I. Minutes:
Approval of minutes for the October 7, 2008 Academic Senate meeting (pp. 2-3).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
UDEC Report of Activities & Accomplishments, 2007-08: (pp. 4-12).

III. Reports:
Regular reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost:
D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
E. Statewide Senate:
F. CFA Campus President:
G. ASI Representative:

Special report(s):

IV. Consent Agenda:
Curriculum proposals for IS 352 (Organizational Leadership), IS 453 (Special Topics in Organizational Leadership), and RELS 378 (Religion and Contemporary Values)

V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Master of Arts in Biological Sciences: Hannings, chair of Curriculum Committee/Kitts, Biological Sciences, second reading (pp. 14-17).
B. Resolution on Policy Concerning Periodic Evaluation and Performance Review of College Deans: Foroohar, chair of Faculty Affairs Committee, second reading (pp. 18-23).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
I. Minutes: none.

II. Communications and Announcements: none.

III. Regular Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair: Soares reported that information from the September 19, Academic Senate Retreat will soon be available on the web.

B. President’s Office: Howard-Greene announced that the governor has approved the state budget, which includes a $3 million shortfall for Cal Poly. The budget also allocates $101 million for the new science building.

C. Provost: New Provost, Robert Koob, mentioned that our main purpose as a university should be to serve our students; therefore, every proposal he receives will be analyzed for evidence that it has the students’ best interest at its core. Feedback is welcome at rkoob@calpoly.edu. David Conn introduced Dr. Erling Smith, Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives and Planning.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs: Morton reported on the Academic Senate Retreat on Inclusive Excellence, which tied the notion of inclusivity to excellence in an attempt to bring a more comprehensive interest in addressing issues of inequity and under representation on campus.

E. Statewide Senate: Foroozar reported that the first meeting was in September and all resolutions were first reading only, therefore, none was approved. Senator LoCascio reported that the Lower Division Transfer Practice (LDTP) Committee is discussing the lack of agreement between community junior colleges and the CSU.

F. CFA Campus President: Saenz mentioned that the question he is most frequently asked has to do with payroll raises, and since the budget does not include enough funds to meet the raises scheduled for July 1, 2008, the Chancellor will have to decide whether to pay the raises or ask the CFA to renegotiate. The approved budget does provide funding for GSI (3%), SSI and equity raises for associate and full professors.

G. ASI Representative: Kramer, ASI President, introduced Sean Christy, ASI Chair of the Board. A diversity forum will be held on November 14 to discuss, with all student leaders across campus, the importance of inclusiveness.

Special Reports:
John Soares provided an overview of the Academic Senate and its procedures.

There is a rather bulky packet of materials in today’s agenda designed to help new senators and remind returning senators how business gets to the senate and how that business is conducted. We are a community that puts into practice shared-governance and provides a forum for inquiry on matters that affect our lives here at Cal Poly. You are a part of this community either because you have something to
say or your speaking on behalf of a constituent you represent. Either way your service on this body is more than an obscure line on your resume... it is very much a direct line to the administration on policies, procedures and the decision-making process.

Meetings of the Academic Senate are controlled by Robert’s Rules of Parliamentary procedure, which are in your packet and they read like an owner’s manual for a VCR. Many of the motions listed have never been used in my three years on Senate... so do not be overwhelmed.

Do not be overwhelmed by the fact that some of our fellow senators know the rules really well and are a lot better at using them in the course of debate. Truth be told I am not a member of that group. But more importantly... don’t let that fact silence you. We are here to practice shared-governance, the process and the rules are meant to enable participation by everyone in attendance. In addition, if there is a stumble, the senate’s past chair serves as parliamentarian.

To participate you need to simply raise your hand, be recognized, and you will have the floor for one question with a follow-up. Questions are directed to the chair. You may ask another question after anyone wishing to speak on the resolution for a first-time has been given that opportunity. The Chair is the traffic cop, and does not take a position for or against a resolution.

There are a number of ways business gets to the senate floor. Today’s proposed resolutions come from Senate committees on curriculum and faculty affairs. One final reminder, the resolutions we have before us today are first readings... you will have an opportunity to make comment and where appropriate those comments will be taken by the presenters of each resolution back to their respective committees for discussion.

And finally, before our next meeting, I will send to new senators a FAQ list for second readings that hopefully will help when we get to that stage of any resolution.

Next week the senate executive committee will meet to consider additional items and resolutions to bring to these proceedings. That agenda will be forwarded to all senators, not just caucus chairs. It’s not another email to delete. It gives you as senator an opportunity to weigh in on matters through your caucus chair, or simply give yourself some extra time to think about an issue so that if the executive committee elects to place the item on the Senate agenda, it will not be an issue of first impression.

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

V. Business Item(s):

A. Resolution on Master of Arts in Biological Sciences (Curriculum Committee): Hannings presented the resolution, which proposes a Master of Arts in Biological Sciences degree. The resolution will return as a second reading item.

B. Resolution on Policy Concerning Periodic Evaluation and Performance Review of College Deans (Faculty Affairs): Foroohar presented the resolution, which proposes new policy for the review of college deans. This resolution will return as a second reading item.

VI. Discussion Item(s): none.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
Inclusive Excellence Retreat

Prompted by a proposal from the Committee on the Status of Women and championed by Barbara Gilbert, Counseling Services, a small working group prepared plans for an executive leadership "summit" retreat intended to highlight the Inclusive Excellence model developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).\(^1\) The working group consisted of Denise Campbell, Barbara Gilbert, Cornel Morton, and David Conn. The plans were endorsed by UDEC and ultimately approved by Provost Durgin (who agreed to provide funding) and President Baker. Attached is an extract from the invitation, which describes the background to, and purpose of, the retreat.

The Nov 29-30 retreat, held at El Capitan Canyon Resort, was attended by 27 Academic Affairs personnel (primarily administrators but also including some faculty and staff) as well as 14 Student Affairs professionals. President Baker joined us on the second day. Facilitators were Lee Mun Wah of Stir-Fry Seminars (first day) and Alma Clayton-Pedersen of AAC&U (second day). The program included a very frank panel presentation by several students who were willing to travel from campus (during exam week) to share their experiences and concerns.

Diversity Planning Group

Under the aegis of UDEC, the Diversity Planning Group (DPG) was formed to maintain the momentum established by the November retreat. It consists of the members of the original working group plus a few additional participants including the Academic Senate chair, the ASI president, the directors of Admissions, Recruitment, & Financial Aid, Institutional Planning & Analysis, and Student Academic Services, and the dean of Liberal Arts.

The DPG received a formal charge from the president's Executive Staff (copy attached). In weekly meetings throughout the year, it reviewed existing documents relating to diversity at Cal Poly, most notably the 2002 Diversity/Multicultural Learning Strategic Action Plan, and ultimately produced a set of short-term recommendations for submission to the Executive Staff, most likely in July 2008. Included is a recommendation that the university formally adopt the Inclusive

\(^1\) The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has led in developing "Inclusive Excellence" as a guiding vision for the higher education community.
Excellence model. The DPG intends to continue meeting regularly during the summer and into the next academic year, with the production of a longer-term Inclusive Excellence plan as one of its goals.

**Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation (LSAMP)**

Initiated in 1994, with support from the National Science Foundation (NSF), the California State University Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation (CSU-LSAMP) program is a comprehensive, statewide program dedicated to broadening participation in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) disciplines (see attached description).

For most of the program’s duration to date, Cal Poly has not been among the participating CSU campuses, now 19 out of 23. However, we were invited to join in the fourth five-year phase, known as the Senior Level program, due to start later in 2008. For this purpose, we prepared and subsequently revised a campus proposal for incorporation into the overall CSU proposal, submitted to NSF.

Funding has been approved for Cal Poly, initially at the $40K level, but it will not become available until September 2008. The provost has also committed university funds to the program. In the meantime, plans have been made and activities begun (with university funding) to “ramp up” for implementation; for example, the 2008 Summer Institute has been expanded to accept ten additional students, who are LSAMP-eligible.

Serving as directors of the CSU-LSAMP program for Cal Poly are David Cantu, Director, Multicultural Engineering Program; Susan Sparling, Director, Student Academic Services; and David Conn, Vice Provost and UDEC chair.

**First Generation (1st Gen) Initiative**

1) **Student Panel**

   a) Only one panel was requested, which was scheduled during early Fall 2007 with the CAED Advisory Council. Two CAED 1st Gen students participated and the panel received rave responses from the Advisory Council. No further panel development was done this year, given that panel requests were limited to only one.

2) **Student Connections**

   a) Updated Week of Welcome (WOW) flyer that introduces the 1st Gen student connections was provided to all new incoming WOW participants. A range of key campus services was noted on the one-page flyer, along with the 1st Gen logo.
b) Ecomm (electronic communication) was sent via the Admissions office to all first quarter students who self-reported being 1st Gen; provides websites for all resources listed in the WOW flyer.

3) **Scholarships for 1st Gen students**

   a) An endowment for 1st Gen scholarships had been established in the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) during 2006-07, funded initially with $10,000 raised by faculty and staff, as well as an external donation of $30,000. In its first year, 3 recipients received $1,000 scholarships from the seed fund. Two continued to receive the award during 2007-08 (one graduated), and an additional student was awarded a third $1000 scholarship. A fourth award, the Mayhew Family 1st Generation Scholarship, was made for the first time in 2007-08; it was worth $2,500. A total of 42 CLA students applied for 1st Gen awards.

   b) In fall 2008, CLA will launch a community challenge. Over the next 3 years, CLA alumni, many of whom were themselves 1st Gen students, will host events in their communities, to raise money toward the $700,000 overall endowment goal. Within the goal, named endowments of $56,000 are being sought, each of which would fund a $2,500 scholarship in perpetuity.

**President’s Diversity Award**

UDEC again managed and judged the competition for the President’s annual Diversity Award. A small committee recommended that:

1) the 07-08 award be shared by Omega Xi Delta and the Department of Psychology & Child Development, and

2) the award should normally be shared between one recipient that is a student organization and another that is a unit of the university or an auxiliary (provided that deserving entities are nominated in each category), and this should be stated explicitly in the solicitation for nominations. The latter recommendation reflects the difficulty of making meaningful comparisons between these categories as well as the desire to honor students whenever possible.


Attachments:
* Invitation to Inclusive Excellence Summit Retreat (extract)*
* Charge to Diversity Planning Group*
* Recommendations for Immediate Attention*
* CSU-LSAMP Overview*
Extract

Invitation to
THE INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE SUMMIT RETREAT
For the Executive Leadership at Cal Poly
NOVEMBER 29 and 30, 2007

Background
The WASC Visiting Team’s Final Report in 2000 serves to summarize an important issue we face: “In view of these conditions, the need for additional effort toward diversity seems to be fairly characterized as urgent. Even students themselves expressed concern that their education was weaker than it might be as preparation for a diverse workforce because of lack of experience with diversity on campus.”

The Concern
Among many concerns is the CSU Board of Trustees’ request for President Baker to lead the campus community in responding to campus feedback about diversity. Examples of this feedback are: comments obtained in the development of the 2007 WASC self-study proposal, the Access to Excellence plan, the report on the National Survey of Student Engagement administered at Cal Poly and the significantly lower graduation rates among some groups of students of color.

The Plan
The Status of Women Committee, University Diversity Enhancement Council and the Council on University Citizenship formed a planning group and designed this first of the series of retreats—the Summit Retreat. In this retreat, you will engage in seminars for two days, in which you will gain competencies for implementation of the Inclusive Excellence model in your areas. This model, rapidly becoming the standard for higher education, was developed by the American Association of Colleges & Universities based on a solid research foundation and on what is working at other higher education institutions. The Inclusive Excellence model is “designed to help campuses: (a) integrate their diversity and quality efforts, (b) situate this work at the core of institutional functioning, and (c) realize the educational benefits available to students and to the institution when this integration is done well and is sustained over time.” (p. iii of “Introduction to the Series” commissioned by the Making Excellence Inclusive initiative.) Through these seminars, you will gain tools for leading your areas in effective changes towards a professional and learning climate that cultivates higher levels of success for all our Cal Poly community.
Charge to
THE DIVERSITY PLANNING GROUP

Following up on the October 2007 retreat, the Diversity Planning Group, a task force of the University Diversity Enhancement Council, is charged as follows:

1. The Planning Group will assess progress to date in implementing actions recommended in existing diversity-related Cal Poly planning and related documents (including the 1995 University Strategic Plan, the 2000 WASC Self-Study, the 2002 Diversity/Multicultural Learning Strategic Action Plan, and the 2007 plan entitled “Recruitment and Retention of First Generation Students”).

2. The Planning Group will provide recommendations to the Executive Staff on actions that should be continued, expanded, or modified in the short term.

3. Through liaison with, and possibly representation on, the various task forces appointed both to develop the updated University Strategic Plan and to carry out the institutional self-study for WASC reaffirmation, the Planning Group will advocate for strong consideration of diversity-related issues, and assist the committees as necessary in obtaining consulting support for this purpose.

In support of this item, the Planning Group will independently review the charges given to each of the task forces, seek to identify connections between these charges and significant diversity-related issues, and explore ways in which these issues might be addressed in task force recommendations.

4. The Planning Group will monitor the task force recommendations that ultimately emerge and report to the Executive Staff on the extent to which relevant diversity-related issues are addressed.

5. After further review of, and discussion about, the AAC&U’s Inclusive Excellence model for addressing diversity issues on university campuses, the Planning Group will recommend to the Executive Staff whether or not this model should be formally adopted at Cal Poly.

6. After providing a second update to Summit Retreat participants on the process being used for follow-up, the Planning Group will pass on to Public Affairs the responsibility for further communications with these people, as part of the overall diversity-related communications strategy for the campus.

---

2 “Inclusive Excellence” is the term given by the Association of American Colleges & Universities to describe its current project on integrating diversity and quality efforts on university campuses.

3 The first update was sent by email on January 24, 2008.
DIVERSITY PLANNING GROUP

Recommendations for Immediate Attention

Policy Recommendations

- Adopt the Inclusive Excellence model at Cal Poly for reference and use in strategic planning, program review, accountability, and faculty/staff/student development.

Strategic Planning and Assessment Recommendations

- Ensure that diversity is appropriately addressed in strategic plans at all levels and that the plans incorporate minimum and aspirational benchmarks for use in planning, accountability, and assessment.

Make it a priority in 2008-09 to:

- Address diversity as a key issue in the updated University Strategic Plan.
- Address diversity as a key issue in the WASC reaffirmation review.
- Produce updated diversity plans in each of the colleges, with "ambitious" goals. Seek demonstration by colleges of how and to what extent the Diversity Learning Objectives are being met (not wait for complete cycle of Program Review).
- Encourage campus constituency groups to review the place that diversity occupies in their plans and ensure that it is addressed (e.g. Academic Senate, ASI).

Programmatic and Operational Recommendations

Communications

- Complete publication of the President's series on diversity and consider development of a diversity handbook to be provided to all new students and employees.

- Use creative methods including on-line self-directed means to educate the campus community on diversity and Inclusive Excellence measures (e.g., on-line training similar to sexual harassment training, with certificate or other recognition upon completion; create Inclusive Excellence channel on the Cal Poly portal).

---

4 Note: The Academic Senate is addressing diversity in its September 2008 retreat, with the assistance of Dr. Alma Clayton-Pedersen.
• Make special effort to convey message that all communities should feel welcome at Cal Poly. The obligation to convey and reinforce this message starts at the top but is shared by all members of the university community.

• To support voluntary programmatic activities, establish necessary protocol for securing contact information, differentiated by diversity-related demographics, for students, faculty, and staff.

• Create a strong roll-out of the recently adopted Diversity Learning Objectives.

Program Development

• Establish a "mini-grants" program to encourage broad based attention and actions related to diversity, equity, and social justice programs for students.

Campus Facilities and Operations

• Identify a central location in a permanent building for the Pride Center (preferably within the University Union).

• Evaluate accommodation issues such as requirements for ADA compliance and the need for gender-neutral restrooms in existing and new buildings, and identify and implement options for addressing them (e.g. through such things as adopting principles of "universal design").
CSU-LSAMP Overview

Initiated in 1994, with support from the National Science Foundation, the California State University Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation (CSU-LSAMP) program is a comprehensive, statewide program dedicated to broadening participation in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) disciplines.

At the time the Alliance was established, it included 16 campuses of the California State University, each associated with at least one California Community College (CCC) partner. During the current (Phase III) project period, 19 CSU campuses comprise the Alliance, and this number will grow to 22 in fall 2008 when the fourth project period ("Senior Level") will begin. Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, will join the Alliance at this time. The only CSU that will not be included is the California Maritime Academy, a unique and specialized campus of the CSU that offers only a limited number of bachelor's degrees.

In Phase I (1994-1998) and Phase II (1998-2003), San Francisco State University served as the Alliance's lead institution. California State University, Sacramento, is serving as lead institution for the Phase III project period (2003-2008) and will continue in this role through the fourth phase.

The commitment of the CSU to the goals of the project is evidenced not only by the past support and pledges of continued support from participating campuses but also by support from the system wide Chancellor's Office. This office has already made a leveraged investment in the project of $12 million real dollars of general fund support, and it will invest an additional $4 million real dollars to sustain CSU-LSAMP efforts for the five-year "Senior Level" period and beyond.

In the first year of Phase III, CSU-LSAMP engaged 3,395 URM-STEM students in activities that sustained or further improved individual student retention and progression rates achieved during Phase I and Phase II. Since many of the strategies initiated in Phase I and Phase II for lower division students had already been institutionalized, CSU-LSAMP introduced activities in Phase III that are designed to enhance graduate school preparedness of upper division students with the goal of improving aggregate student progression to STEM graduate programs. To broaden the participation of LSAMP students in graduate study, CSU-LSAMP also established Bridge to the Doctorate supplemental activities at San Francisco State University and California State University Los Angeles, two of the Alliance's member institutions.

In the fourth phase, CSU-LSAMP will focus on persistence and progression to graduate study, institutionalization and dissemination of best practices, interventions for community college transfer students, and expanding opportunities for student engagement in international activities. In addition, as a Senior Level LSAMP, CSU-LSAMP will take full advantage of eligibility to submit proposals for
LSAMP Bridge to the Doctorate activities and other projects (e.g., a Bridge to Teaching project) as these opportunities arise.

Benefits

- Academic Advising
- Orientation Courses
- Math Workshops
- Annual visits to PhD granting institutions and research centers
- Undergraduate Research Experience
- Graduate School Preparation Workshops

NSF Synopsis of the Program (through Phase III)

"This program is aimed at increasing the quality and quantity of students successfully completing science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) baccalaureate degree programs, and increasing the number of students interested in, academically qualified for and matriculated into programs of graduate study. LSAMP supports sustained and comprehensive approaches that facilitate achievement of the long-term goal of increasing the number of students who earn doctorates in STEM fields, particularly those from populations underrepresented in STEM fields. The program goals are accomplished through the formation of alliances. Phase I awards place emphasis on aggregate baccalaureate production. Phase II awards augment the Phase I emphasis with attention to individual student retention and progression to baccalaureate degrees. Phase III awards augment the Phase I and Phase II with attention to aggregate student progression to graduate school entry."

Coordination

LSAMP at Cal Poly is being coordinated by the Multicultural Engineering Program (MEP) and Student Academic Services (SAS). You can find additional information about these two programs at their respective websites.
Continuous Course Review
For Academic Senate Consent Agenda

**Note:** The following courses have been summarized by staff in the Academic Programs Office for review by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC). *Unless otherwise noted, the ASCC recommends approval of the following courses to the Academic Senate.*

Date Prepared: October 10, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number, Title</th>
<th>(Total Units) Mode</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS 352 Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>(4) 4 lecture</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 453 Special Topics in Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>(4) 4 lecture</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELS 378 Religion and Contemporary Values</td>
<td>(4) 4 lecture</td>
<td>Approval (Pending GE C4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, The Biological Sciences Department has a Master's of Science program in Biological Sciences with both thesis and non-thesis options; and

WHEREAS, Program reviews in 1995 and 2005 suggested the non-thesis option be replaced with a separate Master of Arts in Biological Sciences; and

WHEREAS, The current program for the Master's of Science in Biological Sciences is being modified to be a thesis-only degree; and

WHEREAS, The Biological Sciences Department is proposing to create a master of arts program made up of coursework and a comprehensive exam as the culminating experience; and

WHEREAS, The College of Science and Mathematics 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 a Master of Arts in Biological Sciences and that the proposal be sent to the Chancellor's Office for final approval.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Date: September 12, 2008
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo

Summary Statement of Proposed New Degree Program for Academic Senate

1. **Title of Proposed Program.**

Master of Arts in Biology

2. **Reason for Proposing the Program.**

The last two academic program reviews of the MS Biology (1995 and 2005) suggested the creation of a MA program to replace the non-thesis option in the MS program. The current MS program is being amended to a thesis only degree (see attached curriculum requirements for both MA and MS programs). The proposed MA program will be a coursework-based degree that does not require a research-based thesis and the culminating experience will be a comprehensive written exam covering three areas of biology.

The common interpretation of an MS degree is that of a research thesis-driven degree. By removing the non-thesis option we are making a clear distinction between a thesis-based degree (MS) and a coursework-based degree (MA). By creating a new degree we will be able to specifically recruit students for this MA degree because it is designed to allow interdisciplinary study (more units taken outside of the department) and flexibility of focus for career goals.

We expect the MA program will be most useful for students wishing to enhance a career in teaching biological sciences primarily at the middle school, secondary school, or community college levels and for current teachers who want to move into higher paid positions. It will also be useful for students with career plans in industry and/or civil service where a Master’s degree commands a higher starting salary.

3. **Anticipated Student Demand.**

Over the last ten years, 20 to 30% of our MS students have graduated with the non-thesis option. Incoming classes have averaged between 10 and 20 students with between two to six students choosing the non-thesis program. There are currently 44 active students in the MS Biology program, seven of whom have declared for the non-thesis track. Three non-thesis track students graduated in June 2008. It is expected that the creation of a separate MA degree will enhance our ability to increase overall enrollment since the difference between the two programs will be clearly defined, thus making each more desirable to the appropriate prospective students.
4. Indicate the kind of resource assessment used by the campus in determining to place the program on the academic plan. If additional resources will be required, the summary should indicate the extent of university commitment to allocate them and evidence that campus decision-making committees were aware of the sources of resource support when they endorsed the proposal.

All of the faculty currently in the Biological Sciences Department will be involved in this program, just as they are in the current MS program. Current space, facilities, library resources, and academic technology and equipment that support the existing MS program will be available to the proposed MA program. No additional faculty or resources will be needed for the MA Biology program.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

7. 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 Trustee policy calling for “broadly based programs,” provide rationale:

The Master of Arts in Biology is a commonly offered program.

8. Briefly describe how the new program fits with the campus mission.

*Cal Poly Mission Statement.* Cal Poly fosters teaching, scholarship, and service in a learn-by-doing environment where students and faculty are partners in discovery. As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly promotes the application of theory to practice. As a comprehensive institution, Cal Poly provides a balanced education in the arts, sciences, and technology, while encouraging cross-disciplinary and co-curricular experiences. As an academic community, Cal Poly values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility.

The MA in Biology program is closely aligned with the university’s mission. The program is poised to encourage co-curricular experiences with a teaching credential. The inclusion of a project also ensures a hands-on application of knowledge and the additional elective units provide room for students to tailor their program to meet cross-disciplinary aspirations.
ATTACHMENT

CURRICULUM FOR MA BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Units

Required courses ................................................................. 19
BIO 501 Molecular and Cellular Biology (4)
BIO 502 Biology of Organisms (4)
BIO 503 Population Biology (4)
BIO 590 Seminar in Biology (3)
BIO 500 Individual Study (4)

Electives ............................................................................. 26
Additional units at the 400 or 500 level. At least 11
units must be 500-level.
Culminating experience: Satisfactory completion of
the comprehensive examinations.

45

CURRICULUM FOR MS BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Units

Required courses ................................................................. 27
BIO 501 Molecular and Cellular Biology (4)
BIO 502 Biology of Organisms (4)
BIO 503 Population Biology (4)
BIO 561 Proposal Writing for Bio Research (3)
BIO 590 Seminar in Biology (3)
BIO 599 Thesis, including oral defense of
thesis (3) (3) (3)

Electives ............................................................................. 18
Additional units at the 400 or 500 level. At least 3
units must be 500-level.
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RESOLUTION ON

POLICY CONCERNING PERIODIC EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF COLLEGE DEANS

1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the attached Policy Concerning Periodic Evaluation and Performance Review of College Deans drafted by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: February 17, 2008
Revised: September 30, 2008
Revised: October 20, 2008
POLICY CONCERNING PERIODIC EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF COLLEGE DEANS

1. Purpose
Periodic Evaluations and Performance Reviews of college deans are designed to renew the understandings among the various constituencies of a college regarding a dean’s leadership, conduct of office, establishment of objectives and attainment of administrative goals. The review process shall represent a cooperative effort by representatives from faculty, students, staff and administration. These evaluations and reviews are regarded as constructive and are designed to maintain a sense of collegiality among all persons directly involved with the review process for the dean.

2. Scheduling
Scheduling of all Periodic Evaluations and Performance Reviews of college deans shall be the responsibility of the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs.

A. Periodic Evaluation
A Periodic Evaluation of college deans shall be conducted every year by tenured faculty, probationary tenure-track faculty, full-time lecturers (with 12.12 appointments in the same college) and permanent staff. Special questionnaires for faculty and support staff, prepared by the Review Panel, and approved by the Provost, will be used for the annual Periodic Evaluation of College Deans and the results will be computed and added to the Dean’s personnel file. The current evaluation form “Annual Evaluation of Academic Deans” will be used until it is revised by the Review Panel of each college. The periodic evaluations shall be conducted in the winter quarter.

B. Performance Review
In addition to the annual Periodic Evaluations, a Performance Review of each college deans will be conducted at least every three years. Approximately one-third of the college deans should be scheduled for Performance Review each year.

The elections of the Review Panel members shall be scheduled in the fall quarter, and the Performance Review shall be conducted in the winter quarter.

Special requests for early Performance Reviews shall be approved by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. Circumstances warranting a special request must be compelling. Special requests shall be made in writing to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and shall state clearly and in detail the specific reason(s) for the request.

3. Review Panel

3.1 General Provisions
The Review Panel shall be representative of constituencies within the college. Normally the Review Panel shall consist of seven (7) members from the college. Small colleges and the library may have fewer than seven members.
The Associate Vice President for Academic Personnel and other appropriate administrative personnel from Academic Affairs may serve as non-voting members and resource persons for the Review Panel.

3.2 Review Panel Selection

3.2.1 Up to five full-time faculty members (tenured, probationary tenure-track or full time lecturers with 12.12 appointments in the same college) shall be elected from the college whose dean is to be reviewed. No more than one faculty member shall be elected from any department or administrative area unless full membership on the Review Panel cannot be achieved with this limitation. The panel may include no more than one full-time lecturer (with 12.12 appointment), no more than one probationary tenure-track faculty, and no more than one department chair/head. The majority of faculty members on the Review Panel shall be tenured faculty.

Elections for these positions shall be conducted by the Academic Senate Office. All full time faculty (tenured, probationary tenure-track and lecturers with 12.12 appointments in the same college) are eligible to vote.

3.2.2 Up to two (2) One (1) non-academic staff members who have permanent status within the college whose dean is to be reviewed and who does not directly report to the dean shall be elected by all non-academic staff members who have permanent status.

3.2.3 One (1) upper-division student from the same college as the dean, who is to be designated by the ASI President in consultation with the chair of the college student council.

4. Responsibilities of the Review Panel

4.1 General Provisions
The Review Panel shall consider diverse educational philosophies within the college; interpret the objectives, goals and expectations for leadership and management within the constituencies of the college; assess the strengths as well as the weaknesses of the performance of the dean as the chief administrative officer of the college; and evaluate the overall effectiveness of the operation of the college within the university.

4.2 Areas of Evaluations
To assist the Review Panel in its deliberation, the following items are suggested for consideration. These suggestions should not be taken as limiting, definitive or prescriptive. During the process of review, the Panel may find areas to be reviewed not specifically noted here. The Review Panel shall remain free to expand, select from, add to or condense this list of suggestions as appropriate to the college whose dean is to be reviewed.
4.2.1 Leadership
Does the dean provide intellectual leadership in support of the teacher-scholar model including teaching excellence, creative scholarship, and research? Does the dean foster confidence, trust and respect in the area of leadership? Considerations here might include such items as providing vision and direction for the college, availability for assistance and consultation, fairness and honesty in dealing with problems, resolution of conflicts, and other items of a general nature related to leadership.

4.2.2 Fiscal Management
Does the dean maintain and openly communicate the fiscal affairs of the college? Considerations here might include items such as preparation and maintenance of the budget, allocation and expenditure of funds, including college based fees, appropriate purchases and/or repair of equipment, and handling of special money allocation.

4.2.3 Instruction
Does the dean maintain appropriate curriculum standards within the college? Considerations here might include items such as establishment of appropriate educational policies, assistance in curriculum development, quality control of instruction, and other items related to curriculum and instruction.

4.2.4 Faculty Relations
Does the dean maintain appropriate professional relationships with the faculty within the college? Considerations here might include items such as consultative and collegial decision making, performance reviews or periodic evaluations, recruiting and retaining high quality faculty, fairness in workload allocation, overall protection of faculty against excessive workload, fostering diversity, conflict resolution, faculty professional development, and other items related to the faculty of the college.

4.2.5 Student Relationships
Does the dean maintain appropriate professional relationships with students? Considerations here might include items such as resolution of registration problems and practices, acceptable handling of complaints, involvement in outreach programs, encouragement of student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, availability for advisement and consultation, student development beyond the classroom, fostering diversity in the student body, and other items appropriately related to students.

4.2.6 Staff Relationships
Does the dean maintain appropriate professional relationships with the members of the non-academic staff of the college? Considerations here might include items such as recruiting practices, fostering diversity, appropriate work assignments, performance reviews and evaluations, in range progression, disciplinary or removal procedures, and other items related to non-academic staff.
4.2.7 Administrative items
Does the dean handle the administrative affairs of the college in an appropriately professional manner? Consideration here might be items such as relationships with department/administrative area chairpersons, associate/assistant dean (s), interactions with other deans and administrators, and other items which are related to the administration of the college.

4.2.8 Office Management
Does the dean maintain a current knowledge of relevant policies and procedures, follow them appropriately, and ensure that functions of the office are carried out in an orderly and organized manner? This includes, but is not limited to, the office organizational structure, allocation of responsibilities and feedback on performance of the support staff and associate/assistant dean(s).

4.2.9 Advancement
Does the dean develop and maintain appropriate professional relationships with alumni and key supporters of the college? Considerations here might include items such as: fund-raising efforts and results, support of departmental efforts in advancement, development of college advancement goals in consultation with college faculty, periodic updates on college advancement activities and achievements, and other items appropriately related to the advancement activities of the college.

5. The Review Panel will be charged with the following responsibilities:

5.1 Meet with the Provost to be briefed on the procedures to be used in the review process as outlined in this document, the time frame for conducting the review, and details about the position under review.

5.2 Elect the chair of the Review Panel.

5.3 Review specific material developed by the dean under review and meet with the dean to discuss the review process. The dean should provide the Review Panel with a self-study to include:

(a) A listing and brief narrative of primary areas of administrative responsibility since recruitment or last review.

(b) A listing and brief narrative of the most significant achievements as a dean since appointment or last review.

(c) A listing and brief narrative of major goals for the college during the next three years.

(d) A listing and brief narrative of competencies which the college dean would like to strengthen or develop.
(e) A response to the prior Review Panel recommendations.

(f) A list of names or constituencies that can be surveyed or contacted as the Review Panel deems desirable.

5.4 Acquire additional information and comments from those who have direct knowledge of the dean’s work, such as administrators/managers, faculty, staff, students and off campus constituencies. In cases where student input is appropriate, the Review Panel shall invite the president of the student council of the college, or the ASI president, to suggest ways of soliciting student input in the reviews.

5.5 Following the collection of information, the Review Panel will analyze the information, including periodic evaluations, and prepare a preliminary report, which shall contain the following:

(a) An executive summary.

(b) An analysis of the college dean’s self-study (Section 5.3).

(c) An analysis of the annual periodic evaluations.

(d) An analysis of all other information obtained from sources mentioned in Section 5.4.

(e) A comparison of accomplishments to goals.

(f) Recommendations concerning changes the college dean should undertake with respect to all of the areas evaluated in Section 4.2.

5.6 The preliminary report shall be provided to the dean. The dean shall have two weeks to provide a written response to the Review Panel and/or meet with the Review Panel prior to the final report submission to the Provost. The Review Panel shall consider the dean’s comments prior to finalizing the report.

5.7 A final report by the Review Panel shall go forward to the Provost and to the dean, with a copy to the President.

5.8 The dean shall have an opportunity to provide the Provost with a written response to the final report within two weeks.

5.9 The dean shall prepare a three-year plan in response to her or his discussions with the Provost regarding the Review Panel’s findings and recommendations.

5.10 The Provost shall arrange one or more meetings to discuss the findings and recommendations of the Review Panel. The Provost shall invite faculty, students, staff, administrators and others directly involved in the review. Copies of the report and the dean’s plan shall be made available by the Provost to the members of the college.