I. Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:10 pm.

The Chair asked that the Resolution on Program Review and Improvement become business item E on the agenda and this was approved by consensus. He also noted that a discussion item which will continue throughout the fall quarter is the Cal Poly Plan.

II. Minutes: none

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

A. Academic Senate Calendar for 1995-96

IV. Reports:

Academic Senate Chair: In addition to the Cal Poly Plan a major agenda item this quarter will be the Performance Pay. If the contract is approved the Senate must develop criteria and procedures for determining who receives this compensation. It was noted that even if the contract is not approved by the faculty, the Senate will have to deal with it anyway. Other major items include Charter Governance and the Visionary Pragmatism report which is now out and has major recommendations.

B. President’s Office: no report

C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: As of today Fall enrollment is at 99.8% of our head count target and 99.9% of the FTE and SCU targets.

D. Statewide Senators: Hale reported that a statewide Senate meeting is scheduled for this Friday.

E. CFA President: The contract ratification election is proceeding. Tomorrow is the last day to vote.

F. Staff Council: Staff Council is focusing on the Cal Poly Plan and is using both focus groups and a staff survey to address it. Another priority area for the Council is diversity.

G. ASI: President’s Week and the Neighborhood Cooperation Week are coming up.

H. Joe Jen: Report on the proposed restructuring of the College of Agriculture. In spring 1994 an ad hoc committee was developed to deal with the issue of structure. It included one faculty member from each department plus a staff representative. The committee looked at budget, problems caused by perceptions of the College of Agriculture, and the need for the Dean to have a more effective decisionmaking group. The committee’s work went out to the entire Agriculture faculty ten times before finalized. The committee also reviewed five colleges across the country that had restructured recently. From all this information ten recommendations were made ranging from department head allocation to teaching methods. The two recommendations for structure were as follows: (1.) make no changes in the current structure but implement the recommendations; or (2.) implement a three division model.

The implementation phase was dealt with by a separate committee. An open forum was held for all the college’s faculty and staff. Currently the college is operating with the existing structure with the three division model on file. Funding for transition was requested, primarily to help the directors with staffing because the Dean is not willing to take money away from instruction to finance restructuring.
V. Consent agenda: Resolution on Department Name Change for the Chemistry Department. Seeing no objections the resolution was approved.

VI. Business Items

A. Resolution on Charter Governance Committee—Gooden, first reading. The proposal for the Cal Poly Governance Council was presented. Gooden noted that initially the Senate Executive Committee was extremely reluctant to participate in the Charter Governance Committee unless faculty had a voting majority. In an effort to break the stalemate, Senate representatives were selected and charged to bring back several plans for Senate consideration as opposed to one plan. Although only one model has been brought to the Senate, Gooden assured Senators that several models were reviewed by the Charter Governance Committee.

Questions (Q) and points (P) raised during discussion included the following:

Q—Does exclusivity of faculty in curriculum decisions mean that the President will no longer have final say in this area? R—No, the President will continue to have the final say. Q—What about multicultural/ethnic issues. Would they fall under the purview of this Council? R (Gonzalez)—I don’t think this group will be able to deal with this in the area of curriculum because this is the faculty area of exclusivity. P—This model does not provide for multicultural representation on the group. R (Gonzalez)—The committee decided not to do so because there are so many different ways that the “pie” can be cut in terms of representation.

Q—How does budgeting change or not change? R (Gonzalez)—The committee talked about budget repeatedly. This Council is being charged with policy and defining how policy would be developed. Q—Do you feel comfortable that the faculty prerogatives outlined in pages 18 and 19 are adequately reflected on page 11? Q—What is the process that will be followed in attaining agreement of this plan? R (Gonzalez)—The document is going to all four constituencies for a vote. Then the committee will meet to refine the document if necessary based on what was agreed to by the groups when voting. The committee will forward the final version to the president.

Q—How would agendizing work? A (Gonzalez)—According to this model, the group would have to agree to agendize. The committee is striving to create a model which is “live” in the sense that it is not a top-down model. In other words the group will determine agenda priorities, not the chair. Q—In a consensus model is it not the case that any one of the constituent groups could block action on an issue? A (Gonzalez)—Yes, as long as it’s not one of the areas of exclusivity. P—In reading that paragraph it sounded like the remainder of the group could override the dissenting group (page 17 under Blocking Disagreement.) Q—What are the boundaries of the President’s area of exclusivity? A—(Gooden) It is in terms of how far he wants to go in dealing with the Trustees. I don’t know how Baker would answer that.

(Gonzalez) We will research this and bring back an answer.

B. Resolution on Revisions to the Cal Poly Strategic Plan (to include Global Awareness—Urreiztieta, first reading. While the university is involved extensively in international activities the strategic plan is silent on this issue. Questions and points raised during the discussion included the following:

Q—Will international students pay different fees than residents as they do now? A—This is not addressed in the strategic plan.

Q—One gets the impression that we’re torturing a document in order to address a single concern. Was it felt that international activities were precluded by the existing document? A—That wasn’t the issue. The administration wanted some guidance on prioritizing programs abroad. P—The strategic plan does not address priorities among many worthwhile activities. P—If we accept foreign students, we are required by Federal law to provide services for the students (in reference to 5.6 and 5.7). Q—7.3 What does this mean and why is it there? R—The intent is to pose the question of what is the right balance.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adhourned at 4:59 pm.
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