Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:13pm.

I. Minutes:
   The minutes of the January 7, 1992 Academic Senate meeting were approved without correction.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
   The Chair brought the Senate's attention to the Communications and Announcements:
   A. Position opening for Faculty Director for the Institute for Teaching and Learning.
   B. Academic Senate/committee vacancies for 1992-94 vacancies. The Chair explained if the School of Professional Studies moved to the School of Liberal Arts, the number of senators allocated to SPS and SLA would be readjusted in the 1992-93 academic year.

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: none
   B. President's Office: none
   C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office: none
   D. Statewide Senators:
      Senator Kersten reported on the Trustees' meeting where university fees were discussed. Last November, the Academic Senate CSU brought to the Trustees' attention, the erosion being caused by budget deficits. At the Trustees' meeting earlier this month, the decision was made to impose higher fees. This decision was made after discussion of various other options. Several constituencies are presently trying to get support in Sacramento to find other sources of State money and to approve the fee increase (which requires legislation).

      Senator Gooden further explained that in the past the CSU would get less of a budget than the Trustees' asked for and whatever fees could be applied never came back to the CSU. So the Trustees' didn't have an interest in raising fees, particularly, and wrestling with that problem. What the Governor has done this time, is given the CSU even less of a budget but allowed it whatever fees can be increased. So now we get less State money, but we keep the overage of student fees.

   E. CFA Campus President:
      J Conway reported (1) that the CFA has taken a position to oppose the Trustees' action on the 40 percent fee increase and will be working with students to find alternate ways to raise money; (2) a proposal was intended for presentation at the last Trustees' meeting to eliminate all MSA's (merit salary adjustments) for faculty. It was not presented because of its Collective Bargaining implications; (3) the Governor's budget for the additional revenues provided is a $23 million increase over what we had last year. We can't just look at "State appropriations." There are several other kinds of fees and revenues that come in, and for the first time, are represented in the Trustees' Gold Book; (4) CFA's Governmental Relations Office has stated that the 40 percent fee increase is "dead-in-the-water" in Sacramento. But, that doesn't mean there won't be some kind of fee increase eventually; (5) Copies of the large-print version of the CFA-Unit 3 Contract are available (the Letters of Understanding are not included in this version); (5) CFA is one of the sponsors of the Pension Protection Act petition drive. This petition stops the Legislature and the Governor from raiding PERS and STRS pension funds. It also allows the PERS/STRS Board to elect the actuary who determines the amount that the State contributes. And, it makes sure that
the board members are elected by the people in the system, not appointed by the Governor; (6) CFA is also sponsoring the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1992; (7) there is also a Wilson initiative on the ballot called the Taxpayer Protection Act of 1992. This Act gives him the authority to unilaterally cut salaries, benefits, and any part of the budget he wishes including those parts of the budget covering Collective Bargaining-represented employees. If asked to sign this petition, we would suggest you don't.

F. CSEA Campus President: none

G. ASI Representatives:
K Burnett announced that the Academic Commission is looking at a comprehensive, universal form for student-teacher evaluations. This would be separate from what the departments establish and maintain for their records. The form being reviewed is modeled after a form used at UC San Diego. It will not be enacted without significant consideration and recommendations from faculty. It is not mandatory and is not intended to slander teachers with harsh comments from students who have illogical personal feelings. It will address the needs acknowledged by the community at Poly as stated in the Student Satisfaction section of the Strategic Planning Document. A survey is going out to both students and faculty for their participation. It will include subjective answers "indicative of 10 percent of the population." It is being researched as to how this can be distributed for maximum participation and minimum disruption of class time. It will be administered by ASI. The Senate's Student Affairs Committee and Personnel Policies Committee will be asked to review the proposal. Again, the survey would be elective. It will be more representative and comprehensive than what currently exists on this campus—which is word-of-mouth. It will assist the faculty as a means to further gauge student responses to class and instruction, and it will help administrators further gauge student opinions of the academic environment on campus. Any comments faculty would like to submit are welcomed.

H. Euel Kennedy, Interim Director for Enrollment Support Services, gave a report on the activities of Enrollment Support Services. Faculty workstations: In 1988, there were 353 faculty workstations, in 1989 there were 452, and by 1990 there were 593. In 1991 there were 890 (although not all were in use). The increases in 1990 and 1991 reflect $176,000 received from lottery funds. SSM = 70% of FTEF workstations; SAED, SLAS, SPS = about 60%, and UCTE is around 30%. Many of these workstations are outdated models and not in full use.

Faculty connectivity (dedicated ports hardwired to the data system) has increased significantly since 1989. This enables faculty to use Poly Cat and services on the main frame (which accesses data bases on and off campuses). Faculty Offices East was completely wired with its construction. Faculty Office Building will be completely rewired by February 1992. Probably 75 percent of faculty on this campus have good, solid connectivity.

Botwin: What's the annual budget for these types of revisions? Kennedy: I'd have to check to see precisely. I suspect it cost around $60,000 to $70,000 to do Faculty Office Building North. Harris: Once the hardware is placed, it needs maintenance and repair. This becomes very costly for the department. This needs to be recognized and put into the budget. Kennedy: I have the same problem within my department. I think the CSU has been slow in recognizing how to deal with information resources and technology. It was only two years ago that they allocated any money for faculty workstations.

Dr. Kennedy explained that Enrollment Support Services consists of the Admissions Office, the Evaluations Office, the Records Office, and Student Data. Faculty can get an account number and access student information through the SIS system. We want as many people to have access to the student data base as possible. For example, within one year, students will be able to get their grades over the phone within one day of grades being turned in.

IV. Consent Agenda:
GE&B course proposal for MU X325 was approved by consensus.
V. Business Items:

A. Proposed Academic Program Review Criteria: The Chair announced that discussion on this item would close at 4:30pm. A resolution accompanying this document was distributed at the meeting. M Pedersen, W Howard, and J Weatherby, members of the Program Review Criteria-setting Committee, were present for discussion. Freberg: Did the committee consider looking at applicants instead of enrolled students. Our enrolled students don't necessarily represent the quality of our applicants. Pedersen: There was quite a bit of discussion whether to consider the enrolled students or the students applying. It was felt the students actually enrolled in the program would better reflect the program better. This would not exclude a program from reporting the student profile information of its applicants separately. The introduction to the document was written general enough to be adapted for each department's needs. Anything a program feels is important should be added to its criteria.

Freberg: Under Program Quality, can you tell me of what interest are over-enrolled courses? Pedersen: One reason is we always talk about under-enrollment, but there are certain courses where enrollment may be quite high and quality may be sacrificed. We felt both ends of enrollment needed to be looked at. High enrollment may not reflect poor quality, but it's something we felt needed to be identified and addressed. J Murphy: This document is an excellent point of departure. Anyone who has a concern about the factors identified in the document should make those known in writing so the committee can consider them. Something that separates this document from earlier efforts is the fact that departments have the option, and are encouraged, to submit information that shows strength in their program. I am concerned about the history of having a program review process be convoluted into a budgetary evaluation. I hope that a priority system does not result from this review. The Chair brought the Senate's attention to item 14 on page 27 which reads, "Any action taken by the administration, which is based upon the recommendations of the APRC shall be communicated to the parties involved and to the Academic Senate."

Peach: It was discussed in the Executive Committee that the process of review needs to be consistent and uniform for all programs. One of the available pieces of data consistently is program demand and that ought to be a required piece of data. Harris: A number of the topics are not criteria. In using this within my department, I have a lot of descriptions but I don't know what the standard is. Also, not all programs have the same barriers. This isn't recognized in the document. I think we should look at accrediting bodies' standards and what they use before we do another internal review to see if it's necessary. Andrews: It is proposed in the document to try and coordinate these reports.

Amspacher: On page 24 under Selection of Academic Programs for Review, it states the review is for program quality. But in the resolution, six of ten Whereas clauses talk about budget, money, allocation of money. Is the review going to be used for program review or for budget allocations? Andrews: The objective of this document is to build quality programs. The review will impact on the allocation of money through these reports.

Balasubramanian: We are assembling a lot of data to send to the review committee. After the information is accumulated, the department should conduct a self-assessment. Pedersen: This is a very good idea. One suggestion made in the report is that the committee that does the review send their review back to the program. What you're suggesting would actually speed up the process in helping the department/program to do a lot of the work the committee would be doing. That would be an excellent suggestion to submit in writing. Balasubramanian: Let us say that a program is judged to be of poor quality. But maybe the program is being run with deficit resources. The evaluation should recommend more resources to that program. The data required should illustrate the constraints of a program by connecting data instead of presenting individual pieces of data. Andrews: If a program can document their case; that the program is needed in this institution, that it is a vital part of the mission, and it cannot meet its obligation under the current funding structure, I hope a recommendation to support the program will occur.

Vix: I would like to see the review committee set out its ideal. I would like to know what the standard is for acceptability. Andrews: Each department will get the opportunity to respond to the committee's findings. Pedersen: We didn't want programs across the campus to all be evaluated compared to each other so there isn't criteria established for
that. We didn’t want to compare dissimilar programs. Bailey: One of the considerations the Curriculum Committee has always had is that often times we are looking at proposals in a vacuum. Programs and departments will grow quickly according to what factions want a program and we have asked departments to go back and look at things in context. Right now the committee is looking at how we evaluate curriculum in terms of context. The information requested by this document would help us when we are looking at program courses. It would help the Senate as a whole make more informed curriculum decisions.

Bailey: On page 25 under the Constitution of Members of the Committee, item 3, I’m concerned that if someone from the outside is going to be sitting on the committee just for the one evaluation, they may not be aware of what the whole procedure is. Having tenure on this committee gives experience, and bringing in someone from the outside may not be fair to that department. Maybe the person from the department under review should be a nonvoting member at that point but still be there to explain things. I would be concerned about bringing someone in who was not aware of the criteria used in the past. (Senator Bailey also noted that the School of Science and Mathematics had been omitted from the listing.) I think it is valuable to have someone there from the department at some point in the deliberations to answer questions. Amspacher: On page 26 under Implementation of Review and Report Format, number 1, is there going to be recommendations on how this data is to be used and weighted for some sort of recommendation? How do you take each one of these components to come up with the assessment? Pedersen: That’s the charge of the next committee. The intent was not to weight programs. We didn’t want there to be any kind of a ranking. The point was to focus on the program and identify strengths and weaknesses and make suggestions for areas of improvement. The implementation committee will come up with a statement of their intent. Andrews: Specificity was not encouraged or else every program would be forced into the same mold. Amspacher: I would like to support this body in having some control of the quality in making some of these decisions. I don’t want to say I support the types of information given for evaluation in the document and then find that we will be competing for funds even though that’s not what the document was written for. Mueller: I see where hundreds of hours will go into the preparation of documents and evaluation of programs. I would suggest a review clause to streamline the procedure once it has been tried. Viikitis: Faculty have a responsibility and duty to deal with academic programs and academic affairs. That is our part of the process. We are bridging a gap with administration in allocating resources. Maybe we should ask Dr. Koob to tell us how he will be using the information. If the information is not provided to him, he has told us he will have to make decisions without it. The two processes that seem to be merging in our discussion is one where faculty have jurisdiction and one where administration has jurisdiction and we can’t see how to gap these two together for the benefit of both.

Irvin: I can’t seem to find a clear definition of "programs." Are there time lines for completing the review of all programs? Kersten: No matter what kind of restrictions are put into the document, it will be used for the allocation process. This may be a good thing. If we move forward with this program review process, we need to be sure that the committee reviewing allocations is given some expanded role in terms of its influence in the area of the academic program budget.

Balasubramanian: Retitling the document to include the words "Academic Program Quality Review and Improvement" would state what it is we are reviewing and for what reason. It gives a purpose to the data collection. Harris: A tremendous amount of data will be generated by these reviews. How will the Senate review this much paper? How much quality information will be provided to this quality-control body?

Andrews: Thank you for all your input. We have received some excellent suggestions for changes. In order to get these comments back to you before the next Senate meeting, please get your comments to us, in writing, by noon on February 4. We will send these to the committee for review and corrections.

B. Resolution on Visibility of the Policy on Cheating and Plagiarism: J Murphy gave background information on the resolution. Suggestions were made for wording changes that would make the resolution read more clearly. C Russell suggested a friendly amendment to
change the wording in the title from "...will not condone..." to "...will not tolerate..." Irvin pointed out that the statement to be printed should clarify where disciplinary action begins. Certain actions belong to faculty and other actions are administrative. Murphy:
The committee did not feel there was any contradiction to CAM and have referenced CAM for review. We’re not changing the wording of CAM other than using a stronger word than "condone" as suggested. Bailey: My concern is that students will not look at CAM to see what the definitions of cheating and plagiarism are. Maybe these definitions should be spelled out in these documents and what the consequences are. Gamble: In UC Berkeley’s catalog they have a very effective statement, "cheating or plagiarism may result in an F in the course." It’s simple and students understand it. By saying "...may result in disciplinary action..." it also says it may not result in disciplinary action. I think a simple statement would be more effective.

VI. Discussion:
B. Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2064-92/AA on Support for Executive Order on CSU General Education-Breadth Requirements (Supersedes Executive Orders 338 and 342): Vilkitis explained the action proposed by this resolution. He asked senators to take this document back to their departments and let him know if any issues are raised. Bertozzi asked where the major changes existed. Vilkitis stated that the major change involved the challenge process. Other changes are handwritten in the right margins of the document. Please return any comments to J Vilkitis at the next Senate meeting on February 18.

A. Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2061-92/FA on Year Round Operation (YRO) Within the CSU System: Vilkitis explained that this resolution dealt with funding of YRO on the four campuses that have a summer quarter. These campuses are under-funded and this resolution requests that summer quarter be funded at the same level as the other three quarters. Please return any comments to J Vilkitis at the next Senate meeting on February 18.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:59pm.

Approved: Craig Russell, Secretary
Academic Senate

Date: