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

I. Minutes:
The minutes of the October 29, 1991 Academic Senate meeting were approved without correction.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
The Chair reviewed those items appearing under this section of the agenda: A. Reading List B. Openings for International Programs Resident Director Assignments. Additional items added to Communication(s) included: The 1992-1995 vacancy for a representative to the Academic Council for International Programs (ACIP); the statewide Academic Senate resolutions on "Indirect Instruction", Faculty Responsibility for Campus Discussion on Issues of Critical Importance to Higher Education, Establishment of Campus Public Policy Networks, Editorial Change in the Definition of Critical Thinking for GE&B Program, and Support for Budget Proposals from the CSU that Accurately Reflect the Needs of California's Citizens; the two resolutions voted on by the General Faculty both passed by a majority ( "Resolution on Professional Consultative Services in the Academic Senate," AS-353-91/C&BC, and "Resolution on Academic Senate Representation, University Center for Teacher Education," AS-365-91/C&BC); Foundation summer grants are available to minority/female probationary faculty to pursue research, etc. to achieve tenure and promotion. $25,000 total/ $5,000 each; the following faculty were elected to the selection committee for the SAGR dean: Donald Grinde and Barbara Weber (from other schools); Phillip Doub, William Kellogg, Mary Pedersen, and Jo Ann Wheatley (from the SAGR).

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
Andrews: The Ad Hoc Committee for Program Review Criteria will meet for the first time on Wednesday, November 20, 1991.

B. President's Office: none

C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office:
Koob: Mid-year budget corrections are not planned at this time. However, to date we still have not received a final budget. We expect to receive it sometime after January 1. What this means is that we are financing the deficit being created now with next year's budget. The most optimistic we can be is to hope for equal dollars next year to what we have this year (probably without inflationary dollars). I have asked the management staff of the university and the deans to begin coming forward with a process and plans to deal with as much as a 7 or 8 percent reduction for next year because we will have to self-fund any salary or inflationary increases with the same number of dollars as this year.

One question being asked in Sacramento is whether student fees should replace lost general fund support. Another issue is, what is the "enrollment?" Is it that which is generated by the available resources, the current enrollment, or is it the Master Plan enrollment figure? There is no CSU-wide position on whether or not we should reduce enrollment to match resources or that we should somehow maintain enrollment level with reduced resources. This is a public policy issue in addition to being a CSU issue. Faculty have a major role to play in providing information to the system in terms of making judgments as to how to deploy whatever resources we will have next year.

There has been discussions on Year Round Operation, but the Chancellor has not made it clear as to whether we have the freedom to discuss changes in the way we operate or not.
There is only Trustees' policy governing this matter. There are no Title V or other legal requirements that restrict the university calendar.

Conway: To my knowledge, the two bodies that provide faculty input into the budgetary process (PACBRA and IPRAC), have not met since last spring. J Murphy: I'm the representative on IPRAC and we have met this year. We are waiting for more information, before we can deliberate further. Andrews: I believe PACBRA has met also this year. Koob: I have asked that the role of PACBRA be looked at to see if there's a better way to carry out that role. The input I was talking about is the task for carrying out the evaluation of academic programs. The Senate has accepted this role and is in the process of obtaining that input. Gooden: The Gold Book (Trustees' wishbook) is still in the process of being transformed. The projection of the deficit keeps changing so they don't have stable numbers to deal with.

D. Statewide Senators:
Vilkitis brought the Senate's attention to statewide resolution AS-2049-91/GA, "Support for Budget Proposals from the CSU that Accurately Reflect the Needs of California's Citizens" (handed out at the meeting). He stated this resolution was felt to be the most important policy directive made by the statewide Academic Senate this year. The quality of higher education and access to higher education are the main concerns of this resolution. The other resolutions contained in the attachment were briefly reviewed.

Gamble: Has the Chancellor's Office designated 'growth' and 'no growth' campuses? Gooden: The Chancellor in his talks throughout the State is saying we can't accommodate any more students. What makes this hard for some legislators to believe is that some campuses have increasing enrollments. Koob: A further confusion is that the Chancellor's Office has not designated 'growth' and 'no growth' campuses, but approximately 4 of the 20 presidents have taken the position that they should be allowed to grow. That would be all right if no resources followed that decision, but our experience of last year was that we lost resources to "growing campuses" in a time when we thought we would be funded at our budgeted enrollment. So if the CSU rewards growth even when it says it doesn't want it, the message is very clear—you don't have to have a designation of any kind. We lost about 16-1/2 positions as a result of the growth of other campuses. An unanticipated cut for Cal Poly.

E. CFA Campus President:
Conway: This first issue deals with the materials that came with this present RTP cycle asking that all faculty have some statement of goals/objectives included in their personnel file. Several faculty contacted me saying this requirement was not in their school guidelines which are the approved guidelines for the procedure and asking what they should do. I will be sending this question to the Personnel Policies Committee of the Academic Senate for their deliberation. The second issue concerns the IRA Referendum. None of the IRA fee money can be used to pay salaries. So if staffing is going to be increased, the money must come from someplace else. Koob: The IRA board was aware of that. It turned out not to be a concern because there were adequate sources from other places to pay salaries since student fees would be paying for other costs previously paid from these other sources.

F. CSEA Campus President: none

G. ASI Representatives:
Austin: (1) In response to the concerns about riots and out-of-control parties, the ASI President created a peer policy action and reward for the conviction of anybody involved in an assault on a police officer. This is a $500 reward from the ASI President, Cal Poly's President, and Cuesta College. (2) The Rec Sports/PE Center will be completed in January, 1993. (3) November 20 and 21 will be voting days for the four referendums on the ballot. Burnett: ASI and IRA have done extensive advertising of these referendums. A request has also been made to faculty to encourage students to vote.
IV. Consent Agenda:

A. GE&B Proposal for HUM X402: Shelton: A grammatical change should be made in the Subcommittee Recommendation and Remarks section. The word "addition" should be changed to "substitution." Passed by consent.

B. Curriculum Proposal for Biological Sciences Department: Passed by consent.

C. Curriculum Proposal for Natural Resources Management Department: Passed by consent.

V. Business Items:

A. Resolution on Faculty Suspension with Pay, second reading: Berrio: Paragraph 3 of the Resolved clause should be deleted because it repeats CAM 346.3.e. Paragraph 3 of the Resolved clause was omitted as a friendly amendment. J Murphy: What kind of impact will the 48-hour requirement place on administration? Koob: It's not clear to me whether that's 48 business hours or 48 consecutive hours. This would make a big difference. J Murphy: If it's 48 clock hours? Koob: Weekends are going to get in the way of that. 48 hours doesn't seem unrealistic. Mueller: Can I suggest a friendly amendment to change that to two working days? 48 hours was changed to two working days as a friendly amendment. Gooden: I would suggest adding "or his/her designee" after the word President in paragraph 2 of the Resolved clause. I would also suggest the wording "delivered to the member" after the words "formal written notice." Andrews: Restated the motion to read, "...will not exceed two working days without delivery of formal written notice..." "without delivery of... notice..." was accepted as a friendly amendment. Pokorny: I still don't like two working days because it is not clear what is two working days. 48 hours is better. Koob: there is a formal working calendar published for the university. The non-working days are published in that calendar. From an administrative point-of-view, we wouldn't have even thought of the objection that you raise because that's the calendar we go by. I would have read this as the President and/or designee's working days, not the individual to whom notice was delivered. J Murphy: I think references to his/her or he/she should be dropped. All references to his/her or he/she being omitted was accepted as a friendly amendment. Vix: Is this resolution specific to safety and security issues? Andrews: It doesn't restrict it. Vix: But the resolution reads,...necessary to ensure the safety and security of the university..." Andrews: Immediate suspension has to have certain circumstances in existence, and that is set forth in the first Whereas. If these conditions do not exist, then there is another set of circumstances ruling the process. Does that address your question? Vix: It appears from the wording of the resolution that the suspension is because the faculty member has done something relative to the safety or security of the university. If it's just that, then I understand the resolution. Andrews: That's correct. That's the only thing this is applicable to under those sets of circumstances. J Murphy: But, I think any reasonable person could interpret such a high variety of problems dealing with safety and security that it would be hard not to put just about anything under that classification. Andrews: If they use that reason, then they have to follow this. A person can be suspended for reasons that do not affect the safety and security of the university. For example, filing false financial claims is a basis for suspension but does not affect the safety and security of the university. Williamson: So, they don't have to inform you for any length of time. Andrews: That's correct. Mori: In the Resolved, it just says, "strong and compelling justification." It doesn't specifically say with regard to safety and security. There can be many strong and compelling justifications for suspension with pay, but they do not deal with safety and security. Andrews: The circumstances of suspension are already set forth in CAM 346.3.C.1. M/S/P unanimously.

B. Voting Membership of the General Faculty, second reading: M/S/P unanimously.

VI. Discussion:

Formation of Ad Hoc Committee for Program Review Criteria: This ad hoc committee will be meeting for the first time on November 20, 1991. The charge to
the committee appears as page 17 to the agenda. Harris: How are academic programs being defined? Andrews: Everything under the jurisdiction of the Academic Affairs Office. Let me clarify that the elimination of programs is not the function of this committee. This committee has the function of identifying the criteria for program evaluation. They will not be doing the evaluation. They are setting up the process.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:36pm.

Approved: Craig Russell, Secretary
Academic Senate

Date: Dec. 2, 1971