Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:15 pm.

I. Minutes: The minutes for January 26 were approved with a correction on page 2, the next-to-last paragraph. Vilkitis clarified that all references to "7%" should read "7-plus %.”

II. Communications & Announcements:
   B. Nominations received for Academic Senate/elected committee vacancies. A sheet was distributed with the heading "Academic Senate Nominations Received for 1993-1994."

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: J. Wilson gave an update of the Executive Committee's meetings that have been taking place to examine the various aspects of the university budget. He stated that the Senate would meet next Tuesday [February 23] so that the Executive Committee could provide its report. He also gave the schedule for PACBRA's meetings: they met last Friday [February 12] and arrived at a tentative plan to accommodate a possible budget cut of 6.4 million dollars, roughly estimated at a 7% reduction of funds to this campus. They are proposing that the library receive no reduction in funding, the colleges receive a 5% cut, and the rest of the units a 6% cut. The President must send this campus's tentative plan for meeting the budget reduction to the Chancellor's office by March 5.

   B. & C. President's Office & Vice President for Academic Affairs: none.

   D. Statewide Senators: T. Kersten reported on the Master Plan in Focus that is serving as a discussion paper for the Committee on Higher Education in the State Assembly. He and Barbara Mori read through points 1, 6, 9, 10, and 15. Kersten stated that the Committee on Higher Education would be discussing these issues at their meeting on February 23 [although I contacted Assemblywoman Marguerite Archie-Hudson's office and was informed that the discussion of the Master Plan in Focus will not take place until March]. Sarah Lord asked whether the proposals had been the result of a blue ribbon committee. Kersten replied that this was not the case. He contrasted the present procedure with the one that had been in place several years ago when the Assembly and Senate formed a joint committee to examine higher education. Kersten predicted that some of the points in the Master Plan in Focus might come out in legislation. Irvin and Kersten both cautioned against over-reaction and against personalizing the debate. In Kersten's words, "Our task is to tell our story and to show where ideas hinder or help." Never give a personal challenge.

   E. CFA Representative: none.

   F. ASI Representative: none.

   G. Project DELTA report. Ed Sullivan, Don Floyd, and Charlie Andrews gave a detailed account and distributed a handout of their experiences with the Direct Electronic Learning Teaching Alternative project (DELTA). D. Floyd observed that the DELTA project was not synonymous with the elimination of faculty positions. It is a technological and educational resource, not a cost-cutting or labor-saving program. C. Andrews concurred, observing that it takes the same
number of faculty but has the distinct advantage of providing access. Andrews felt that in the area of electronic learning and teaching, Cal Poly was on a par with any of the other CSU campuses. Cal Poly is the only campus with a mechanism for self-assessment. P. Petzer asked whether there had been any feedback regarding distance learning. Andrews responded that two of the three professors involved were satisfied and that the one individual who was not satisfied was—in Andrews's estimation—nevertheless doing an outstanding job. R. Gooden asked whether there were deadlines for Research Faculty Proposals (RFPs). Andrews replied that that information had previously been distributed. C. Dana stated that we should not reverse the logical order [of the educational process]: he explained that we should not start by playing with technology, but instead should begin by establishing our teaching goals and then seek the appropriate technologies. Vilkitis and Floyd commented on the high cost of this teaching method. Equipment is expensive and there must be continual reinvestment. John Connelly observed that electronic teaching methods have the possibility of becoming even more labor intensive if they become increasingly tutorial in nature.

IV. Consent Agenda: L. Burgunder asked that the resolution on the consent agenda be pulled and placed on the agenda as a business item.

V. Business Items: J. Vilkitis moved (2nd by T. Bailey) that items B, C, and D be addressed before item A, after which the resolution that had been pulled from the consent agenda would become business item V-E. The motion passed.

B. GE&B course proposal for STAT 217X. B. Mori and J. Harris asked why the proposal had not been reviewed by the GE&B committee. T. Bailey responded that it was not required or customary for an "X" course to be reviewed by the GE&B committee. C. Dana concurred that this was the proper and logical process. We should see if a course is successful and has a clientele first. C. Andrews asked for information regarding the staffing and possible budget implications. B. Mori explained that the proposed course would replace other courses presently offered and thus would not increase the [staffing] load [or expenses]. Bailey further elucidated that the proposed course was more appropriate for certain majors. We will thus be shifting resources from one course to another. J. Wilson asked for the department to bring back further statistics and/or information to clarify issues regarding staffing and funding.

C. GE&B course proposal for PHIL 305, 306, and 308. Vilkitis explained that the new courses replace current GE&B courses. Regarding resources, then, it is a one-for-one shift. The proposal is primarily one of nomenclature. Bailey explained that there would be a redistribution of faculty resources but no added load. Andrews moved (2nd by Mori) that this be placed on the consent agenda for the next meeting of the Academic Senate. The motion passed.

D. GE&B course proposal POLS/BIO/AG 371X. Andrews expressed support for the idea but requested budget information. R. Gooden stated there would be no added charge and asked why it was thus necessary to supply budgetary details. B. Mori stated she had spoken with Professor Evans—who was to be one of the instructors—and he was unaware that it was to be a GE&B course. She was reluctant to approve the course until she knew how it was going to be taught. Burgunder asked why we need to see the budget. Andrews responded that GE&B is the only place that we have a review. Extensive discussion ensued. Gooden explained that POLYSCI 371 has been on the books from the beginning. It had been taught by Will Alexander and later by Dick Krejsa. It was now being taught by [Emmitt] Evans. The only change is trying to be more innovative. Students would benefit from four different professors in different disciplines: two in agriculture, one in political science, and one in biology. Kersten asked if the old courses POLYSCI 371 would go away or if there would be two different courses. Gooden responded that there would not be two different courses but only cross-listing [with the other participating departments]. Kersten asked for more details as to how the course would be taught and implemented. W. Mueller wanted to know what would be done...
with FTE allocations. By having four different professors teaching the course, would we have to quadruple the resources? Andrews agreed with Mueller's concerns: if four faculty members teach one class, we need to know the budget implications. J.Wilson pulled the discussion to a close with a request that the submitters of the proposal come back with specific information that would address the expressed concerns [i.e., budget, FTE allocations, and how the course would be taught].

A. Cal Poly Strategic Plan. Finalization of sections 5-8.

"Old" Item 5.2.1 [identified as item "5.2.1" on p. 19 of the agenda from January 26]. P. Fetzer moved (2nd by Bailey) to reintroduce and reconsider item 5.2.1 since it was passed at the last meeting in a rush at the end of the meeting. Discussion ensued. B.Hallock called the question. The requisite 2/3 was achieved. The motion to reconsider item 5.2.1 failed.

Item 5.2.1. [previously item 5.2.2 on p. 19 of the agenda from January 26] D. Peach moved (2nd by Andrews) that item 5.2.1.a replace item 5.2.1 [that had been items 5.2.2.a and 5.2.2 on the January 26 agenda] with the word "for" added so that the item reads ". . . and for the retention and promotion of all its employees." C. Russell offered a friendly amendment which was accepted by Peach that the opening words "Cal Poly shall continue to develop programs" be replaced with the words "Cal Poly shall initiate or maintain programs . . . . " Discussion ensued. Bailey offered as a friendly amendment the addition of words to the next-to-last line so that it reads " . . . faculty and staff and the retention of students as well as the retention and promotion of all its employees." J. Harris asked why "administration" was not included in this item. Peach stated he was willing to accept the addition of "administration" as a friendly amendment. The motion as amended failed.

W. Mueller moved (2nd by Mori) that item 5.2.2 on p. 19 [which will now become item 5.2.1] be accepted as originally stated. Bailey offered a friendly amendment that the word "student" be inserted so that the words "quality applicants" now read "quality student applicants." Bailey expressed concern over the lack of a statement that might address student retention. She offered the friendly amendment that the words "and retain" be inserted after the word "attract." There was discussion. It was eventually agreed that the words "and retain" should go after the word "attract." C. Russell offered the amendment (2nd by M. LaPorte) that the opening words "Cal Poly shall continue to develop programs" be replaced with the words "Cal Poly shall initiate or maintain programs . . . . ." The amendment passed. P. Fetzer then expressed his concern that the word "qualified" was redundant and demeaning and made the amendment that it be deleted. The amendment failed for lack of a second. H. Johnston called for the question. The requisite 2/3 was achieved.

The motion itself passed. Thus the approved item now reads:

5.2.1 Cal Poly shall initiate or maintain programs to increase the number of qualified student applicants, attract and retain students of high calibre, and increase the diversity of the student population in accordance with the campus enrollment management plan.

VII. Adjournment: the meeting was adjourned at 5:01.

Craig H. Russell, Secretary of Academic Senate
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