

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

San Luis Obispo, California 93407

ACADEMIC SENATE

Executive Committee
Academic Senate Agenda
Tuesday, April 25, 1989

UU220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

<u>Member:</u>	<u>Dept:</u>	<u>Member:</u>	<u>Dept:</u>
Aceto, Jeanne (Secty)	Placemt	Moustafa, Safwat	MechEngr
Andrews, Charles ((CH)	Acctg	Murphy, James	IndTech
Borland, James	ConstMgt	Terry, Raymond	Math
Burgunder, Lee	BusAdm	Vilkits, James	NRM
Crabb, A. Charles	IntAsDn, SAGR	Weatherby, Joseph	PoliSci
Dobb, Linda	Library	Wilson, Malcolm	VPAA
Gooden, Reg	PoliSci	Zeuschner, Raymond	SpCom
Kersten, Timothy	Econ	<u>Copies:</u> Warren J. Baker	
Lutrin, Sam (VC)	StLf&Actvs	Bill Rife	
		Howard West	

4.18.89
minutes
removed

- I. Minutes:
 - Approval of the April 18, 1989 Executive Committee Minutes (pp. 2-3).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. President
 - B. Academic Affairs Office
 - C. Statewide Senators
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. Resolution on Accreditation Guidelines-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee (pp. 4-5).
 - B. Resolution on Fall Conference Week-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee (p. 6).
 - C. Resolution on the Academic Calendar-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee (pp. 7-10).
 - D. Selection of nominees to review the Multi-Criteria Admissions (MCA) Program pursuant to Resolution AS-116-81. (This will be a university-wide ad hoc committee formed to review the requirements of the MCA program and the criteria used in making MCA decisions.) **Please bring the names of nominees from your school to this meeting.**
 - E. Selection of nominees to serve on an ad hoc committee to develop a graduate survey to implement Resolution AS-104-80/LRP. (This will be a university-wide ad hoc committee formed to develop a questionnaire to survey Cal Poly alumni.) **Please bring the names of nominees from your school to this meeting.**
 - F. Selection of nominees to act as statewide coordinators for the Institute on Teaching and Learning. Nominees are needed from the disciplines of Physics, Psychology, Engineering, and Critical Thinking. (Persons will be appointed at the state level to be statewide coordinators for their discipline. Statewide coordinators will be expected to attend a seminar in North Carolina from 5/30/89 to 6/3/89.) **Please bring the names of nominees from your school to this meeting.**
 - G. Campus Planning for Faculty Development Programs-selection of nominees to serve on an ad hoc committee to look at faculty development at Cal Poly and make recommendations as proposed in the attached guidelines (pp. 11-20).
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
 - Qualifications for Graduation Honors (pp. 21-22).
- VII. Adjournment: time certain 4:55pm

4

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

Background: Since 1968 the CSU has had in place a policy advocating and providing budgeting for the accreditation of all academic programs for which officially recognized professional accreditation was available. In the early 1980's the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) developed a set of nine principles to guide the accreditation process. These principles are:

1. Evaluation must place its emphasis on the outcome of the educational process.
2. The standards applied in the accreditation process must not discourage experimentation, innovation or modernization, either in teaching methods or in the curriculum itself.
3. Recommendations should be diagnostic, not prescriptive.
4. The accreditation report must explicitly recognize institutional diversity.
5. Accreditation should not encourage the isolation or self-containment of an academic program.
6. The burden of accreditation must be kept as light as possible, both for the institution being accredited and for the accreditation team.
7. The institution being accredited should be consulted as to the composition of the accreditation team, and has a right to expect that a majority of team members will be drawn from peer institutions and comparable programs.
8. In the case of professional schools, although there must be a significant input from the profession itself, the ultimate authority over educational policies must remain firmly in the hands of the academic institutions.
9. The greatest help an accrediting agency can offer to a program is to demand that its educational goals be clearly stated and that the program be reasonably calculated to achieve those goals.

RESOLUTION ON ACCREDITATION GUIDELINES

- Whereas, Concern with certain of the processes and policies of particular accrediting agencies has been expressed periodically in meetings of the Academic Vice Presidents, the Executive Council of the CSU Board of Trustees and elsewhere; and
- Whereas, The CSU needs to be well-served in its relationships with various accreditation agencies; and
- Whereas, There is the possibility that different accreditation agencies may operate independently at different institutions, resulting in potential abuses; and
- Whereas, The CIC Statement of principles has been adopted by the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (March 1987), by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (1986) and by the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education; therefore, be it
- Resolved, That the Academic Senate of the California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo, California endorse the nine principles enumerated in the CIC Statement of March 14, 1984 and summarized in the background statement above; and be it
- Resolved, That the Academic Senate of the California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo, California urges the CSU Academic Senate to recommend to the CSU Board of Trustees and directly urges the CSU Board of Trustees to adopt the CIC principles as system policy for the conduct of accreditation reviews.

Instruction Committee
Approved: April 13, 1989
Vote: 8 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain

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

Background: The Fall Conference Week is a tradition at Cal Poly that has existed for more than three decades. Begun as a welcome-back period for faculty, the format was expanded under President Robert E. Kennedy to a week. For most faculty, the Fall Conference Week is a tradition of apparently unknown origins whose format has not been questioned.

RESOLUTION ON FALL CONFERENCE WEEK

- Whereas, Substantive activities during the Fall Conference Week are of unequal significance to newer, and to more experienced faculty; and
- Whereas, Cal Poly already has a longer academic calendar than most (perhaps all) other CSU campuses; and
- Whereas, The interval between the summer and fall quarters can be less than a full week and / or be so short as to necessitate extending the summer quarter final examination period through Saturday; and
- Whereas, Many experienced faculty regard the Fall Conference Week of varied significance on a day-to-day basis, and react and participate accordingly; therefore, be it
- Resolved, That the Fall Conference should be rescheduled so as to allow Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday to be used for the orientation and edification of new faculty and departmentally organized events such as retreats, and to concentrate those matters of universal applicability and significance on Thursday and Friday of that week.

Approved: April 13, 1989
Vote: 7 Yes, 0 No, 1 Abstain

27

To: Charles Andrews, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Raymond D. Terry, Chair
Instruction Committee

Re: Proposed Academic Calendars for 1990-1992

The Academic Senate Instruction Committee met on Thursday, 4/13/89, at 11:00 a.m. to discuss the information package which you provided with your charge to the committee on 4/10/89.

Eight members of the Instruction Committee were present including 5 school members and three ex officio members.

By consensus of those present, the Academic Senate Instruction Committee approves the proposed academic calendars for 1990-1991 and 1991-1992. We further endorse the guidelines provided by the "Academic Calendar Norms and Definitions," subject to the following reservations:

1. The Final Exam period should be shortened, for example, to three or four days.
2. There remains too little time between Spring and Summer Quarters.
3. There is often too little time between Summer and Fall Quarters for those teaching during the Summer Quarter.
4. The Fall Conference Week should be eliminated or greatly reduced in length. A Resolution will follow.

8

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

Background: At present the University is operating on an approved Academic Calendar extending through the end of 1990. Forthcoming catalog deadlines make it timely to begin campus-wide consultation on the calendar for the next catalog issue, 1990-1992. In accordance with CAM 481 the Vice President for Academic affairs has proposed a calendar to the President for approval following appropriate consultation including the Academic Deans' Council, Academic Senate, Student Senate, Student Affairs Council, Foundation, and Dean of Students.

RESOLUTION ON THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR

Whereas, The proposed Academic Calendars for 1990-1991 and 1991-1992 conform to the guidelines of the document "Academic Calendar Norms and Definitions;" therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Academic Senate of the California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo, California approves the proposed Academic Calendars for 1990-1991 and for 1991-1992.

Approved: April 13, 1989

Vote: 8 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain

Instruction Committee

ACADEMIC CALENDAR 1990 - 91

SUMMER QUARTER 1990

JUNE 21	THURSDAY	BEGINNING OF UNIVERSITY YEAR BEGINNING OF SUMMER QUARTER SUMMER QUARTER CLASSES BEGIN
JULY 4	WEDNESDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- INDEPENDENCE DAY
JULY 5	THURSDAY	LAST DAY TO DROP CLASSES
JULY 6	FRIDAY	LAST DAY TO ADD CLASSES AND LATE REGISTER
AUGUST 9	THURSDAY	END OF SEVENTH WEEK
AUGUST 28	TUESDAY	LAST DAY OF CLASSES
AUGUST 29- SEPTEMBER 1	WEDNESDAY-SATURDAY	FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD
SEPTEMBER 2- SEPTEMBER 9	SUNDAY-SUNDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY

FALL QUARTER 1990

SEPTEMBER 10	MONDAY	BEGINNING FALL QUARTER (FACULTY ONLY)
SEPTEMBER 17	MONDAY	FALL QUARTER CLASSES BEGIN
SEPTEMBER 28	FRIDAY	LAST DAY TO DROP CLASSES
OCTOBER 1	MONDAY	LAST DAY TO ADD CLASSES AND LATE REGISTER
NOVEMBER 2	FRIDAY	END OF SEVENTH WEEK
NOVEMBER 12	MONDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- VETERANS' DAY OBSERVANCE
NOVEMBER 21-25	WEDNESDAY-SUNDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- THANKSGIVING
NOVEMBER 30	FRIDAY	LAST DAY OF CLASSES
DECEMBER 3-7	MONDAY-FRIDAY	FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD
DECEMBER 8	SATURDAY	FALL COMMENCEMENT
DECEMBER 9- JANUARY 6	SUNDAY-SUNDAY	END OF FALL QUARTER ACADEMIC HOLIDAY

WINTER QUARTER 1991

JANUARY 7	MONDAY	BEGINNING OF WINTER QUARTER
JANUARY 18	FRIDAY	WINTER QUARTER CLASSES BEGIN
JANUARY 21	MONDAY	LAST DAY TO DROP CLASSES
JANUARY 22	TUESDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. BIRTHDAY OBSERVANCE
FEBRUARY 18	MONDAY	LAST DAY TO ADD CLASSES AND LATE REGISTER
FEBRUARY 26	TUESDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- GEORGE WASHINGTON BIRTHDAY OBSERVANCE
MARCH 15	FRIDAY	END OF SEVENTH WEEK
MARCH 18-22	MONDAY-FRIDAY	LAST DAY OF CLASSES
MARCH 23-31	SATURDAY-SUNDAY	FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD ACADEMIC HOLIDAY

SPRING QUARTER 1991

APRIL 1	MONDAY	BEGINNING OF SPRING QUARTER
APRIL 12	FRIDAY	SPRING QUARTER CLASSES BEGIN
APRIL 15	MONDAY	LAST DAY TO DROP CLASSES
MAY 17	FRIDAY	LAST DAY TO ADD CLASSES AND LATE REGISTER
MAY 27	MONDAY	END OF SEVENTH WEEK
JUNE 7	FRIDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- MEMORIAL DAY
JUNE 10-14	MONDAY-FRIDAY	LAST DAY OF CLASSES
JUNE 15	SATURDAY	FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD
		SPRING COMMENCEMENT
		END OF SPRING QUARTER
JUNE 16	SUNDAY	END OF UNIVERSITY YEAR (FACULTY ONLY) ACADEMIC HOLIDAY

SUMMARY OF CALENDAR DAYS 1990-91

	Summer 1990	Fall 1990	Winter 1991	Spring 1991
Beginning Year/Quarter	--	5	--	--
MWF Days	28	30	28	29
TTH Days	20	21	20	20
Total Class Days	48	51	48	49
Exams	4	5	5	5
Quarter/Year End	--	1	--	1
Academic Work Days	52	62	53	55

Academic Year Work Days (F-W-SP) = 170

ACADEMIC CALENDAR 1991-92

SUMMER QUARTER 1991

JUNE 20	THURSDAY	BEGINNING OF UNIVERSITY YEAR BEGINNING OF SUMMER QUARTER SUMMER QUARTER CLASSES BEGIN
JULY 4	THURSDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- INDEPENDENCE DAY
JULY 5	FRIDAY	END OF SECOND WEEK OF INSTRUCTION--LAST DAY TO DROP A CLASS
JULY 8	MONDAY	LAST DAY TO ADD A CLASS
JULY 11	THURSDAY	LAST DAY TO REGISTER LATE AND PAY LATE REGISTRATION FEE
AUGUST 8	THURSDAY	END OF THIRD WEEK OF INSTRUCTION -- CENSUS DATE
AUGUST 27	TUESDAY	END OF SEVENTH WEEK
AUGUST 28-31	WEDNESDAY-SATURDAY	LAST DAY OF CLASSES
AUGUST 31	SATURDAY	FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD
SEPTEMBER 1-		END OF SUMMER QUARTER
SEPTEMBER 15	SUNDAY-SUNDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY

FALL QUARTER 1991

SEPTEMBER 15	MONDAY	BEGINNING OF FALL QUARTER (FACULTY ONLY)
SEPTEMBER 23	MONDAY	FALL QUARTER CLASSES BEGIN
OCTOBER 4	FRIDAY	END OF SECOND WEEK OF INSTRUCTION--LAST DAY TO DROP A CLASS
OCTOBER 7	MONDAY	LAST DAY TO ADD A CLASS
OCTOBER 11	FRIDAY	LAST DAY TO REGISTER LATE AND PAY LATE REGISTRATION FEE
NOVEMBER 8	FRIDAY	END OF THIRD WEEK OF INSTRUCTION -- CENSUS DATE
NOVEMBER 11	MONDAY	END OF SEVENTH WEEK OF INSTRUCTION
NOVEMBER 27-	WEDNESDAY-SUNDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- VETERANS' DAY
DECEMBER 1	SUNDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY--THANKSGIVING
DECEMBER 6	FRIDAY	LAST DAY OF CLASSES
DECEMBER 9-	MONDAY-FRIDAY	FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD
DECEMBER 14	SATURDAY	MID-YEAR COMMENCEMENT
DECEMBER 15-	SUNDAY-SUNDAY	END OF FALL QUARTER
JANUARY 5		ACADEMIC HOLIDAY

WINTER QUARTER 1992

JANUARY 6	MONDAY	BEGINNING OF WINTER QUARTER
JANUARY 17	FRIDAY	WINTER QUARTER CLASSES BEGIN
JANUARY 20	MONDAY	END OF SECOND WEEK OF INSTRUCTION--LAST DAY TO DROP A CLASS
JANUARY 21	TUESDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY--MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. BIRTHDAY OBSERVANCE
JANUARY 24	FRIDAY	LAST DAY TO ADD A CLASS
FEBRUARY 17	MONDAY	LAST DAY TO REGISTER LATE AND PAY LATE REGISTRATION FEE
FEBRUARY 21	FRIDAY	END OF THIRD WEEK OF INSTRUCTION--CENSUS DATE
MARCH 13	FRIDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY--GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY OBSERVANCE
MARCH 16-20	MONDAY-FRIDAY	END OF SEVENTH WEEK OF INSTRUCTION
MARCH 20	FRIDAY	LAST DAY OF CLASSES
MARCH 21-29	SATURDAY-SUNDAY	FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD
		END OF WINTER QUARTER
		ACADEMIC HOLIDAY

SPRING QUARTER 1992

MARCH 30	MONDAY	BEGINNING OF SPRING QUARTER
APRIL 10	FRIDAY	SPRING QUARTER CLASSES BEGIN
APRIL 13	MONDAY	END OF SECOND WEEK OF INSTRUCTION--LAST DAY TO DROP A CLASS
APRIL 17	FRIDAY	LAST DAY TO ADD A CLASS
MAY 15	FRIDAY	LAST DAY TO REGISTER LATE AND PAY LATE REGISTRATION FEE
MAY 25	MONDAY	END OF THIRD WEEK OF INSTRUCTION--CENSUS DATE
JUNE 5	FRIDAY	END OF SEVENTH WEEK OF INSTRUCTION
JUNE 8-12	MONDAY-FRIDAY	ACADEMIC HOLIDAY -- MEMORIAL DAY
JUNE 13	SATURDAY	LAST DAY OF CLASSES
		FINAL EXAMINATION PERIOD
		COMMENCEMENT
		END OF SPRING QUARTER
		END OF UNIVERSITY YEAR (FACULTY ONLY)

SUMMARY OF CALENDAR DAYS

	Summer 1991	Fall 1991	Winter 1992	Spring 1992
Beginning Year/Quarter		5		
HUF Days	29	30	28	29
ITH Days	19	21	20	20
Total Class Days	48	51	48	49
Exams	4	5	5	5
Quarter/Year End	--	1	--	1
Academic Work Days	52	62	53	55

Academic Year Work Days (F-W-SF) = 170

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4275
(213) 590- 5649

Code: FSR 89-08

Date: January 25, 1989

To: Presidents

Please Respond by
October 1, 1989

From: Caesar J. Naples
Vice Chancellor
Faculty and Staff Relations

Subject: Campus Planning for Faculty Development Programs

The California Postsecondary Education Commission has directed the three systems of public higher education to establish a planning process that will lead to better planning, coordination and evaluation of faculty development programs and make available more comprehensive and detailed information about campus objectives, needs and expenditures for faculty development. CPEC required that each segment establish guidelines for the campus planning process and the CSU guidelines are attached to this letter. The CPEC recommendations which direct this planning process are in Appendix A of the guidelines.

The purpose of this letter is to request that you begin the planning process on your campus which is described in the attached guidelines. Please note that a campus plan which meets the requirements of the guidelines is due in this office no later than October 1, 1989. For campuses which have not completed the planning process in time to submit a plan by October 1, 1989, an interim report may be submitted by that date with the final plan due on April 2, 1989.

The guidelines have been drafted with considerable help from an advisory committee and have been modified in response to campus comments. If you have any questions about the implementation of these guidelines, please call Dean Judith Hunt, (ATSS 635-5649, 213/590-5649) or Associate Dean William Coffey, (ATSS 635-5594, 213/590-5594).

CJN:dd

Attachment

Distribution:

w/attachment

Vice President, Academic Affairs
Associate Vice Presidents/Deans,
Faculty Affairs
Vice Presidents, Administration
Business Managers

Personnel Officers
Payroll Supervisors
Affirmative Action Officers
Auxiliary Organizations
Chancellor's Office Staff

GUIDELINES FOR A CAMPUS PLANNING PROCESS FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Campuses are directed to establish a campus coordinating committee to develop a campus-wide plan for faculty professional development in response to the guidelines in this memorandum and to submit the plan to the Office of the Chancellor no later than October 1, 1989.

A. PREAMBLE

1. Background.

In the 1986 Budget Act the Legislature directed the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) to study faculty development programs in California's public colleges and universities in order to clarify State policy and improve State decision making. Following a study by consultants, Berman, Weiler Associates, CPEC staff prepared a report which described the findings and offered policy recommendations. Because of limitations of time and funds, CPEC and the consultants focused primarily on the role of faculty in undergraduate instruction, with the main objective of the study being the improvement of undergraduate instruction. The report was approved by CPEC in May 1988. It directs the three systems of public higher education to establish a planning process that will lead toward better planning, coordination and evaluation of faculty development, and more comprehensive and detailed information regarding campus objectives/purposes, needs, and expenditures for faculty professional development. The CPEC recommendations are attached (appendix A).

These guidelines have been prepared in consultation with a statewide advisory committee. They are intended to encourage the coordination, planning and evaluation of faculty professional development and related activities which CPEC seeks, while preserving the differences among campus approaches which best suit the needs of the individual campuses. These guidelines presuppose that there will be significant faculty participation throughout the planning process. This is in keeping with the CPEC report which states that planning for specific programs must involve participants throughout the process, from beginning stage through evaluation (see the attached Standards for Effective Faculty Development from the CPEC report, appendix B).

2. Definition.

The CPEC report refers to faculty development as those university activities designed "to help faculty members improve their competence as teachers and scholars " and states that most observers include the areas of:

- o professional development that promotes the expertise of faculty members within their primary discipline and is often accomplished through research grants, sabbatical leaves, attendance at professional conferences;
- o instructional development that improves faculty members' ability to teach more effectively and is often accomplished by videotaping their classes, having other faculty observe their teaching and advise them about it, attendance at workshops and conferences on teaching;
- o curriculum development that aims at evaluating or revising the curriculum and goes well beyond the normal expectations that professors will periodically revise the course they teach;
- o organizational development that involves faculty members in improving the institution such as the Administrative Fellows Program.

The Berman, Weiler study noted that the three systems defined faculty development differently and in the California State University, the consultants' study defined "faculty development as both instruction-related activities and activities designed to support the conduct or dissemination of research, scholarly study, and the maintenance of up-to-date knowledge (or 'currency') in scholarly disciplines and fields."

For these planning purposes, the CSU defines faculty development as the enrichment and renewal of the faculty in order to maintain and increase teaching timeliness and effectiveness. As campuses develop their mission statements incorporating faculty development goals, we expect variety and diversity in goals and priorities, in the programs chosen to meet faculty needs and in definitions. The CPEC report calls for coordination of "faculty development and related activities at the campus level." The nature of these activities will vary from campus to campus.

3. CPEC State Priorities for Faculty Development Funding.

The CPEC report recommends that the State should ensure that an increased proportion of any additional State funds for faculty development should be directed towards improving undergraduate instruction and lists, but does not limit the improvement to, five specific priorities:

- a. Improving instruction for students with diverse learning styles;
- b. Improving the faculty's abilities to use new technologies;
- c. Developing new means of student assessment;
- d. Retraining faculty for teaching in a related field; and
- e. Providing release time and other support for women and minority faculty for scholarly activity.

B. THE PLANNING PROCESS.

1. Coordination.

This process is an opportunity for each campus to do broad based planning for faculty professional development and to coordinate a range of both existing and proposed activities for the better use of resources and for better dissemination of information. Some of these activities will be programs at a faculty development center, others may be handled by school deans or a research coordinator, yet others may involve competing proposals for support to attend an off campus conference. The focus is on coordination, not centralization.

Examples of the diversity of activities which could be included are: faculty learning to meet the needs of students for whom English is not their first language, performing artists developing the skills of fine arts management, physicists or electrical engineers learning to work with newly developed materials such as high temperature superconductors, social science faculty developing skill at grant writing in their discipline.

2. Campus Coordinating Committee.

The campus shall establish a broadly representative committee to prepare the campus plan. The means of establishing the committee and its size are at campus discretion and the approval process for the plan should follow normal campus procedures for faculty governance. The committee must include substantial faculty representation, including both senior and junior faculty, and academic administrators.

3. Record-keeping.

Records will be kept for state general funds which are specifically designated, at the system or the campus level, for faculty development activities. The purpose is not to create onerous reporting requirements but rather to allow the campus, the CSU and the State to assess the extent of and the need for faculty development programs. Although some additional records will be required, the intent is to use existing approval and reporting mechanisms to the extent possible. Thus, if an Associate Dean approves faculty travel claims, that Associate Dean would be the appropriate person to record faculty travel for faculty development purposes.

a. Records are to be kept by each campus of the state general funds which are expended for the following programs on an annual basis.

- o Systemwide training funds if used for faculty development
- o Sabbatical and difference in pay leaves
- o Affirmative Action Faculty Development Program
- o Any centers or programs for faculty development
- o Assigned time for a faculty development purpose if not included in another category
- o Travel if authorized for faculty development.

b. Reporting Categories for record-keeping are:

- o Direct expenses for faculty development:
 - 1. travel
 - 2. operating expenses
 - 3. faculty assigned time for faculty development
- o Administrative time-per cent of time in direct support of faculty development and related activities such as 40% of an Associate Dean's time assigned to coordinate faculty development and research activities. Do not report percentages less than 5%.

C. CAMPUS PLAN.

The campus plan is a document prepared in accordance with these guidelines and due in the Office of the Chancellor on October 1, 1989.

1. Mission Statement. The CSU mission statement will be incorporated into the system report to CPEC. Campuses are asked to incorporate portions of their own mission statement which are related to faculty development along with the campus goals for a coordinated faculty development program, or to draft a mission statement specifically for faculty development which includes the goals of the campus faculty development program.

2. A Definition of Faculty Development. The CSU definition for purposes of these guidelines is in the preamble of this memorandum. Campuses may add a different definition to their plan or incorporate the system definition.

3. Needs Assessment Strategies for Recruitment and Retention. Campuses are asked to describe their plans for hiring, the strategies that are expected to be necessary to recruit high quality new faculty and to retain high quality faculty, and the ways that these strategies involve the campus faculty professional development program.

Faculty development often emerges out of perceived needs of the faculty and an assessment of the individual needs of faculty and the institution for the next five years is to be part of the campus plan. Various means may be used to assess needs such as a short survey to faculty, an analysis by chairs and deans, an existing campus committee's report, group discussions. The campus assessment must include the views of faculty, including new faculty. System-wide analysis of recruitment and hiring needs for the next fifteen years will be included in the system report to CPEC.

4. CPEC Priorities. CPEC asks for a statement of how the State priorities of the improvement of undergraduate education and faculty affirmative action will be addressed at the campus and departmental levels. Depending upon the campus needs, these priorities may or may not be the highest priorities on the campus. Since the CPEC priorities (see Preamble, A 3.) refer to the expenditure of additional funds, campuses may either incorporate the means they will use to address these priorities into the plan of the faculty development program (item 5 below) or include a separate description of the procedure that would be followed in addressing these priorities if new funds were made available.

5. The Faculty Professional Development Plan. Describe the faculty development strategy aimed at meeting the needs identified by the campus. Include description of existing programs and how they will be coordinated and a description of any new programs which are envisaged. As part of the plan, include an analysis of the current decision making processes for faculty development and how these processes will change in implementing an on-going process of planning for faculty development. Include a description of the campus coordinating committee and the process the campus followed in developing this campus plan.

6. Estimated Resources. CPEC requests an estimate of the resources needed to implement the campus faculty professional development strategy. Assume the campus will continue to have non-State funds available for some activities and estimate the additional State funds needed annually to implement the campus plan for the next five years. It will be helpful in combining campus estimates into a system-wide estimate if estimates can be tied to specific portions of the plan. Use the record-keeping and reporting categories from B 4 a,b.

7. Evaluation.

a. A part of the campus faculty professional development program should involve provision for on-going evaluation of the program, including the record keeping outlined in B.3. Describe the means the campus will use to evaluate the program.

b. As part of a system-wide evaluation process, each campus will be asked to prepare a brief (2-3 pages) annual report of faculty professional development and related activities which are funded by State general funds. The annual report will be submitted to the Office of the Chancellor each July 1 (beginning in 1990) and used in system-wide planning and the preparation of budget requests. The reports will include a summary of the activities funded according to:

1. items funded (e.g. workshop, sabbaticals) and expenditures
2. estimated number of faculty served
3. needs met and unmet, by category and type of need
4. description of evaluation procedures and results
5. summary statement of effects on undergraduate instruction, including particularly effective examples.

D. SCHEDULE.

The Planning Process.

- a. December 1988 guidelines submitted to CPEC.
- b. January 1989 guidelines sent to campuses.
- c. October 1, 1989 three copies of the campus plans due in the Office of the Chancellor**
- d. December 1, 1989 system report summarizing campus plans submitted to CPEC.

** If the campus planning process has not been completed in time for a campus plan to be submitted by October 1, 1989, an interim report should be submitted consisting of a description of the campus planning process and a progress report. The final plan will be due April 2, 1990.

Send three copies of the campus plan to Judith A. Hunt, State University Dean, Faculty Affairs, Suite 222, Office of the Chancellor. If you have any questions, please call Dr. Hunt at (213) 590-5649, ATSS 635-5649.

APPENDIX A

- Faculty access to development programs are limited by a number of factors, including scarce resources, heavy workload, and institutional choices in the use of discretionary funds that are often "husbanded to support instruction" (ibid.).
- Faculty "are often unaware of development opportunities and felt they were under too much work pressure to become much more proactive in advancing their interests at the campus level" (op. cit. p. 51).
- Resources to support comprehensive, effective faculty development programs are inadequate.

These problems are not impossible or impractical to address at the State policy level, and they suggest that the State should give more, rather than less, attention and support to meeting them. Berman, Weiler found that State University faculty members are highly motivated to participate in faculty development opportunities: "Many faculty members recognized their need for more development and had expended considerable effort and ingenuity to utilize what support was available. Faculty motivation and demand at the State University were important strengths, and would be critical to the success of any new or expanded faculty development programs" (ibid.).

University of California

The University of California holds that research is an assigned part of the faculty member's regular responsibilities and should not be considered as a faculty development activity. While numerous by-products of basic and applied research are identical to faculty development objectives, Commission staff has agreed that no feasible way exists to link some fraction of the University's research investment to these by-products for the purposes of this study.

The absence of data on this matter and the difficulty in securing information from the University's divisional and departmental levels create a gap in information that makes it difficult to generalize about the adequacy of faculty development support as a whole in the University. The attention that Berman, Weiler gave to the University's instructional improvement efforts, however, provides some basis for drawing conclusions about this aspect of its program. Two findings are significant in this regard:

1. A large proportion of faculty state a need for assistance in improving their ability to use technology in instruction (69 percent) and in developing curriculum (59 percent); and
2. Several systemwide efforts are associated with the improvement of instruction, including the University Opportunity Fund, the Task Force on Lower Division Education and new campus committees charged to implement its recommendations; and Committees on Teaching, which are divisional committees of the University's Academic Senate on six campuses.

The faculty response regarding the need for assistance in improving their ability to use technology is salient because it involves a need that is not readily met by an application of individual resources to keeping current with the burgeoning field of technology, and the application of technology to a growing number of academic disciplines is central to the future development of these disciplines.

The University's current systemwide efforts demonstrate not only that the University has begun to respond to the call from several quarters for more attention to its instructional mission but that its resources are equal to the task at the present level of effort. The University has not called for additional financial assistance from the State for faculty development except in the areas of faculty affirmative action. More remains to be done in continuing the direction the University has begun.

Policy recommendations

Recommendation for State policy

The State has been funding faculty development in the three public segments of higher education at an estimated level of \$42 million per year. Considering the fact that the State's General Fund expenditure for current operations in the three segments exceeds \$4.5 billion, this level of investment (less than 1 percent) in the maintenance of faculty is modest at best, and appears to be unfocused in its aims.

RECOMMENDATION 1: The State should ensure that in the budgeting of any additional funds for faculty development, an increased

proportion of its support is directed toward the improvement of undergraduate instruction. Specifically, this goal includes: but is not limited to:

1. Improving instruction for students with diverse learning styles;
2. Improving the faculty's abilities to use new technologies;
3. Developing new means of student assessment;
4. Retraining faculty for teaching in a related field; and
5. Providing release time and other support for women and minority faculty for scholarly activity.

Recommendation for the three segments

Segmental and campus efforts at planning for the most effective use of State funds have been minimal. In order to ensure that the priority needs of the faculty are met, that the State's objectives for improved undergraduate education and faculty affirmative action are addressed, and that appropriate attention is paid to the evaluation of alternative forms of faculty development and their effectiveness, the Commission offers the following four recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION 2: The President of the University of California, the Chancellor of the California State University, and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges should each establish a process that will lead toward better planning, coordination and evaluation of faculty development in their segments, and will provide to the State more comprehensive and detailed information regarding campus objectives/purposes, needs, and expenditures in this area.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Toward that end, each segment should report to the Commission by January 1, 1989, with a procedure, guidelines, and schedule for initiating a campus planning process to provide for the coordination and evaluation of faculty development and related activities at the campus level. These guidelines should encourage the coordination of various

faculty development and related activities through such means as a broadly representative campus-wide committee and the adoption of record-keeping procedures that will enable each segment to report the use of State funds for various campus, system, and State priorities. These guidelines should also encourage the development of evaluation processes with appropriate output measures for assessing the effectiveness of campus and segmental faculty development programs.

RECOMMENDATION 4: The California State University should indicate in its January 1, 1989, report to the Commission how it will coordinate planning for, allocating of, and reporting on the \$2.5 million for research contained in the 1988-1989 Governor's Budget, if funded.

RECOMMENDATION 5: By December 1, 1989, each segment should provide the Commission with a report that summarizes and comments on these campus plans. In their reports, the State University and the University of California should address the following two policy issues:

- a. The effects and feasibility of using a budget ratio as a funding goal for faculty development; and
- b. The effects and feasibility of employing a restricted budget line item for funding faculty development.

The purpose of the segments' reports is to provide an information base for the Commission's review of the segments' on-going expenditures for faculty development and subsequent requests for additional State funds.

In establishing a process for planning at the campus level, the segments should consider recommending that the following information be included in each campus plan:

1. A mission statement that incorporates faculty development goals;
2. A definition of faculty development;
3. An analysis of recruitment and hiring needs and strategies and the ways in which these needs

and strategies involve faculty development;

4. A statement of individual faculty needs over the next one to five years;
5. A statement of the needs of the institution over the next one to five years;
6. A statement of how the State priorities of the improvement of undergraduate education and faculty affirmative action will be addressed at the campus and departmental levels;
7. A faculty development strategy aimed at meeting these priorities and needs;
8. An analysis of current decision-making processes for faculty development;
9. An estimate of the resources needed to implement this strategy;
10. A comprehensive accounting system for faculty development expenditures; and
11. Provisions for the evaluation of faculty development programs.

Recommendations for Community College faculty development

The finding that faculty development in California's Community Colleges suffers from "serious resource scarcities" is clearly borne out by the information they submitted for this report. Seventy percent of the responding institutions reported spending less than 1 percent of their operating budget on faculty development -- and over half reported spending one-half of 1 percent or less. This stands in sharp contrast to Florida, where approximately 2 percent of each college's budget is routinely allocated to staff and program development.

Despite the likelihood that some colleges may be choosing not to make allocations of available funds to faculty development, the overall evidence of need for additional resources for this purpose is considerable. Provision of additional State resources should

be made over the next several years in a way which enlists the best efforts of the institutions to plan effective development programs and, where possible, to reallocate current funds in combination with new State funds for supporting these programs.

Toward that end, the Commission offers these three recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION 6: The State should adopt a budget goal that will raise each Community College's support of staff, faculty and program development to 2 percent of the College's State and local revenues for the previous budget year (Adopted March 21, 1988).

RECOMMENDATION 7: The State should allocate to each district in fiscal year 1988-89 an amount of funds equal to one-half of 1 percent of the district's State and local revenues during fiscal year 1987-88 for the planning and support of staff, faculty, and program development. These funds should be used to supplement the level of funds spent during fiscal year 1987-88, and a report on these expenditures should be made to the Board of Governors at the end of the fiscal year (Adopted March 21, 1988).

RECOMMENDATION 8: The Board of Governors should develop a funding plan for the support of staff, faculty, and program development in the California Community Colleges that provides:

- a. An appropriate institutional matching requirement;
- b. A requirement that planning, evaluation, and accountability procedures referred to in the recommendation for segmental planning be adopted at the district and campus levels.
- c. A restricted budget line item for staff, faculty, and program development at the district and campus levels; and
- d. Appropriate adjustments based on size or geographical considerations.

type of program in his 1988-89 budget. His inclusion of this specific line item for research in the State University establishes a precedent, although "research . . . consistent with the primary function (i.e., instruction) of the state colleges" was authorized by statutes enacting certain provisions of the 1960 Master Plan.

In part, because the University of California maintained that no aspect of its research activities should be reported as faculty development during Berman, Weiler's survey of its development activities, the issue of whether research contributes to instructional quality was raised by Berman, Weiler but, as far as it affected the University, it was not resolved. The Commission discussed the issue at some length in an earlier report on research in the University (1987, p. 15), in which it identified both the positive and negative effects of research on undergraduate instruction.

Certain by-products of research activity, such as keeping current with one's field, gaining new knowledge that has immediate applicability to the curriculum, and access to resources to attend professional meetings and add new equipment to the laboratory, obviously contribute to faculty members' instructional capabilities. Because none of these benefits were covered in Berman, Weiler's survey of the University, Berman, Weiler state that their description of instruction-related faculty development at the University "may understate matters." From the State's perspective, the segments of higher education should be as direct as possible about the relationship of instruction, research, and faculty development.

Standards for effective faculty development

Faculty development efforts can be evaluated for their effectiveness at two levels of analysis -- program planning and program objectives -- even if at a third and most desirable level -- the impact of development activities on instruction -- little research has been able to trace its effects on the learning of students.

Standards exist for the evaluation of the effectiveness of faculty development programs at the planning level as a result of professional experience and the distillation of research on effective programs. In

Faculty Development from a State Perspective, Commission staff presented the following summary of standards (p. 13):

1. Encouragement of opportunities for continued professional growth must rank high on an institution's list of priorities.
2. An institution-wide plan for this growth is essential.
3. The plan should respond to the perceived needs of faculty in achieving institutional priorities.
4. Planning should reflect the benefits of faculty development to students, faculty, the institution, and society.
5. Planning should be based on the understanding that the faculty have different needs at different stages of their career.
6. Planning should provide for a multi-faceted program, including professional, instructional, curriculum, and institutional development.
7. Planning for specific programs must involve participants throughout the process, from beginning stages through evaluation.
8. Only the most exemplary training activities should be implemented.

Much of the literature on faculty development programs stresses that they must be designed close to the participants with very clear purposes in mind. A correlative requirement is that institutions should have the flexibility to design their programs based on their mission and needs. State policy should ensure not only that this provision is made, but that the planning process outlined in the summary above is also taking place.


Standards for evaluating programs at the program objective level must be developed in conjunction with planning the programs. For example, an affirmative action program designed to retain and promote qualified women and minority professors should have program objectives that are reasonable and acceptable measures of success. Even if increased instructional effectiveness of those professors in the program may not be one of these measures, the proportion of faculty in the program who are retained and promoted is an appropriate standard of its effectiveness.

Memorandum**RECEIVED**

JAN 3 1989

OASIS Implementation Team

Date : May 16, 1988
File No.: Academic Senate
HONORS
Copies ..

From : 
Elaine M. Doyle, Implementation Team Member
OASIS Project

Subject : POLICY CHANGE ON HONORS AT GRADUATION

BACKGROUND:

Cal Poly's policy on honors at graduation was changed to the present system for the 1984-86 catalog. The present honors system selects students whose overall grade point average falls within the top 10% of the students graduating from each school. The top 10% is further broken down into three categories within each school:

Summa cum laude - the top 1%
Magna cum laude - the next 3%
Cum laude - the next 6%

These calculations are based on the grades from the previous years graduating class. This explains the situation that arose in Science & Math for the 1986-87 graduates when no one received Magna cum laude.

Prior to 1984, honors categories were calculated using a designated overall GPA as follows:

Highest Honors - overall GPA 3.60
Honors - overall GPA 3.20

Of the 19 CSU campuses, 15 use a designated overall GPA to calculate honors at graduation. Of these 15 campuses, 10 of them use the Summa, Magna and Cum laude designations. (see Attachment 1)

The new SIS software computes honors at graduation using a designated GPA for the three honors categories, Summa, Magna and Cum laude.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that Cal Poly return to the designated overall GPA system utilizing the following GPA's:

Summa cum laude - 3.85
Magna cum laude - 3.70 ~~3.75~~ 3.70
Cum laude - 3.50

Using the 1986-87 graduates as an example (see Attachment 2), the total number of students in each honors category would not change dramatically. Also, using the new

HONORS AT GRADUATION
Page 2

system as opposed to the present system, 18 more students would have been eligible for honors at graduation.

The new criteria will inform students as to what GPA requirement is needed to gain graduation honors. The new criteria also gives more academic credibility to Cal Poly, because it will eliminate the situation where two students end up with the same GPA and one receives honors at graduation when the other student does not.

Ex Can find 4.25.89

RECEIVED

MAR 10 1989

State of California

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Academic Senate

M e m o r a n d u m

To: Charles T. Andrews, Chair
Academic Senate

Date: February 22, 1989

File No:

Copies: William Rife
Peter Lee

From: C.A. (Tina) Bailey, Chair *Cap*
Academic Senate Curriculum Committee

Subject: Proposal for Joint MBA/MS Degree

I would like to forward to the floor of the Academic Senate the attached proposal for a joint MBA/MS degree program from the schools of Business and Engineering. As the proposal was approved in concept by the 1987-88 Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, there is no need for the current committee to reconsider the material which has been modified in its displays and editorially but not in substance.

School of Business and School of Engineering

MBA/MS Engineering with Specialization in Engineering Management

1989-90

Date: March 9, 1989

V	A	C	
P	S	C	
			I. DEGREE PROGRAM PROPOSALS -----
			<u>A. Degree Program</u>
	A*		1. Joint MBA/MS Engineering with Specialization in Engineering Management (see attached)
			<u>B. Minors</u>
			1. None
			<u>C. Concentrations or Specializations</u>
			1. None
			II. NEW COURSES -----
			<u>Graduate School of Business</u>
	A*		1. GSB 579 Manufacturing Strategy (4) 4 sem C5
	A*		2. GSB 582 High-Technology Marketing (4) 4 sem C5
	A*		3. GSB 590 Seminar in Sociotechnical Systems (4) 4 sem C5
			<u>Industrial Engineering</u>
	A*		1. IE 556 Technological Project Management (4) 4 sem C5
	A*		2. IE 557 Technological Assessment and Planning (4) 4 sem C5
	A*		3. IE 558 Engineering Decision Making (4) 3 lec, 1 lab C4/16
	A*		4. IE 559 Engineering Research and Development (4) 4 sem C5
			III. DELETED COURSES -----
			1. None
			IV. CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES -----
			<u>Number, Title, Unit Value, C/S Number, Description and Prerequisite Changes</u>
			1. None
			V. GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH COURSES -----
			1. None
			VI. CURRICULUM CHANGES -----
			1. None

CC = Academic Senate Curriculum Committee

AS = Academic Senate

VP = Vice President for Academic Affairs

A* = approved June 1988

Cal Poly
Joint Degree Curriculum for MBA/MS in Engineering
with
Specialization in Engineering Management¹

FIRST YEAR Units

Fall.....15

- GSB 511 Financial Accounting (4)
- GSB 513 Organizations and Management (4)
- GSB 514 Legal Aspects of Management and
the Market System(4)

²Technical Elective in Specialization (3)

Winter.....16

- GSB 521 Accounting for Management Planning and Control (4)
- GSB 523 Managerial Economics (4)
- GSB 524 Marketing Management (4)
- IE 557 Technological Assessment and Planning (4) (new)

Spring.....16

- GSB 531 Managerial Finance (4)
- ³GSB 532 Quantitative Business Analysis II (4)
- GSB 533 Aggregate Economic Analysis and Policy (4)
- ⁴GSB 534 Operations Management (4)

Summer.....4

- GSB 598 Graduate Internship in Business (4)

☛ SECOND YEAR

Fall.....15

- GSB 541 Organizational Behavior (4)
- GSB 542 Marketing Research and Planning (4)
- ⁵GSB 543 Information Systems for Decision Support (4)
- IE 545 Advanced Topics in Simulation (3)

Winter.....16

- GSB 551 Management in an International Environment (4)
- GSB 552 Financial Analysis and Planning
- IE 555 Computer Integrated Manufacturing (4)
- IE 558 Engineering Decision Making (4) (new)

Spring.....15

- GSB 561 Business, Government and Society (4)
- GSB 562 Business Strategy and Policy (4)
- IE 556 Technological Project Management (4) (new)
- ²Technical Elective in Specialization (3)

⁶Summer.....8

- Business Elective (4)
- Business Elective (4)

Curriculum for MBA/MS in Engineering with
Specialization in Engineering Management (continued)

Footnotes

1. Interdisciplinary program requiring admittance to both the School of Engineering and the School of Business, and concurrent enrollment towards M.B.A. and M.S. in Engineering Degrees each with Specialization in Engineering Management.
2. Technical Elective to be selected from ~~electives~~ approved for Engineering Management Specialization which include:
 - IE 470 Selected Advanced Topics (1-3)
 - IE 500 Individual Study (1-3)
 - IE 541 Advanced Operations Research (3)
 - IE 543 Advanced Human Factors (4)
 - IE 544 Advanced Topics in Engineering Economy (3)
 - IE 559 Engineering Research and Development (4)
 - CSC 420 Artificial Intelligence (3)
 - CSC 421 Knowledge Based Systems (3)
 - CSC 444 Health Information Systems (3)
3. Waived if satisfied prior to admission by IE 304 (Operations Research) or IE 305 (Operations Research II) or equivalent course. If waived, four (4) less units in total are required and an elective normally taken in last summer could be substituted.
4. Waived if satisfied prior to admission by appropriate IE 410 (Inventory Control Systems) or IE 411 (Production Systems Analysis) or equivalent course. If waived, four (4) less units in total are required and an elective normally taken in last summer could be substituted.
5. Not required for students who have taken an equivalent course in their undergraduate program. However, replacement course must be taken.
6. May possibly be taken earlier if other courses waived. Business elective courses include GSB 579, GSB 582, and GSB 590.
7. Total number of units could be reduced if previous coursework taken justifies waiver of some required courses (e.g., see footnotes 3 and 4 above).

April 24, 1989

To: Charles Andrews, Chair
Academic Senate

From: John C. Rogers, Chair *J.C.R.*
Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Resource Implications for Joint MBA/MS Degree

The Academic Senate Budget Committee has reviewed the summary information supplied from the Department of Industrial Engineering and the School of Business. Both the School of Business and the Department of Engineering have assumed that this new concentration will require no additional sections of existing courses during the initial startup. The School of Business will add three new courses and the Department of Engineering will add four new courses. Thus leading to a total increase of 28 WTU's.

Attached is a summary spread sheet prepared by the Academic Senate Budget Committee and an explanation of faculty resources needed from the School of Business.

MBA/MS JOINT DEGREE BETWEEN THE SCHOOL
OF BUSINESS AND THE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

- | | | |
|-------|------------|---|
| | <u>WTU</u> | |
| 1. IE | +16 | IE assumes no additional sections of existing courses are needed. |
| 2 GSB | +12 | School of business assumes no additional sections of existing courses are needed. |

MBA/MSEngr JOINT DEGREE PROPOSAL

APPENDIX G: Faculty resources needed to implement and sustain the proposed concentration or specialization.

- I. Start-up phase: Assuming that initially, MBA/MSEngr students will be accommodated in existing sections of currently offered courses:

Required new courses:

BUS: 3 @ 4 credits = 12 credits/year

ENGR: 4 @ 4 credits = 16 credits/year

Total new WTU: 30 credits/year

Total additional faculty = .80 position

All the new GSB courses will be offered as electives in the "regular" MBA program, and thus will not require incremental faculty; it is assumed that at least 2 of the IE courses will be offered as electives in the MSIE program. Thus, the incremental total faculty would be more like:

Net new credits taught: 8 credits/year

Inasmuch as the MBA program generates over 125% of the positions required to actually teach the courses, these courses could be taught from the "dean's reserve," which is currently used largely for lab assistants, graduate assistants, and faculty assigned time. After two years, the additional credits taught result in additional faculty positions earned by the respective schools, and the program will become "self-supporting," in terms of faculty needs.

- II. Full enrollment: Assumed to be 50 new students admitted to the program each year, or two sections of each course per year.

Total WTU's taught: 2 sections x 4 credits x 27 courses
= 216 WTU's over two years

Total WTU's per year + $216/2 = 108/\text{year}$

Total new faculty needed = $108/36 = 3.0$ positions

The program will be expanded as demand grows and faculty positions are generated, so that the 3 new positions will not be needed all at once.