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

The business at hand was completion of the agenda from March 9, 1993.

I. Minutes: none submitted.

II. Communications:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: J. Wilson gave a presentation explaining the various tables and charts that he distributed in the handout titled "PRELIMINARY BUDGET SUMMARY by JDW 3,8,93."

V. Business Items:
   G. Resolution on Academic Senate Budget Report. [See handout labelled "ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACCOMMODATING IMMEDIATE BUDGET REDUCTIONS."

C. Andrews moved (2nd by Murphy) that there be an Item 9 added to the list of eight recommendations that reads: "Adjustments to funding of Academic Affairs be predicated upon the Reorganization Report of 1984 and the Program Review and Improvement Committee Report of 1992." J. Bermann suggested that the report of the "Committee of Fourteen" [i.e., the Program Review Committee two years ago] be included as a criterion for budget decisions along with the reports suggested by Andrews. Andrews commented that that report is unavailable. [Since the budget recommendations were only a first reading item on the agenda, no vote was taken.] J. Wilson stated that Andrews' motion would be taken under advisement at the next Executive Committee meeting.

W. Reynoso expressed displeasure and concern with item 7 regarding English Placement Tests and cuts in remedial programs. G. Irvin addressed some of her concerns. J. Wilson passed on concerns regarding remedial programs in English that had been submitted by John Harrington in English. They involved: 1) basic writing skills, and 2) English as a second language. It was also observed that reductions in funding to remedial courses would have a disproportionate effect on Asian and Latino students. J. Murphy stated we need to look at Student Affairs more closely [for possible savings]. J. Wilson said that Art DeKleine—who has been involved with remedial math courses at Cal Poly—had communicated to him that there are approximately 200 students enrolled in remedial math courses each quarter that equates to a teaching load of 6 to 12 units per quarter that normally are taught part-time faculty. It is not very costly. T. Hale observed that if we admit someone to the university who is math-deficient then it is obligatory that we help remediate the individual. W. Reynoso added that it is often the non-traditional student who would be affected by cuts in remedial course offerings: if we were to have them take remedial courses through Extended Education it could jeopardize their financial aid since those three or four units would be transferred [out of their 'normal' course load]. J. Harrington then spoke, identifying himself as the coordinator of Writing Skills. He stated that Poly has already reduced the number of sections of remedial writing classes. If those students who enter with writing deficiencies do not receive remedial help, they will simply fail—and that will end up costing more. Another cost that should be considered is the psychological cost of failure. Reynoso then observed that the
campus receives ILE [Instructional Learning Experience] and EPT [English Placement Test] money and inquired how much we actually have to pay out of our pockets. G. Irvin responded that the CSU assumes a 30-1 student-faculty ratio, but the ILE and EPT funds reduce the ratio to 15-1. Some of those funds also go to tutors.

C. Russell objected to the cursory manner in which the Executive Committee had arrived at its targeted reductions in Transportation Services (see Item 2). He observed that the Executive Committee had based its decision solely on the basis of an anecdote that on one occasion a faculty member needed a car [for his grant project] and had been able to get a rental car for less from a commercial rental establishment than from Transportation Services. Russell urged further investigation of the issue before forwarding this decision.

M. Vix observed that if we are forced to vote on all of the items as a package—all or nothing—then we are setting it up for defeat. He requested that when it comes time for a vote, we vote on each item individually.

To focus discussion, Vilkitis suggested that we go down the list recommendations and consider them one by one.

1. **Athletics:** reduce state funding to Athletics by 50 percent.

M. Vix said several issues need to be addressed. First, there is an implied contract between students and faculty due to the 1991 referendum. Presently, with the student assessment increasing, the general fund allocation is going down. We were contributing 1.7 million dollars from the general fund to Athletics and now it is down to 1.2 million. Secondly, there are contractual agreements with coaches and individuals in Athletics. Additionally, the proposal goes contrary to the student referendum. Kersten said it was an interesting point, and then asked what do students feel now in the present environment? Have things changed? Nicole Brown (the student representative to the Academic Senate) reminded the Senate that the student referendum did pass and there has not been a call to have another. She observed the students would not want to pick up the added expenses for Athletics if a 50% of the general fund dollars for Athletics were cut out. She felt students would understand if there was a reduction in some funds and would consider a modest and reasonable cut under current circumstances—but a 50% slice she deemed ridiculous.

C. Andrews spoke to the issue of contractual obligations. It is an important consideration, but he reminded the Senate that there are faculty all over campus in a multitude of disciplines who have moved here expecting a career—and they have implied contracts as well. These faculty address the student complaint: "I can't get any classes." He asked whether or not we need seventeen sports. There are ways to economize and be in Division II. Our function, in Andrews' words, "is to educate students." Mori then continued along the same line. She acknowledged Vix's theses as valid, but stated we are being asked to make difficult choices—between sports and classes. Our mission first is classes. Nicole Brown returned to the issue of student perceptions. She stated that the students have assessed themselves $43 dollars a quarter to enable Cal Poly to move to Division I athletics. Students agree some cut is acceptable, but 50% is too much. Then Amy Porter (another student present) stated that not all students wanted or want scarce funds to go to sports. M. Botwin inserted that the referendum was put before the students before the other fee increases were put in place that they have had to absorb. C. Dana stated he has not heard students favoring the athletic fee and wondered whether or not there would be a call for another referendum. Murphy explained, there is only so much money in the pie: the question is, how are we going to cut it? The cold truth is that a lot of weight has to be lost—how can we do it with the least pain? He also wondered what the outcome of the referendum would be if it were held today. L. Maksoudian stated he had done a statistical survey of student opinion with one of his classes that indicated 70% of the student body would vote against the referendum if it were held today. W. Mueller observed that Athletics went up by three positions this year—and that was
after both horizontal and vertical cuts campus-wide. J. Harris stated that an implied contract applies to dozens of things. For instance, there is an implied contract with students that the library will be open a certain number of hours. There is not enough support for classes for students. Implied contracts can apply to almost any area. To think that athletics is unique is ridiculous. M. Vix then voiced his objections to the previous comments. It is a strange twist, he argued, when the Senate regards the voice of the minority in an authorized referendum as taking precedence now over the majority vote. He said that if there were to be another referendum it should be student initiated. With respect to the studies or anecdotes just mentioned that indicate a falling off in student support for athletics, those studies have no authority. N. Brown asked how the precise figure of 50% had been determined by the Executive Committee. J. Wilson responded that it was an arbitrary figure. R. Gooden also added the observation that "quality" had not entered into the discussion: unless we reach a consensus on quality, there is nothing to say that Athletics is not on a par with any other program.

2. Transportation Services: reduce state funding to Transportation Services by 100 percent.

J. Murphy commented that Frank Lebens had sent a memo through E-Mail with which Murphy agreed. Plants operations should be maintained. He asked rhetorically if we expected the carpenters to carry their own gear across campus on foot. Vilkitis added that Transportation Services provide vehicles for faculty development. D. Hannings agreed, commenting that they also provide vehicles for field trips. Andrews asked if we should run a full garage or go out to the lowest bid. Hanson observed that the elimination of Transportation Services would hit some departments harder than others. [Russell had objected to this provision as well: see above.]

3. University Relations: reduce state funding to University Relations and Development by 100 percent.

M. Hanson asked what University Relations does. J. Wilson responded that they raise money and that they bring in four times as much as they spend. Vilkitis asked if they were capable of lifting themselves up by their own straps—are they far enough advanced [to remove state funding]? Maybe it is too soon to pull out 100%. J. Harris stated it sounded like a wise investment to maintain, noting that we are so vulnerable to state general funds [that we should diversify our sources of income]. We have to spend money to make money: if significantly reduce funding to this area we might be cutting our own throats. R. Gooden stated that what had startled the Executive Committee and led to this resolution was that they were projecting an increase in general fund dollars every year that they would receive. The feeling of the Executive Committee was that they should gradually reduce their share taken from general funds. Vilkitis then suggested that we gradually reduce their funding over a period of six years as opposed to imposing an instantaneous cut. C. Dana commented that some of the funds are not for "development," as can be gathered from their chart. H. Johnston felt their accounting did not make sense.

4. Student Affairs.

A. more student services to be fee-based;
B. reduce the number of administrators in Student Affairs.

Nicole Brown observed that if more student services are to be fee-based, the decision should be a campus or system decision [and not exclusively that of the Senate]. She told of the value of the Coop program and how it had been severely cut in recent years. She also stated that it would be hard to cut the number of administrators further—they have already been severely cut. W. Reynoso observed that last year we replaced an upper-level, highly paid administrator right on the heels of eliminating Home Economics and Engineering Technology. Kersten responded to N. Brown's comments on fee-based services. He stated that students
had previously considered assessing themselves to preserve Athletics. Perhaps they would
like the opportunity to maintain access to other services—because the funds are simply not
there and if no action is taken, they will be reduced. B. Andre added that there was dissention
in the Executive Committee on this issue. N. Brown stated her reservation concerning more
fee-based services is that we always seem to turn to students to raise the revenues. There will
be a [new] health fee of $128. The oft-heard complaint is that not all students make use of
this service yet all have to pay for it. She also voiced concern that if we hit Student Affairs we
hit those who can least afford it. M. Botwin replied, stating we have "all icing and no cake."
M. Vix added that his daughter is paying well over $300 for her health fee at another
institution. W. Mueller commented that most of the employees in Student Affairs are
"directors": do we need that many? Sue Keihn from Student Affairs clarified that there are
eleven director positions in Student Affairs. J. Harris asked why we were micro-budgeting
here in items 4 and 5.
W. Reynoso suggested we separate items 4A, and 4B. and make them different items.

5. Administration: reduce the number of positions at the director's level and above with the
exception of college deans.

T. Bailey stated that there has been concern by the Long Range Planning Committee and the
Curriculum Committee over the recent search for a Dean of Graduate Programs. The
Executive Committee had recommended last year that the position not be filled yet we find
ourselves embroiled in a national search nevertheless. M. Botwin would like a moratorium on
all hiring in Administration. B. Mori commented that much of Administration is at a salary
level twice that of faculty. N. Brown asked why we had separated Student Affairs from
Administration [and specifically targeted them for cuts]. C. Andrews responded that Student
Affairs had stuck out by its sheer size.

6. Computing Services. We are concerned with the cost of central computing services
provided by Information Services. We request that the IACC and the IRMPPC report to the
Academic Senate on: 1) what are the essential computing functions on campus; and 2)
recommend the most cost-effective ways of delivering those services.

J. Wilson informed the Senate that he will be receiving reports from the IACC [Instructional
Academic Computing Committee] and the AACC [Administrative Academic Computing
Committee]. J. Connely felt that over the years the academic side has been slighted over the
administrative side. We need a more equitable balance: academics needs a more equitable
share. C. Dana emphasized that item 6 has two different parts. He also noted that the cost of
computing is always going down and gave several specific examples. C. MacCarley wanted
assurance that service to students be considered.

7. Remedial Courses: remedial courses be offered through Extended Education.

Hale felt that if we accept a student to our campus then we are obliged to service that student.
Gamble asked if he had any suggestions as to how to handle the issue of remedial courses.
He offered none. M. Botwin offered Junior College as a possible solution. Hale responded
he thought that was not a viable answer to the problem.

Andrews moved for adjournment. The motion passed

VII. Adjournment: the meeting was adjourned at 4:55.

Craig H. Russell, Secretary of Academic Senate

April 2, 1993
MEMORANDUM

Date: March 10, 1993

To: ACADEMIC SENATORS

From: Margaret Camuso
      Academic Senate

Subject: Academic Senate Meeting on Tuesday, March 16, 1993

REMINDER

Academic Senate meeting
Tuesday, March 16, 1993
3 to 5pm, UU 220

Please bring your agenda and handouts from the March 9 meeting. We will attempt to complete the Business Items noted on the March 9 agenda in the following order:

1. Resolution on Academic Senate Budget Report
2. Cal Poly Strategic Plan
3. GE&B course proposal for POLS/BIO/AG 371X
4. Resolution on Double Counting of GE&B Courses