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

I. Minutes: The minutes of the May 28, May 30, and June 4, 1991 Academic Senate meetings were approved with the following corrections: May 28, 1991, III.C., 'This is the first time a Chancellor Munitz has met with this body.'; May 30, 1991, VI.C., 'Zueschner' changed to Zeuschner; June 4, 1991, III.A., 'Conseleion' changed to Consolacion.

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

A./B. Memo Koob to Ribeau re TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language) Certificate (p. 10) and Memo Whiteford to Distribution List re TESL Certificate Program (p. 11): M Botwin: How much does a program like this cost? C Andrews: I think the second paragraph on page 11 gives us some indication of what we're asking for--"The Evaluations Office does not monitor the progress of students pursuing certificate programs..." so the unit offering this is the one who will have to come up with the financial figures. R Gooden: Do we know to what degree the Senate's resolution (re changes to the TESL Certificate Program) were accepted? C Andrews: We will research that. L Gamble: Is this just for Cal Poly students? T Bailey: It was proposed for matriculated students.

C. Resolutions approved by President Baker (p. 12): There were no significant changes or variations from what the Senate approved for those resolutions listed on page 12.

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair: The Chair reported that one meeting of the Executive Committee was held on September 24 (and continued on October 1). Items discussed at that meeting appear on today's agenda as discussion items. The Chair also noted that reports would be received from the school deans regarding the programs and objectives of their schools. Administrators will also be asked to speak to the Senate regarding their programs and activities. If someone would like to know more about a program area, the Chair will invite the individuals responsible for the program to give a report to the Senate. Our administrators have been very open to these invitations.

B. President's Office: none

C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office: none

D. Statewide Senators: T Kersten: There are a number of issues the statewide Senate is looking at. I will touch on some of them. We are working on changing the approach to the budget and changing the budget's mechanism at the system level by dividing it into two categories. (1) development of monies out of Sacramento, and (2) a separate system for allocating that money among the campuses. This is a highly sensitive area and everyone at Cal Poly should be alerted to it because Cal Poly is a very high-cost program campus. What may emerge from this new revision of the budget process and allocation mechanism is unknown. A derivative effect from this change in methodology of budget development is a change in attitude concerning admissions--we would not admit more students than we could afford. One concern that should be mentioned as a corollary to these changes is that there is a potential for conflict between admissions equity and improvement in minority entrance and success.

With the decentralization of the CSU administration, we should be alert to the need for stronger senate and faculty governance at the campus level, as more authority will be given to each campus over a wider range of matters--budget, curricular and planning issues. It will be important to be on top of these issues at the campus level and to be an effective partner in the development of these matters.

T Kersten brought the Senate's attention to Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2035-91/FA, "Faculty Responsibility for Campus Discussion on Issues of Critical Importance to
Higher Education," and emphasized this was a critical issue because if campuses cannot be open to a wide diversity of ideas and thoughts, even when they are very controversial, then it has lost one of its main purposes for existing.

J Vilkitis brought the Senate's attention to Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2034-91/FA, "The Definition of "Indirect Instruction"..." and explained that the new MOU sets aside one unit for professional development activities. It is important to understand that this might impact class size because classes will have to be increased to make up for the loss of that one unit. This could impact the quality of instruction. Resolution AS-2038-91/FA supports the efforts being made "to obtain judicial review of the allegedly unconstitutional provisions of AB 702." Resolution AS-2039-91/FA endorses the securing of General Funds to support the Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program.

M Hanson: If I understand correctly, (AS-2039-91/FA) says someone would have to be in a minority to be in a doctoral program for free? J Vilkitis: It's not exactly free. The Forgivable Loan Program was created to encourage multi-cultural persons into the system who would not be able to afford it otherwise. J Andrews: We have such a program now. The maximum funding is $10,000/year for three years and the person must come back to the CSU system and teach for the loan to be forgivable. The program currently in place is funded through lottery funds and this resolution recommends funding through General Funds. R Gooden: And it recommends the establishment of an oversight committee to review it.

M Hanson: The resolution on "Indirect Instruction" (AS-2034-91/FA), has lots of things wrong with it. One of them is that it says we can't teach 12 units, that ultimately we should only teach 9 units. To say we can't put in 12 units is short-cutting taxpayers. We will need more faculty to teach the same load. With budget cuts, this could create a lot of problems. Some of the problems could be the reduction or loss of upper-division classes. The term "indirect instruction" is very misleading. It's inappropriate when what it's referring to is a reduction in teaching load. C Andrews: When the Chancellor was here, he did express his concern as to how it's going to be accomplished. J Vilkitis: I believe by mid-November they're (Academic Senate CSU) going to try and come up with a definition for this that is more accurate. R Gooden: The logic of your argument, Mike, would then be to increase the teaching load to 15 units. I think part of what we're trying to do is come up with a positive definition of what this kind of instruction would be. The idea is not that you use this time to goof off, but somehow it supplements your instruction. C Andrews: This came about, in part, because of the changing emphasis on research. R Gooden: If you're going to be held to the RTP, and research is a factor in it, you're going to burn out if you try to meet that criteria and keep up the teaching load we presently have. T Kersten: The Academic Senate has nothing to do with the creation of this. It is a result of the contract by CFA. Concerns about appropriate workload levels need to be addressed also to CFA. When contractual commitments are made that impact on academic matters, then we have a responsibility to deal with it as effectively as we can whether we approve of it or not. D Bertozzi: I don't understand the meaning of the second Whereas, "This reduction in direct instruction WTU's is being referred to as 'indirect instruction.'" C Andrews: The problem is the lack of a definition for that term. What is to be substituted for the 3 units of "indirect instruction" time is what they are trying to define.

J Conway: The "indirect instruction" area is going to be a third component of the workload. You're still going to have your three units of instruction-related duties, your weighted teaching units, and then you're going to have this indirect instruction which has yet to be defined. There is a joint committee between the CSU and the CFA which is now working to define what indirect instruction will include. It will recognize professional development activities which many people are taking out of their own hides in order to do it. It comes at a bad budgetary time, but it is our understanding that even on this campus there are some departments that are only teaching nine WTU's. And, on some other campuses, like San Diego, the average WTU's before the budget cuts was nine. So systemwide this may not be as great a change as people are seeing it because many campuses are lower than we are. J Murphy: This resolution just tries to define "indirect instruction." J Wilson: If class size is increased to accommodate fewer WTU's, then the workload may not change at all. You may have less preparations, but the same number of students. So you may have
the same workload and are required to do 3 WTU's of professional development as well.

J Harris: On this campus there is a horrendous diversity as to how we evaluate people. This could be an even larger can of worms as to how it's evaluated in the RTP process. In advance of that, if we want to quality control it, is this something the Senate can work on to have less of a can of worms. C Andrews: Currently, in the RTP process, except for promotions, they're done at the school level. There is no universitywide RTP committee. You may want to take this to the Personnel Policies Committee as an addition to the evaluation criteria. J Harris: That's what I'm suggesting. G Irvin: Under this agreement, we are instructed to teach the same number of SCU's and the same number of students with the same number of faculty and at the same time reduce direct instruction WTU's. You can see immediately that this will have to drive up the student/faculty ratio. So the faculty workload may be exactly the same. The purpose of this agreement is to lower workload over the next three years, but we're going to have to have about one-fourth more faculty to meet this end. J Conway: I want to emphasize what John said was the key issue, I think, for the Senate. As this "indirect instruction" becomes a component in the evaluation process, then the Academic Senate role in developing criteria for evaluation comes heavily into play. M Hanson: Upper-division classes can potentially be hurt by this. R Rutherford: Does this wording indicate that the supervision-type courses are excluded from this? J Conway: Right now the joint CSU-CFA committee is studying the S-factor component as to how that would be reduced to fit into this.

E. CFA Campus President: Regarding class size—in our continuing battle to get the university to live up to the contract, we had a problem occur over summer because of increased class size and that department heads were being told they were going to have to increase class size this fall. The position of the CFA is that class size is part of the terms and conditions of employment and must be negotiated with the faculty involved and the CFA. A grievance was brought this summer and, thankfully, settled at level I. A Settlement Agreement was achieved stating any increase in class size above normal mode and level limits has to be negotiated with the faculty involved. This means a dean or department head cannot unilaterally increase class size. It must be negotiated with the faculty involved and the union. If a faculty member is being FORCED to teach increased class sizes, a grievance can be filed. (A copy of the Settlement Agreement was distributed.) The new contract will be sent to our campus on October 18 and distributed to union members.

Regarding the two twin-track committees Tim spoke about earlier on budget development and budget allocation, CFA was granted a representative on the budget development committee because of our influence in Sacramento, but we were not allowed a representative on the budget allocation committee. We are going to fight to have a member of CFA on that committee.

[The agenda was interrupted to allow Roger Swanson to make an announcement regarding the University Union Advisory Board (UUAB) and the need for faculty representation.]

R Swanson: The UUAB has undergone a number of changes over the past few years. It was reconstituted in January 1991 at the President's request. Its purpose is to oversee and recommend to the President any policies regarding University Union operations, programs, and activities related to it. Its companion committee, the University Executive Committee, also has a faculty representative and oversees the operation and budget of the Union. There are some major issues coming before the UUAB this year: (1) setting of policy for the new recreation sports complex, and (2) the development of an overall policy and procedure manual governing all of the Union's activities, its programs, and the building. The UUAB meets twice a month throughout the year.

F. CSEA Campus President: none
G. ASI Representatives: none

[The Chair introduced the Senate representative from the Deans' Council, William Boyes, the new dean from the School of Business.]

W Boyes: I've been here two and one-half months. I came from Arizona State University
where I was department head for the Economics Department in the School of Business. I came because of the weather, the hopeful family environment, and the reputation of Cal Poly. This reputation is so strong, I didn't realize Cal Poly was part of the Cal State system. I think the education system is very ill. I think we need to look at issues differently. We squash creativity, we ruin innovation, we ruin independent thinking, we put people in boxes and force them through those boxes and by the time they're in high school they aren't challenged. They don't even know how to ask why? At Cal Poly we have this learn-by-doing tradition, we have a high-quality student body, we have faculty committed to teaching, and maybe, here at Cal Poly, we can do education differently. That's what I intend to try to do with the Business School. I'd like to see programs that are not classroom-driven (taught because a faculty member wanted to teach that class), but demand-driven, where students realize what they need to know and ask the instructors to come in and teach that. I'd like to see a program where the students actually come in with a plan and almost bring a product to market. And in the process, they learn almost everything they need to know. I'm trying to form joint courses with some of the other schools. I'd like to see students here a couple years taking various courses before deciding what major to enter.

IV. Consent Agenda:


V. Business Items:

A. Resolution on Voting Membership of the General Faculty, first reading: C Andrews: This resolution identifies who the voting membership of the General Faculty is. This requires a Constitutional amendment. It must be carried by two-thirds of those voting. This resolution adds membership to the definition of General Faculty. Those additions are as follows:

Voting members of the General Faculty shall consist of those persons who are full-time academic employees...Department chairpersons, officers of the Faculty and representatives to The California State University Academic Senate will not cease to be members of the Faculty because of any reassigned time allotted to them by virtue of their offices. Personnel in Professional Consultative Services as defined in III.l.b. of the Constitution...Faculty whose appointments are full-time for an academic quarter are considered members of the General Faculty during each quarter of their full-time appointment...

C Andrews: The objective is to try and address the situation pertaining to people who are on FERP or Pre-Retirement Reduction in Time Base. Should they be members of the General Faculty? Nonvoting membership shall include all part-time academic personnel not included in the voting membership. M Vix: Is the University Center for Teacher Education (UCTE) represented in this? C Andrews: There is a ballot going out to the General Faculty regarding UCTE representation on the Academic Senate. [AS-365-91, "Academic Senate Representation: University Center for Teacher Education," was read by the Chair to clarify the issue of UCTE representation on the Senate. It was explained that the reason for this resolution was to separate faculty-unit centers from other centers on campus. This resolution gives the Executive Committee the discretion to decide if a center qualifies to be on the Senate.] The following additions were suggested for inclusion. In the first sentence of the definition, add: ...occupying a position in an academic department or center within the university. In the second sentence of the definition add the following words: Department heads/chairpersons, center directors, officers of the Faculty...

J Vilkitis: Will the wording as AS-353-91, "Professional Consultative Services (PCS) Representation on the Academic Senate," which needs to be voted on by the General Faculty, affect this resolution? Should this resolution be held until the results of that vote come in? C Andrews: AS-353-91 cleans up the wording re classifications included in PCS that no longer exist and specifies what classifications do exist. S Lutrin: What happens if AS-353-91 does not pass? It's important that the faculty know that this resolution doesn't change what's already in existence. C Russell: If the resolution is not passed, the present
VI. Discussion:

A. Year Round Operation: Overview of YRO and charge to Senate committees: C Andrews: The issue of year round operation (YRO) has been raised again. By my definition, Cal Poly does not have YRO. We have three quarters plus a summer quarter. YRO has different funding. To be a YRO, each quarter has to be funded equally. Charges to the Budget Committee, Instruction Committee, and Long-Range Planning Committee have been made requesting review and analysis of several year-round options. [These charges are attached to these minutes.] M Shelton: If you are asking these committees to look at YRO, either you are talking about four quarters or trimesters, but not semesters. C Andrews: Looking at semesters will be stricken from the charges. I am proposing the following time lines: The Budget Committee and Instruction Committee are to have their reports in by January 14, 1992, and the Long-Range Planning Committee should have their report in by February 4, 1992.

L Gamble: What did the statewide Senate say about YRO? C Andrews: The statewide Senate did not reach a conclusion. R Gooden: To accommodate the increase in students expected in the future, this is being looked at to see if YRO would be more efficient to budget. J Vilkitis: The thought here that needs to be made clear is that summer session is generally funded at Step 12, it is not funded at occupied faculty levels. So, subsequently, in funding the four campuses who have summer quarters, full year-round funding has not been provided. This campus, in the past, has lost about $500,000 in funding a summer quarter. It seems to appear, after a preliminary review, that it would be an efficient way of moving students through in a shorter time span and it would make better use of the resources available to us. R Gooden: Why are we looking at YRO for our campus? C Andrews: President Baker, two or three years ago, requested a pilot program for funding year round operations. This particular research by our body would help substantiate or refute the concept. If we’re going to have much say about this, we should provide information to the Chancellor to provide leadership for the direction they go in.

B. Suggested process for receiving recommendations to the Strategic Planning Document: A memo will be prepared by the Chair of the Academic Senate to all deans, department chairs/heads, Academic Senate caucus chairs, and academic senators notifying them of the time table which has been developed for obtaining faculty input into the review of the Strategic Planning Document.
C. Continuing program review: C Andrews will be preparing a document to be brought to the Academic Senate. That document will propose (1) a committee comprised of faculty from each school to establish what the criteria will be for evaluating programs (what factors to be considered). That criteria will come to the Senate for approval; (2) a different committee will be established to implement the process of review; (3) and volunteer programs will be used to see how the process functions. This proposal will be sent to all senators before the next Academic Senate meeting. The Chair stated he does not anticipate any program being eliminated, but there may be adjustments, realignments, and changes. All programs will eventually be reviewed on a continuing basis. These reviews should be made in conjunction with accreditation reviews so there is no duplication of information accumulation.

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

Approved: Craig Russell, Secretary
Academic Senate

Date: