

Adopted: April 14, 1992

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California**

**AS-383-92/EX
RESOLUTION ON
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS**

- WHEREAS, The current process of five-year reviews of "existing degree programs" required under AB 82-1 has not been effective in assessing the academic environment at Cal Poly, and
- WHEREAS, Academic program reviews under AB 82-01 are largely internally-generated and lack the perspective and objectivity of broader peer review, and
- WHEREAS, Budgetary allocations have not been linked to academic program reviews under AB 82-1, and
- WHEREAS, In response to budgetary shortfalls in the 1991 academic year, the academic program review process conducted by faculty to identify programs at risk, created an environment of apprehension and tension amongst the faculty and staff, and
- WHEREAS, Budgetary problems have continued and are anticipated to continue over an extended number of years, and
- WHEREAS, The faculty have a responsibility to both review academic programs and provide input into the budgetary decision making process, and
- WHEREAS, The faculty are responsible for curriculum and academic programs, and
- WHEREAS, The quality of the academic programs at Cal Poly needs to be a primary consideration in academic program review, and
- WHEREAS, The administration is responsible for allocation of funds between and among programs, and
- WHEREAS, The administration may use program review recommendations in determining the allocation of resources; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopt and recommend to the President the attached "Academic Program Review and Improvements" process as the university's means for comprehensive academic program review at Cal Poly; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the intent of the "Academic Program Review and Improvements" process is to improve the quality of academic programs at Cal Poly; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate appoint an interim "Academic Program Review Committee" for the 1992-93 academic year in accordance with the attached guidelines; and be it further

RESOLVED: That an interim committee be charged with initiating the implementation of the "Academic Program Review and Improvements" process; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the interim committee report back to the Academic Senate, by Spring Quarter 1993, for Academic Senate approval, any changes in the criteria or process which have been identified as appropriate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That during the 1993-1994 academic year, the Academic Senate establish a standing committee of the Senate to be known as the Academic Program Review Committee, following the guidelines established by this resolution.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: January 28, 1992
Revised: April 14, 1992

State of California
Memorandum

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
Academic Senate

Date : Aug. 24, 1992

File No.:

Copies : R. Koob

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTIONS AS-383-92/EX,
AS-384-92/IC AND AS-385-92/C&BC

By memos dated April 29 and May 6, Charles Andrews transmitted the subject resolutions which were adopted by the Academic Senate. As noted in the transmittal memo, AS-385-92/C&BC dealing with Committee Reporting is internal to the operations of the Academic Senate and requires no action on my part.

Based upon a review and recommendation from Vice President Koob, I am pleased to approve the Change of Grade resolution, AS-384-92/IC.

Vice President Koob and I have also reviewed in detail AS-383-92/EX on Academic Program Reviews. Overall, the document is quite comprehensive and will be very helpful. I am very pleased with the Academic Senate's concerns and efforts in this critical area as we move forward with our strategic planning efforts. With the addition of reference to the Cal Poly Mission Statement being included as a basis for evaluation under Section I.A. -- Mission, Goals and Objectives -- the resolution is approved. At the present time, "the special mission of Cal Poly" is included, but the only references to this Mission is Title 5 language in the detailed guidelines. I believe the official Mission Statement of the University should also be utilized.