Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:12pm.

I. Minutes:

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

The Chair directed the Senate's attention to the items under the Communications and Announcements section. He also announced the need to fill the vacancy on the Program Review and Improvement Committee for an at-large Senate member.

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair:

The Chair gave a brief review of some of the matters which were discussed at the recent Academic Senate Chairs' meeting on October 2, 1992.

B. President's Office: none

C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: none

D. Statewide Senators:

Statewide senator, Vilkitis, discussed three resolutions presently before the statewide Senate: (1) devising strategies to maintain the state's investment in the CSU's faculty, (2) the theft of intellectual property when professional notetakers sell copies of class lectures, (3) implementation of the general education transfer curriculum. The Executive Orders to replace EO 338 and 342 will be distributed to campuses this week.

Statewide senator, Kersten, noted that the CSU is presently reviewing its entire relationship to the Master Plan, in view of the budget situation, to see what portions of the Plan can be enforced. He also explained that there are a series of structural impediments within the state budget that will steadily make funding to the CSU more difficult. It will be important to push hard for the CSU's position before the state.

E. CFA Campus President:

CFA President, Conway, mentioned that CFA is going to move ahead to bargain for funding of MSA's this year. The Chancellor has unilaterally said they would not be funded, but this decision was made without CFA negotiations.

F. ASI representatives: none

G. John McCutcheon, the new Director of Athletics, spoke on the present Athletics program at Cal Poly. The campus is planning to move its sports programs to Division I and is presently looking to align itself with a Conference. Recommendations have been sent to the President regarding Cal Poly's football program that should put this program in a financially stable condition. McCutcheon encouraged anyone with questions to please come to him. He would like to maintain an open and accessible department. Even if there are differences of opinion regarding the place of athletics at this institution, he would like to explain why a certain action may have been taken.

IV. Consent Agenda:

A. Resolution on Promotion Eligibility: The Chair gave background information on the reason for this resolution (faculty need their fourth MSA in order to apply for promotion. Since MSA's have not been funded this year, faculty should still be eligible for promotion). The Executive Committee acted on this resolution on September 22, 1992 to allow the Personnel Office to get the information out to eligible faculty so they could start preparing their packages. This resolution applies only to the 1992-93 academic year. The matter has been referred to the Personnel Policies Committee for drafting of a policy statement should the situation occur in the future. The resolution was adopted by consensus.

B. Resolution on Departmental Precedence in Elections: Adopted by consensus.
V. Business Items:

A. Resolution on Evaluation of School Deans, first reading: The Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, Terry, gave some background information regarding the development of this resolution. It had been suggested that the period of time for reviews be changed from three years to one year. Gooden stated he would like to see language that started the review process with the first year of the dean’s appointment. Kersten asked if there was a process to express concern in between these three-year reviews. Terry responded there was not. Andrews encouraged more frequent reviews to see if there was a pattern of faculty input regarding the dean’s performance. Harris stated the Director of the School for Teachers Education should be added to the resolution. There was some debate as to whether a better evaluation form should be considered. Brown stated if this evaluative tool doesn’t allow a college to pass the information it wants regarding its dean to the administration, then a form should be constructed that does. If we want regular input to pass, then a process that allows this should be created.

A straw vote was taken to see whether the body preferred a three-year evaluation of deans or an annual evaluation. The majority of members indicated their preference for an annual review. This item was referred back to committee for further deliberation.

B. Resolution on Modification of Resolution AS-268-88/BC...Budget Information Reporting, first reading: The Senate Chair gave some background information on the purpose of this resolution (present method of distributing budget information is voluminous and costly). Conway noted the original resolution on budget information reporting (1988) was drafted because not all schools were allowed to view the budget information for that school and the 1988 resolution made all school funding information available to departments and faculty within each school. Vice President Koob pointed out that due to the new budget environment (absence of formulas), that budgeting mechanisms throughout the CSU are in change. He felt it would be appropriate for the Senate to discuss what these new processes should be. The resolution was moved to second reading at the next Senate meeting.

C. Curriculum proposal for Religious Studies, first reading: The Philosophy Department is requesting five new religious studies courses which replace three existing philosophy courses. This brings the Philosophy Department more in line with Religious Studies offerings at other CSU campuses.

D. Curriculum proposal for BS in Manufacturing Engineering, first reading: The College of Engineering is requesting this new degree program and is deleting three present programs. The Department Head for Industrial Engineering, Freeman, stated the Budget Committee had reviewed this proposal for any budgetary impact and approved it. Due to the elimination of three programs, it may result in a savings of units. It was M/S/P that the Budget Committee bring a budget evaluation of financial impact to the Senate before approving same. Connelly spoke against this motion stating it was an internal decision to restructure the program for more efficiency and no new money or faculty were being requested. A budget analysis would just slow down the process. Freeman asked if a statement of the Budget Committee's earlier review would be sufficient? Andrews replied affirmatively.

VI. Discussion:

Strategic Plan, first reading: Discussion was held regarding the editing body/process by which the faculty responses to the Strategic Plan would be finalized. Kersten: The final editing should have the broadest possible support with the fullest input. The process is as important as the document. Put it on the floor of the Senate to be reworked even though this may be clumsy. Wilson: It will be going to the caucuses first for some refinement. Hampsey: I support the caucuses being allowed to edit and organize the responses. Possibly the seven caucus chairs can then get together to edit it some more. Gamble suggested the comments go to the colleges and then any changes to the original document be offered by amendment on the Senate floor. Bailey stated she would want to see the concerns expressed from her college and to give the document to the Executive Committee without Senate review would eliminate personal representation. Vilkits suggested the Executive Committee develop "procedures" for implementing any changes. A motion was made that the document go to the Executive Committee for editing but that these meetings be open to the campus. The motion failed. M/S/P that the calendar and process adopted on page 41 of the agenda be adopted for implementation (attached).

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 pm.
**RE: STRATEGIC PLAN**

**CALENDAR PRINTED IN THE MEMO OF SEPTEMBER 14, 1992 WHICH WAS SENT TO ALL FACULTY**

The following calendar has been established for receiving comments and finalizing a Faculty Response from these comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 21</td>
<td>Final draft of the Cal Poly Strategic Plan mailed to faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 9</td>
<td>Last day for individual faculty comments to be received by the Academic Senate office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13</td>
<td>Final draft of the Cal Poly Strategic Plan presented to the Academic Senate as a first reading item. (Senate action will not be taken until all faculty comments have been received and finalized into a Faculty Response.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16</td>
<td>All comments received will be placed in a &quot;Academic Senate Working Draft of the Cal Poly Strategic Plan.&quot; The comments received from each college will be sent to that college's caucus for deliberation and consolidation into a college response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11</td>
<td>Last day for college responses to be received by the Academic Senate office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>The college responses to the Strategic Plan (Mission Statement and sections 1 - 3) will come before the Academic Senate for second reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3</td>
<td>The college responses to the Strategic Plan (sections 4-8) will come before the Academic Senate for second reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early January 1993</td>
<td>Referendum on the Faculty Response to the Strategic Plan to be sent to all faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>