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   B. [Revised] Resolution on Student Evaluations Policy: Stegner, chair of Instruction Committee, first reading continued (pp. 15-18). [Additional revisions being reviewed by Instruction Committee.]
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VIII. Adjournment:
RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED NEW DEGREE PROGRAM FOR MASTER'S OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN DAIRY PRODUCTS TECHNOLOGY

WHEREAS, There is substantial industry demand for professionally educated 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’s 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’s 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
Revised: February 19 2013
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo

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

1. Title of proposed program:
   Master's of Professional Studies in Dairy Products Technology

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 Products Technology 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 Products Technology:

   • 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.
- 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 internship, examination, projects and employer surveys.

4. **Anticipated student demand:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3 years after initiation</th>
<th>5 years after initiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Majors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</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 educational background:

   (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 Products Technology 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 Products Technology 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>1st Quarter</th>
<th>13 Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Chemistry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Microbiology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Foods Issues and Practices</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>15 Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety, Plant Sanitary Design and Practice, Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product and Process Quality Control, Assurance, and Regulatory Compliance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Processing and Manufacturing I - Unit Operation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Processing and Problem Solving Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>15 Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Foods Ingredients Functionality</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project, Plant and Personnel Management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Processing and Manufacturing II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Processing and Problem Solving Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
<th>47 Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3 – Program Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>Year -2</th>
<th>Year -1</th>
<th>Year Zero</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>Year Four</th>
<th>Year Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Fee/participant</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SOURCES</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENSES

Direct Expenses:

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors compensation</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$147,000</td>
<td>$154,350</td>
<td>$162,068</td>
<td>$170,171</td>
<td>$170,171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assistant</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$22,050</td>
<td>$23,153</td>
<td>$24,310</td>
<td>$24,310</td>
<td>$51,259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director (25% New Position)</td>
<td>$38,250</td>
<td>$40,163</td>
<td>$42,171</td>
<td>$46,493</td>
<td>$48,818</td>
<td>$51,259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$110,250</td>
<td>$115,763</td>
<td>$121,551</td>
<td>$127,628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Advertising</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Technician</td>
<td>$56,250</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>$86,625</td>
<td>$90,956</td>
<td>$95,504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning Software &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Expenses</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$38,250</td>
<td>$218,413</td>
<td>$479,171</td>
<td>$447,281</td>
<td>$468,545</td>
<td>$490,872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE, Campus and Systemwide Assessments</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$168,750</td>
<td>$168,750</td>
<td>$168,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Science Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Administrative Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$87,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$175,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$218,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$218,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$218,750</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G &amp; A Rate</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Reserves (3%)</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL USES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>$218,413</strong></td>
<td><strong>$572,671</strong></td>
<td><strong>$681,031</strong></td>
<td><strong>$702,295</strong></td>
<td><strong>$724,622</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>($38,250)</strong></td>
<td><strong>($218,413)</strong></td>
<td><strong>($372,671)</strong></td>
<td><strong>($181,031)</strong></td>
<td><strong>($202,295)</strong></td>
<td><strong>($224,622)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFSET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Position endowment Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor (25% from Endowment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovered by Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor release time (75%)</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$110,250</td>
<td>$115,763</td>
<td>$121,551</td>
<td>$127,628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Science Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Gift Startup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Advertising</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Designer and Technician</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$56,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning Software &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gift for Startup</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$198,250</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OFFSET</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$38,250</td>
<td>$238,413</td>
<td>$238,808</td>
<td>$258,749</td>
<td>$269,186</td>
<td>$280,145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Returns</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>($18,329)</td>
<td>$24,779</td>
<td>$77,718</td>
<td>$66,892</td>
<td>$55,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Returns</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$1.671</td>
<td>$26,450</td>
<td>$104,168</td>
<td>$171,059</td>
<td>$226,583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumes no endowment principle growth.*
Faculty Program Director. Endowed funds will be used to hire an additional tenure-track professor who will have a split assignment of instruction in the MPS program management of the MPS program and research in the dairy foods area. The specific assignment of each component will depend on the person who is hired. This new person will hold the title of Endowed Chair in Dairy Foods with the potential of the chair being named in honor of the donor. This person will have an excellent research record in an area of dairy foods, food engineering, or other relevant area, and will bring prestige and recognition to the program. This position will begin in 2012-2013.

Pasted from www.calpolyjobs.org:

Leprino Foods Chair in Dairy Products Technology. This tenure-track position in the Dairy Science Department is anticipated to begin in 2012-2013 and will be filled at the rank of Assistant, Associate or Full Professor, commensurate with the qualifications and experience of the selected candidate. This newly formed endowed position supports the study, education, scholarship, and practice of dairy products science and technology in a state with the largest dairy industry in the nation. The Leprino Foods Chair will also serve as the faculty program coordinator of a new and highly innovative Master of Professional Studies (MPS) in Dairy Products Technology program. The MPS in Dairy Products Technology will be a one-year program to train graduates from technical disciplines and culminates with a dairy foods internship. The goal of the program is to develop graduates with important critical thinking and leadership skills sharpened by dairy products experiential learning to enter careers in the global dairy products industry. Although this tenure-track position will be given on an academic year basis, the Leprino Foods Chair's duties involve work that is performed over a twelve-month period, including academic breaks and summers, for additional compensation. The Leprino Foods Chair appointment will be reviewed for renewal after five years.

The Leprino Foods Chair will be
responsible for faculty leadership and have teaching responsibilities in the MPS in Dairy Products Technology program, and will be an active team member of the Dairy Products Technology Center, one of five national dairy foods research centers. For more information about the DPTC please visit http://DPTC.CalPoly.EDU. In addition, the Chair will be involved in supporting research and outreach that meets regional and global needs. The candidate will also support and mentor graduate students and staff.

Minimum Qualifications (Staff Only)

PhD required in Dairy Science, Food Science or a related field. The ability to develop strong relationships with industry that will result in support of the College, department and the MPS program; a desire to successfully develop the MPS in Dairy Products Technology program; have demonstrated effective teaching; and the ability to work in a team of diverse faculty.

Required Qualifications / Specialized Skills

The ideal candidate for the Leprino Foods Chair in Dairy Products Technology will possess the ability to be a future leader and innovator of the next generation of technologies, knowledge and science directly applicable to dairy products. Understanding of the global dairy products industry is an important part of what the successful candidate will bring to Cal Poly.
Program Manager. Startup funds will be used to hire a Program Manager who will assist with recruiting and administrative tasks in the MPS in Dairy Foods program. This person will be responsible for working with Continuing Education, developing recruiting materials and traveling to locations around the country to seek applicants for the program. Additionally, this person will assist the Faculty Program Director in coordinating internships and contacting sites to place students in internships. This person will work under the supervision of the Faculty Program Director to facilitate the effective operation of the program. This position is projected to be filled in Fall 2012, the year prior to the entrance of the first cohort.

Pasted from www.calpolyjobs.org:

***THIS POSITION IS OPEN UNTIL FILLED***

The Dairy Science Department offers a Bachelor of Science degree for students who are interested in careers in either dairy animal husbandry related fields or dairy foods related fields. Additionally, the department offers a Master of Science in Agriculture degree with specialization in Dairy Products Technology. The department is supported by extensive dairy facilities that includes, a modern approximately 250 cow dairy; a production facility for commercial dairy products including cheese, ice cream, a fluid milk; research laboratories and other spaces. The average enrollment is approximately 130 undergraduate students and 15 graduate students and post-doctoral research associates. There are eight full time faculty members including the Department Head. The department is focused on sustaining a viable and healthy California dairy industry through education, scholarship and outreach.

The department is developing a new Master of Professional Studies program in Dairy Products Technology. This position plays a major role in managing the MPS and developing industry contact.
and support. The program is initially funded by a $5 million contribution from Leprino Foods, Inc, but will grow to be self-sustaining primarily from the tuition revenue. The MPS in Dairy Products Technology program will be administered through Continuing Education and this position will be responsible for coordinating this effort. The MPS in Dairy Products Technology program will be housed in the Leprino Foods Innovation Institute (Building 18-A) where specialized, dedicated instruction facility and capability are being constructed.

EXPERIENCE:
• Minimum of eight (8) years of demonstrated management experience in the food industry.

LICENSES, CERTIFICATES, DEGREES, CREDENTIALS:
• Bachelor Degree in Dairy Science, Food Science or equivalent.
• Possession of a valid driver's license or the ability to obtain by date of hire.
• Understanding of manufacturing disciplines such as 5S is required with substantial experience working in an environment that adhered to sound manufacturing principles.
• Strong understanding of the importance of sanitation and food safety and experience applying food safety in management.
• Excellent ability to work independently and to perform high level analytical and professional tasks for efficient program management; must possess excellent organizational skills.
• Ability to establish and maintain cooperative and effective relationships with internal and external constituents.
• Ability to function effectively in social and professional situations and to communicate goals and programs in one-on-one and group settings.
• Excellent written and oral communication skills.
• Ability to articulate ideas and make presentations in high-level interpersonal situations, group and large audience forums.
• Self-directed, highly motivated and able to set goals, meet deadlines, and work efficiently and collaboratively in a team environment.
• Ability to exercise discretion and independent judgment.
• Strong commitment to excellence in serving students, faculty and stakeholders.
• Strong interpersonal skills and the ability to effectively
interact with diverse individuals/groups on and off campus, including donors, faculty, staff, industry and volunteers.
• Proven leadership and supervisory skills with the ability to establish and maintain cooperative working relationships with colleagues and university friends; ability to motivate and instill enthusiasm in potential industry partners in order to achieve their involvement in achieving goals.
• Ability and willingness to travel and work varied hours, including evenings and weekends.
• Competency with standard computer word processing, spreadsheet and database software.
• Knowledge of or ability to learn database, query, and reporting applications, e-mail, and calendaring systems.
• Master's Degree.
• Experience in training food plant operations people is desired along with demonstrated leadership development skills.
[REVISED] RESOLUTION ON STUDENT EVALUATIONS POLICY

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 policy that requires that student evaluations include university-wide questions and the opportunity for students to provide written comments on teaching effectiveness; and that they may also include (1) college- and/or department-level questions and (2) faculty generated questions 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 the scale for measuring these questions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate designate the Instruction and Faculty Affairs Committees as the appropriate committees 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, departments, and/or programs may require the inclusion of additional student evaluation questions, based on their respective faculty-based governance procedures the faculty of colleges and programs have the ability to design student evaluation questions; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve that faculty members may include student evaluation questions for their own classes have the ability to design student evaluation questions; and be it further
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve that student evaluation scores of faculty generated questions be excluded from the calculated mean of student evaluations and not required any summary statistic (such as a mean) that may be calculated, and that those scores are not required for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel action file (PAF); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve that colleges, departments, and/or programs may require the inclusion of students' optional written comments in a faculty member's personnel action file (PAF), based on their respective faculty-based governance procedures.
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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, Food and Environmental Sciences, 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 colleges, 25 depts.
2. Requirement vs. elective course 3 colleges, 25 depts.
3. Instructor’s overall quality 3 colleges, 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 nationwide, 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 Committee recommends that a five-point Likert-type scale be used for university-wide questions. This scale would be divided as follows: 1. Strongly disagree; 2. Disagree; 3. Neither
agree nor disagree; 4. Agree; 5. Strongly agree. Currently, student evaluation forms used across the University are largely based on such a rating scale (the ratings are typically labeled as A-E, 0-4, or 1-5). The Committee recommends that the University continue to use this same scale in order to provide continuity with previous evaluations and Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) cycles. This will be particularly important when evaluations are administered online rather than the current Scantron forms.

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).