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

I. Minutes:
The minutes of the January 28, 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. Attachment: Nominations received for Academic Senate/committee vacancies. Academic Senate/committee elections will be held the week of February 24, 1992. Ballots will be counted March 5, 1992 at 2pm in 33-292.
B. Nominations are now open for the positions of Academic Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary.
C. Attachment: Memo Kerschner to Presidents dated 1/21/92 re "Proposed Executive Order to Replace EO 338 and 342..."
D. Attachment: Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2061-92/FA on "Funding for Year Round Operation" and AS-2064-92/AA on "Support for Executive Order on CSU GE&B Requirements..."

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: The Faculty Response to the Strategic Planning Document will be mailed to all senators, deans, department heads, and various administrators tomorrow. This will be the final opportunity for faculty to make comments regarding the document.
B. President's Office: none
C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: Dr. Koob announced that the mode and level funding distribution model is no longer being used for campus allocations. A single allocation (without restrictions) will now be given which is not based on 'number of students.' This campus will have to prepare an anticipated budget by March 31 based on 14,480 FTES. This budget will define for the Chancellor's Office how we intend to accommodate our assigned number of students (14,480) with the assigned number of dollars. This is a major shift in the State's structuring of the budget for higher education. The tools for administering a dollar-based budget still need to be put in place both at the Chancellor's Office and on our campus.

The second phase of budgeting involves a request by the Chancellor's Office to have the campuses build a base budget for basically the same number of dollars and roughly the same number of students we had last year (whether or not the fee increase is passed). This will include so-called 'unavoidable cost increases' (e.g., costs of opening the new Business building). We can only build a budget for the Chancellor's Office if the fee increase passes, otherwise we will have to start over again. During the third phase we will be given an opportunity to request FTE increments above 14,480 based on the money assigned in the governor's budget for growth within the system.

In summary, the three phases of budgeting are as follows: (1) the base budget will be for the same dollars as last year for 14,480 students, (2) the base budget will include unavoidable cost increases in the event of a university fee increase of 40 percent, and (3) an opportunity will be provided to request money for growth above 14,480 students. This will be a very different budget year. A memo to the campus community has been
distributed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs Office which explains some of these things.

Andrews: There have been questions raised about the process given to the deans regarding the '95 percent level' budgeting, and the issue of how they are to cut below 95 percent then ask for more funds for anything more than that. The Budget Committee will be coming forth with a proposal to do a 90 percent budget and then Budget Change Proposals would be submitted for anything above that.

Koob: Since the old formulas are no longer operative, a couple of issues come up: Should we adopt a hardline stance to keep student enrollment at 14,480? To avoid cutting further from the incoming class, other techniques are available for reducing students; i.e., mandatory academic disqualifications. In other words, should the fee increase fail and should we fail to achieve reverse growth, will we then cut down to 14,480 and use mandatory techniques for doing so? It is an important issue which should be debated widely.

P Murphy: Even though the budget won't be based on formulas, some form of productivity will be required to measure what we are doing with the dollars received.

Koob: The formula developed by the Department of Finance allocates roughly $6,500 per student.

D. Statewide Senators:
Vilkitis: The statewide Senate is preparing a formal response for action regarding the budget shortfalls. The response will be available in the Academic Senate office. A higher $/FTES will be requested.

E. CFA Campus President:
In the absence of J Conway, P Murphy announced that there would be a meeting for CFA members next Thursday. This will be Cal Poly's only chance to talk with union representatives about their priorities.

F. CSEA Campus President: none

G. ASI Representatives: none

H. Lloyd Beecher introduced Susan Ford, who will be coordinating a student program that addresses drug and alcohol usage. A three-year U.S. Department of Education grant was received for the purpose of increasing drug and alcohol awareness on campus. This two-year, $147,000 grant requires that 900 students be surveyed. The classes have been identified by George Stanton of the Testing Office. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to fill out. The program was funded to provide alternate ways of looking at the drug and alcohol problem. Materials were made available at the meeting.

IV. Consent Agenda:
A. Resolution on Appointment of Temporary Academic Employee to the Academic Senate: approved by consensus.
B. Resolution on Representative of Temporary Academic Employees to the Academic Senate: approved by consensus.
C. Resolution on Academic Senate Meeting Schedule: approved by consensus.

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Proposed Academic Program Review Criteria, second reading: A revised copy of the document was made available at the meeting. Shelton/Freberg made a motion to approve the resolution. Botwin: I still have concern as to how this document is to be used from a budgetary point-of-view. I would like this to be put in writing. Koob: There’s no question that the Senate’s position on academic programs will influence budget decisions. I have stated in the most recent letter to the faculty (just mailed) what I thought was a response to this request. Simply, for any budget decision the university must make, information needs to be collected from a variety of sources—information about the administrative use of funds through the administrative process; information regarding the
quality of programs through some form of program review process through the Academic Senate; information about working conditions from bargaining units; information about student satisfaction of programs, government, etc. Any decisions made with respect to the budget would be less valid if any of these pieces of information was not available. If faculty are to aid in budget decisions, a process needs to be in place wherein faculty define what they feel are the strengths and weaknesses of campus programs. How should we deal with program elements already in place? Will they be there forever? That's a programmatic decision the Senate needs to make.

P Murphy: I strongly oppose this resolution. I'm not opposed to program review, but this particular document is encyclopedic in what a review committee will review. It should be pruned to a manageable core process. No committee will be able to digest this volume of information. It should be small enough to be an informal process. Criteria has to be rational in the sense that it can be addressed. If we are serious about program review, we will narrow this list. Howard: There are 28 programs on this campus that have external certification. What is in this document precisely what those external bodies require. Therefore, this review has to be done every five years no matter what. Harris: Accreditation bodies don't weigh the same information equally. I think the review document should address what is most important. Brown: My concern is the lack of time that was available to create criteria to be used for this coming year's budget. If the document won't be used to establish budgets for this coming year, why was the committee only given a few weeks to put this document together. Is there any reason we can't now look at what is most important and narrow the criteria? Do we need it this year? If not, we should take more time to refine it.

Hanson: It sounds like the document will be used for several purposes. Are there better ways in existence to do a "program review." The physical aspects of doing this are demanding. Who's going to do it? Will release time be given? Wilson: I agree I don't see how this will be used this year. Suppose the five strongest programs are evaluated this year. Does that mean one of those strongest programs might be weighted down and cuts made to that program? What I see happening is some of the programs identified last spring as being 'not as strong as others' might be in the first wave of evaluations and I'm not sure that this would be fair. So I don't see where it's going to be of much use this year. I think we're rushing into a very important process that has a lot of implications for the future of Cal Poly and we could wait a few months. We still haven't addressed the question of how this is going to be weighted. If this is the charge of the "next" committee, this gives that committee a lot of power. If some weights are going to be set, I think they should be set by this group, not a committee.

Koob: I separate clearly in my mind budget process and academic review process. I don't view it as administration's task to eliminate an academic program; that is the Senate's task. However, my task is to get faculty input regarding budget processing. It seems the Budget Committee could identify a few key quality cost indicators for programs. This could be done with the help of Institutional Studies. Having pulled those indicators out of the data base you will see things which highlight key factors about programs. This would provide a mechanism for tracking quality indicators year after year. From a budgetary point-of-view, it would be nice to have faculty comments on various programs. Most programs are going to go forward unaffected.

Harris: Can we have Wally Mark come in to tell us what indicators are available for comparison? Koob: Yes. Harris: I would like to see this tabled for now until a time certain when we know what kind of data we have available to us. Gooden: I would also like to see this tabled. I think our concerns are different from accrediting bodies and the document we use could be pared down and be usable considering the time constraints that exist. Pedersen: The committee had a charge to develop criteria that would identify the quality of a program. We provided components under which 'quality' could be identified--to provide criteria that would make departments look at certain things they may not be looking at now. We did not set out to provide a short quick list for budget purposes.

Vilkitis: I'd like to move to send this back to committee so the issues and concerns expressed here could be addressed. Bailey seconded the motion. Primarily those concerns...
of length and weight should be addressed. Pedersen: I'm not clear on exactly what is being asked because initially there were very strong feelings that weight not be put on any of the criteria. Vilkitis: I think the Senate is asking that the original charge to your committee be modified. Peach: From the beginning it seems the purposes of the exercise were incompatibly mixed. Maybe the charge needs to be reconsidered. Possibly two processes need to be developed, one for budget and one for program review. P Murphy: I think the way we insert what is important is by shortening the document. Certain criteria given does not address program quality. The questions which get to the core of what a quality program is should be kept. From a broad point-of-view, the committee should be able to say whether a program is compatible with the mission of Cal Poly.

Harris: In order to confront this problem, we need to (1) look at what data Institutional Studies has available, and (2) possibly form an ad hoc group to see if we can do anything that would help Koob with the decisions he needs to make. Andrews: This is the responsibility of the Academic Senate Budget Committee. Brumley: If this goes back to the committee, it needs to go back with a clearly articulated charge. Pedersen: What would be helpful in paring down the list is to receive information regarding the number of factors you would like to see considered. Hanson: Part of the charge should be identifying key criteria. Gooden: The question might be posed to the committee in terms of what data they would need to look at if they were doing the review of programs. What information would they need to know? Pedersen: I would then assume that this would be criteria that could compare all programs across campus--both similar and dissimilar. Harris: Possibly the criteria could be set in groups comparing groupings of programs that are compatible.

P Murphy: There should be something of a dialogue between the department and the committee. There may be general question areas where inviting the dean and department heads to a committee meeting would provide an opportunity for informal discussion of the information received. Where budgetary considerations are involved, it can't be done in bureaucratic fashion. You need face-to-face dialogue. Howard: I still haven't heard anything yet that I can put something on. The committee cannot read people's minds. We cannot work with nonspecific terms. Unless individuals can be extremely specific about what's wanted, we will never get past the arguments about what criteria represents quality. Andrews: I want to point out that written input was requested. Some comments were received, but what we're hearing today is very different. The committee still doesn't know what you want done.

The motion to refer to committee passed. The committee will report back to the Senate on April 14, 1992. The Chair thanked the committee for all the work they had done.

THE CHAIR AGAIN REQUESTED THAT ANY COMMENTS SENATORS HAD REGARDING THE PROGRAM REVIEW DOCUMENT BE SUBMITTED, IN WRITING, TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE THIS WEEK. THE COMMITTEE NEEDS TO HAVE EXPLICIT INPUT.

B. Resolution on Visibility of the Policy on Cheating and Plagiarism, second reading: Brown: There isn't a very visible statement about cheating and plagiarism in either the campus catalog or class schedule, and if a student wanted to know where to look for specific information, that person would have a very difficult time finding it. That's what prompted this resolution. M/S/P unanimously.

C. Resolution on Voter Eligibility, first reading: DeMers: This resolution clarifies that part of the Bylaws that states who can and cannot vote for the University Professional Leave Committee. It is only an editorial change. (Botwin/Hanson) Motion made to move this resolution to a second reading item. Motion passed. No discussion was held. M/S/P unanimously.

VI. Discussion:

ELM Recommendations: Irvin: This is an item which has been looked at by the Student Progress Committee. The adjustments recommended in the ELM make it more useful for diagnostic purposes. These are not just changes to the policy but also changes in how the
ELM would be used and how scoring would be used for placement. We would like to get ELM scores during orientation so students would not be able to sign up for math classes they aren't prepared for. This allows us to identify students earlier who need assistance and help them through the math sequences. We are looking at new technologies to solve the problem of class crowding for the lowest level math classes.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:55pm.

Approved: Craig Russell, Secretary
Academic Senate