area, Institutional Studies, was not able to provide the information you needed at this time, a review of new students (first time freshmen and new transfers) was conducted by Academic Records to compare the university-wide academic probation rates with those of student athletes. For review purposes, Fall '95 (954) was used. Additionally, complete team rosters were reviewed to determine team AP rates. It should be noted that team rosters are subject to change throughout the quarter.

Findings

Cal Poly's new students (first time freshmen and transfers) had an academic probation (AP) rate following the Fall '95 term of 19%. Business was the low College at 13% and Agriculture, the high end at 24%. Total students involved were 3,911 with 778 being placed on AP at the end of the term (See Exhibit 1).

During this same term (954) we had 174 new student-athletes coded and of these, 42 were placed on AP at the end of the term (24%). Distribution by College ranged from a low of one (1) student (4%) in the College of Engineering to a high of 10 students (40%) in the College of Agriculture (See Exhibit 2).

Individual sport rosters for Fall '95 (these contain new as well as continuing students) were reviewed and have been provided. We find basketball at the high end with 53% followed by football, wrestling, and soccer at approximately 30% (See Exhibit 3).

We hope this provides the background you needed for your meeting. If you need additional information, please call me at 6016.

PRIVACY NOTATION: Please note that this report contains information that is student specific and that we consider confidential (Name, SSN, GPA). This information is provided because of your "need to know," and so you are aware of the specific details behind the summary data. The confidentiality of the "student specific" data must be maintained.

FALL 95 ATHLETES BY SPORT
ON ATHLETIC PROBATION

SPORT	TOTAL	ON AP	%
Men's Basketball	15	8	53.33%
Men's Football	95	29	30.53%
Men's Wrestling	34	10	29.41%
Men's Soccer	28	8	28.57%
Men's Tennis	12	3	25%
Women's Volleyball	14	3	21.43%
Women's Softball	20	4	20%
Women's Track/ Cross Country	32	6	18.75%
Men's Swimming	27	5	18.52%
Women's Basketball	12	2	16.67%
Men's Baseball	40	6	15%
Men's Track/ Cross Country	51	7	13.72%
Women's Swimming	33	3	9.09%
Women's Soccer	30	2	6.67%
Women's Tennis	11	0	0%

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

AS-459-96/LRPC
RESOLUTION TO
APPROVE POLICY AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR
DISCONTINUANCE OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program be forwarded to the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs for approval and implementation.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Long-
Range Planning Committee
February 15, 1996
Revised May 21, 1996

Revision of March 20, 1997
by the Academic Senate Budget and
Long-Range Planning Committee

POLICY AND REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR DISCONTINUANCE OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Many CSU campuses, including Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, may find it necessary to reduce faculty, support staff, and administrative positions due to enrollment declines or financial support reductions. ~~When financial support is reduced,~~ The discontinuance of programs or departments sometimes emerges as the alternative which does the least harm to the quality of remaining programs. Program and department discontinuance are valid ways of responding to reductions in resources; however, program discontinuance can and must be accomplished with minimal impact. Program discontinuance decisions must be made in a reasoned way which will minimize damage to the ~~institution~~ university and to the majority of their programs. ~~The process should be based on the fact that the university is a community with a responsibility for the well being and interest of students, faculty, staff, and alumni.~~

The following procedures have been developed in response to EP&R 79-10, January 26, 1979, Chancellor Dumke to Presidents, "Interim Policy for the Discontinuance of Academic Programs," and EP&R 80-45, June 12, 1980, Vice Chancellor Sheriffs to Presidents, "Clarification of Interim Policy for Discontinuance of Academic Programs." These documents outline general procedures for program discontinuance and request that campuses submit local discontinuance procedures.

I. PROCEDURES

A. Initiation of a discontinuance proposal

A proposal to discontinue an academic program will ordinarily be the result of regular program review but a request for ~~special review~~ ~~discontinuance~~ may be initiated at any time by any of the following:

- a majority of the tenured and tenure track faculty of the affected department(s)
- the dean of any of the colleges involved in the program
- the Provost for the university
- the President for the university

~~The proposal shall clearly indicate that the proposed discontinuance is to be permanent.~~ The proposal shall be submitted to the Provost for review.

B. Review of a discontinuance proposal

The Provost will review the proposal for discontinuance and ~~accept or reject the proposal~~ ~~either reject the proposal or begin the discontinuance process within three calendar weeks.~~ ~~If the request for review is approved~~ If the discontinuance procedure is to begin, a discontinuance review committee will be appointed within the next three calendar weeks ~~after approval~~, to conduct a review in accordance with the procedures outlined in this document and make recommendations to the Provost as required by the CSU Chancellor's Office.

C. Appointment of a discontinuance review committee

The discontinuance review committee will consist of two groups ~~appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Senate.~~

The first group will include ~~six persons (one nonvoting)~~:

1. a nonvoting representative from the Academic Programs office (~~nonvoting~~), nominated by the Provost;
2. two ~~members of the deans Council~~ representing colleges not involved in the program and nominated by the Chair of the Academic Senate;
3. one student not involved in the program, nominated by the ASI President;
4. two faculty representatives from colleges not involved in the program, nominated by the Chair of the Academic Senate; and
5. a staff representative not involved in the program, nominated by the Provost.

The second group will include ~~at least five persons~~:

1. the dean(s) of the college(s) involved in the program [or a representative nominated by the deans(s)];
2. the chairs/heads of departments or the coordinators of areas involved in the program;
3. one student involved in the program, nominated by the ASI President;
4. faculty representatives involved in the program nominated by the tenured and tenure track faculty involved in the program ~~There will be at least one faculty from each program involved if there is more than one program being reviewed~~;
5. a staff representative involved in the program, nominated by the chairs/heads of departments or the coordinators of areas involved in the program;
6. at least one graduate of the program nominated by the faculty involved in the program.

D. Recommendations from the discontinuance review committee

The ultimate decision to discontinue a program rests with the Chancellor's Office. The purpose of the discontinuance review committee is to create a report for the President and Provost on the ~~merits or lack of merit~~ strengths and weaknesses of the program under review. If there is no opposition to the proposed discontinuance within the committee, the proposal will be forwarded to the Provost, with a report indicating that there is no opposition. If any of the committee members oppose the discontinuance, the discontinuance review committee will generate a report, using the following two step process.

In the first step, each group will elect its own chair and create a document describing the strengths and weaknesses of the program under review, and a justification of why the program should or should not be ~~terminated discontinued~~. The documents must be generated within sixteen weeks after the committee has been appointed. The merits of the program shall be assessed using the elements described in Sections II and III below, and in the Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines. If appropriate, the documents shall include what remedies could be taken to address weaknesses, including a precise statement of goals and a time table to reach those goals.

The chair of each group shall make ~~the its~~ document available to ~~all faculty the Cal Poly faculty~~ members ~~community~~ for comments for four weeks. A written request for comments must be sent to all the faculty and staff directly affected by the potential discontinuance at the start of the period for comments. ~~The two groups will review the comments and revise their document as appropriate.~~

In the second step, immediately following the four weeks of comments, the two groups will exchange documents and provide a written critique of the arguments presented in the document from the other group within six weeks.

The two groups will then ~~each select five voting representatives who will then merge into a single group, with the nonvoting representative from the Academic Programs office as chair. Within four weeks, the group will elect a chair and jointly~~ discuss and amend the documents produced. The final version of the two analyses, with the ~~comments from the other groups critiques of the arguments presented~~, and with all the information deemed relevant, shall be bound in a single document (which,

at this point, should have a format similar to what is produced by the state analyst to assist voters). A tally of how many ~~committee members~~ voting representatives are in favor or against discontinuance shall be part of the final document sent to the Provost, the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate for their review and recommendation.

E. Final decision on discontinuance of the program

The Provost, the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate will forward their recommendations to the President within six weeks, and the President will make the final recommendation to the Chancellor's Office.

II. CONSIDERATIONS IN PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE REVIEW

Considerations for program discontinuance will be similar to those for initiation of new programs. In addition to the program review criteria, the elements that will be considered in a final recommendation must also include, but will not be limited to:

1. the university Strategic Plan and Mission statement;
2. the effectiveness of the program ~~to meet the identified needs~~ in meeting its goals and objectives;
3. ~~The existence of programs within the CSU which could enroll students in this program~~ a three-year history of student enrollment, a projection of future student enrollment, and the existence of similar programs within the CSU;
4. a three-year history of the student-faculty ratio, and the total cost per FTEF and per FTES for the program at Cal Poly and at other institutions offering comparable similar programs;
5. the effects of enrollment shifts changes on other instructional areas at Cal Poly;
6. the current or expected statewide or regional demand for graduates of the program;
7. the contributions of the program to the general education and breadth of students;
8. the effects of discontinuance on facilities,
9. the financial effects of discontinuance, including an estimate of the yearly costs or savings for the three years following discontinuance;
10. the effects on faculty and staff, including a description of what career opportunities within the CSU ~~will offer them: agreements to transfer to other departments or to may be available; i.e., opportunities for temporary or permanent appointments at Cal Poly or visiting appointments in other branches of the CSU, retraining, etc.;~~
11. the impact of discontinuance on student demand.

III. INFORMATION FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE REVIEW

The information considered during the evaluation of an academic program for discontinuance will contain all the information that is needed for the creation of a new program. In addition, the information will include but will not be limited to:

- A. The most recently completed Review of Existing Degree Programs with current statistical update;
- B. The most recent accreditation report, if a program is accredited or approved. If the accreditation is over six years old, or if there is no accrediting body for the program; a review of the program by a panel of professionals ~~outside the CSU with no contractual association with Cal Poly~~ can be substituted for the accreditation report, provided the review has been completed within the last six years ~~The review shall contain all the elements included in an accreditation report;~~

- C. If not contained in A or B:
 - 1. FTEF required each quarter for the past three years
 - 2. special resources and facilities required
 - 3. number of students expected to graduate in each of the next three years;
- D. Conclusions and recommendations of the project team on Academic Programs, contained in the most recent edition of Academic Program and Resource Planning in The California State University.

TIME TABLE FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE

Initial step

- 1. Proposal to discontinue an academic program received by the Provost.

Three calendar weeks after receipt of the proposal

- 2. The Provost accepts or rejects the proposal.

Three calendar weeks after acceptance of the proposal

- 3. Discontinuance review committee appointed.

Within sixteen weeks after appointment of the discontinuance review committee

- 4. Initial report: Each of the two groups from the ~~program~~ discontinuance ~~review~~ committee produce their report and exchange it for the report from the other group.

Within four weeks after the initial reports have been exchanged

- 5. Period of comments: Each of the two groups from the ~~program~~ discontinuance ~~review~~ committee solicit comments on the reports from the university at large.

Within six weeks after the end of the period of comments

- 6. Critique of the initial reports: Each of the two groups from the ~~program~~ discontinuance ~~review~~ committee produce a critique of the findings produced by the other group.

Within four weeks after the critique of reports have been produced

- 7. Final report: The two groups from the ~~program~~ discontinuance ~~review~~ committee jointly discuss and amend, if necessary, the final document and send it to the Provost, the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate.

Within four weeks after the critique of reports have been sent

- 8. Recommendations: The Provost, the Academic Deans' Council, and the Academic Senate make recommendations to the President.

NOTE: A calendar week is five working days. Calendar weeks exclude summer ~~breaks~~ ~~quarter~~ and the breaks between quarters.

TIME TABLE FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE (in weeks)

Activity	Duration (Weeks)
Initiation of the proposal	1
Review by the Vice President for Academic Affairs	3
Appointment of the committee	3
First step of the review	16
Period of comments	4
Second step of the review	6
Final document drafted	4
Review by upper levels	6
Final comments to the President	1
Total time	42 weeks

CCT 9 1996


Memorandum

To: Harvey Greenwald, Chair
Academic Senate

Academic Senate

Date: September 23, 1996

From:


Warren J. Baker
President

Copies:

Paul J. Zingg
Glenn W. Irvin
Michael Suess
Carlos Cordova

Subject: Initial Response to AS-459-96/LRPC, Resolution to
Approve Policy and Review Procedures for
Discontinuance of an Academic Program

This is in response to the above subject Academic Senate resolution. The following are a number of initial observations of this Resolution. However, based upon the complexities involved, further administrative review by the Academic Deans' Council, Faculty Affairs, and University Legal Counsel must be conducted. This review will begin this Fall Quarter.

General Comments:

Throughout the document, references to the Vice President for Academic Affairs should be revised to refer to the Chief Academic Officer.

References to "school" should be revised to refer to colleges or other appropriate units.

Department "heads" should be revised to "chairs/heads."

The process and information required by this policy should be consistent with the resolutions on external program review, the information required for program and course proposals, and the requirements of the Program Review and Improvement Committee.

Specific Comments:

Opening paragraph, sentence 2: as proposed, there is only one condition for discontinuance--reduction of financial support. There could be others, some of them voluntary, such as loss of student enrollments. As an example, in the past, this policy was used to discontinue the master's degree in Chemistry at the request of the Department.

I. Procedures

- A. Initiation of a discontinuance proposal. This section states that a proposal to discontinue an academic program will ordinarily be the result of a regular program review. However, the opening paragraphs propose that discontinuance will occur only when there is a reduction of financial support.

The first bulleted item differentiates programs and departments, and requires a vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in those departments to instigate a special review. This may result in procedural difficulties if a program includes more than one department.

- B. "will review the proposal for discontinuance" revise to "will review the proposal for special review."
- C. The first group: 2: Two members of the Deans Council. The Deans Council's membership includes individuals who are not college deans. If the membership of this committee is intended to include college deans specifically, then please revise accordingly.

The second group: "Faculty representatives involved in the program,"--something has been omitted from this statement. Should it be item 4?

Last sentence in this section: revise to read: "There will be at least one faculty member from each program involved if more than one program is being reviewed." However, this requirement could make the memberships of these committees very complex. It is not merely a case of adding faculty members, but affects Items 1, 2, and 3 as well if the programs include more than one department and college.

- D. Recommendations from the committee:

First sentence: "merits or lack of merit," revised to "strengths and weaknesses."

Paragraph 2, sentence 1: "terminated," revise to "discontinued."

Paragraph 3: it is not clear who "all faculty members" in Sentence One refers to--all faculty members on the committees? Or in the affected programs/departments? Or in the University? Item 5 of the timetable suggests this may be all faculty members in the University.

Last paragraph in item D:

Sentence 1: the "eleven members" could be considerably larger given the conditions for membership set forth in Item C.

Sentence 2: it is not clear who the "other groups" are.

Reference to the document produced by the State Analyst: this is desirable, but perhaps not achievable. The State Analyst is a disinterested party; the document called for in this paragraph will not be produced by disinterested parties.

The process set forth in this paragraph may be workable, but it is not certain that the two groups can produce the report called for, or that it would not result in unnecessary bitterness and acrimony that could be avoided by having the two reports forwarded to the Chief Academic Officer, who will then have them reviewed according to the proposed procedure.

II. Considerations in Program Discontinuance Review

Item 2: "program to meet the identified needs," revise to: "program in meeting its goals and objectives."

Item 4: FTEF and FTES data from comparable programs in other institutions might be difficult to obtain. Further, it might be problematic if the programs are not identical.

Item 5: "sifts," revise to "changes."

III. Information for Program Discontinuance Review

B. Sentence 1, revise to: "The most recent report of external review, if a program is accredited or approved."

A "panel of professionals outside the CSU." This condition needs to be consistent with the requirements for external program review, which may include reviewers from CSU institutions.

1. FTEF "required." It is not clear what "required" means in this context.

Time Table for Program Discontinuance

Item 6: "produce a critique of the arguments," revise to "produces a critique of the findings."

Item 8: as the title to the items suggests, the Academic Senate would make "recommendations" to the President, not "a recommendation.."

I would appreciate the Senate's review and comments to the above suggestions.

Final Sec 4/17/97

	<u>1996</u>		<u>1997</u>	
Total Student-Athletes	454		464	
			142	30.6% 3.0 or better 8 had 4.0
Student Athletes on AP After Winter Quarter	96	21.114%	91	19.61%
Student Athletes no longer on AP By Fall Quarter	66	68.75% AP Group		

As of the beginning of Fall Quarter, of the 30 still on AP

- 4 Had a 1 quarter deficiency but overall GPA and Cal Poly GPA was over a 2.0 and they were cleared for competition by Faculty Athletic Rep.
- 5 Were ineligible for Fall quarter but came off AP after Fall quarter and became eligible.
- 1 Came off AP after Winter quarter and became eligible.
- 3 Are continuing students who remain on AP and ineligible
- 17 Left school, but had they remained, would have been ineligible.

1996 Grad Rate for Freshmen Entering in 1990-91

- 56% of all students graduated in 6 years
Comparable number for scholarship student athletes is also 56%
- Of those scholarship student-athletes who complete their 4th year of eligibility at Cal Poly, 84% ultimately graduate from Cal Poly.

Minutes - Exec 4.17.97

4.16.97

**Academic Senate Executive Committee
Ballot Results for GEB Director**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Dept</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>	<u>Not Acceptable</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
<u>CAGR</u> John Harris	NRM	11	1	1
<u>CAED</u> none				
<u>CBUS</u> Dan Williamson	Economics	10	2	1
<u>CENG</u> Ron Mussulman	MechEngr	11	0	2
<u>CLA</u> John Harrington	English	12	0	1
Mike Wenzl	English	4	7	2
<u>CSM</u> Ralph Jacobson	Chemistry	7	4	2
Bob Smidt	Statistics	10	3	0

4.16.97

**Academic Senate Executive Committee
Ballot Results for GEB Committee**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Dept</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>	<u>Not Acceptable</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
<u>CAGR</u>				
John Harris	NRM	12	1	0
Steve Kaminaka	AgEngr	10	1	2
Joe Montecalvo	FdSci	3	6	4
Tim O'Keefe	NRM	2	8	3
Rob Rutherford	AniSci	9	2	2
James Vilkitis	NRM	9	2	2
<u>CAED</u>				
Walt Tryon	LandArch	9	4	0
Matt Wall	ConstMgt	7	4	2
Chris Yip	Arch	2	7	4
<u>CBUS</u>				
Dan Bertozzi	GISt&Law	13	0	0
Dan Williamson	Economics	11	1	1
<u>CENG</u>				
Russ Cummings	AeroEngr	12	0	1
Shan Somayaji	C&EEngr	9	1	3
<u>CLA</u>				
Linda Bomstad	Philosophy	10	1	2
Reg Gooden	PoliSci	8	4	1
Barbara Mori	SocSci	10	1	2
Bill Preston	SocSci	2	6	5
Tal Scriven	Philosophy	7	5	1
Debra Valencia-Laver	Psyc&HD	12	1	0
Mike Wenzl	English	5	7	1
<u>CSM</u>				
Ralph Jacobson	Chemistry	12	0	1
George Lewis	Math	6	7	0
Bob Smidt	Statistics	13	0	0

C O N G R A T U L A T I O N S M U S T A N G S !

1997 WINTER QUARTER GRADE POINT AVERAGES

BASEBALL

3.519 Maier, Taber
3.482 Bland, Michael
3.363 Elam, Matthew
3.349 Brady, Matthew
3.332 Novi, Jason
3.281 Dolan, Kenneth
3.250 Henry, Troy
3.214 Osorio, Bryan
3.024 Rohlmeier, Steven
3.024 Melnick, Matthew
3.017 Kopecky, Michael

WOMEN'S BASKETBALL

3.666 Carmola, Megan
3.500 Oaks, Tracie
3.189 Osorio, Stephanie
3.099 Maristela, Jacqueline
3.000 Bevien, Rona

MEN'S BASKETBALL

3.307 Bryden, William
3.092 Antonioni, Brad
3.000 Fleming, Steve

FOOTBALL

3.907 Oliver, Matthew
3.849 Nowakowski, Maciej
3.777 Clark, Ernest
3.676 Sverchek, Andrew
3.644 Casner, Steven
3.566 Jones, Terrell
3.549 Renfro, Todd
3.372 Parker, Gary
3.353 Winter, Ben
3.332 Madonna, Mark
3.332 Lichtenberger, Doug
3.281 Henry, Chad
3.279 Beilke, Alan
3.270 Irving, Charles
3.250 Knowles, Brad
3.250 Henry, Troy
3.232 Murkey, Kevin
3.217 Agnitsch, Trevor
3.192 Clarin, Jeffrey
3.179 Greco, Victor

3.149 Watts, David
3.099 Hatley, Ryan
3.090 Craft, Delon
3.072 Brunton, Scott
3.049 Lumsey, Andre
3.000 Lombardi, James
3.000 Behr, Patrick

MEN'S SOCCER

4.000 Cox, Bryan
3.691 Bedrosian, Jonathan
3.666 Sato, Kyle
3.468 Yenokida, Trenton
3.419 Chrisman, Randall
3.337 Hill, Daniel
3.243 Connell, Greg
3.000 Vachek, John

WOMEN'S SOCCER

3.924 Layton, Karrie
3.466 Teal, Patricia
3.330 Moss, Gina
3.119 George, Michelle
3.042 Kassis, Kathryn
3.012 Podesto, Lisa
3.006 Gerhard, Eryn
3.000 Stickel, Shana

MEN'S SWIMMING

4.000 Wyles, Eric
3.719 Collins, Eric
3.491 Esola, Marino
3.307 Brawner, Curtis
3.199 Unruh, Mark
3.199 Sheriff, Jeff
3.066 Bradshaw, Clayton
3.000 Budke, Jeffrey

SOFTBALL

3.824 Marquez, Alana
3.416 Sims, Cynthia
3.000 Scattini, Heather

WOMEN'S SWIMMING

3.666 Letts, Diane
3.622 Cude, Christina
3.537 Bullock, Jennifer
3.508 Franklin, Hollie
3.500 Bandy, Sara
3.399 Kiedrowski, Krista
3.392 Huszcz, Monica
3.322 Morello, Karla
3.309 Otley, Rebecca
3.143 Dyer, Jennifer
3.132 Vernoga, Marsha
3.099 Shumaker, Jill
3.099 Semosen, Dana
3.072 Beetle, Leah

MEN'S TENNIS

3.657 Regala, Alan
3.369 Meyers, Jason
3.332 Magyary, Christopher
3.299 Zenopian, Sevan
3.199 DeVera, Jason
3.000 Masi, Brett

WOMEN'S TENNIS

4.000 Kolb, Karly
3.174 Westermann, Kim
3.149 Wright, Jami
3.112 Brummelt, Hanna

MEN'S TRACK

4.00 Mack, Kristopher
4.00 Pedigo, William
3.913 Haberlin, Brian
3.890 Katri, Michael
3.730 Cullum, Brian
3.699 Bane, Christopher
3.676 Sverchek, Andrew
3.607 Jones, Ahmik
3.481 Koenig, Leslie
3.432 Esponda, Ricardo
3.299 Engel, Eric
3.199 Tokubo, Eric
3.157 Vaughan, Ryan
3.000 Dalrymple, Melvin

C O N G R A T U L A T I O N S
M U S T A N G S !

1997 WINTER QUARTER GRADE POINT AVERAGES

WOMEN'S TRACK

3.849 Kaz, Allison
3.766 Carlson, Hillary
3.635 Brunkal, Hillary
3.562 Morris, Courtney
3.500 Krause, Lindsey
3.392 Velarde, Melissa
3.384 Hird, Linda
3.307 Robinson, Amber
3.305 Sathre, Kim
3.278 Pettibon, Cynthia
3.232 Lacson, Andrea
3.199 Dorn, Dena
3.149 Long, Kristy
3.089 Becker, Claire
3.082 Pennycook, Jody
3.078 Jones, Barbara
3.074 Blanchard, Gina
3.000 Beck, Akeida

VOLLEYBALL

4.000 Moro, Colleen
4.000 Lee, Heather
3.717 Pierce, Melissa
3.700 Garrison, Hallie
3.455 Lipana, Louella
3.449 Roden, Jessica
3.299 Wagner, Asha
3.137 Nelson, Devin

WRESTLING

4.000 Abdullah, Nayif
3.419 Mertel, Michael
3.356 Pratt, Jason
3.199 McGee, Gan
3.000 Carkner, Jess