

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

Minutes of the  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MEETING

Tuesday, July 14, 1992  
UU 207, 3:00-5:00pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:14pm.

- I. Minutes: none
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none
- III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair: none
  - B. President's Office: none
  - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: none
  - D. Statewide Senators: none
- IV. Consent Agenda: none

V. Business Items:

**Review and Submission of the Program Review and Improvement Committee Report:**

Opening remarks: Jack Wilson, Chair of the Academic Senate, opened the meeting by welcoming the individuals present from the campus, the Telegram-Tribune, the Mustang Daily, and KCPR. The Chair thanked the Program Review and Improvement Committee (PRAIC) for the hard work and numerous hours the members devoted to completing their program review in the short time given.

Wilson: This report will be used by the administration to make budget-related decisions if reductions greater than six percent are required. It is unfortunate the report has already been made public since some of the recommendations made by the Committee could lead to individuals losing their jobs in the event program cuts are necessary. Releasing that information at this time puts those programs in a bad position since program merging or cutting may not happen.

Wilson: The PRAIC was formed by the Academic Senate at the end of spring quarter '92 to review the strengths and weaknesses of all academic programs. It's original objective was to review all programs over a five-year period, but that time was compressed into six weeks. The PRAIC's report will go forward to the administration from the Academic Senate. Since the responsibility for the report rests with the Academic Senate, it is bound to pass judgment on the report and not simply sign off on it. It is not the intent of the Academic Senate to rewrite the report; however, there are concerns regarding the report.

Question: What actions might the Academic Senate take on the report? Wilson: I think we would be inclined to look at some of the general things that might have affected some of the evaluations of departments. We would look more at procedure.

Question: Will the report be forwarded with the Executive Committee's comments? Wilson: We don't know for sure. This is a new process. The least we will do is forward the report with our comments within the next few days.

Question: Is the report to be forwarded to the President the same report that was sent out last week? Andrews: No. Some changes were made after receiving the departments' responses to the preliminary reports.

Charles Andrews, as co-chair of the PRAIC, asked to make some comments on behalf of the Committee. The purpose of the comments was to establish a common ground for discussion.

On April 14, 1992, AS-383-92/EX "Resolution on Academic Program Reviews" was adopted by the Academic Senate. This resolution and attachment outlined the intent and process for conducting a comprehensive academic program review at Cal Poly. According to the resolution, the members of the PRAIC were s/elected by a two-screening process (individuals were selected by the caucuses to be placed on the ballot and then one member from each school was elected by the Academic Senate Executive Committee). A time constraint was placed on the Committee which changed the nature of the review process. These changes were discussed by the Academic Senate at its meeting of May 26, 1992. It was moved by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, on June 2, 1992, that all deliberations and findings of the PRAIC would be made open and public.

The focus of the Committee was on program improvement of quality. We understand there is concern we may have exceeded our charge by recommending program reduction or elimination. But, it was the consensus of the Committee that quality could be attained by the reduction or elimination of certain programs.

Question: When will the final document be available? Wilson: The deans will have a copy at the end of this week.

Question: (Rathbun) Why were recommendations related to the schools/colleges made when the schools/colleges were not requested to provide data to the Committee? In the absence of that data, I request the report be stricken of the college recommendations. Greenwald: The comments that appear as college recommendations were a compendium of several department recommendations.

Question: (Carter) There is one recommendation made in the report (for the department of Journalism) that still angers the Journalism Department. The recommendation says the department has done little since last year's report and has not sought accreditation. This is not so. The department has been actively pursuing accreditation. The suggestion to establish a television studio has been done and we will go on cable during fall of 1992. We have approached numerous individuals to be part of an advisory body to make recommendations to the department. I ask that Finding No. 3 be deleted.

Wilson: I think there is a question here asking how did the Committee respond back to the programs after receiving the department responses to the preliminary recommendations. Andrews: The purpose of this meeting is to go over the procedures and process the Committee used in making its recommendations. Although it would be nice to have a rehearing of the issues, there is not enough time for this. However, the written responses from the departments were made a part of the final report. The final recommendations were changed in some instances as a result of the information contained in the department responses. Heidersbach: Time did not allow a forwarding of the final recommendations to the departments. Long: Every finding and recommendation were reviewed at least twice.

Vilkitis: In the College of Business, why were the Business Administration Department and Economics Department the only departments looked at? Andrews: There are four departments in the College of Business, but there are only two degrees. Most programs on campus have a department that offers a degree. CBUS is unique in that three departments service one degree (Business Administration). Long: In some cases, a department will offer more than one degree. In these cases, each degree program was looked at.

Havandjian: It would have been nice if the Committee would have found space to say something positive about all programs. Montecalvo: We would have enjoyed doing that and it was discussed by the Committee. However, there wasn't time to list both positive and negative comments.

Cann: May I ask what the purpose is of holding a closed session of the Executive Committee? Wilson: We will be examining the report, address the concerns that have been raised and concerns the Executive Committee might have about procedure, and discuss whether programs should have

been recommended for elimination. That's generally what we will do. When we start talking about eliminating programs, that involves people's jobs. This type of sensitive information we would like to keep as secret as possible since they are only recommendations going to the administration. Based on the experience of last year's review committee, some of the recommendations were followed by the administration, many were not. Personally, I don't think it will serve any good purpose to make public the recommendations of this committee that involve the elimination/combining of programs when in fact those are not the final decisions the administration might make. The Committee had very little time to review all programs. The criteria was very broad and general and the meetings were made as open as possible. I don't believe it was ever the intent to make the findings open to the public as soon as they were put out.

Vilkitis: I was involved in drafting the resolution that formed this Committee and the intent of the resolution was to deal with the strengths and weaknesses of the programs being reviewed. Program elimination was never intended to be part of the charge to this Committee. When we start discussing program elimination, we are talking about the elimination of jobs, and those discussions should have a right to privacy because they involve personnel action. Russell: I'm confused with the openness/secretcy of the document. I assumed if the meetings were going to be open then the document would be open as well. From the Committee's viewpoint, is the final report to be viewed only by the Executive Committee or are we open to share the information with others? Andrews: The Committee recommended a distribution process. Our report goes to the Executive Committee, acting as the full Senate during summer. No requests were made by the Committee to withhold the document or conduct closed meetings to discuss its contents. Edmisten: If the security of the document has been compromised, I would suggest you give widespread exposure to it. Carnegie: I would like to have the meeting open. I'd like to hear the reasons one of the programs in my department was recommended for elimination. Carter: Personnel matters must mention the individuals by name and deal with specific issues by name in order to be a closed meeting.

Andrews: The Committee's report will incorporate the responses from the various programs when it goes forward. These are recommendations. President Baker and Vice President Koob will not be acting on them without extensive consultation. Program quality was related to size of department, so we believe recommending elimination of a program is within our purview.

Kersten: Will the PRAIC be present at the Executive Committee that follows this discussion?

Wilson: That wasn't the original plan. I would like to have the Executive Committee look at the process and see if there were some things that were overlooked. Kersten: I would recommend the members be there so questions of that character can be addressed by the participants. Wilson: I prefer the Executive Committee act on its own, look at this document and study it, have a discussion among ourselves--whether others are present or not, exchange ideas, and come to some kind of agreement as to what to do with this document.

A motion was M/S/P to have the Executive Committee remain open to the public. (Kersten/Burgunder). Kersten: I feel the contents and process of this program review need to be in the public forum. It is healthy to dispel rumors and misinformation which tend to proliferate in a quasi-secret environment. Openness is the best approach in dealing with public policy questions which this clearly is. Vilkitis: What procedures will be followed if the meeting is open. Would individuals other than those on the Executive Committee be allowed to participate. Wilson: That's open for discussion. Again, my feeling is that the Executive Committee members focus and discuss what to do with this report and how to send it forward, whether we want to amend/append some things to it, etc. Vilkitis: I would like to make a friendly amendment that the Executive Committee carry on its business and the people that want to stay and listen be allowed to do so. Wilson: If we have an open meeting and someone other than an Executive Committee member wants to speak, that person will have to have an Executive Committee member yield the floor to her/him.

Gooden: Could someone address the matter of confidentiality regarding discussion of personnel matters? Pieper: I don't see any problem if no specific individuals are being named.

\*\*\*\*

(Second portion of the meeting)

Vilkitis: The focus of the Committee was directed at eliminating, merging, or reducing departments. I have concern with that because the intent of the PRAIC was to "improve" programs by listing their strengths and weaknesses, and letting the administration determine through budgetary means where the funding would go. I, therefore, would like to put forth a resolution. (See attached Resolution on the Intent of the Program Review and Improvement Committee.) [Acceptance of this resolution was seconded by Shelton.] Gooden: I can see where the Committee could be fulfilling its charge to suggest elimination of a program if it is part of strengthening the other programs in a department. Could someone from the Committee give us some background regarding this. Andrews: It would be easier to address that by looking at program size. We looked at a variety of factors; for example, would the quality of a program be improved (workload, overload, resources) if there were less students in that program. In one instance, we found that one program had never been reviewed in past reviews and we found that it was not academically sound, and available resources should be given to the rest of the department. Greenwald: It's not the department being eliminated, it's just a portion--a program--of a department that's suggested for elimination.

Wilson: You related program quality to program size. What do you mean by "quality?" What necessarily makes a large program higher quality than a small program? Were resources a major issue in determining program quality? Andrews: We looked at things such as course content, enrollments, and demand for the program as a indicator of quality expectations. Vilkitis: I don't understand how you can strengthen a program by eliminating it. I feel the Committee moved beyond its charge. It was to identify areas where a program was weak and let the administration make its decisions.


Burgunder: I too believe it is within the charge of the Committee to make recommendations with an eye towards improvement in terms of merging programs or bringing programs together under some umbrella. I do have trouble with the one instance where elimination was the recommendation. Where I take issue with this resolution is where it states, "Resolved: That any statements or conclusions reached regarding reorganization within a college that MAY cause a program to be eliminated be removed from the PR&IC report." A friendly amendment was made by Shelton to change the word "may" to "does" in this Resolved Clause. A friendly amendment was offered by Burgunder to reword this same Resolved Clause to read, "Resolved: That any statements or conclusions reached regarding reorganization within a college that ~~may cause~~ recommends a program to be eliminated be removed from the PR&IC report." This friendly amendment was accepted. Gooden: I would speak against the resolution for the following reason. I think it is within the purview of a faculty committee to say for the purpose of improving one program that another should be eliminated. I see no conflict with the original instructions given to the PRAIC if that is the spirit in which its recommendations were made.

Andrews: The eighth Whereas Clause states, "The Academic Senate will determine how/where the PR&IC report is to be distributed." This is inconsistent with the previous Whereas Clauses. I move to delete this Whereas Clause.

Vilkitis: I suggest we recess the meeting and take up this motion at a later time. A motion was made to recess the meeting to Thursday, July 16, 1992 at 1pm (Andrews/Kersten). The motion was approved.

VI. Discussion: none

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

  
Recorded by: Margaret Camuso  
Academic Senate



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

AS- -92/EC  
RESOLUTION ON THE INTENT OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW  
AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE

- WHEREAS, The intent of the "Academic Program Review and Improvements" process is to improve the quality of academic programs at Cal Poly (AS-383-92); and
- WHEREAS, An interim committee, identified as the Program Review and Improvement Committee (PR&IC), is charged with initiating the implementation of the "Academic Program Review and Improvements" process (AS-383-92); and
- WHEREAS, The PR&IC is to report to the Academic Senate any changes in the criteria or process which have been identified as appropriate (AS-383-92); and
- WHEREAS, The PR&IC will prepare a list of Findings based on the materials contained in the information packages submitted by programs under review; and
- WHEREAS, Members of the program being reviewed shall have the opportunity to meet with the PR&IC and discuss Findings, and submit written Responses; and
- WHEREAS, After reviewing Responses the PR&IC will prepare Recommendations; and
- WHEREAS, The PR&IC prepares a report to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for review that contains the Findings, Responses and Recommendations; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate will determine how/where the PR&IC report is to be distributed; and
- WHEREAS, The Vice President for Academic Affairs has requested that PR&IC provide information (report) regarding program strengths/weaknesses by July 15, 1992 which the administration may use in making decisions regarding academic program funding; and
- WHEREAS, The intent of the PR&IC activities and report is not to identify programs that should be eliminated; and
- WHEREAS, Any recommendation regarding academic program elimination violates the Executive Committees' charge to the PR&IC; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That any statements, conclusions or recommendations that deals with program elimination be removed from the PR&IC report; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That any statements or conclusions reached regarding reorganization within a college that may cause a program to be eliminated be removed from the PR&IC report