

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

FILE COPY

Academic Senate
Executive Committee Agenda
March 30, 1993
UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>
Andre, Barbara	StLf&Actvs	Murphy, James	IndTech
Andrews, Charles	Actg	Mori, Barbara	SocSci
Brown, Ronald	Physics	Russell, Craig (Secty)	Music
Dana, Charles	CompSci	Vilkitis, James	NRM
Gamble, Lynne (VC)	Library	Wilson, Jack (C)	MechEngr
Gooden, Reginald	PoliSci	Copies: Warren Baker	
Johnston, Harold	ConstMgt	Glenn Irvin	
Kersten, Timothy	Economics	Patricia Mulligan	
Koob, Robert	VPAA	Howard West	
Mueller, Wesley	CropSci		

- all minutes were reviewed*
- I. Minutes: Approval of the January 14, January 19, January 28, February 4, February 11, February 18, February 25, and March 2, 1993 Executive Committee minutes (pp. 2-15).
 - II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
Bridges Video Project (p. 16).
 - III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair
 - B. President's Office
 - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
 - D. Statewide Senators
 - E. Glenn Irvin - enrollment management
 - F. Thomas Zuur - "no grade" policy
 - G. Wesley Mueller - computer expansion at Cal Poly
 - IV. Consent Agenda:
 - V. Business Item(s):
 - A. Academic Senate/committee vacancies (p. 17).
 - B. Process for/and selection of programs to be reviewed by the Program Review and Improvement Committee during 1993-94 (pp. 18-20).
 - C. Election of members to the Program Review and Improvement Committee for the 1993-94 term (p. 21).
 - D. GE&B proposal for JOUR 318-Vilkitis, co-chair of the GE&B Committee (p. 22).
 - E. Resolution on Evaluation of College Deans or Equivalent Administrators-Terry, chair of the Personnel Policies Committee (pp. 23-26).
 - F. Resolution on the Selection of a Campus Representative to the Academic Council on International Programs-Terry, chair of the Personnel Policies Committee (pp. 27-29).
 - G. Resolution on Vote of Confidence for Administrators-Terry, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee (pp. 30-34).
 - H. Resolution on Revision of Guidelines for Leave with Pay-Terry, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee (pp. 35-43).
 - I. Resolution on Department Name Change Request for Physical Education Department-Head, Department Head for Physical Education (p. 44).
 - VI. Discussion:
 - A. Budget recommendations (pp. 45-46).
 - B. Program discontinuance procedures.
 - VII. Adjournment:


MEMORANDUM

To : Jack Wilson, Chair
Academic Senate

Date : 01/25/93

File No: Document2

Copies : Bridges Committee

From : 
Lisa Taylor
Coordinator of Student Development, Santa Lucia Hall

Subject: Bridges Video Project

This is a proposal on behalf of the Bridges Video Project as we would like to be considered for the upcoming Academic Senate meeting in February. However, I do think some background information would be helpful to you. This committee was formed as one means of meeting Cal Poly's needs to establish effective programs for educating management and staff members about cultural and gender issues and their responsibilities for interacting successfully with colleagues and students from diverse groups as outlined in the Educational Equity section of Cal Poly's Strategic Planning Document. This video has been made possible due to the generous allocation of funds on behalf of the Division of Student Affairs as well as the support and representation of a wide array of departments.

Our committee is comprised of faculty, staff and students who are committed to creating a video that will not only serve as an educational tool but will also stimulate necessary dialogue between all of the above groups. The video will present a panel of students and faculty who will have been interviewed by the central committee and will then be available to respond to questions from the audience. The second part of the video will consist of the panel and the audience being viewed by a group of students and faculty and we will videotape their responses and also use this in the discussion part of the program. It is also our hope to develop a facilitation guide for the use of student and faculty facilitators which will emphasize particular aspects of video for either classroom use, training or as a means orientation for new students and faculty of Cal Poly.

I submit this memo to you so that members of the Bridges committee may attend an Academic Senate meeting and gain not only the support of faculty but also their participation in the video. We hope to have faculty from a wide array of disciplines represented on the video and would utilize this opportunity to further explain the merits of their support and participation. I am the primary liaison between the committee and the Senate and may be reached through extension 5631. Thank you for your time.

**ACADEMIC SENATE/COMMITTEE VACANCIES
FOR 1992-1993**

Academic Senate

CSM one vacancy (replmt for Goers, spring quarter '93)

Academic Senate Committees

CAGR Elections Committee
 Status of Women Committee (replmt for Cochran, '92-94)

CAED Constitution and Bylaws Committee
 Elections Committee
 Library Committee
 UPLC Committee (replmt for Gaines, '92-94)

CENG Fairness Board (replmt for Yang, '92-93)
 Research Committee (replmt for Nahvi, '92-93)

CLA Constitution and Bylaws Committee

CSM General Education and Breadth (replmt for Wheeler, '92-94)
 University Prof Leave Committee (replmt for McDill, '92-93)

PCS Elections Committee (replmt for Pritchard, '92-93)
 Research Committee

Athletics Governing Board

one vacancy (replmt for Murphy, spring quarter '93)

Student Throughput Committee

CSM vacancy

University-wide Committees

ASI Student Senate (one vacancy)

Conference and Workshop Advisory Committee (one vacancy)

pages 8-10 of the ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT document.

SELECTION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS FOR REVIEW

The selection process for programs to be reviewed should be in accordance with the following steps:

1. Develop a MASTER FILE on all programs subject to the program review process, both undergraduate and graduate.
2. Identify those programs that are subject to accreditation review and the dates when such review is to next occur.
3. Project the program reviews over a five-year period, and insure that programs subject to accreditation have congruent times for the accreditation reviews as well as the internal program reviews; thus, minimizing demand upon resources.
4. In each year, by May 1, the Academic Senate office shall solicit programs for those wishing to be reviewed, either because of accreditation or other external reviews, or for other reasons.
5. If a sufficient number of programs are not identified in #4, then the Academic Senate Executive Committee shall select additional programs, from those subject to review on a current basis, using random selection.
6. A listing of programs to be reviewed in the next academic year shall be completed by the Academic Senate by June 1, with said list being submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the affected programs. Every effort should be made to provide notice of review at least one academic year in advance.
7. Assure there is a mix of programs between those that are subject to accreditation as well as those that are not.
8. No college shall have all of its programs reviewed in the same year, irrespective of accreditation review or other external review.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

1. The committee shall consist of seven (7) tenured full professors; one from each of the six colleges, one from the Academic Senate, and a nonvoting ex officio person appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The School for Teacher Education shall be included with a college of its choice for the selection of the representative from that

unit.

2. Each college caucus shall forward the names of three nominees to the Academic Senate office. The Academic Senate Executive Committee members shall receive a ballot of these nominees and shall have five days to vote and return their marked ballots to the Academic Senate office for counting of the returns by the Academic Senate Elections Committee. The name of the person receiving the highest number of votes from each college shall be the person elected to serve on the Program Review and Improvement Committee.

The person receiving the second highest number of votes from his college shall be the alternate to the committee, if from a different department. If the person receiving the second highest votes is from the same department as the persons with the highest number of votes, then the third person on the ballot will be considered to be the alternate, if from a department different from the department of the highest vote receiver.

3. No member of the committee shall participate or be present when a program sponsored by that representative's department is under consideration by the committee. In such instances, the alternate, whom shall be from a department other than the one under review, will represent that college until the program review is completed and a report forwarded to the Academic Senate.
4. Committee members shall be elected for a two-year term, and may be reelected for a second consecutive term.
5. The representatives from the Colleges of Agriculture, Business, and Liberal Arts elected in 1991-92 shall be elected for two-year terms ending June 1, 1994.
6. The representatives from the Colleges of Architecture and Environmental Design, Engineering, and Science and Mathematics, elected in 1991-92 shall be elected for a one-year term ending June 1, 1993.
7. Should a vacancy occur, the replacement shall be elected in the same process as described in #2 above, and shall complete the term of the person replaced.
8. Should a vacancy occur in the first year of the term for that position, the replacement person shall be eligible for one additional consecutive term. Should the vacancy occur after the first year of a term, the replacement will be eligible for two consecutive terms following the completion of the term as a replacement.
9. Persons excluded from eligibility for the 1991-92 election only, are those persons who served on the program review

task force in 1990-91 and those who served on the 1991-92 Ad Hoc Committee for Program Review Criteria.

10. The administration shall be expected to provide the necessary support staff to enable the Program Review and Improvement Committee to carry out its responsibilities.
11. Members of the Program Review and Improvement Committee should be provided with released time in which to perform this responsibility.

IMPLEMENTATION OF REVIEW AND REPORT FORMAT

1. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall provide all program heads with a copy of the university Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines that are to be used to evaluate academic programs. (This document, once approved, should remain largely unchanged from year-to-year.)
2. The review process shall be conducted by the Academic Review and Improvement Committee (PRAIC), with the composition and selection of the committee in accordance with other parts of this document.
3. Programs selected by the Academic Senate Executive Committee will prepare information packages for evaluation by the PRAIC. These packages shall be formatted in conformity with the criteria and guidelines instructions. The completed packages will be submitted to the Academic Senate office for distribution to the PRAIC, with a copy also being forwarded to the appropriate college dean.
4. The evaluation process shall be a review and assessment of the materials pertaining to a program. The committee will prepare a list of FINDINGS based on the materials contained in the package submitted.
5. Members of the program being reviewed shall be given the opportunity to meet with the PRAIC and to discuss the FINDINGS, and to submit written RESPONSES to the FINDINGS.
6. After receiving the RESPONSES, the PRAIC will prepare RECOMMENDATIONS. In developing the RECOMMENDATIONS, the PRAIC shall give careful consideration to the RESPONSES received.
7. The PRAIC shall prepare a report to the Academic Senate Executive Committee, with a copy to the program administrator and the appropriate college.

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

B A L L O T

**NOMINEES TO THE
PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE
FOR 1993-1994**

Specific Instructions:

Place a mark in the space opposite the name of the nominee of your choice. Select one individual from each of the six colleges.

College of Agriculture

_____ Harris, John (NRM)
_____ Rice, Thomas (Soil Sci)

College of Architecture and Environmental Design

_____ Ballew, Thomas (Arch Engr)

College of Business

_____ Abitia, Fred (Ind Tech)

College of Engineering

_____ Freeman, JoAnne (Ind Engr)

College of Liberal Arts

_____ Freberg, Laura (Psyc & HD)

College of Science and Mathematics

_____ Knight, Randall (Physics)

General Education and Breadth Proposal

24.

<p>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</p> <p>Nishan Havandjian & Clay Carter</p>	<p>2. PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT</p> <p>Journalism</p>
<p>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)</p> <p>C. 3: (note:submitted first for C.3 consideration and then in late Fall '92 for D consideration; no subsection identified)</p>	
<p>4. THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Course</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change to an Existing GEB Course</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB</p>	
<p>5. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format)</p> <p>JOUR 318--MASS MEDIA IN SOCIETY. 4 lecture hours, 4 units.</p> <p>An appreciation of the political, economic and cultural impact of newspapers, magazines, radio and television in democratic societies. Role of informed media consumers in shaping media and messages.</p>	
<p>6. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</p> <p>Area C subcommittee recommends against JOUR 318 (1/3/92); too much overlap with ENGL/JOUR/SPC 385; contents not focused on arts and literature, but sociological issues; no prerequisites; problems with objective teaching.</p> <p>Course proposal revised a bit but again rejected by subcommittee C, 11/30/92; note re: rejections sent by Culver to Navandjian and he resubmits to Area D. Course proposal reviewed and rejected by Area D subcommittee (1/21/93) on the grounds that the course did not satisfy the guidelines to be in Area D.</p>	
<p>7. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS</p> <p>On Jan. 28, the GE&B Committee again reviewed this course and the recommendations of the two area subcommittees. We agree with the subcommittee recommendations that JOUR 318 does not meet the criteria for inclusion into either distribution area; there is too much overlap with existing courses, the course has more of a sociological emphasis, rather than one on humanities (for C) and it does not address the nonwestern component required for (D). There are other problems as well.</p>	
<p>8. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</p>	

Adopted:

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

AS- -93/PPC
RESOLUTION ON
EVALUATION OF COLLEGE DEANS OR
EQUIVALENT ADMINISTRATORS

- WHEREAS, The dean/equivalent administrator has primary responsibility for leadership of the college/equivalent academic unit in the allocation and utilization of financial resources, quality of academic programs, admission and dismissal of students, appointment, retention, tenure and promotion action, long-range direction of the college/equivalent academic unit, development of external financial resources and the representation of the college/equivalent academic unit both internal to the university and to external constituents; and
- WHEREAS, The faculty of a college/equivalent academic unit are directly affected by the dean/equivalent administrator's performance in meeting these responsibilities; and
- WHEREAS, The dean/equivalent administrator's evaluation by the faculty is utilized for the purpose of providing evaluative information to the dean/equivalent administrator and the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and
- WHEREAS, Each probationary and tenured faculty member, regardless of time base, including those persons in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP), has a professional responsibility to complete the evaluation form in order to provide useful and timely input to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and
- WHEREAS, The Vice President for Academic Affairs evaluates the deans/equivalent administrators every three years; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the attached evaluation form be adopted for use by the faculty in evaluating the dean/equivalent administrator of each college/equivalent academic unit annually; and, be it further

RESOLUTION ON EVALUATION OF COLLEGE DEANS
OR EQUIVALENT ADMINISTRATORS
AS- -93/PPC
Page Two

- RESOLVED: That the Library may develop an evaluation form appropriate for its use subject to the approval of the Academic Senate and the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend that said evaluation results be a major part of the Vice President for Academic Affairs' evaluative consideration of each dean/equivalent administrator; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Vice President for Academic Affairs report to each college/equivalent academic unit's faculty the number and percentage of faculty in that college/equivalent academic unit that responded to the dean/equivalent administrator's evaluation and that a summary of the evaluation results be placed in the dean/equivalent administrator's personnel file.

Proposed by the Academic
Senate Personnel Policies
Committee

ANNUAL EVALUATION OF COLLEGE DEANS and EQUIVALENT ADMINISTRATORS

Faculty completion of this evaluation form is of utmost importance if it is to be given serious consideration by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in his evaluation of the dean/equivalent administrator. Good performance should be recognized and inadequate performance should be identified.

DEAN/EQUIVALENT ADMINISTRATOR: _____

Please rate your dean/equivalent administrator's performance this academic year, using the scales provided for each item. Respond on the enclosed scantron form.

Scale: Outstanding = A, Good = B, Fair = C, Poor = D, Don't Know = E

1. Engages in effective strategic planning
2. Promotes improvements in goals, objectives, policies and procedures
3. Supports and recognizes professional development and accomplishments of faculty
4. Recognizes and rewards faculty service
5. Recognizes and rewards excellence in teaching
6. Recognizes and rewards effective student advising
7. Effectively advocates college/equivalent academic unit's positions and concerns to the university administration
8. Encourages and supports cultural diversity in recruiting and retention of high quality faculty, staff, and students
9. Demonstrates sensitivity to student needs in a multi-cultural educational environment
10. Fosters effective communications with alumni and community
11. Administers established policy fairly
12. Adequately explains decisions which reverse or modify established college/department policy
13. Makes reasoned decisions in a timely manner
14. Plans and allocates budget resources openly and fairly
15. Provides faculty with periodic (at least annually) reports of the allocations and uses of funds
16. Actively seeks supplemental financial support for new and existing programs
17. Manages personnel relations effectively
18. Handles conflicts and differences diplomatically and effectively
19. Communicates effectively
20. Solicits input and consults with faculty when appropriate
21. Is willing to consider alternative points of view
22. Provides opportunities to make her/himself available to the faculty
23. How do you rate the dean/equivalent administrator overall

Please provide written comment in response to the following:

- 24a. Please describe any actions by your dean/equivalent administrator that you have been especially pleased with during the year:
- 24b. Please describe any actions by your dean/equivalent administrator that you have been especially displeased with during the year:
25. What suggestions do you have for how your dean/equivalent administrator could improve her/his functioning:

Adopted:

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

Background Statement: CAM 451.6 establishes procedures for the selection of a campus representative to the statewide Academic Council on International Programs. Specifically, CAM 451.6 provides that the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall submit the name of a nominee to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for its endorsement. In reality, for the last several years, the Academic Senate has actually been doing the solicitation for interested nominees and submitting a candidate to the Vice President's office. There appears to be no objection to the continuance of this practice. To avoid the confusion of past selections, CAM 451.6 should be amended to make it conform to the current practice which has evolved.

AS- -93/
RESOLUTION ON
THE SELECTION OF A CAMPUS REPRESENTATIVE TO THE
ACADEMIC COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, CAM 451.6 provides a procedure for the selection of a campus representative to the statewide Academic Council on International Programs; and

WHEREAS, The procedure provided in CAM 451.6 has not been followed for the last several years; and

WHEREAS, The procedure which has evolved is acceptable to all concerned parties; and

WHEREAS, The initial nomination of a representative to the Academic Council on International Programs should originate in the Academic Senate; and

WHEREAS, The ultimate nominee will represent the campus and, hence, should be acceptable to the administration; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That CAM 451.6 be amended as indicated on the attached page.

Proposed by the Personnel Policies
Committee
February 16, 1993

451.6 Academic Council on International Programs

The Trustees of The California State University have authorized as a part of their policy on The California State University International Programs the establishment of a statewide Academic Council on International Programs. The Academic Council on International Programs consists of one member from each college or university of the CSU system, selected in accordance with locally approved procedures.

Pursuant to the By-laws of the Academic Council on International Programs of the CSU, "Nominees must be either tenured, or tenure-track, members of the teaching faculty, or hold an academic/administrative appointment, and should have demonstrated their interest in international/intercultural education through personal participation in [such] activities..."

The following procedure governs the selection of Cal Poly's representative to the Council:

- A. During the winter quarter in the final year of a current term of appointment, the Academic Senate office will conduct a campus-wide solicitation for persons interested in serving on the Academic Council on International Programs for the following three years. The criteria for membership on the ACIP will be publicized.
- B. Each candidate shall submit a memo of interest with her/his vita to the Academic Senate office. These names will be brought to the Academic Senate Executive Committee for consideration and the selection of one candidate.
- C. The name of the nominee chosen by the Executive Committee shall be transmitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs with a memo of endorsement.
- D. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall transmit the name of the nominee and the Executive Committee's endorsement to the President.
- E. In the event the President cannot endorse the nomination, the nomination shall be returned to the Executive Committee along with the reasons for non-endorsement. The Executive Committee shall then have the option to reaffirm its selection or to select another nominee from among the list of candidates brought to it in item B above.
- F. The President shall transmit the name of the candidate to the Academic Council on International Programs.

451.6 Academic Council on International Programs

The Trustees of The California State University have authorized as a part of their policy on The California State University International Programs the establishment of a statewide Academic Council on International Programs. The Academic Council on International Programs consists of one member from each college or university of the CSU system, selected in accordance with locally approved procedures.

The following procedure governs the selection of Cal Poly's representative to the Council:

- A. No later than February 1 in the final year of a current term of appointment, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, after consultation with the appropriate dean and department head, shall transmit to the Chairperson of the Academic Senate the nomination of a member of the University's faculty to serve on the Academic Council on International Programs for the following three academic years.
- B. The chairperson of the Academic Senate shall present the nomination to the Senate's Executive Committee for consideration.
- C. Following the Executive Committee's endorsement, the chairperson of the Academic Senate shall forward the nomination accompanied by the endorsing statement to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for transmittal to the University President.
- D. In the event the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate fails to endorse the nomination, they shall return the nomination to the Vice President for Academic Affairs along with reasons for nonendorsement.

~~452 Research Activities (See also CAM 324.2, 542 - 544.)~~

~~The research activities of the university are encouraged and guided by the administration of the university and the Academic Senate. To give direction to this effort, the University Research Committee was established as a committee of the Academic Senate. The Research Committee directs its recommendations affecting university-wide policies and procedures to both the Academic Senate and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Director, Research Development, is responsible to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and is permanent secretary to the University Research Committee.~~

~~452.1 Research projects may include the following types of activities: community service research, institutional research, research in The California State University graduate programs, and individual faculty research.~~

~~452.2 Research projects must be compatible with appropriate rules and regulations of the State of California, Trustees of The California State University, Office of the Chancellor, and university administration. The university will not approve participation in research projects for government agencies or private industry which are "classified" or "secret" in nature. While there are many different interpretations and definitions of these two words, the basic underlying principle of this policy is that unless the university is free to make public in general terms the purpose and scope of a proposed research project it will not be approved or endorsed by the university.~~

~~452.3 Research activities should increase the effectiveness of instructional assignments.~~

~~452.4 Faculty members employed full time by the university during the academic year shall not undertake research projects for extra compensation during the same period of more than the equivalent of 1/4 the full-time load. (See CAM 324.2.)~~

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

**AS- -92/
RESOLUTION ON
VOTE OF CONFIDENCE FOR ADMINISTRATORS**

WHEREAS, At the present time there is no formal process for a Vote of Confidence for Administrators at Cal Poly, and

WHEREAS, Such a process is appropriate for a university; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the following procedure be adopted by the Academic Senate:

PROCEDURE FOR VOTE OF CONFIDENCE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

1. If a Vote of Confidence for any administrator is to take place it should not be a regular periodic event, but should be considered an extraordinary measure.
2. Campus-wide official petition forms will be created for the administration of a Vote of Confidence. The forms shall include spaces for printed names, signatures and employee identification numbers.
3. It will be left to each department to establish its own policy about a Vote of Confidence for its chair/head.
4. The following procedure will be followed for college deans:
 - 4.1 A petition signed by at least 25 percent of a college's tenured and tenure-track faculty is presented to the college caucus chair. Simultaneously, a notification of the petition is presented to the Chair of the Academic Senate.
 - 4.2 Upon receipt of the petition, the caucus chair shall present it to the Chair of the Academic Senate in a timely manner.
 - 4.3 Within five (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter), from the date the petition was presented to the college caucus chair, the Chair of the Academic Senate and the caucus chair will verify with the assistance of the Faculty Affairs Office that the people who signed the petition constitute at least 25 percent of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the college.

- 4.4 The names of the people who signed the petition will be kept confidential by those who have access to it. The petition will be destroyed after the Vote of Confidence is conducted.
- 4.5 Within ten (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date of the petition verification, the Chair of the College Caucus shall hold an open forum of tenured and tenure-track faculty for the purpose of allowing the Dean to respond to the petition.
- 4.6 The Academic Senate Elections Committee shall conduct the Vote of Confidence within five (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date of the open forum.
- 4.7 The results of the Vote of Confidence for a college dean will be distributed by the Chair of the Academic Senate to the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the dean, and the faculty of the college.
5. The following procedure will be followed for the President and Vice Presidents:
 - 5.1 The process to administer a Vote of Confidence for the President or Vice Presidents can be initiated by one of the following two alternatives:
 - 5.1.1 Alternative 1: A petition, signed by at least 10 percent of the constituency who are represented by the Academic Senate, is presented to the Chair of the Academic Senate.
 - 5.1.1.1 The Chair of the Academic Senate presents the petition to the Academic Senate Executive Committee after the petition was handed to the Chair.
 - 5.1.1.2 The Academic Senate Executive Committee will verify with the assistance of the Faculty Affairs Office that the people who signed the petition constitute at least 10 percent of the constituency represented by the Academic Senate.
 - 5.1.1.3 The names of the people who signed the petition will be kept confidential by those who shall access to it. The petition will be destroyed after the Vote of Confidence is conducted.
 - 5.1.1.4 Within ten (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date

the petition was presented to the Academic Senate Executive Committee, the Chair of the Academic Senate shall hold an open forum of the Academic Senate constituency for the purpose of allowing the President /Vice President to respond to the petition.

- 5.1.1.5 The Academic Senate Elections Committee shall conduct the Vote of Confidence within five (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date of the open forum.
- 5.1.2 Alternative 2: A motion to administer a Vote of Confidence for the President or Vice Presidents is passed by the Academic Senate by simple majority.
 - 5.1.2.1 Within ten (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date the Academic Senate passed the resolution to conduct a Vote of Confidence, the Chair of the Academic Senate shall hold an open forum of the Academic Senate constituency for the purpose of allowing the President /Vice President to respond to the vote.
- 5.2 The Academic Senate Elections Committee shall conduct the Vote of Confidence within five (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date of the open forum.
- 5.3 The results of the vote of Confidence for the President or Vice Presidents will be distributed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee to the President, the Vice Presidents, the college deans, all personnel represented by the Academic Senate, and the Chancellor of The California State University system.
- 5.4 In the case of exceptional circumstances the Academic Senate Executive Committee may modify the timelines, but not the procedures, provided in this document.
- 5.5 The Academic Senate Executive Committee may by a two-thirds vote enlarge upon the list of administrators affected by this Resolution.

Proposed By:
The Academic Senate
Personnel Policies Committee
September 29, 1992

VOTE OF CONFIDENCE PETITION

I, the undersigned, request that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate initiate the procedure for a Vote of Confidence for _____, _____ as stated in C.A.M. _____. It is understood that the names of all of the petitioners will be confidential.

PRINT NAME

SIGNATURE

FACULTY I.D.#
(Social Security No.)

* Academic Senate Executive Committee only: *
* * * * *
* valid signature: _____ verified by: _____ *
* * * * *

VOTE OF CONFIDENCE PETITION

I, the undersigned, request that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate initiate the procedure for a Vote of Confidence for _____, _____ as stated in C.A.M. _____. It is understood that the names of all of the petitioners will be confidential.

PRINT NAME

SIGNATURE

FACULTY I.D.#
(Social Security No.)

* Academic Senate Executive Committee only: *
* * * * *
* valid signature: _____ verified by: _____ *
* * * * *

Adopted:

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

Background Statement: The university Leave with Pay Guidelines was last revised in 1988. Since that time, a CFA/CSU contract has been ratified that has made *de facto* changes in the "rules" for such leaves. The University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) has for at least the past three years been operating on its own interpretation of these changed rules. For instance, the UPLC no longer ranks or otherwise prioritizes leave applications on a university-wide basis but merely recommends approval or denial of the leaves to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. This non-prioritization has come about at least in part because leaves are no longer "funded", and the colleges/departments must find the funds to replace faculty on leave, or otherwise modify course offerings, if leaves are granted. Such a situation makes it imperative that prioritization, and solutions to funding/staffing problems associated with a proposed leave, should occur primarily at the department level. The UPLC feels that all leave applications that are forwarded to a higher level with departmental endorsement, and are then recommended for approval on their merits by the Collegewide Professional Leave Committees (CPLC)/Library Professional Leave Committee (LPLC) and the deans, should be granted, and therefore the CPLC/LPLC also should not rank-order applications that it recommends for approval. The deans retain the right to recommend that a leave be deferred, but not denied, for budgetary reasons, or to recommend disapproval of a leave application on its merits. The major roles for the UPLC then become only: (1) to see that college/library and university guidelines have been followed in recommending approval or denial of a leave application; and (2) to "arbitrate" when the CPLC/LPLC and the dean's recommendations differ. Proposed revisions to the university Leave with Pay Guidelines have therefore been prepared by the UPLC and the Personnel Policies Committee. Approval of these revised guidelines will bring consistency to the leave-with-pay process at all levels of review.

**AS- -93/
RESOLUTION ON
REVISION OF UNIVERSITY LEAVE WITH PAY GUIDELINES**

- WHEREAS, The university Leave with Pay Guidelines have not been revised since 1988, and
- WHEREAS, An MOU ratified since 1988 has made significant changes in the sabbatical leave process, particularly in the way such leaves are funded, and
- WHEREAS, Prioritization of leave applications has now become primarily a department rather than college/library or university-wide responsibility as in the past; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the attached university Leave with Pay Guidelines be adopted.

Proposed By: The Personnel Policies
Committee
March 30, 1993

LEAVE WITH PAY GUIDELINES

General Principles

A. Purpose:

Leaves of absence with pay may be granted faculty members for purposes of research, study, creative activity, service, or travel appropriate to ~~one's~~ their positions at the university.

B. Eligibility:

1. Full-time faculty unit employees shall be eligible for either a sabbatical leave or a difference-in-pay leave if ~~he/she has~~ they have served full time for six (6) years in the preceding seven (7) year period ~~prior to~~ before the leave and at least six (6) years after any previous sabbatical leave or difference-in-pay leave. (MOU 27.2 and 28.4)

2. All eligible faculty whose leave applications are judged to have merit by their departments and by their college/library professional leave committees, and which meet college and university criteria, should be granted leaves with pay. Recognizing that such leaves with pay, however meritorious, can have a negative impact on budget and staffing, leave applications shall be prioritized at the departmental level. It is also important, therefore, that the department head/chair's recommendations regarding a leave application state clearly whether the department has adequate resources to replace a faculty member, and whether such a leave, if approved, would cause an undue hardship on the department's ability to offer its program.

College-wide Professional Leave Committees (CPLC)

A. Membership:

One member shall be elected from each department by tenured and probationary faculty from that department. ~~Eligible faculty~~ Faculty eligible for membership are tenured, not on the University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC), and not applying for a leave with pay.

Once elected, members of the committee serve two-year terms with one-half of the members being elected ~~in even years and the other half in odd years~~ each year.

B. Committee Chair:

1. The committee chair must be a member of the CPLC and shall be elected by the members of the CPLC.
2. The chair is responsible for forwarding the college procedures and criteria to the UPLC.
3. The chair is responsible for forwarding the applications and CPLC recommendations to the dean.

C. Committee Functions:

1. Review and/or recommend college leave with pay procedures and criteria.
2. Review all sabbatical and difference-in-pay leave applications and interview all applicants.
3. Sabbatical and difference-in-pay applications that do not meet established University and college guidelines should be given a negative recommendation.
4. Recommend a priority ranking to the dean to the dean approval or denial of the applications based on college procedures and criteria.
5. The CPLC must clearly state in its report to the dean its reasons for recommending denial of an application.

Library Professional Leave Committee (LPLC)

A. Membership:

~~Eligible librarians~~ Librarians eligible for membership are tenured, not on the UPLC, and not applying for a leave with pay.

Once elected, members of the committee serve two-year terms with one-half of the members being elected ~~in even years and the other half in odd years~~ each year.

B. Committee Chair:

1. The committee chair must be a member of the LPLC and shall be elected by the members of the LPLC.
2. The chair is responsible for forwarding the library procedures and criteria to the UPLC.
3. The chair is responsible for forwarding the applications and LPLC recommendations to the dean of library services.

C. Committee Functions:

1. Review and/or recommend library leave with pay procedures and criteria.
2. Review all sabbatical and difference-in-pay leave applications and interview all applicants.
3. Sabbatical and difference-in-pay applications that do not meet established University and library guidelines should be given a negative recommendation.
4. ~~Recommend a priority ranking to the dean of library services to the dean approval or denial of applications~~ based on library procedures and criteria.
5. ~~The LPLC must clearly state in its report to the dean its reasons for recommending denial of any application.~~

University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC)

The UPLC shall be considered the Professional Leave Committee, as referenced in MOU 27.5.

A. Membership:

1. One member shall be elected from each college and the library by tenured and probationary faculty unit employees from the college and library, respectively:
 - a. ~~Eligible faculty~~ Faculty eligible for membership are tenured, not on a CPLC or the LPLC, and not applying for a leave with pay.
 - b. The term of office of each elected member of the UPLC shall be two years.
 - c. The representatives of the Colleges of Agriculture, Business, and Engineering shall be elected in the spring of odd-numbered calendar years.
 - d. The representatives of the library and of the Colleges of Architecture and Environmental Design, Liberal Arts, and Science and Mathematics shall be elected in the spring of even-numbered years.

B. Committee Chair:

1. The chair must be a member of the UPLC and shall be elected annually by the members of the UPLC.
2. The chair shall be responsible for forwarding recommended UPLC procedures and criteria, leave with pay applications, and priority ranking to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

C. Functions:

1. Recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, after approval by the Academic Senate, changes in procedures and criteria ~~and ranking for~~ leave with pay applications.
2. Recommend changes in leave with pay application response deadlines to the Vice President for Academic Affairs after approval of the Academic Senate.
3. Review college/library leave with pay procedures and criteria for compliance with MOU and university guidelines. Recommended changes shall be directed to the appropriate administrator with a copy to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
4. Review all ~~candidates'~~ applications and the ~~prioritization recommendations~~ by college/library professional leave committees ~~and deans~~ to ensure compliance with approved guidelines and quality of applications; inform the Vice President for Academic Affairs of any apparent ~~inequities in these rankings~~ problems concerning those recommendations; and make ~~its own~~ recommendations based on its findings.
5. Make ad hoc recommendations concerning the filling of such unused sabbatical leave vacancies which occur after the initial awarding.

D. Criteria:

The UPLC shall evaluate each application for a leave with pay in accordance with the criteria established by and for the appropriate CPLC or LPLC.

E. General Characteristics:

The following general characteristics are expected in proposals for a ~~leave with pay or with a sabbatical or difference-in-pay leave~~:

1. An abstract or summary of the proposal.
2. A detailed outline of the proposed plan of study, research, or creative activity.
3. Supporting documentation from universities, employers, or institutions that might be sponsoring the project (if appropriate).
4. Annotated literature search indicating the need for the project (if appropriate).
5. A statement of the benefits that will accrue to the university, to ~~your~~ ~~the~~ ~~candidate's~~ profession, and/or to the students.

6. A statement of the probability of completion of the proposed project. This should include a statement of:
 - a. The feasibility of the proposal;
 - b. The applicant's background in relation to the proposal;
 - c. The amount of preparation for the leave as evidenced by advanced study or research (if appropriate).
7. A statement of the urgency of the proposed leave in terms of its benefit to the university.

8. A current resume or curriculum vitae.

F. Procedures:

1. Each member of the UPLC shall individually and separately review the professional leave applications, which shall be kept in the Faculty Affairs Office.
2. Each member of the UPLC shall make such notes as will be adequate to enable him/her to make comparative judgements on the relative merits of the applications for leaves with pay.
3. After each UPLC member has been allowed sufficient time to examine the professional leave applications, the UPLC shall meet in plenary session to discuss the relative merits of the proposals.
4. The UPLC shall adhere to established quotas by college (library); recommend approval of a minimum number of sabbatical leaves based on the number of faculty eligible MOU provisions.
 - a. An initial target allocation of sabbatical leaves will be distributed to each college/library based on the proportion of eligible faculty in the respective area and with a minimum of at least one sabbatical leave in each college/library.
 - ab. The number of sabbatical leaves allocated to the university recommended for approval will be distributed on an equitable basis among the colleges and the library.
 - bc. Guidelines for distributing sabbatical leaves include an initial distribution of one professional leave to each college and the library, with the balance of the allocation to be distributed according to the ratio of eligible faculty members in the respective colleges and the library to the total eligible faculty in the university. The number approved will not be fewer than those granted in 1991-92, provided sufficient applications are submitted that meet college/library criteria (MOU 27.10b and d).

- ~~e. In the event sufficient applications are not received by any college or the library, the UPLC will recommend a redistribution of the unfilled leaves to the other colleges (and/or the library) after considering an equitable distribution in accord with the past practice.~~
 - ~~d. In the event of actual university quota of fundable leaves is less than the projected quota initially used the UPLC shall compute the revised college quotas.~~
 - ~~e. The UPLC shall annually review the rounding off of fractions of leaves allocated to the various colleges and the library and use this information to establish an equitable allocation pattern over a period of years.~~
5. The UPLC shall examine the college-wide rankings recommendations of the colleges/library to:
 - a. Verify that proper college procedures and criteria were used for evaluation were used.
 - b. Identify any apparent inequities in college rankings problems concerning approval or denial because of failure to use follow proper procedures and/or criteria at the college/library level;
 - c. Identify any apparent deficiencies of applications in one or more of the general characteristics enumerated in E.1-E.7 § above.
6. If an application is found deficient in one or more of the general characteristics enumerated in E.1-E.7 §, or if additional information is desired by the committee, the chair of the UPLC shall request the information from the chair of the appropriate CPLC or from the LPLC.

If the information requested is not provided, the UPLC shall include in its report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs a statement of the apparent deficiency.
7. If the UPLC determines that an apparent inequity problem exists in the rankings concerning the recommendations of a CPLC, or the LPLC, or dean, the chair of the UPLC shall report the apparent ranking inequity problem to the appropriate dean of the appropriate college (or to the dean of library services) and to the chair of the appropriate CPLC (LPLC) CPLC/LPLC.
8. In a conference of three, the chair of the UPLC, the dean (dean of library services) and the chair of the CPLC (LPLC) the chair of the CPLC/LPLC, and the dean shall either affirm the ranking recommendation of the CPLC (LPLC) CPLC/LPLC and/or dean or shall put forth agree upon a revised list recommendation.

9. ~~The UPLC shall not provide an "a priori" university-wide ranking. Rather, it shall~~ may make ad-hoc recommendations concerning the filling of leaves with pay to fill such vacancies as may exist after the approval process has been completed.
 - a. If a faculty member granted a leave subsequently withdraws his/her application, the UPLC dean shall may recommend a another candidate after reconsidering the highest alternates on the priority lists submitted by the college (library) those whose applications were previously recommended for approval by the department and the CPLC/LPLC but were subsequently deferred, or denied based on campus program needs or for budgetary reasons.
 - b. If the vacancy cannot be filled from among the remaining applicants of the college (library) involved, the UPLC shall recommend candidate(s) after considering Item F.4.e. above.
If there are no other applicants from the college/library where a vacancy exists, a candidate from one of the other colleges/library whose application was similarly deferred or denied may be considered by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
10. Requests by an applicant for a change from a difference-in-pay leave to a sabbatical leave may not be made after the professional leave applications have been forwarded to the UPLC (in early January).
11. ~~Postponements from one academic year to a subsequent academic year shall not be authorized. This would allow the postponement of a leave from one quarter to another quarter within the same academic year, which is not uncommon and allows faculty some flexibility between the time of their initial application and the commencement of that leave.~~
An applicant whose leave is approved for one or two quarters may reschedule his/her leave for a different time within the same academic year. This allows the faculty some flexibility between the time of their initial application and the commencement of that leave.
12. Deferral of an approved leave from one academic year to the next can only be authorized by a dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and usually only because of budget/staffing problems that might arise if the leave were granted in the academic year for which it was originally requested.

CALENDAR FOR PROCESSING PROFESSIONAL LEAVE APPLICATIONS

- | | |
|---|--|
| October 15 | Leave with pay eligibility lists, target allocations, are distributed and deadlines are announced distributed by the Faculty Affairs Office to the deans and department heads/chairs. Department heads/chairs, notify eligible employees of eligibility and deadlines. |
| November 1 | Candidates are responsible for submitting applications for leaves with pay to department heads. |
| November 9 | Applications are forwarded to CPLCs/LPLC via the deans with department head/chair's recommendations following consultation with the departmental faculty. The department shall provide a statement to the appropriate administrator and to the CPLC/LPLC regarding the quality of the proposed leave project and the possible effect on the curriculum and the operation resources of the department should the employee be granted a leave with pay (MOU 27.6 and 28.8) |
| November 15 | Applications are forwarded to the CPLCs/LPLC by the deans. |
| Wednesday of
Fall Quarter
Finals Week | CPLCs and the LPLC shall complete their review of applications and interview all leave with pay candidates on or before this date. |
| Friday of
Fall Quarter
Finals Week | Priority lists recommended by Recommendations of the CPLCs/LPLC are forwarded to the deans. |
| January 10 | Deans forward a copy of their recommendations, and priority lists, the CPLC's/LPLC recommendations, department head/chair's recommendations, all applications, and a report of the criteria and procedures followed in the recommendation process to the UPLC via the Vice President for Academic Affairs. |
| Jan 11/Feb 14 | UPLC reviews college/library procedures and criteria for compliance, reviews applications, and develops a priority ranking of all applicants. forwards its Recommendations on priority are forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by February 14. |
| February 25 | The Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies applicants of action final decision on applications. Such actions are subject to fiscal appropriations which are proposed for inclusion in the budget. |
| Feb 25/Mar 25 | UPLC recommends changes in college/library procedures and criteria to the Vice President for Academic Affairs with a copy to the appropriate dean. The UPLC recommends to the Chair of the Academic Senate and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs any changes in its procedures, criteria, or the "Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications." |

Whenever one of the above dates falls on a weekend or academic holiday, that deadline is extended to the next regularly scheduled academic workday.

Adopted:

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

AS- -93
RESOLUTION ON
DEPARTMENT NAME CHANGE FOR
PHYSICAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

- WHEREAS, The Physical Education Department requests that its department name be changed to PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND KINESIOLOGY DEPARTMENT; and
- WHEREAS, The request for a department name change has been approved by the College of Science and Mathematics Council and the dean for the College of Science and Mathematics; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the name of the Physical Education Department be changed to the PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND KINESIOLOGY DEPARTMENT.

Proposed By: The
Physical Education
Department
Date: March 30, 1993

Adopted:

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

AS- -93/
RESOLUTION ON
ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR ACCOMMODATING IMMEDIATE BUDGET REDUCTIONS

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the attached recommendations for accommodating immediate budget reductions; and, be it further
- RESOLVED: That the attached recommendations be forwarded to President Baker for his review and consideration.

Proposed By: Academic Senate
Executive Committee
March 9, 1993

March 9, 1993

**ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR ACCOMMODATING IMMEDIATE BUDGET REDUCTIONS**

In planning for the expected 1993/94 budget shortfall, a 7.4+ percent overall reduction is anticipated for Cal Poly. In an effort to suggest ways of meeting this challenge, the following recommendations have been adopted by the Academic Senate. In proposing these recommendations, it is the concern of the Academic Senate that all efforts be made to maintain the integrity of classroom instruction at Cal Poly.

These recommendations are in addition to the reductions presently being identified by each divisional area of the university as necessary for meeting that area's portion of the across-the-board cuts.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **Athletics:** reduce state funding to Athletics by 50 percent.
2. **Transportation Services:** reduce state funding to Transportation Services by 100 percent.
3. **University Relations and Development:** reduce state funding to University Relations and Development by 100 percent.
4. **Student Affairs:**
 - A. more student services to be fee-based;
 - B. reduce the number of administrators in Student Affairs;
5. **Administration:** reduce the number of positions at the director's level and above with the exception of college deans.
6. **Computing Services:**

We are concerned with the cost of central computing services provided by Information Services. We request that the IACC and IRMPPC report to the Academic on: (1) what are the essential computing functions on campus; and (2) recommend the most cost-effective ways of delivering those services.
7. **Remedial Courses:** remedial courses be offered through Extended Education.
8. **Faculty Consultation:** faculty to be consulted in each college on the question of total personnel costs versus O&E funds.

DMPP Salary Summary

Mine - Exec Com 3/30/91

		Distribution of MPP Salaries as per 1/1/91 (in thousands of \$)						
	\$100 & >	\$90-99.9	\$80-89.9	\$70-79.9	\$60-69.9	\$50-59.9	\$40-49.9	\$30-39.9
Title								
Vice President	3	2						
Dean	2	6						
Assoc. V.P.		2	1					
Director	1	2	8	9	6	1		
Assoc. Dean			2	5				
Manager					1	1	2	2
Assoc. and Asst. Director					1	4	6	2
Coordinator						1	4	
Other			2		2			
Supervisor						1	3	5
P						1		1
Other include 1 staff personnel officer, 1 business affairs associate, 1 project assistant and 1 archi								
	coordinator							

INFORMATION RELATING TO PROPOSED BUDGET INITIATIVES

A. Requiring remedial classes be taken through extended education.

1. The two general areas in which remedial courses are offered are English and mathematics.
 - a) Remedial math courses involve 218 to 256 students per quarter and require 6-12 units of part-time instruction. The average class size is 53 students per section. No special funding from the CSU.
 - b) Remedial courses in English are in two categories. They are basic English and English as a second language. In 91/92 147 students completed the BW course and 126 the ESL course. The students are predominately of latino and Asian descent. The budget for these classes comes from the Chancellor's Office designated for this purpose.
 - c) The coordinator for the math. remedial program states "We recommend that priority be given to baccalaureate level general education and support courses required by specific degree programs, and that alternative strategies, courses, and programs be considered for remedial and elective courses whenever possible."

B. Charging fees wherever possible to students.

1. "The various fees that are currently permitted by the Trustees are outlined in the State University Administrative Manual. The section is somewhat lengthy and tends to be quite restrictive. Campuses may request special fees for unique purposes but these do require Trustee approval." (Statement by Frank Lebens to a question posed by Jack Wilson, 3/25/93)

C. Transportation Services- "Do you realize transportation services maintains all vehicles on the campus including those for Facilities Services, Public Safety and many for the campus farm? It is more than the 17 vehicles in the fleet used primarily by the colleges. I would welcome eliminating the hassle associated with the latter but it would mean that all vehicular travel will have to be done by private or rental car at an increased cost." (quote from Frank Lebens, 3/04/93).

D. Computing Support - Suggest adding the Advisory Committee on Administrative Computing to those advising the senate.

E. Recommendation reducing the number of administrators at the Director ~~level~~. See spreadsheet show distribution of MPP people as of 1/1/91.

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT AT CAL POLY

Principles:

1. EM should be a student-centered, process approach from initial contact to graduation.
2. EM should be service oriented.
3. EM should reflect quality in all efforts.
4. EM should address areas of student satisfaction found in the Strategic Plan:
 - a. retention
 - b. learning services
 - c. advising
 - d. social and cultural activities
 - e. follow-up (assessment)
5. EM should include efforts in Educational Equity found in the Strategic Plan:
gender and cultural pluralism.
6. EM should involve instruction as found in the Strategic Plan:
 - a. active methods
 - b. involvement of student in learning
7. EM should include articulation and transferability as found in the Strategic Plan:
 - a. GE&B
 - b. major and support
8. EM should include admissions and institutional size as found in the Strategic Plan:
 - a. undergraduate
 - b. graduate
9. EM should be supported by faculty development activities consistent with the Strategic Plan:

10. EM should address the University image consistent with the Strategic Plan:
the presentation of university to prospective students, families, communities, politicians.

Recruitment, Application, and Selection Process:

1. The University should attract and enroll the best quality students based on selection criteria:
 - a. high school GPA
 - b. basic course preparation
 - c. scores on national tests
2. The student body should be selected consistent with University educational equity goals.
3. All avenues to admission should have regular, established procedures and criteria accepted by the faculty. This includes graduate admissions:
 - a. separate application processes for international students, graduate students, art and music students (portfolio).
 - b. May 1 declaration date for all undergraduates.
4. The application and selection process should:
 - a. be straightforward and timely.
 - b. be easily explainable to a general audience:
 - c. be a single application, eliminating multiple forms.
 - d. eliminate the ASQ.
 - e. develop simplified MCA model.
 - f. develop an explanation and report on selection process to distribute to interested students, parents, counselors, etc.

5. All outreach activities should be coordinated, especially between divisions and units:
 - a. all communications should be reviewed by a coordinating group.
 - b. all communications should be professionally developed. The University should move away from ad hoc communications toward coordinated communications.

example groups:

testing
housing
coaching
colleges and departments

Assessment:

1. All Enrollment Management Goals and Objectives, and all components and activities will include performance measures (Key Performance Indicators).
2. Institutional Studies will be responsible for supporting assessment, with most assessment activities taking place at the unit closest to the activity.

Specific responsibilities for Institutional Studies include:

- a. analyzing the MCA and validating selection criteria against success for selected students:

GPA
progress toward degree
time frame when students graduate
persistence toward graduation
- b. describing retention by college, department, gender, ethnicity, etc.
- c. presenting data in easily understood formats useful for making decisions.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF CAL POLY RELATIVE TO ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

STRENGTHS:

Faculty and Staff:

- committed faculty and staff
- high percentage of full-time faculty
- instructional methods that encourage faculty/student interaction.

Mission and External Relations:

- distinctive mission
- effective governmental relations
- a perceived reputation regionally, statewide, and nationally, for high academic quality of colleges, majors, and degree programs
- successful placement of graduates
- acceptance of graduates at top graduate schools
- strong alumni and development support

Students:

- high quality student
- active student roles in governance
- effective selection criteria (MCA)
- first choice institution for students who enroll
- highest retention in the CSU system

Cost:

- relatively low tuition in comparison to University of California and independents
- higher than average student parental income and education

Educational Support:

- well-developed technological infrastructure
- high level of library services

Campus:

- convenient geographic location
- safe environment
- attractive appearance and setting
- extensive campus life: housing, rec. sports, and activities
- residential campus
- good social reputation

WEAKNESSES:

Students:

- uncoordinated and complex admission process
- uneven academic advising
- uneven career guidance from faculty
- lack of yield evaluation and marketing studies
- uncoordinated publications (advertising/marketing, etc.)
- perception of campus-based obstacles to goals

Costs:

- lack of part-time jobs or full-time jobs that allow schooling

Campus:

- parking
- lighting

Resources:

- severely declining resources
- scheduling and class availability

<u>COLLEGE</u>	<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>ACCRED VISIT</u>	<u>PRAIC REVIEW</u>
CAGR	Agricultural Business BS)		
	Agricultural Engineering (BS)	1996/97	
	Agricultural Engineering Technology (BS)		
	Agricultural Science (BS)		
	Agriculture (MS)		
	Animal Science (BS)		
	Crop Science (BS)		
	Dairy Science (BS)		
	Food Science (BS)		
	Forestry and NRM (BS)	1993/94	
	Fruit Science (BS)		
	Home Economics (BS)	under discontinuation review	
	Home Economics (MS)	under discontinuation review	
	Nutritional Science (BS)	2002/03	1992/93
	Ornamental Horticulture (BS)		
	Poultry Industry (BS)		
CAED	Recreational Administration (BS)	1995/96	
	Soil Science		1992/93
	Architectural Engineering (BS)	1993/94	
	Architecture (BArch)	1993/94	
	Architecture (MS)		
	City and Regional Planning (BS)	1994/95	
	City and Regional Planning (MCRP)		
	Construction Management (BS)		1992/93
	Landscape Architecture (BS)	1996/97	
CBUS	Business Administration (BS)		1992/93
	Business Administration (MBA)		1992/93
	Economics (BS)		1992/93
	Industrial Technology (BS)	1995/96	
	Industrial and Technical Studies (MA)		
CENG			
	Aeronautical Engineering (BS)	1996/97	
	Aeronautical Engineering (MS)		
	Civil Engineering (BS)	1996/97	
	Civil and Environmental Engineering (MS)		
	Computer Engineering (BS)		1992/93
	Computer Science (BS)	1995/96	
	Computer Science (MS)		
	Electrical Engineering (BS)	1996/97	
	Electronic Engineering (BS)		
	Electronic and Electrical Engineering (MS)		
	Electronic Engineering Technology (BS)	1994/95	
	Engineering (MS)		
	Engineering Mgtmt Program (MBA/MS)		1992/93
	Engineering Science (BS)		1992/93
	Engineering Technology (BS)	under discontinuation review	
	Environmental Engineering (BS)	1993/94	
	Industrial Engineering (BS)	1996/97	

	Materials Engineering (BS)	1996/97
	Mechanical Engineering (BS)	1993/94
CLA	Applied Art and Design (BS)	
	English (BA)	
	English (MA)	1992/93
	Graphic Communication (BS)	1992/93
	History (BA)	
	Human Development (BS)	
	Journalism (BS)	
	Liberal Studies (BA)	
	Music (BA)	
	Social Sciences (BA)	
	Speech Communication (BA)	
	Philosophy (BA)	
	Political Science (BA)	
	Psychology (MS)	1992/93
CSM	Biochemistry (BS)	
	Biological Sciences (BS)	
	Biological Sciences (MS)	
	Chemistry (BS)	1992/93
	Ecology and Systematic Biology (BS)	
	Mathematics (BS)	
	Mathematics (MS)	
	Microbiology (BS)	
	Physical Education (BS)	
	Physical Education (MS)	
	Physical Science (BS)	
	Physics (BS)	1992/93
	Statistics (BS)	
UNIVERSITY FOR TEACHER EDUCATION		
	Education (MA)	
	Teaching Credential Program	

March 26, 1993

**COMMENTS FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE HEARING OF THE
REVIEW OF THE HOME ECONOMICS ACADEMIC PROGRAM**

by

Robert D. Koob
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Mr. Chairman and members of the Academic Senate,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide information for your review of the Home Economics academic program. I'd like to review briefly the administrative role, my perception of the Senate's role, the history of the administrative action, and my view of options available to the Academic Senate.

The CSU Board of Trustees delegates to the President of Cal Poly responsibility and authority to make decisions on virtually all aspects of campus operation. In turn, the President delegates authority for individual aspects of the University to different elements of the campus. All resource allocation authority is delegated to the line structure of the University, subject to the approval of the President. The Academic Senate has been delegated, through its constitution, considerable curricular authority. There are few, if any, examples of curricular decisions that have not followed the will of the Academic Senate.

While it is common for fiscal structure to parallel curricular structure, there are enough examples where this is not true to demonstrate that the two are not inextricably tied. A good Cal Poly illustration is the Computer Engineering Program which is a joint effort between the Computer Science and EL/EE Departments. Other examples include programs without departments or allocated budgets such as Liberal Studies and Engineering Management. In a decision last Spring, the President accepted a recommendation of the Academic Deans' Council that funding for the Home Economics Department be phased out over a three-year period. It is important to distinguish between the funding issue, which is not part of this review, and the programmatic issue which is the subject of the matter before the Senate. Simply stated the Programmatic issue is whether Cal Poly should continue to offer a Home Economics academic program and, if it were to be continued, what form that program might take.

The decision to phase out the Department of Home Economics has a context as well as specific issues. The context is the rest of the University and concerns about the welfare of the University as a whole. Cal Poly has dealt with extraordinary budget difficulty for at least two years, and it appears this will continue for at least one more year. Paramount to the University is that it retain programs it views critical to its

future, and that those programs be funded at a proper balance of people and support to assure their quality. Specific issues related to Home Economics are attached as Appendix A. Regardless of how one might view any single issue, taken together they lead to the conclusion that the general Home Economics Department was a less critical element in the future of Cal Poly than many of its other departments. In that sense, general Home Economics is following the path of mechanic arts that gave birth to the many Engineering professions, and general Agriculture that gave birth to many Agriculture disciplines. General Home Economics has already given rise to important new disciplines, several here at Cal Poly, more nationally, and the evolution from general to more specific is an undeniable national (and California) trend.

What remains is for the Academic Senate, should it choose to do so, to recommend which path into the future it feels is most appropriate for Cal Poly. Several paths are obvious although the choice among them is not. One choice is to allow the academic programs associated with the current Home Economics Department to phase out along with the Department's funding. Another is to select components of the program that might be transferred to other departments for continuation, and finally, a third choice is to continue the general program, as presently constituted, in another arrangement. If the last choice is made, it would be extraordinarily useful to have a suggestion as to the source of funding for such a venture. The Department's home College, Agriculture, of all the colleges, is most likely to have to send layoff notices for next year to probationary or tenured faculty and does not appear to have the resources to divert support for the current departmental arrangement.

I close with a comment about the process. From my view (see Appendix B), it would be preferable to make decisions about future funding affecting academic programs if there existed a well-debated body of opinion on which programs best fit the faculty's view of the future of Cal Poly. Without that resource, it is much more difficult to assure that funding decisions, which clearly affect programs, are wisely made.

APPENDIX A

Elements and issues considered in the decision to phase out the Home Economics Department:

1. Although the program is authorized in Title 5, there is no provision in the California Administrative Code or other regulations requiring the University to offer Home Economics.
2. The Home Economics Department reported that its program could not be accredited by the American Home Economics Association unless it contains Nutrition and Child and Family Studies.

In 1984, Nutrition was separated from Home Economics and became part of the Food Sciences Department.

In 1984, Human Development was separated from Home Economics and became part of Psychology and Human Development. During the Spring 1991, Cal Poly's administration asked the Human Development faculty if they would like to return to the Home Economics Department. The Human Development faculty elected to remain in Psychology and Human Development.

The concentration in Interior Design is currently accredited by the Foundation for Interior Design Education Research.

3. Although the Home Economics faculty is active in service to the Department, College, University and community, professional and creative/scholarly activities at the regional and national level have been modest.

Of the five tenure-track faculty, two hold doctorates, three have master's degrees.

4. Much of the subject matter remaining in the department could be offered in other venues:

Interior Design is often associated with programs other than Home Economics. After Home Economics, affiliation with Architecture is most common.

Textiles and Foods programs are commonly available in Agricultural colleges.

Merchandising and Consumer Affairs may be considered elements of business training.

5. After peaking in Fall 1989, applications declined steadily through Fall 1991.
6. At the time the decision to phase out the Home Economics Department was made, the Department was a member of a school that was being discontinued as well.
7. There existed reasonable opportunities for placing most faculty in the Department with other departments in the University.
8. The Department could be phased out in a manner which guaranteed degree completion to then enrolled students.
9. There existed other opportunities for Home Economics education within the CSU.
10. Failure to select some department or departments for phase out meant more layoffs in all other departments of the University as the only alternative to selection of some unit smaller than the whole University for layoff appears to be across-the-board layoffs. The latter alternative would be expected to reduce overall quality of instruction.
11. Reduction in personal services over the long term is the only alternative available to restore funding necessary for the support and operating services of the instructional program. Support budgets are disproportionately reduced in times of severe cutbacks. The cumulative effect of continuous reductions in support and operating services adversely impacts the instructional quality in all areas.

APPENDIX B

A brief history of the budget reduction decisions from a VP's perspective:

For FY '92 (AY 1991/92):

1. During the Fall of 1990, the administration requested of the Academic Senate program review information to aid in the budget decision making. The Academic Senate had no mechanism in place to comply with this request.
2. To demonstrate its sincerity in using faculty input in budget decision making, the administration requested the Senate appoint 7 members to an ad hoc task force. The President also appointed 7 faculty members. The task force began its work approximately the beginning of the 1991 Spring Quarter.
3. The ad hoc task force was charged with recommending cuts equivalent to the expected budget reduction in Instruction. The task force decided a program review was necessary to guide its deliberations and used a modified version of program review criteria found in the draft strategic plan. The task force assigned dollar reduction targets to each school and other units in Academic Affairs. Total reduction target for Academic Affairs was \$6 million.
4. The Academic Deans' Council adopted the task force targets on a per school basis with one change (Athletics received 20% cut instead of 50%).
5. The President accepted the recommendation of Academic Deans' Council.
6. The Vice President for Academic Affairs assigned reductions to respective units and left the mechanism of achieving reductions to the discretion of deans and directors.
7. In late May of 1991, the Academic Senate Executive Committee heard the report of the task force from the Academic Vice President. It decides to develop program review as a standing University process.
8. Result: each unit met the assigned reduction, but the detail of reduction corresponded only roughly to the task force's rationale for assigning amount of reduction. The reduction to the School of Professional Studies was so severe (>30%), that the School was destabilized to the degree that the Academic Deans' Council, with the consent of the affected departments, reorganized SPS into the remaining schools.

For FY '93 (AY 1992/93):

1. During Fall 1991, the administration requested of the Academic Senate provide program review information to aid in budget decision making. It requested that the information be made available by early March 1992. The Academic Senate began work to develop a program review mechanism.
2. The Academic Deans' Council began the development of a plan to meet anticipated budget reduction for eventual reconciliation with whatever program input might come from the Senate. The Deans' plan included a set of Budget Change Proposals to be used to adjust school profiles, but they were not be program specific.
3. The Academic Senate indicated it would not be able to meet the March deadline for program information. The administration requested guidance as to some general expectations as to type of cuts to execute. The Senate took no position as a body, although three committees of the Senate recommended against an across-the-board approach.
4. In the Spring of 1992, the Vice President for Academic Affairs proposed school profile adjustments and proposed reduction targets to each school, making suggestions on some recommendations to meet reduction, and requested each school's response. The most dramatic recommendations included the phase out of Departments of Engineering Technology and Home Economics.
5. Counter proposals were not made, and the President accepted the recommendations of Academic Deans' Council.
6. The President requested the Academic Senate Program Review Committee to quickly conduct an overview of programs in the event that budget reductions should become more severe than projected. The Program Review Committee made the report by August 1. The Academic Senate took no action on the report.
7. Result: No two colleges received the same percentage reduction. Each college made the reduction as assigned. Again, details of the implementation were left to the individual deans. Colleges planning to phase out departments made temporary reductions in other areas in anticipation of recovering the savings as departments were reduced in size.

For FY '94 (AY 1993/94):

1. During the Fall of 1993, the administration requested of the Academic Senate program review information to aid in budget decision making. It requested that information be made available by early March 1993.

2. The Academic Senate Executive Committee undertook a comprehensive University budget review. Draft recommendations submitted to the Senate on March 9, were silent on academic program information.
3. The deans developed individual college plans to be shared with the Academic Deans' Council in late March. An early review by each dean with the Academic Vice President indicates considerably more consultation occurred within colleges than with prior plans. The deans of both colleges housing departments being phased out confirmed their intentions to continue on the plan. Each requested the President to notify the Chancellor's Office of intent to issue layoff notices to some fraction of identified unit.
4. The process continues.


MEMORANDUM

To: Charles Andrews, Chair
Academic Senate

Date: June 2, 1992

File No.:

Copies:

From: 
Robert D. Koob
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: **ACADEMIC SENATE PROGRAM REVIEW--REQUEST FOR
INFORMATION FROM 1990-91 ACADEMIC PROGRAM
EVALUATION TASK FORCE**

As requested, I have provided below a list of comments and summaries made by last year's ad hoc Academic Program Evaluation Task Force on the programmatic review it conducted. In addition to the comments provided, task force members also rated each program on a scale of 1-5 (five being the highest). If after review of this information you have any questions, please do not hesitate to discuss them with me.

Please recall that this information was the result of events and information a year ago and many actions have occurred that would change these comments/ratings if they were to be done today.

School of Agriculture

General comments: concern over the high number of 100-200 level courses not required in majors in SAGR, high accommodation rates, the number of synthetic majors, student/teacher ratio is low in SAGR, lack of faculty and student diversity, and concern over the labs and activities in School.

Agricultural Education--the highest cost program in the School, admits everyone, is a small department, has some overlap with Animal Science, and did not have "scholarly productions". Rating: 2.

Agricultural Engineering--has a 98% accommodation rate of students, and has a low percentage of students graduating (it was noted, however, that this could be a transferability problem and a problem with synthetic majors the department was experiencing several years ago). The committee did not have a problem with the qualifications and need for this program. Rating: 3.

Agribusiness--concern was expressed over the quality of incoming students, a number of older faculty, they have more faculty than they generate. Note was also made of the high cost of this program as compared to the lower cost in Business Administration (there may be a duplication and efficiency problem). Agribusiness has labs associated with its program. It also has the lowest class size in the School. Rating: 3.

Crop Science--this is a high cost program, it needs to look at its direction. Rating: 2.

Dairy Science--has two concentrations, there is no duplication within the CSU. Rating: 2.

Food Science and Nutrition--generates more faculty than they have (generates 11.7, has 9 tenure track), adequate scholarly activity among faculty, enrollment standards look to be overly easy, budgeting pressures could be reduced if the department's accommodation rates were less. Department should also look into the size and viability of its MS program. Rating: 2.

Natural Resources Management--has good resources (forest, computer lab), enthusiastic faculty, generates less faculty than accreditation requirements (8), excellent scholarly activities amongst faculty, noted concern of problems, and overlap, over the past several years with Bio Sci and the negative interaction between departments. Rating: 3.

Ornamental Horticulture--program was compared with Landscape Architecture (some merger was suggested), appears to have abuse of labs and activities, department, as a whole, needs close attention. Rating 1.5.

Soil Science--there could possibly be a merger of NRM and Soil Science, third least expensive program in SAGR, department has been on an upswing for the last ten years.

Animal Sciences/Industry--low enrollment is in Poultry courses, low graduation rate, some concern over the Dairy Science program, and committee recommended the Horseshoeing program be cut (1 position). Rating: 2.

School of Architecture and Environmental Design

Architectural Engineering--very high ethnic/gender mix, most expensive program in the School, overlap concerns in Civil Engineering. Rating: 3.5.

Architecture--low student/faculty ratio (typical of this type of program), high cost, Master's is the terminal degree. Rating: 4.

Construction Management--program not unique, overlap concerns with Civil Engineering (concrete courses) and SBUS, diversity of degrees by faculty, possible combination of this department and Arch Engr., too many 500-level courses supported by faculty. Rating: 2.

Landscape Architecture--overlapping concerns with OH, lowest student/faculty ratio in the entire University, very expensive program. Rating: 2-.

City and Regional Planning--strengths in terms of mission to the University, high number of low enrollment classes (but have been rising over last 5 years), small master's program. Rating: 3.

School of Business

No comments available.

School of Engineering

Aeronautical Engineering--no concerns noted. Rating: 4.

Civil Engineering--noted the duplication and conflict with Architectural Engineering. Rating: 3.5.

Computer Science--very little duplication with Math, 18 other programs in CSU, jobs in CSc are dropping drastically, could possibly be reduced in size, computer science was noted as being the "life-line" in a polytechnic university, and important to architecture and engineering programs. Rating: 4.

Electronic/Electrical Engineering--concern over the overlap in courses within the same department, noted the decline in the number of graduates in EE. Rating: 4.

Engineering Science--program was designed for students to do different things, does not quite fit Cal Poly's image of hands-on, faculty are drawn from other departments and programs, program has reduced in popularity, advisement is the only resource requirement in addition to space in classroom. Rating: 3.

Environmental Engineering--crossover between civil/environmental engineering faculty, generates 2.2 positions but have 3.0 faculty. Rating: 4.

Engineering Technology--department is more of a trade school type program, greater industry experience by faculty, not academically oriented, welding and manufacturing processes is high-cost program, high cost program, lowest student/faculty ratio in SENG, have options of running the program smaller, program has its place, but needs to modernize and increase the quality, could be some efficiency with IT, and some overlap with IT and IE. Rating: 2.

Industrial Engineering--high cost program compared with others in SENG, there has been an increase in accommodation rates, is an overlap with courses taught in Computer Science (could be better taught in IE), possible overlaps in SBUS and IT, ET). Rating: 4.

Mechanical Engineering--concerned about Petroleum concentration (student reluctance to major in this program), purposely over courses under the break-even point (labs) and covered in lectures. Increasing lab size is a possibility in tight budget situations. Rating: 4.

Materials Engineering--possible overlap between courses in other programs, concern about student accommodation data. Rating: 2.5.

School of Liberal Arts

Art and Design--"applied" program, low demand from employers, possible combination with Graphic Communication and perhaps in another school rather than SLA, looks like a graphic design program, possible overlap with Graphic Communication, Journalism, and SBUS in advertising courses, has only a very few GEB offerings, a targeted program for consolidation, Journalism and Art are not accredited (and could be). Rating: 2.5.

English--issue of a quality faculty without a corresponding degree program, recommend putting 4-unit courses back to 3, concern by the Curriculum Committee over the large number of 300-400 level courses offered for majors (need to reduce the GEB backlog), need to teach English as a communication skill. Rating: 3.

Foreign Languages and Literature--no major, but departments desires one, should be teaching more Pacific Rim courses rather than European-based languages (there was some disagreement by committee members on this), would not recommend a major at this time. Rating: 3.

History--cannot meet demand for GEB courses, some overlap with Political Science, 59 total course offerings, concern over the compatibility with the mission of the University, need for recognition of teaching credential program and need for teachers, department has become overburdened with GEB, seems to be a lack of the department taking advantage of technological/polytechnic environment of the University, and some courses could be taught in the larger class sizes. Rating: 4.

Journalism--question the SCU's generated by internships, there is a decline in SCU's, very costly program, reduce the number of faculty positions, possible overlap with Speech Communication, Graphic Communication, and Art, the department, itself, noted the weakness in TV studio, and there could be a

"communication" area combination (Journalism, Graphic Communication, and Art and Design). Rating: 1.5.

Music--is an electronic-oriented degree program, Senate Budget Committee did not support the major, question their SCU generation. Rating: 3.

Philosophy--degree program was approved by Academic Senate, recommended a format of large lecture/small seminar classes. Rating: 1 (as a major), 3 (as a minor degree program).

Political Science--noted the high increase in majors at the same time GEB requirements were increased (Committee member noted the problem of only admitting a small number of majors, but ending up with a much larger incoming class--EOP admits), the department would like to decrease the number of its majors, minor program has very little impact on the program, and there is no GEB backlog. Rating: 2.5.

Social Sciences--WTU's not as high as others, choice of concentrations are not real, department is proposing a new BA in Sociology and a BA in Anthropology/Geography (currently a minor), odd collection academically--sociology, geography, and anthropology are usually separated, questioned the rigor of the sociology program--majors should be reduced. Rating: 1.5 (Sociology), 3.0 (Anthropology/Geography).

Speech Communication--possible reorganization with Journalism, lack of larger class size for Critical Thinking. Rating: 4.

Theatre/Dance--concern was expressed over the frequent mention of "low morale" in department, concerned about becoming too large, possible reorganization to a Performing Arts Department, workload problem could be eased if University changes to a semester system, program could be unique if interacted more with architecture (set design), costume design (home economics), etc., cost factor is well below average, problem was noted of not seeing the department as being essential to the mission of the University, departments makes a small contribution to the GEB requirement. Rating: 1.5.

School of Professional Studies

Graphic Communication--donation of equipment by industry noted, some overlap with this department, i.e. Journalism and Art. Rating: 3.

Home Economics--no program overlap, some concern noted on the interior design option and its possible relation to Architecture, and the historical nature of the concentrations. Note was made of the increased demand for food courses by food production in Ag. Rating: 3.

Industrial Technology--watered down marketing courses, lack of professional development by faculty, generalized curriculum (a generalists program), a people-oriented program, lack of understanding by the university. Rating: 1.

Physical Education/Recreation Administration--much proliferation of courses with little substance, recreation administration has little substance, no requirement for PE activity courses in any curriculum, not impressed with professional development activities for most of the faculty, only small number of courses are science related, and consideration should be given to the teacher education program and courses related to this program. Consideration was given to the three aspects of the program: 1) science oriented portion (physiology/kinesiology, etc.); 2) activity courses; and 3) recreation administration. Rating: 2 (overall), .5 (Recreation Administration).

Psychology/Human Development--low SAT scores could be accounted for EOP admits. Rating: 3.

School of Science and Mathematics

Biological Sciences--program became better as degree program became more specialized, microbiology program is the strongest, very real problem with MS program, question the professional development by faculty, difficulty with the large number of entrenched faculty, noted again the problem between this department and NRM. Ratings: 2.5 (Bio Sci), 3.0 (Ecology and Systematic Bio), 3.0 (Microbiology), 1.0 (MS program).

Chemistry--little interest in retaining MS program, professional development by faculty is low, there is some program overlap with Bio Sci, efficiencies could occur. Rating: 3 (undergrad), 1.0 (grad.).

Mathematics--low professional development by faculty (this is apparently typical in this discipline). Rating: 3.0 (undergrad), 2.5 (graduate).

Physics--large number of low enrollment courses, information provided by faculty on professional development was low, graduation rate in both programs is low, physical science program is the teacher education program, overfunded about 4-5 positions, budget needs to be tightened. Rating: 2.0-2.5.

Statistics--department does not teach what other departments want their students to know, productivity is weak by faculty, this discipline would be a good way for interdisciplinary courses and research, low professional development activity. Rating: 1.5 (in present form), 2.0 (if some reorganization occurred).

University Center for Teacher Education--MS Counseling moved to Psych/Human Dev Department, development of center opened up communication with school districts, highest OEE cost in the University and high FTE cost, low enrollment courses, especially in master's programs, would be a cost savings if put back into a school, there could be administrative savings if communication efforts could be made, there was some committee support for being a separate unit, belief that some master's programs should be closed. programs are not cost effective, lack of quality in master's program (content and poor faculty), program could function with less faculty. Rating: 2.5.

I have also included a matrix which summarizes the actions recommended by the task force.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM EVALUATION TASK FORCE
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
May 20, 1991

PROGRAM	GROUP RATING	SUMMATIVE RATING	TOTAL FACULTY	REDUCTION RECOM.	EQUIV. FAC. REDUC.	REDUC. IN \$1,000'S	% REDUC.	ACCUM. TOTAL
UCTE	2.5/4		27.8	-4 units	4	250	14	4
ATHLETICS				-50%, non-scholarship, & emphasize "student athlete"	13.2	711	50	17.2
COOP. EDUC.			6	-4 units, retain 2.0 Coord.	4	200	67	21.2
COLLEGE FARM				10%	3.8	208	10	25
LIBRARY				-10% across the board	10	540	10	35
GRANTS/INT PROGS/GRAD STUD			5	-1 unit, no cuts in Grants	1	54	18	36
ESS				5% across the board	2	109	5	38
PE/REC ADMIN	2.0/0.5	15.5	31	-20 units, eliminate activity courses and Rec Admin	20	1080	65	58
OH/LAND ARCH	1.0/2.0	20.4/25.6	26	Close OH/transfer LA to SAGR and save 6.0 positions	6	324	23	64
JOURNALISM	1.5	20.5	6.2	Close Journalism	6	324	100	70
IT	1.0	21.9	12	Close IT/transfer some of the programs to SENG & SBUS and save 4 positions	4	216	33	74
THEATRE/DANCE MUSIC	1.5/ 3.0	24.5 25.7	14	Combine and reduce by 1 unit	1	54	7	75
ART & DESIGN	2.0	24.6	15	-2 units	2	108	13	77
ENCR TECH	2.0	27.2	23.5	-5 units	5	270	21	82
DAIRY SCIENCE	2.0	29/27.5	25	Combine/reduce by 2 units in Equine area	2	108	8	84
AGRIBUSINESS		27.3	23	-5 unit reduction	5	270	21	89
SAGR			119	-4 units	4	216	3/12	93
SBUS			67.2	-4 units	4	216	6	97
SAED			77	-6 units	6	324	8	103
SENG			153	-7 units	7	378	5/8	110
SLA			176	-3 units	3	162	2/6	113
SSM			147	-7 units	7	378	5	120

Memorandum

To: Robert Koob
Vice President for Academic Affairs

James Murphy
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Ray Zeuschner 
Chair, Academic Program Review Task Force

Subject: Report of Task Force

Date: 21 May 1991

This report is in response to the charge to the Task Force issued jointly by you on April 19, 1991. The Task Force has completed its efforts and will disband as of this date.

The membership of the Task Force was comprised of appointees by the Chair of the Academic Senate (7 members) and the President of the University (7 members) and included: Brent Hallock, James Vilkitis, Linda Dalton (later replaced by David Hatcher), Jens Pohl, Earl Keller, William Forgeng, Jack Wilson, John Culver, Laura Freberg, Raymond Zeuschner (Chair), Lezlie Labhard (Interim Chair), Myron Hood and Peter Jankay. We received administrative support from Robert Koob and Bonnie Tuohy.

We established meeting times which included 7:AM on Tuesday and Thursday, 6-11 pm Mondays, 9:00Am Saturdays, and 6:00 pm on Sunday.

We selected a chair, discussed the Program Review Data Collection Procedures from the Senate Long Range Planning Committee and the draft statements developed this year by the Academic Planning Committee. Various items were identified and sent to all departments and programs for short responses. Definitions included any unit in the University which has resources identified with it, including departments, other academic units and programs, and related ancillary units contained under Academic Affairs. Procedures and guidelines were developed by the committee, and criteria for evaluation were identified. Prime among these criteria were: Relevance to the Mission; Importance to the rest of the university; Support of the university's goals in Educational Equity and Affirmative Action; projected demand by society, students, industry and the labor force, and region; overlap with programs both within this and with other institutions; requirements of accreditation associations, ability to offer sufficient classes; resource requirements (variety of faculty, facilities, equipment); efficient use of resources, resource generation; quality of program, including faculty, students and curriculum.

Each program was reviewed initially by the entire committee, an "in depth" evaluation was conducted for each program by a Task Force

member from outside of the School being reviewed, data were obtained from Institutional Research and other sources and combined with self-reports from programs and departments. Each item was again discussed in committee and initial ratings were made, debated and justified. Each program was then reviewed again by every member of the committee, rated on a multi-dimensional scale. These ratings produced a cluster of programs determined to be "at risk." Each of the identified programs were again discussed by committee of the whole and appropriate recommendations were made concerning resources for that program, department or unit.

Members spent 8 to 15 hours a week in meeting time and perhaps twice that in reviewing materials. When multiplied by 16, you can be assured that as much effort as reasonably possible under the time constraints was spent. All recommendations were done by open vote. No recommendation was made lightly, and most were made with very broad consensus and clear support from the members.

All programs in the university will likely be asked to participate in some way to achieve the savings mandated by the budget. Increased effort and decreased resources will characterize Cal Poly intensively for the immediate future. Be assured that quality considerations were primary, and no effort was made to avoid those judgments for simple ease of decision-making. The respect, diligence, candor and professionalism exemplified by the members of the committee and support staff made this unpleasant task as best as possible and gives me confidence in both the recommendations and quality of the faculty across the campus.

State of California California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

MEMORANDUM

TO : Academic Senate

DATE: March 22, 1993

FROM: Home Economics Department

SUBJECT: Response to Request for Accreditation Information

Attached is background on accreditation as requested at the March 9 Senate meeting. The information provides a chronology of events/correspondence, a list of AHEA concerns related to the final decision, and a summary of departmental accomplishments since accreditation review.

For your information, there are more than 300 home economics units offering baccalaureate degrees in the United States of which 73 are accredited by AHEA. While accredited status may be indicative of program quality, a number of prestigious programs throughout the United States have elected NOT to seek accreditation. Examples would be Cornell, Ohio State, Purdue, etc.

A provision of AB 81-5 clearly states that accreditation documentation should be included only for programs that are currently accredited. For that reason the Home Economics Department included appropriate information on FIDER accreditation ONLY which is the only current accreditation the department has.

If members of the Senate are still concerned about this issue, complete files (including AHEA old and new criteria) are available in the Home Economics Department Office for review. The Home Economics Department considers loss of accreditation as past history.

(Note: notification letter dated July 15, 1985 specifying a complete self-study by March 1, 1986, contradictory to the normal one-year time period allowed for the preparation of self-study reports.)

September 20, 1985: Request from Barbara Weber to the Provost for full funding of Accreditation including document preparation, site visit, and consultant (which was and still is standard procedure in this discipline).

(Note: Provost funded \$840 but denied request to fund the hiring of a consultant and all other expenses. All other costs were funded by the school/department).

February 15, 1986: Self-Study Report submitted to AHEA prior to March 1, 1986 deadline.

(cost = \$5,900; faculty co-authors = 519 hours).

November 6-10, 1986: Site Visit.

November, 1986-October, 1987 (11 months): Serious delay in preparation of report by team (should have been ready in 6-8 weeks); one team member (also Director for Office of Professional Education) fired; delay by AHEA jeopardized the department's time to respond to report of site team.

October 9, 1987: Letter of transmittal from Malcolm Wilson to the Director of Accreditation of AHEA, Carl Weddle.

Responded to report by the site visitation team; notes the department's concern on *"large number of inaccuracies, misunderstandings, and inconsistencies in report"*.

October 29, 1987: Letter from Judy Bonner, Chair, Council for Professional Development, AHEA.

Provisional status granted for 2 years; strengths/weaknesses addressed. (See next section of this report.)

August 15, 1989: Letter from Barbara Weber to Virginia Caples, Chair, Council for Accreditation.

November 8, 1989: Letter from Karl Weddle, Director of Accreditation, AHEA.

Accreditation denied.

FINAL DECISION ON ACCREDITATION

The following items refer to the 1984 criteria that were still of concern to the Council for Accreditation at its October, 1989

plans to return Fall, 1993.

The recognized terminal degree for interior design faculty is the masters degree. Interior design faculty hired since program review have had the terminal degree.

Based on a severe nationwide shortage of Ph.D.-qualified faculty in fashion merchandising, the school's Personnel Policies and Procedures were revised and approved by higher administration to allow appointment on tenure track (with promotion limited to associate level) of masters candidates with appropriate background of education and experience. One person was appointed under these provisions.

Two tenured faculty hired more than 25 years ago under previous criteria have been promoted to full professor since the site visit. In addition, four faculty members are recognized by AHEA as Certified Home Economists; one is a licensed architect and is NCIDQ certified; and the retired annuitant is a Certified Financial Planner.

Documentation in the Accreditation materials did present faculty teaching assignments (on AHEA Self Study Report Form 2).

6.3 Curriculum

The progress report (August, 1989) did include appropriate information regarding depth and breadth and verifies that the program had added 2 officially recognized concentrations since the Self Study Report in 1986.

6.5 Curriculum

Measurable objectives reflect anticipated competencies and were included on expanded course outlines accompanying the progress report. In addition, programmatic objectives were and continue to be listed on student advising sheets.

6.7 Curriculum

The department indicated the levels/process for formal curriculum review. However, we did not submit the university's timetable for providing curriculum revision materials and a detailed explanation of curriculum committee structures throughout the university.

UPDATE

Since the accreditation process, the department has:

1. Received full 6-year FIDER accreditation of the interior design program, one of only 3 in the CSU system.