Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, February 19 2013
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: Approval of Executive Committee meeting minutes for January 29 2013 (pp. 2-3).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost:
D. Statewide Senate:
E. CFA:
F. ASI:

IV. Business Item(s):
A. Appointment of nominees to Academic Senate committee vacancies (p. 4).
B. Appointment of nominees to university committee vacancies (p. 4).
C. Resolution on Proposed new Degree Program for Master of Professional Studies in Dairy Products Technology: Schaffner, chair of Curriculum Committee (pp. 5-9).
D. Resolution on Revision to Student Evaluation Policies: Stegner, chair of the Instruction Committee (pp. 10-12).

V. Discussion Item(s):
Academic Senate membership: possible changes in representation and voting status of the Senate’s membership. (Materials sent under separate cover.)

VI. Adjournment:
I. Minutes: The minutes of October 30 and November 6 2013 were approved as presented.

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

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: Rein announced that President Armstrong has approved:
      resolution on the proposal for the establishment of the Institute for Advanced
      Technology and Public Policy and resolution on proposed name change: "Cal Poly
      Extended Education." Dustin Stegner, chair of the Instruction Committee, reported that
      the evaluation structure is being reviewed as well as the policy on the maximum
      number of final exams a student can take in one day.
   B. President’s Office: Kinsley reported that Steve Rein, Katie Morrow, and President
      Armstrong have invited Chancellor White to visit Cal Poly on May 2, 2013. Cal Poly
      will be offering three honorary degrees at spring commencement.
   C. Provost: Enz Finken reported that the CSU Board of Trustees approved a resolution
      requiring all programs to reduce the number of units required for graduation to 180
      units. A group is being formed to look at multidisciplinary activities on campus. The
      Student Success Fee Committee has approved the proposal for next year, which
      include $7.1 million for instruction. Faculty is asked to encourage colleagues to offer
      valued classes during summer session. Additionally the campus needs to start thinking
      about offering online courses in the summer since many students are taking online
      courses in the summer and transferring them to Cal Poly. The Enrollment Committee
      will be looking at the possibility of admitting students into zones, in some majors, as a
      way to provide greater stability and increase the retention rate.
   D. Statewide Senate: Foroozar reported that after acknowledging the need for faculty
      consultation on the 180-unit policy, Chancellor White voted in favor of modifying all
      programs to a maximum and minimum of 180 units. Vice Chancellor Ben Quillian
      announced the addition of $250 million to the budget because of Prop 30. Governor
      Brown’s budget proposal provides for a 5% increase for each of the next two years and
      4% yearly for three additional years. LoCascio reported that Governor Brown has asked
      the CSU to pay the interest due on building bonds, which could be $250 million.
      Additionally, there are no funds for GSI, making this 6 years without GSIs. Two
      assembly bills are being discussed; AB-51 a pilot program with the goal of creating a
      model of articulation and coordination among K–12 schools, community colleges, and
      campuses of the CSU that will allow students to earn a baccalaureate degree for a total
      cost not exceeding $10,000, including textbooks. AB-67 would prohibit mandatory
      systemwide fees or tuition charged to students from exceeding the level of the
      mandatory systemwide fees or tuition charged for the 2011–12 fiscal year.
   E. CFA Campus President: Thorncroft will be attending a meeting in Los Angeles to
      discuss the following issues: 180-unit degree, evaluations, online education, and raises.
   F. ASI Representative: Morrow reported that the search for a new Executive Director
      continues with video interviews. At the last CSSA meeting at Chico, three resolutions
were approved: resolution in support of Chancellor White, resolution calling for Cal State to be gender inclusive, and a resolution in support of the Governor’s budget.

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

V. Business Item(s):
A. Appointment of nominees to Academic Senate committee vacancies: The following appointments were made:
   College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Science
   Fairness Board
   Fernando Campos-Chillon, AniSci

   Orfalea College of Business
   Graduate Programs Subcommittee
   John Dobson, Finance

   Professional Consultative Services
   Fairness Board
   Bradley Kyker, Advising/CAFES

B. Appointment of nominees to university committee vacancies: M/S/P to approve Anthony Mendes to serve on the Intellectual Property Review Committee.

C. Appointment of nominees to the Search Committee for Director of the International Center: M/S/P to approve Cyrus Ramezani to serve on the Search Committee for Director of the International Center.

D. Resolution on Modification to Fairness Board Description and Procedures (Fairness Board): Rein presented this resolution, which updates the description and procedures to include services provided by the Student Ombuds Services. M/S/P to send the resolution back to committee for clarification.

VI. Discussion Item(s):
A. Modifications to “Resolution on the Semester Review Task Force Findings”: The following changes were recommended and will be incorporated prior to the second reading on February 12, 2013:
   Remove the comma before “financially” from second whereas clause
   Add a comma between “semesters” and “including”
   Delete “Student Vote” and replace with “ASI/Board of Directors resolution” from second resolved clause

B. Academic Senate membership: Due to lack of time, this item was not discussed.

VII. Adjournment: 5:00 pm

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
Nominations for 2012-2014 Academic Senate Vacancies
*Willing to chair committee if release time is available

**College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences**
Instruction Committee

**College of Architecture and Environmental Design**
Budget and Long Range Planning Committee
Grants Review Committee
Research & Professional Development Committee

**Orfalea College of Business**
Faculty Affairs Committee
Instruction Committee

**College of Engineering**
Distinguished Teaching Award Committee
Instruction Committee

**Professional Consultative Services**
GE Governance Board
Instruction Committee

Nominations for 2012-2013 University Committee Vacancies

Cal Poly Housing Corporation Board – 1 representative, 1 vacancy

Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) – 1 representative, 1 vacancy

Intellectual Property Review Committee – 1 vacancy from CAED

University Union Advisory Board – 1 representative, 1 vacancy
WHEREAS, There is a substantial industry demand for professionally trained graduates prepared to enter management roles in the dairy foods manufacturing industry; and

WHEREAS, The dairy foods manufacturing industry is one of the largest agricultural industries in California and agriculture is the largest economic segment of the California economy; and

WHEREAS, The current undergraduate program for a Bachelor of Science degree in Dairy Science with emphasis on dairy foods does not meet the substantial demand for qualified employees in this growing industry; and

WHEREAS, The Dairy Science Department is proposing to create a Master of Professional Studies in Dairy Products Technology program made up of coursework, internship and a comprehensive exam as a culminating experience; and

WHEREAS, The College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee have carefully evaluated this proposal and recommend its approval; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the proposal for the Master of Professional Studies in Dairy Products Technology and that the proposal be sent to the Chancellor’s Office for final approval.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Date: February 12 2013
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo

Summary Statement of Proposed New Degree Program for
CSU Academic Master Plan Projection

1. Title of proposed program:
   Masters of Professional Studies in Dairy Foods

2. Reason for proposing the program:

   The dairy foods industry is struggling to find qualified management employees to meet its substantial growth. The dairy foods industry has experienced rapid growth resulting in a shortage of skilled entry-level managers. The well-known and highly regarded Cal Poly Dairy Science undergraduate program in dairy foods has also grown in recent years. For example, the class that will graduate in the 2010-2011 academic year will have four students who explicitly studied in the dairy foods elective area. The freshman class that entered in academic year 2010-2011 has eight students that have indicated they are studying the dairy foods elective area. The department will continue to encourage this growth, but recruiting and admitting high school graduates into dairy science is a nationwide challenge. We have implemented a minor in dairy foods that has gained popularity among undergraduates, particularly in Food Science. However, even if we found a way to attract and recruit a substantially larger number of freshmen into the undergraduate program, it would be five to six years from this date before the students were ready to enter the job market.

   Our solution is to initiate the nation's first professional master's degree in dairy foods. As a modern, progressive one-year program, this Master's of Professional Studies in Dairy Foods will build on Cal Poly's learn-by-doing tradition while remaining at the forefront of industry needs. The professional, accelerated program will include intensive course work delivered in person and online, completed by a cohort of students in twelve months.

3. Expected student learning outcomes and methods for assessing outcomes:

   Students who successfully complete the twelve-month curriculum and graduate with the degree of Master's of Professional Studies in Dairy Foods:

   • Have obtained mastery of the technical foundation knowledge necessary to enter a management role in large-scale global dairy foods manufacturing organizations.
   • Can employ leadership principles and recognize leadership's role in management.
   • Are able to use critical thinking and analytical skills to solve problems, evaluate alternatives and predict outcomes in a large dairy food production environment.
-7-

- Have developed a strong awareness of the dairy foods industry’s place in society and can apply that awareness to formulate plans that benefit their company and society.

**Technical Mastery**
The technical mastery that will be developed includes:

- Chemistry, biochemistry and the chemical changes that occur in dairy foods induced by processing
- Analytical chemistry and instrumentation
- Microbiology and its role in both food processing and food safety
- Dairy foods ingredient functionality
- Food safety, quality assurance and control
- Sanitary design and cleaning
- Raw materials receiving and control
- Food laws and regulations
- Food sensory evaluation and process quality
- Unit operations in dairy foods processing

Learning outcomes will be assessed through multiple methods including externship, examination, projects and employer surveys.

4. **Anticipated student demand:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 years at initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Majors</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate briefly what these projections are based upon:

*Pro forma* financial projections and industry impact analysis.

5. **If additional resources (faculty, student allocations, support staff, facilities, equipment, etc.) will be required, please identify the resources, indicate the extent of the college’s commitment to allocate them, and evidence that college decision-making committees were aware of the sources of resource support when they endorsed the proposal. If the college expects the university to provide additional resources, please identify the resources and anticipated cost.

The program startup and initial investment funds are the result of a $5,000,000 donation from Leprino Foods Inc. The funds are to support staff including a new
endowed full professor and instructional support positions as well as remodel of space into expanded classroom facilities. In addition, the MPS program will use the existing plant and facilities at the Dairy Products Technology Center Building (18A). Current faculty will participate in the instruction and WTUs will be reallocated to support. No additional resources will be required from the CAFES.

6. **If the program is occupational or professional**, summarize evidence of need for graduates with this specific education background:

According to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics' Occupational Outlook Handbook (2010-11 Edition) the general area of food scientist is growing at a greater than average rate. The US dairy processing industry in particular is growing at a substantial rate in large part due to the increase in exported dairy products. According to the International Dairy Foods Association, the total value of US dairy product exports was $3.7 billion in 2010, up 65% from 2009. In the past decade the US dairy processing industry has struggled to hire qualified management employees but this has been exacerbated in recent years because of the growth in export demand. In particular Leprino Foods Inc., one of the largest US makers of pizza cheese, is building a new plant every 18 months. Mozzarella cheese production in California in 2010 grew by 14% according the California Department of Food and Agriculture. Additionally, California and national milk production continue to grow and the industry is identifying more aggressive ways to encourage investment in additional processing capacity. According to "Options for a Consumer-Driven Dairy Growth Strategy", prepared by McKinsey & Company for the California Milk Advisory Board in 2007, investment in additional processing capacity is one of the keys to the future viability of the California Dairy industry. Given the current difficulty of identifying qualified management employees and the projected growth, the proposed MPS in Dairy Foods program will help to maintain a viable industry that accounts for approximately $65 billion of economic activity in California alone.

7. **If the new program is currently a concentration or specialization**, include a brief rationale for conversion:

This program will be at a graduate level and target non-traditional students to prepare them to enter the dairy foods industry. We will maintain our current undergraduate program so no "conversion" will occur.

8. **If the new program is not commonly offered as a bachelor's or master's degree**, provide compelling rationale explaining how the proposed subject area constitutes a coherent, integrated degree major which has potential value for students. If the new program does not appear to conform to the CSU Trustee policy calling for "broadly based programs," provide rationale:

Cal Poly does offer a program of study in dairy foods as part of the Dairy Science BS and also offers a MS in Agriculture specialization in dairy foods. However, this particular program is different enough that it targets a different need.
This intensive, one-year program includes training in applications of dairy ingredients, plant operations, manufacturing processes, dairy chemistry, dairy microbiology, sensory evaluation and others. Successful completion of the program will enable those with non-dairy technical bachelor's degrees in the physical or life sciences to become well prepared for roles as dairy products managers and technical supervisors. In addition, the program will emphasize leadership training through special study and group/team collaboration.

While not broadly-based, the program targets a specific need in the largest agricultural industry in California.

9. Briefly describe how the new program fits with the mission and/or strategic plan for the department, college and/or university:

This program is the result of department level strategic planning that included guidance from many industry partners, particularly those on the department’s advisory council. The department’s strategic plan developed in 2007 proposed the development of an MPS in Dairy Foods as an important strategic initiative. Additionally, the University and Chancellor’s Office have promoted the development of graduate degree programs through Continuing Education.

10. Attach a display of curriculum requirements.

Table 1. Draft proposed course of study. This proposed course of study is still under development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Dairy Chemistry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy Microbiology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy Foods Issues and Practices</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Safety, Plant Sanitary Design and Practice, Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product and Process Quality Control, Assurance, and Regulatory Compliance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy Processing and Manufacturing I - Unit Operation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy Processing and Problem Solving Experience</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Dairy Foods Ingredients Functionality</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project, Plant and Personnel Management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy Processing and Manufacturing II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy Processing and Problem Solving Experience</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Externship/Internship</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION ON
Revision to Student Evaluation Policies

WHEREAS The 2012-2014 CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement states that “[w]ritten or electronic student questionnaire evaluations shall be required for all faculty unit employees who teach” (15.15); and

WHEREAS The Collective Bargaining Agreement states that periodic evaluation review of tenured, tenure-line, and temporary faculty unit employees will include student evaluations (15.23, 15.28-29, 15.32, and 15.34); and

WHEREAS The CSU, CSU Academic Senate, and CFA Joint Committee “Report on Student Evaluations” (March 12, 2008) recommended that “[c]ampuses should use a well-designed student evaluation instrument (with demonstrable validity and reliability) in providing diagnostic information and feedback to feedback, and those involved in evaluations should have an understanding of their formative as well as summative uses” (p. 9); and

WHEREAS The “Report on Student Evaluations” stated that “[t]he faculty on each individual campus have the right, through their governance process, to develop the campus-based program of student evaluations of teaching” (p. 7); therefore be it

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate approve a student evaluation policy which includes four components: 1. University-wide questions; 2. College and/or department questions; 3. Faculty generated questions; 4. Student discursive comments on teaching effectiveness; and be it further

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate approve the Instruction Committee’s report that establishes two university-wide student evaluation questions: and be it further

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate designate the Instruction Committee as the appropriate committee for making potential revisions to university-wide student evaluation questions in the future; and be it further

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate approve that Colleges and Programs have the ability to design student evaluation questions; and be it further

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate approve that Faculty Members have the ability to design student evaluation questions.
Background:
In Fall 2013, the Academic Senate Executive Committee, at the request of Provost Kathleen Enz Finken, charged the Instruction Committee to examine the structure of student evaluations at Cal Poly. In particular, the Committee was asked to consider the benefits of university-wide student evaluation questions.

Findings:
The Academic Instruction Committee gathered course evaluations from across the university and compiled their questions in order to identify common evaluation questions. The data were divided between 27 departments across the Colleges Architecture and Environment Design, Liberal Arts, and Science and Mathematics and three colleges—Colleges of Engineering, Agriculture and Food Science, and Business—that use common evaluation forms. UNIV evaluation forms were not included because they tend to be focused on specific faculty members teaching the course.

There exists a significant amount of difference between the length and scope of current student evaluations, ranging from 2 questions in one department to over 40 in others.

Since there exists no clear metric to account for weighting college-wide evaluation forms and departmental forms, the information included below distinguishes between the two. The following evaluation questions were the most commonly asked across the university:

1. Student's class level 3 college, 25 depts.
2. Requirement vs. elective course 3 college, 25 depts.
3. Instructor's overall quality 3 college, 21 depts.
4. Instructor's communication or presentation of material 2 colleges, 18 depts.
5. Instructor's preparation and/or organization 2 colleges, 15 depts.
6. Instructor's knowledge of subject matter 1 college, 12 depts.
7. Student's interest in the course or subject matter 1 college, 12 depts.
8. Instructor communicated course objectives 1 college, 9 depts.
9. Overall quality of the course 1 college, 8 depts.
10. Instructor's interest and/or enthusiasm for the course 1 college, 8 depts.

Recommendations:
After considering the data gathered from across the university and several universities nation-wide, the Instruction Committee recommends that the Academic Senate approve two university-wide evaluation questions:

1. Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher
2. Overall, this course has advanced my learning

The implementation of university-wide questions provides a useful instrument for measuring student evaluations. Limiting the scope of the university-wide questions provides the greatest amount of flexibility for colleges, departments, and faculty to determine the content of student evaluation questions. At the same time, the committee supports the conclusion of the San José State
University “Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) Guide 2011,” which states that “statistically significant” differences exist between colleges and departments and, “[i]n light of this, it is important that RTP committees evaluating candidates from different departments and colleges (University level RTP) compare instructors to colleagues within their own departments and colleges” (p. 10). The importance of contextualizing student evaluation data has also been supported by the CSU, CSU Academic Senate, and CFA Joint Committee “Report on Student Evaluations” (March 12, 2008) and Cal Poly Research and Professional Development Committee (AS-690-09).