Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:14 pm.

I. Minutes: R. Gooden moved (2nd by Russell) that the minutes be approved. The motion passed.

II. Communications & Announcements:
Jack Wilson observed the announcements were self-explanatory in the agenda.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: J. Wilson deferred to Tina Bailey, who is serving as the Academic Senate Representative to the Calendaring Committee. She stated that the faculty and staff will be mailed a survey within the next few weeks with regard to the calendar systems. The committee has not reached any conclusions or formulated any opinions yet—in fact, they are actively seeking input. The committee is considering all aspects of each calendaring model. They hope to have a report to the Academic Senate by the end of the quarter along with a recommendation. Then the Senate will be able to discuss the issues and forward their own recommendation(s) to the Administration. R. Gooden observed that Jim Simmons and a committee had tackled a similar task ten years ago. Bailey commented that she was aware of that earlier committee's work. She added that it is hard to get some of the relevant information. If a change in calendaring does occur there will be at least a three-year turnover.

J. Wilson gave an update on the Executive Committee's meetings concerning the budget. To date, the committee has met with Frank Lebens and Rick Ramírez [for an overall review of budget and budgeting matters] and with Charlie Crabb and Robert Koob [to review the budget of Academic Affairs].

B. & C. President's Office & Vice President for Academic Affairs. R. Koob deferred to the Statewide Academic Senators since they had met most recently with the Chancellor and had the most current information.

D. Statewide Senators: T. Kersten reported that the statewide senators had met very recently with the Chancellor, his senior staff, and the CSU presidents. There was concern that the Governor's budget may not be very realistic. In Kersten's view, we were treated fairly well as a system in the Governor's proposed budget. The Department of Finance had totalled the various needs in the state and found, not surprisingly, that the sum was larger than projected available funds, so they cut everyone. That cut resulted in a 4.5% cut for the CSU system: we came out considerably better than the UC system. But the Governor's assumptions with regard to welfare reform were not accurate, and he misjudged the extent of the economic recovery. Other critical factors include the governor's request for a renter's tax and the views and policies of the Clinton administration. The federal government policies could impact the budget and higher education by as much as one-and-a-half billion dollars. If all factors play out favorably, then the CSU system will only have to absorb a 4.5% cut. But if there is a revenue shortfall in any area, then we will be hit again. A reasonable forecast—not even the worst case—is that we may have to endure a 10% cut in real dollars on our campus. The cut would have draconian effects on the functioning of the university. A 10% cut would
necessitate faculty layoffs. Kersten was concerned that proper consultation be taken if layoffs become unavoidable. Kersten added that Pat Nicholson, the President of CFA, was also in attendance at the meetings and stated that we should be as creative as possible in order to avoid faculty layoffs. The statewide meeting also discussed the possibility of another student fee increase. The Governor stated he would support a fee increase if the Trustees propose one. Kersten's personal view was that a fee increase will occur. R.Gooden added that the student representatives have already taken a clear position [against a fee increase]. Nicole Brown (the student representative to the Cal Poly Academic Senate) replied that students on our campus have not yet taken a stance and are actively examining the issues. She stated the students realize the complexity of the crisis and are not yet committed to any specific view or position. J. Murphy added that we are caught in a downward spiral. We have seen only the slightest decrease in student population on campus but not nearly enough to compensate to make the necessary adjustments in the student-faculty ratio. We will soon have to say "no" to students we would normally not deny if this situation continues. Kersten amplified on Murphy's remark, stating that there is a desperate need for a review of the Master Plan. There is no question that the budgets we have been receiving are not even close to meeting the goals set forth in the Master Plan. There will have to be a major reassessment of what is realistic in the near future. The Assembly Committee on Higher Education is presently holding hearings on Fridays. They are meeting with constituencies from all elements of the academic community in an attempt to revise the Master Plan. Perhaps there will be hearings as well. It is very difficult to tell what direction these hearing will take. But one thing is painfully clear—the major forces driving the discussions are fiscal concerns. Kersten objected to this attitude, stating that budgetary issues should not be their primary concern. He articulated that spending on higher education is an investment. Cutting education is a sure way to assure that the downward economic spiral will continue. He then lamented that most of the individuals with whom he meets in the legislature understand what we are saying and agree—but cannot do much to change things. Gooden added some depressing details: some members of the Assembly are considering such things as having all lower division courses taught at the Community Colleges. It is a constant struggle to educate these individuals about issues and concerns that Gooden felt had been fought over and resolved years ago. Kersten concurred, saying there is a serious discussion about moving large numbers of students from UC and CSU campuses to the Community Colleges. It was Gooden's and Kersten's opinion that the feasibility and ramifications of this proposal had not been considered.

J.Harris had heard a rumor that Munitz believed that half of the CSU campuses will have to layoff faculty. He asked Kersten whether this statement was accurate or well founded. Kersten replied "no" and that the prospect for faculty layoffs depends on each campus on a case-by-case basis. Nevertheless, he added, one can look at the aggregate numbers for the system and deduce that layoffs are probable. Vilkitis then gave his perception of Chancellor Munitz's statements. Vilkitis related that Munitz did state that half of the campuses will be in layoff mode if we are forced to absorb more than the 4.5% cut of the Governor's budget. He then clarified that the 4.5% cut actually translates to a 7% cut when implemented on the campus level since there are fixed costs that cannot be reduced. In short, if we do not get one and a half billion dollars from the federal government, then the campuses will be hit with a 7% cut in real dollars which will then place half of the CSU campuses on layoff mode. According to Vilkitis, Munitz did not feel that Sacramento regarded layoffs as a critical issue. Kersten disagreed. He felt that Sacramento did not want to resort to layoffs of faculty. Vilkitis reported that Munitz recommended that we do a tally sheet to document how we offset the budget reductions so that we can show the public [the ramifications of the cuts] and what we are doing.

R.Koob then addressed two issues: 1) He stated that Cal Poly will follow AAUP guidelines regarding layoffs even though the CSU system as a whole may operate under guidelines that are less stringent, and 2) We have done a preliminary analysis to see if we will need to layoff faculty at a university level if we have to absorb a 5% budgetary reduction. At 5% he does not expect layoffs. At 10%, layoffs cannot be avoided. W. Mueller then asked for clarification concerning the figure of 7% that had been bantered about. Koob began by expounding on
Vilkitis's points. The 4.5% cut translates to a 7% cut because some items in the total CSU budget—such as bond payments—are not subject to cut. In response to a question by J. Connely, Koob observed that budget planning must take into account the long term and the issue of balance. Sometimes we have to do things in the short term we normally would not consider in order to plan for and meet the needs of the future. It is imperative, for example, that we maintain Cal Poly's national reputation.

C. Dana asked for clarification on the 7% figure that kept arising in the discussion of the budget, since a 6% figure had been used last week as the estimate during the meeting of the Executive Committee. Koob stated that he had arrived at the 6% figure by using some of last year's figures but now corrected the estimate with more contemporary information. The 7% figure is more accurate. Kersten then further observed that if the budgetary crisis continues Munitz will be asking for a revision in the way the fee program is set.

E. CFA Representative. J. Conway was puzzled by some of Koob's remarks since he had been informed that each CSU campus had received a detailed budget report from the Chancellor's office. Koob assured Conway that that information had not yet been received. Conway also provided details on the request from the Chancellor's office for information that will help document the severity of the budget crisis and show just how bad things really are. He wondered if it might be an exercise in futility. Koob responded that we are in the 'whine-and-moan' period that is meant to establish the rationale for seeking a fee increase. It is part of a strategy developed to demonstrate the impact [of potential budget shortfalls in the future] to Sacramento. Planning for a possible budget cut is not "the final cut of the cards" but is only one step. Those steps accelerate up to the point a decision is actually made.

On another issue, Conway observed that the administration's policy of following AAUP guidelines concerning layoffs would only apply for tenured and tenure-track faculty. Part-time faculty, lecturers, and rehires would not fall under the AAUP guidelines.

IV. Consent Agenda: passed without dissent. Jack Wilson specifically thanked Ray Terry for all the work that he and the Personnel Policies Committee had done in drafting the Resolution on Promotion Eligibility.

V. Business Items:

A. Resolution on Majority Vote. E. Seim gave the background for the resolution. Kersten agreed with the general tenor of the resolution but felt that campus-wide elections were different from other elections within a particular college. In college elections we generally know the personalities well and can order preferences well. But on a campus-wide vote, it is another matter. It might be hard to rank and make an intelligent order. Kersten then moved (2nd by Vilkitis) to include an Item G to the resolution which would read "Campus-wide elected posts are exempt from the above provisions." Discussion ensued. J. Murphy asked whether there was any really a problem and asked whether history showed a necessity [for the amendment]. Kersten replied that there had been several such occasions in the past. M. Hanson, who had served as chair of the Elections Committee, replied that there have been problems with elections in the past that sometimes required a third run-off. C. Andrews spoke against the amendment stating that all elections should be treated seriously; he therefore did not see the difficulty in researching and then ranking candidates in campus-wide elections. W. Mueller opposed the amendment, stating his preference for the simplest and most direct resolution possible. J. Harris similarly spoke against the amendment stating we should do a better job of education during the election process. The amendment failed. A vote on the resolution itself was then taken, and the motion passed without dissent.

B. Cal Poly Strategic Plan.

Preamble [p.16]. B. Mori moved (2nd by D. Hannings) the approval of the preamble. J. Harris expressed concern with the term "priorities" in the next-to-last line: he felt the Strategic Plan would help set goals but would not be of any real help in prioritizing those
goals. R. Gooden proposed the friendly amendment that the word "functional" in line one be deleted and replaced by the word "means." W. Reynoso proposed the friendly amendment that the words "the direction of" in line two be deleted. Mori accepted both revisions as friendly amendments. The motion as amended passed with dissent. The approved Preamble to the Strategic Plan now reads:

Cal Poly's Strategic Plan was developed as a means to guide the university over the next several years. It establishes a direction for achieving the mission of the university by setting forth the goals and priorities which will direct its future planning, resource allocation, and decision making.

5. Diversity [p. 17-18]. D. Hannings moved (2nd by Botwin) the approval of Item A [on p. 18 of the agenda] as part of Cal Poly's Strategic Plan. C. Russell proposed the following changes: 1) the replacement of the words "to promote" in line 8 with the words "the promotion of"; 2) the deletion of the words "Equity in employment is achievable if" in line 9; and 3) the replacement of the word "development" with the word "attainment" in the last line. Hannings accepted those three changes as friendly amendments. C. Russell then moved that the words "or exceeding" that had been stricken through in line 10 be reinserted as part of the approved text. The amendment failed for lack of a 2nd.

J. Harris asked if "must" on line 12 implied that participation by members of the faculty, staff, and student body was compulsory. J. Connely echoed those sentiments; he interpreted this phrase to mean that all of us would have to participate as a condition of employment. He felt that the words "should be able to participate" were superior to the imperative "must participate." W. Mueller shared the same sentiments and moved the amendment (2nd by Hanson) that the words "will be able to" replace the word "must" in line 12. T. Bailey, P. Fetzer, and J. Murphy all explained that the original statement was not a command but instead was merely an "if-then" statement: if we want to achieve the stated goals, then we must do certain things. W. Reynoso stated that the sentence should be considered in the context of the paragraph as a whole. T. Bailey called the question and obtained the requisite 2/3 majority for a vote on the amendment. The amendment failed. L. Gamble moved (2nd by Russell) that the words "academic and cultural programs" in line 12 be deleted and replaced with the words "in an academic and cultural climate." T. Bailey, B. Mori, and W. Reynoso spoke against the amendment. W. Reynoso called for the question and received the requisite 2/3 majority for a vote on the amendment. The amendment failed. W. Reynoso moved that the paragraph's concluding words "and appreciation necessary for the successful attainment of this ideal" be replaced with "and appreciation of cultural differences." The amendment failed for lack of a 2nd. J. Connely asked if the administration was considered "staff" [and was thus subject to these provisions]. Koob assured him that the administration is to be considered as part of "staff."

C. Andrews called for the question. The motion passed with dissent. The revised text that was approved now reads:

Diversity enhances the quality of life and education for all members of the Cal Poly community and enriches the social and professional climate both on and off campus. The concept of diversity assumes recognition and respect for differences in age, country of origin, creed, economic background, ethnicity, gender, physical ability, race, and sexual orientation. The development and maintenance of an integrated multicultural campus is the responsibility of all members of the Cal Poly community. Achieving educational equity within a diverse student body will require programs in outreach, recruitment, retention, career planning, and the promotion of timely graduation with special emphasis on reflecting the diversity among CSU eligible students within the state. Cal Poly commits to meeting the proportion of eligible underrepresented
individuals by job category in appropriate recruiting areas. To achieve a truly integrated multiracial campus, members of the faculty, staff, and student body must participate in academic and cultural programs that promote the sensitivity, understanding, and appreciation necessary for the successful attainment of this ideal.

Section 5.1. T. Bailey moved (2nd by B. Mori) that the proposed section 5.1.A. replace the existing section 5.1. The motion passed.

Section 5.2. T. Bailey moved (2nd by D. Hannings) that the proposed section 5.2.A. replace the existing section 5.2. The motion passed.

Section 5.2.1. B. Mori moved (2nd by J. Harris) that the proposed section 5.2.1.A. replace the existing section 5.2.1. The motion passed.

C. Resolution for Double-Counting of General Education and Breadth Courses: J. Vilkitis gave the background of the resolution. C. Dana stated that the resolution's wording is quite confusing and that the second resolved clause is redundant. C. Russell observed that the wording of the second resolved clause as printed in agenda is incorrect. Reading from the minutes for January 12, Russell stated that "Andrews offered a friendly amendment that the second resolved clause [p. 17] be altered to read:

RESOLVED: That a General Education and Breadth course cannot be used to satisfy a major and support and General Education and Breadth requirement.

M. Botwin moved adjournment (2nd by Murphy).

VII. Adjournment: the meeting was adjourned at 5:00.