

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

Minutes of the ACADEMIC SENATE
Thursday, April 18, 1991
UU 220, 3-5pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:13pm.

I. Minutes: none.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.

III. Reports: none.

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

V. Business Items:

Review and adoption of the charges to be given to the Program Review Task Force.

A copy of J Murphy's memo to the Chair, Task Force on Program Review, dated 4-16-91 was distributed to the committee. Said memo was reviewed and the following discussion followed:

(Botwin) The document does not contain weighing factors to be used in making judgments re programs;

(Ahern) It still does not represent "criteria". (Murphy) The task force will have to determine what their criteria will be;

(Vilkitis) Item #10 is confusing [10. "When considering resources, consider the following..."]. Items a, b, and c under #10 [a. "Programs that currently offer a good balance of available resources, b. ...need additional resources for maintenance, c. ...can continue with a reduction of resources"] are determined by data. But, item d. [d. "Programs that are not supportive of Cal Poly's Mission Statement and could or should be eliminated"], seems to be a value judgment. (Ahern) suggested using different wording for #10. The wording was changed to read:

For resource priority allocations, identify, based on the following: (a) Programs that currently offer a good balance of available resources, that is are self-supporting; (b) Programs that need additional resources for maintenance; therefore, based on the above, (c) Programs that can continue with a reduction of resources.

(Vilkitis) When dealing with academic programs, lots of data is available. Other programs do not have yardsticks to measure their validity.

(Gooden) The Executive Committee serves as a watchdog committee over the task force--it is to provide input and support.

(Russell) No matter how much data is given, the final decision must be made with wisdom and judgement. Guidelines as set forth in the memo seem fine generally. We must trust in the ability of the task force members to do a responsible job.

Discussion ensued about the short time frame for this review. Koob stated that the time frame was an external one. Andrews felt that the need for a program review was urgent but not a "panic". CSU administrators have not called an emergency exigency situation. Are there administrative mechanisms in place to perform a review under such conditions?

Several questions/responses were voiced:

Information needed to make program determinations will be coming in many forms. How the data in some documents is to be compiled is not identifiable. (Vilkitis) If faculty need to be laid off, can this happen before a program is determined to be ended?

If programs are cut, student enrollment will be lowered and less overall resources will be required.

(Vilkitis) What is the product expected of the task force? It is not identified in the 4-16-91 memo.

(Andrews) Under 10.a., add: "restructuring/relocation of programs." If it is a stand-alone it may not be an appealing program. But if it is moved, it may be more appealing.

Is there a savings/budget reduction in restructuring a program?

(Murphy) The task force should categorize all programs into a, b, c, etc. categories so problem areas can be looked at first.

We can't ask the committee to evaluate programs and create the solutions as well.

Add an item #11: Identify non-support programs and categorize them.

The task force should submit a report to the Executive Committee.

* * * *

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