

-21-
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of the
ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING
Thursday, July 16, 1992
UU 203, 1:12-2:05pm

THIS IS A CONTINUATION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING OF JULY 14, 1992.

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 1:12pm.

- 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:

Vilkitis: After speaking with the other maker of the motion to bring this resolution before this body, (Resolution on the Intent of the Program Review and Improvement Committee), we have agreed to withdraw this resolution and put forth a new one which eliminates the Whereas Clauses under contention and eliminates the last Resolved Clause to simplify the resolution. My concern is with verbiage in the PRAIC's report that suggests elimination of a program or department, how that verbiage is going to be interpreted by people, and how it will impact our colleagues. If we are talking about elimination and discontinuation, there should be more study and review than just a committee review of four weeks. When a committee says something should be eliminated, this is a decision making mode which influences the direction of the decision makers.

Dana: (To Vilkitis) When you say you don't like the committee to be in a decision making mode, does that mean you do not want the Committee to make any recommendations? Vilkitis: The intent of the program review process is very clear; "the process...was developed to evaluate academic programs in order to strengthen them." The recommendations should be made to strengthen programs, not to eliminate them. Burgunder: I take issue with the resolution on one point. The Resolved Clause calls for changing the report. I think there is some question as to whether it's within our power to use the terminology of this resolution. I think we should make our comments about the report but not change the language of the report. There seems to be a feeling that if this report had identified a program as having substantial weaknesses relative to other programs, we would have accepted that (vs. "elimination").

Gooden: I don't see our task as changing the wording of a report, but I'd like to suggest some modifications to the resolution: (1) that appropriate verb changes to past tense be made to the first eight Whereas Clauses in the resolution, (2) eliminate the last two Whereas Clauses, and (3) eliminate the two Resolved Clauses and insert the following:

WHEREAS, The PR&IC prepared a report to the Academic Senate
Executive Committee for review that contains the Findings,
Responses, and Recommendations; therefore be it

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Executive Committee commend the PR&IC for its timely and considerate recommendations; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Executive Committee endorse the findings of the PR&IC and recommend them to the Vice President for Academic Affairs (possibly add, 'with the following exceptions...').

Russell: I'd like to speak against the resolution and would not speak in favor of the proposed amendment. The endorsement of a report means that we've given it careful thought and agreed with the conclusions. I think we should accept the report as a report and then deliberate the clauses as to whether we are or are not in agreement. Andrews: I'd like to suggest the terminology, "this body received and reviewed the report." This gives no indication of acceptance or rejection.

Shelton: Recommending programs for "elimination" may set a precedence for future program reviews. I'd like to have clarified whether the Executive Committee feels this is within the bounds of the review process. Maybe we want to say that in future reviews suggesting elimination of programs is/isn't to be part of the process. Andrews: This is an issue that should be addressed by the full Academic Senate in fall.

Kersten: The Resolved Clauses of the resolution do not indicate where the final report is to go. Vilkitis: Yes. This was intentional. The concern of the resolution is to address the wording of the report.

The motion to approve the superseded resolution entitled Resolution on the Intent of the Program Review and Improvement (see attached) failed.

Another resolution was submitted by Russell and seconded by Dana. The contents of the resolution were read aloud by Russell. Russell: The PRAIC had an impossible task. Six weeks is not enough time to review all the university's academic programs. I don't see how we can use a six-week report as a long-term plan to make decisions on. Vilkitis: If we forward the report to the administration without the endorsement of the document itself, will that hamper its use? Koob: After speaking with the President this morning about the nature of the report, our combined opinion is that the report in its present form is an excellent basis for discussion of long-term planning for the university. It provides inputs and directions for the colleges, but it probably won't have an immediate impact for short-term budget decisions. We have very much appreciated the work the Committee has done. We don't know what will happen with the budget situation. This is the first in a series of discussions about each one of the components of this report and we think it is useful input. We recognize additional processes are still needed with respect to the Deans' Council, discontinuation committees, etc. We would not expect, under normal circumstances, to take any immediate action based on the report as received. Vilkitis: You are saying the recommendations that are coming forth will not be picked up and moved on. They will serve as "the basis" for further discussion. Koob: That's correct. In no way would we adopt any recommendation from any committee without extensive consideration. This shouldn't be interpreted as meaning we won't take any action in any sense if faced with a severe budget situation. We will be forced to take some action if that occurs. The document has to be part of the input. But, we have no intention of blindly implementing recommendations just because they were recommended. This doesn't diminish the importance of what the Committee has done.

Burgunder: My understanding is that we passed a resolution in the Senate setting up a mechanism for thoughtful consideration of programs that would take many years. We then set up this process to happen in a six-week period for the eventuality that information would be needed this summer. This was to be a short-term informative matter for an emergency situation. I'm now hearing that this report will be the basis for some long-term thinking and discussion. It was my understanding that if the budget situation was not as severe as expected, that this report would not be used and we would go through the old process. I'd like to have this clarified. Koob: We were entirely lacking any formal faculty evaluation of the general program structure. We took administrative action this past year attempting to guess what the faculty thought about various programs involved. That's a very uncomfortable position to be in. I have asked for a long-term, continuous process of program review since I arrived. This is the first part of that process which will gain credibility in

time as further reviews reassert findings, or it will stimulate some change and prior findings will then be dismissed.

The resolution brought forward by Russell was unanimously approved.

A second resolution was brought forward by Russell (regarding the recommendations made in the PRAIC report concerning the size of departments), but no second was made.

VI. Discussion: none

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 2:05pm.

Recorded by:



Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate