Preparatory: To accommodate an early flight schedule, the agenda was reordered to allow President Baker to address the Senate. The meeting was called to order at 3:16pm.

I. Minutes: The minutes of the April 13 and May 4, 1993 Academic Senate meetings were approved with one change: Wherever the acronym FIRP appears, it should be changed to FERP.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: none
   B. President’s Office: Dr. Baker was present to discuss the Charter Campus concept with the Academic Senate. He hoped the Senate would have a central involvement in the discussion and/or planning of a Charter Campus. He would like to see the Senate develop policies it would like to see in place and then have those recommendations submitted to the faculty and staff for referendum. He felt it was important to find ways of addressing issues of productivity that relate to learning. Locally and nationally, the legislature is continually looking at education intrusively—questioning faculty workloads, etc. The university would like to try and avoid this type of activity and address these concerns recognizing that faculty workload cannot be increased as a remedy for improving the quality of education. It would deter us from carrying out our major instructional mission. We need to allow ample time to get new ideas into the curriculum and to provide opportunities for faculty development. These issues are connected to the calendar in many ways. A careful look at the calendar also gives us an opportunity to take a careful look at the curriculum and how we might improve it. Of the various models suggested, the trimester (three sessions of 13-1/2 weeks with 60-minute periods) could increase the amount of instruction during the year and increase the opportunity to enroll more students. If students were accepted for designated trimesters, there would be more flexibility for more faculty to teach during the third trimester, which would also reduce conflicts in scheduling.

We should approach the calendar by asking how we could use 12 months more effectively with a net gain to the faculty (retaining current faculty, recruiting new faculty, and addressing inadequate compensation and high workloads). Dr. Baker would like to have the campus look beyond the classical quarter/semester systems to something that would fit our needs most directly. Maybe the most appropriate model is not out there yet, but he hoped we could begin to look beyond existing systems and see if a calendar could be developed that provides enough time for faculty renewal and gets more students through the university in less time. What do we want to achieve and what is the best way of doing it with a reasonable faculty workload?

Looking at a new calendar system will help us in many ways: (1) it allows us to look at the curriculum and see how we can improve things, (2) it allows us to look at ways of increasing productivity, (3) it may allow us to accept more students by expanding the opportunity for year-round attendance, (4) it reduces room scheduling conflicts, (5) it allows us to use 12 months more effectively, and (6) it gives us more opportunity to recruit new faculty by offering more compensation and a better workload.

Most of the country does not offer a year-round calendar system. We need to create a system that allows us to do all we have to do. Our present formula (calendar) does not do this. Our human capital is being burned up. He believed the Chancellor and Board of Trustees would approve such a change because they are interested in productivity improvement. A fund is available for the development of productivity improvement
(approximately $10 million). This fund could provide assigned time for those involved in creating the changeover. In a classical trimester system [tri-semesters] of three sessions with 16 weeks each, it would be difficult for a faculty member to teach all three trimesters. The trimester system proposed by the Calendaring Committee features three sessions of 13-1/2 weeks each with 60-minute periods instead of 50 minutes. It would enable a faculty person to teach all three trimesters if they wished. Their salary would be based on teaching two trimesters with 50 percent additional pay for teaching the third. In a classical trimester, a faculty member could not work year-round because it's too many weeks a year. Under the proposed trimester system, faculty could teach three trimesters without being squeezed.

A lot of discussion regarding what we are trying to achieve will occur as we try to revise the calendar. Revising the calendar will provide an excellent opportunity to take another look at the curriculum and what we're trying to achieve in the curriculum and what resources we have to allocate to efforts for achieving same. It will generate the ideas of what fits us best. How can we make the curriculum meet our objectives in a better way and have the calendar fit that?

Andrews asked whether teaching all three trimesters would be a 12-month appointment? Baker responded that he envisioned a large portion of the faculty having 12-month contracts but not the 12-month contracts we have now. They would be academic year plus 50 percent. We would have to increase the student population during the summer trimester. Students who commit to a third trimester would get a half-year of credit. As it is now, they only get one-third of a year of credit. The purpose would be to increase FTE by using the opportunity to select students who would come two of the three trimesters thereby increasing enrollment over the course of a year, not just over one trimester.

Harris asked whether it was premature to reconsider our calendaring system until we know what our funding base will be. Baker responded it doesn’t impede our thinking about it. We would not be able to implement it if we did not have the resources to do so; however, if we get the thinking done now, we then can decide when we want to put it in place when funding permits.

C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: none

D. Statewide Senators: Vilkitis brought the Senate's attention to three resolutions that were passed by the Academic Senate CSU: (1) resolution regarding faculty issues related to technology assisted teaching [DELTA]: These issues include development of campus policy re intellectual property development as a part of technology assisted teaching, course development, staffing, technical support, and workload related courses taught under technology assisted teaching; (2) resolution regarding the redirection of resources to the Fort Ord campus: This would require $450 million from the general fund over a five-year period. The Academic Senate CSU was not opposed to new campuses, only to the redirection of general funds to a new campus at this time; and (3) resolution regarding the faculty's role in the establishment of charter campuses: This resolution deals with the Academic Senate CSU working with administration in defining the concept of charter campuses. It asks for involvement with aspects of planning for charter campuses which may affect the integrity and stability of the other system campuses. It recommends Academic Senate CSU approval before a charter proposal is submitted for legislation.

E. CFA Campus President: Conway gave a brief report on the anticipated proposals to be offered by the Assembly and Senate re the state budget.

F. ASI representatives: none

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:

C. Resolution on the Calendaring System, first reading: Euel Kennedy gave background information on the survey that was administered to assess faculty and staff preferences regarding the calendar. The majority of those surveyed supported a change from the
quarter system; however, students preferred the quarter system. Those who disfavored the quarter system cited various reasons: intensity, number of processes, mismatching with the semester system, and curriculum concerns (although some of these may be misconceptions). There were 481 returns. One percent felt there was bias in the survey. There were many written comments, and it appears that there is faculty recognition of the amount of work it would take to convert to another system. The committee felt the survey met its objectives. 32 percent favored quarters and 54 percent favored semesters. Time considerations are: 3 trimesters = 42 weeks/annually; 4 quarters = 45 weeks/annually; 2 semesters = 33 weeks/annually; and the tri-semester = 48 weeks/annually. The committee had concerns about the trimester system because universities under this system have been changing to other systems. Only two percent of universities have this system. There was concern about the ability to populate the campus equally year round? There is not a lot of familiarity with a trimester system and lack of experience with that type of a calendar might account for its low popularity with those who returned the survey.

It would take about two to three years to make a conversion and specific guidelines would need to be in place. Bailey expressed concern over classroom/lab space. Taking the number of students served in three quarters and fitting them into two semesters/three trimesters would create a heavier demand on room use, stocking and repair, and equipment used in lab classes.

The resolution on the calendaring system was revised to read:

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate receive the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Calendaring and forward the Academic Senate's recommendations to the President.

A motion was M/S/F (Johnston/Murphy) to move the agenda and close discussion. Andrews felt the discussion on calendaring should be concluded before returning to the regular agenda. Brown stated that unless recommendations are developed at this time, there will be no opportunity to discuss the recommendations with departments before acting on them at second reading. Dana agreed that a recommendation should be made at this time regarding the direction we felt we wanted to move towards.

A motion was suggested by Andrews to recommend trimesters. A suggestion was made by Harris to send the resolution back to the Executive Committee. A motion was M/S/P (Fetzer/Botwin) to table the resolution until a later time. By tabling the resolution, recommendations could be developed at a later time when appropriate rationale and options have been discussed within departments and colleges. Then deliberations on the Senate floor will be more reflective of the feelings of the campus.

I. Resolution on the Program Review and Improvement Committee’s Report, first reading: A motion was M/S/P (Andrews/Mueller) to reorder the agenda to hear item I, Resolution on the Program Review and Improvement Committee, as the next item of business. The departments selected for program review during 1993-1994 are Physical Education, Ornamental Horticulture, Dairy Science, Journalism, Art and Design, Agricultural Engineering and AET, Landscape Architecture, Industrial Technology, Industrial Engineering, Agricultural Education, Liberal Studies, Construction Management, and UCTE. Under "key indicators" used in the selection of programs for next year, "cost per SCU" was deleted.

L Bowker asked if the departments chosen for review next year would be furnished with detailed rationale for their selection? Andrews said numerous criteria were used: one-third were chosen based on "key indicators," one-third based on accreditation and related programs being reviewed, and the others were chosen on other criteria noted in the resolution. The committee did not intend to notify departments on which criteria was used in selecting its program for review. Botwin replied he did not feel comfortable with programs being identified and not being told why. Greenwald stated that the majority of departments were chosen either to create balance or because of accreditation. A few others were chosen for other reasons.
A. Resolution on Academic Senate Recommendations for Accommodating Immediate Budget Reductions, second reading: A motion was M/S/P to return this item to the floor of the Senate after being tabled. Mori expressed concern that in a climate of decreasing funds, there was no decrease in general funds for Athletics. Freberg stated that the Athletic Governing Board recommended a 10 percent cut to Athletics for next year. She stated that students were concerned that fees that were approved for Athletics might start going to other things.

Actions taken last week regarding the recommendations of this resolution are:

2. reduce funds to Transportation Services to 25 percent instead of 100 percent;
4A. delete the recommendation that more student services be fee-based;
7. delete the recommendation that remedial courses be offered through Extended Education.

THIS MEETING WILL BE CONTINUED ON TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1993 TO COMPLETE THE MAY 18, 1993 AGENDA.

VI. Discussion: none

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:02pm.

Recorded by:

Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate