

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

Minutes of the
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, October 22, 1991
(continuation of October 15, 1991 meeting)
UU220, 3:00-5:00 pm

Members present:

<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>
Andrews, Charles (C)	Actg	Mori, Barbara	SocSci
Bertozzi, Dan	Bus Adm	Murphy, James	IndTech
Botwin, Michael	Arch Eng	Russell, Craig	Music
De Mers, Gerald	PE/RA	Shelton, Mark	CropSci
Devore, Jay	Stats	Vilkitis, James	NRM
Gamble, Lynne (VC)	Library		
Irvin, Glenn	AVP	Camuso, Margaret	
Kaminaka, Stephen	Ag Eng		
Kersten, Timothy	Econ		
Koob, Robert	VPAA		
Loomis, Charles	EngrTech		
Lucas, Robert	AVP		
Lutrin, Sam	StLf&Actvs		

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:17 pm.

- I. Minutes - none
- II. Communications & Announcements - none
- III. Reports - none
- IV. Consent Agenda - none
- V. Business Items - none

VI. Discussion

D. Graduate Studies Proposal (pp. 50-61 of Oct. 15 agenda). Robert Lucas discussed several issues including the concern that had been raised in the previous meeting of the Executive Committee with regard to the statement that "By 1995, Cal Poly shall ensure that 10 to 20 percent of each graduating class is in graduate programs (p.54)." He stated we are close to that target level now. There are 400-450 people in the credential program and there are approximately 3,300 graduates each year. If one considers masters and credentials program together as constituting a "graduate" program, then the 10-20% does not constitute a substantial departure from the status quo. B.Lucas further summarized recommendations made by the Oversight Strategic Planning Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee: a Graduate Council should be formed that would play a role in the review of the graduate curriculum. There should be a Graduate Studies Office that serves as a single point of contact outside the specific department of the major.

J.Devore suggested that the quotation beginning be altered from "By 1995, Cal Poly shall ensure . . ." to read "Cal Poly will continue to . . ."

A discussion ensued concerning statistics and figures. To clarify matters, B.Lucas stated that last year there were 746 masters candidates, not including those in the credentials program. There were 241 masters degrees awarded. L.Gamble felt confusion resulted in the document as a result of regarding "credential programs" as a type of "post-baccalaureate" program since many people in the credential program do not yet have a degree. C.Russell expressed concern over the recommendation that "there be a campus-wide academic policy formulating body which has primary responsibility for graduate studies policy and curriculum (p.56)" since there would be an overlapping of jurisdiction and a potential conflict of interest with the present Curriculum Committee. M.Botwin moved that the document be sent to the Long-Range Planning Committee (2nd by C.Russell). The motion passed.

- E. Improved university hour(s) & lunch hours (p.62). S.Kaminaka stated that the School of Agriculture has considered ways to promote informal discussion on campus. They have designated a space to be a "coffee room" that has been well received. The present university hour is only once a week: he felt additional "unscheduled" time on campus would promote collegiality and present opportunities for committees to meet, etc. J.Murphy observed that the university hour is presently ignored by some and that abuse could occur with this proposal as well. C.Andrews commented that adopting the proposal would result in moving a 7:00 o'clock class back to 6:45: that is very early for beginning a class. B.Mori moved that an ad hoc committee consisting of one representative from each of the schools be established to consider the matter (2nd by M.Shelton). The motion passed. C.Andrews requested that each caucus chair bring forward a name from his/her respective school at the next Executive Committee meeting to submit for membership on this ad hoc committee. M.Botwin asked that the committee also discuss and examine the shortage of classroom space on campus. The committee will be asked to report back by February 18 so that their finding(s) can be brought before the committee on February 25.
- B. Program Review, J.Murphy handed out a revised proposal. J.Murphy stated two concerns regarding the Program Review Committee: 1) he would like some assurance that the PRC communicates effectively with the department or program being evaluated, and 2) he was troubled that the PRC would be looking at individual courses. C.Andrews expressed his view that it was appropriate for the PRC to look at individual courses since a course might be taught in two different locations, and the PRC should determine if they overlap and/or whether they should be consolidated. J.Vilkitis observed that the ad hoc committee will determine the *factors* for evaluation: then the PRC will do the *evaluating*. R.Koob clarified that the workload for this committee would involve evaluating approximately 140 programs. C.Andrews and J.Murphy stated it would be helpful if the PRC had ready access to the administration's statistics and information. J.Murphy asked what would be the result or outcome of this process—recommendations to the Senate? to the Administration? C.Andrews responded that the PRC would compile a summary of findings and recommendations and submit that summary to the Academic Senate. It could then be sent forward to the Administration. J.Vilkitis felt a narrative summary was insufficient and that the PRC instead should arrive at a numerical measure. C.Russell responded that a numerical indicator might prove to be unnecessarily divisive across the campus and that more time might be spent in revising the *system* for calculating this number than actually evaluating a program. Russell felt that the strength of the PRC would rest on its abilities to exercise good judgement, not compute numbers. M.Botwin agreed, as did G.De Mers who felt that academic programs might start making decisions in order to win "points" in the calculation of the numerical indicator as opposed to

making those decisions based on academic quality. C.Andrews felt that a "flagged" program should be assisted in resolving its problems. J.Murphy concurred stating that the process might result in improved programs. L.Gamble stated that cost is an *essential* factor that should be considered along with the other factors. C.Andrews gave several examples of how the process might work and elucidated possible outcomes. J.Murphy felt the PRC should actively consult with the Budget Committee, Long-Range Planning Committee, and Curriculum Committee in order to make informed decisions. M.Botwin moved that we agendaize the item (2nd by B.Mori). The motion passed.
 J.Vilkitis moved that the Executive Committee start forming an ad hoc committee charged with forming the criteria that will be utilized by the PRC. (2nd by S.Lutrin).

CONSENT AGENDA FOR SENATE: inform them that the Executive Committee is forming the ad hoc committee and that the committee will consist of one representative per school. The motion passed.

C.Andrews charged the caucus chairs with bringing forth a name and an alternate for this ad hoc committee at the Nov. 5 meeting of the Executive Committee.

VII. Committee memberships: the following names were brought forward and unanimously approved:

Fairness Board	Bette Tryon (SPS)
Student Affairs	Steve Davis (SPS)
Elections	Habib Sheik (English)

VII. Adjournment at 4:57.



 Craig H. Russell, Secretary of the Academic Senate

Oct. 30, 1991

 Date