Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:12pm.

I. Minutes:

The minutes of the February 18, 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. The Academic Senate Budget Committee has been charged with preparing budget recommendations based upon quantitative data available through Institutional Studies. These recommendations will be brought back to the Academic Senate.

B. A special Academic Senate meeting has been scheduled for March 12, 1992 from 3-5pm in UU 220 to address Senate questions concerning the "Academic Program Review and Improvement" document.

C. The Ad Hoc Athletics Planning Committee has chosen to discharge its responsibility by creating a new entity, the Athletics Governing Board. This Board will be composed of three students, three faculty, and one administrator. The Academic Senate has been asked to nominate six faculty members from which President Baker will select three for the Board. Interested faculty are asked to submit their interest to the Senate office at this time. P Murphy: This Board will establish the principles under which the Athletics program will operate. It will also replace the Athletic Advisory Commission.

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair: The Chair relayed a communication from Vice President Koob confirming the discontinuance of the School of Professional Studies as of Fall Quarter ’92. The departments presently housed in SPS will be relocated to other schools.

B. President’s Office: none

C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: none

D. Statewide Senators:

Kersten: Our System Administrative Offices is estimating the budget shortfall for this year at a minimum of $137 million. The Legislative Analyst is estimating $219 million. Student fee increases will recover only about $80 million. However, these fee increases are still a matter of controversy in Sacramento. The budget will not include provision for Merit Salary Adjustments (MSA’s). The Senate has been trying to educate the Trustees and members of the Legislature as to what MSA’s are really about. They only affect about 23-25 percent of the younger faculty who are critical to the university’s continued infusion of new knowledge and information. This younger faculty also represent a broader, more diverse group of people. If we can’t fund MSA’s, we will lose many of these faculty. Senator Gooden reiterated the importance of funding MSA’s. The CSU Senate recommended a trade-off of new building maintenance funds for MSA’s to indicate how important it felt MSA’s were to the campus’ ability to retain new faculty.

Vilkitis: The Executive Order on GE&B was supported by the Academic Senate CSU and will go to the Executive and General Councils before being finalized. The content of the order is procedural in nature and states that in the next year EO 338 will be reviewed. The Resolution on Funding of Year Round Operation (YRO) was tabled until the May meeting of the Faculty Affairs Committee and Academic Affairs Committee. Two resolutions will come forward; one dealing with funding and another which deals with reviewing the academic implications of YRO.
CFA Campus President: J Conway reviewed the bargaining issues that came before the State Board last week: (1) 10 basic proposals were given to the Chancellor's Office regarding matters that had to be settled between the Union and the Chancellor's Office in order to continue collaborative bargaining efforts and to also go jointly to the Legislature regarding the budget. A letter was received from the Chancellor but these concerns were not fully addressed. (2) The CSU will be paying for all health care premiums for this year. Next year, this may be different. (3) The call for nominations has gone out for the main officer positions of this CFA chapter. (4) Flyers will be going out to all members of the campus dealing with bargaining updates, statewide budget handling, and various ballot initiatives.

IV. Consent Agenda:
A. Resolution on Academic Senate Research Committee Membership: approved by consensus.
B. Resolution on Committee Reporting: This item was pulled and placed on the Business portion of the agenda.
C. Resolution on Appointment to Vacant Positions in the Academic Senate: approved by consensus.
D. Resolution on Substitutes and Proxies: approved by consensus.

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Repeating of Courses for Credit, first reading: J Murphy: This resolution adds little new information to the existing procedures. The main changes recommended by this resolution are (1) not allowing a course to be repeated if the grade earned was a C- or better, "satisfactory progress" or "credit." (2) only 20 units can be repeated. The resolution does, however, permit withdrawal by petition. Vilkitis: There's approximately 1,500 FTE students repeating classes. How does this translate into faculty needed to teach these repeat students? This is a substantial number of repeats. J Murphy: The answer to that is too complicated to answer by strict ratio. It depends on the type of course and where it's taught. Vilkitis: What is the rationale for the 20 units? J Murphy: This is the current practice. We're just formalizing it. Vilkitis: In the last Resolved clause it says, "...it enables the student to graduate..." How many units are we talking about and in what time frame? This seems a bit open-ended if a student can petition for a grade change whenever a better grade is needed. J Murphy: There are additional resolutions coming to the Senate dealing with the number of units a student can accumulate towards graduation. Irvin: If Student Affairs has already accepted 20 units of automatic repeats and a situation occurs where a student has the need to substitute one course and grade for another course and grade in order to graduate, this last Resolved clause allows that substitution by petition. P Murphy: This resolution is very difficult to read. There should be a better way to word the resolution so it's not so hard to understand. Also, if there's a problem with large amounts of grade changes, then I would like to see something done about that to discourage it. We are talking about finite resources. 20 units of forgiveness is very gracious, but it is new to academics. Going beyond 20 units means we are not letting students know early enough when they are in true academic trouble. To have below a 2.0 in their major in their senior year is a terrible situation for a student to be in. By allowing that student to graduate by changing this grade for that grade addresses the situation but doesn't resolve what seems to be a persistent problem. Brown: A good part of the language of this resolution comes from existing literature, although I agree it is confusing. Gamble: 20 units of repeats seems to be excessive especially now with the budget concerns. Repeating a course takes a place from another student needing the class. Gooden: Maybe the issue of 20 units should come up in another discussion. Irvin: We have been operating with a 20-unit policy since 1972. It was adopted by the institution, but the system has no policy on it. Grinnell: The idea of the "automatic" bothers me. Maybe this makes it too easy and the 20 units get used up too soon. Bertozzi: The sentence, "If the student repeats a course in which a C- or higher grade was earned both grades will be calculated in the grade point average but the duplicate earned units will not be counted." Is there any limit on how often that can be done? If it's an unlimited kind of thing, this also has substantial resource implications. It seems that whether intended or not, what comes out of these resolutions is a resource question and a grading policy question.
J Murphy: The 20 units is current practice. We are formalizing it as stated in the resolution. There was strong feeling that 20 units should be a cap. It was also felt that the amount of clerical work involved in the processing needed to be reduced. These were the reasons this resolution was proposed.

This resolution has been pulled by the committee for further review in view of the budget concerns expressed on the Senate floor.

B. Resolution on Change of Grade, first reading: Harris: This matter was also submitted to the Fairness Board in 1991 and a position statement was drafted on the procedural points we addressed. We perceived that other campuses operate differently regarding grades: The timing of grades was flagged; whether grade changes could be faculty-initiated as well as student-initiated was discussed; and whether department heads should sign off on grade change forms was addressed. J Murphy: Some key points of the resolution state that "Change of grade should not occur as a consequence of the acceptance of additional work or reexamination beyond the specific course requirements." Also, we have put a time frame on this in the last sentence of the Policy--"Any other request for a change of grade will not be considered after one year from the end of the term during which the grade was awarded." Brown: Part of the motivation for dealing with the time issue is just to establish a time period after which everyone agrees that the student's record is set. Mistakes do happen and a mechanism for checking why a certain grade was earned should be in place. The idea of having another set of people sign on the grade change form is another way of establishing the time line in a way. Botwin: I think having the department head sign puts the student in between what could be a political problem between the faculty member and the department head. I think it should be excluded. This item was agendized for second reading at the next Senate meeting.

C. Resolution on Committee Reporting, first reading: DeMers: The present wording of the bylaws requires all committees to report at each Senate meeting. This is not presently done and would require a tremendous amount of time at the meetings. This resolution proposes to eliminate what isn't happening now. Vilkitis: Should the second paragraph of this bylaw section be moved or eliminated? As it now reads, it doesn't make sense--"Committees responsible to evaluate and/or prioritize applications of faculty members shall develop and publicize criteria to be used in the following year by May 1. The Senate shall be notified if this deadline cannot be met." DeMers: I will bring this back to the committee for discussion.

VI. Discussion:
A. Election of senators from the School of Professional Studies: This was addressed at an earlier Senate meeting. The solution proposed at that time was that individuals elected from departments within SPS would take their Senate membership with them to their new school. Harris: Maybe these should be one-year terms. J Murphy: If they were elected by their constituency, let them remain for the entire two-year term. Mueller: Attrition will take over in due time. These departments will still need representatives. This will be built in during the transition. There was no objection to this proposal.

B. Bylaw conflict: majority vote vs. department representation: The Chair read two bylaw provisions which say (1) departments cannot be represented by more than one representative in the Senate if sufficient nominations have been received from unrepresented departments, and (2) members to the Senate shall be elected by a majority vote.

During the recent Academic Senate elections, two schools had sufficient nominations to fill their school vacancies without duplicate-department membership. However, in two cases, these individuals did not get a majority of the votes. Therefore, it needs to be decided which of the above two bylaw provisions take precedence? Gooden: We don't want to limit people in the same department from running for a position. Kersten: To what extent do we want to spread membership according to departments, and to what extent do we want membership to be determined exclusively by the number of votes one gets. At one time, there was concern that the larger departments would get greater representation than
the smaller departments by following a 'majority vote' precedence. Botwin: It seems that as long as a department has nominated a representative, they have not waived their right to accede. So that department position has to be filled first. J Murphy: We are not electing people from departments, we are electing people from schools. Hanson: I would like us to have department representation take precedence to keep the power diverse and not consolidated within certain departments. This matter was referred to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

C. MAPE vs. ELM references in the Cal Poly Catalog: There are several courses in the Math Department that reference the MAP Exam as a prerequisite to the class. This exam is no longer in existence. All reference to MAPE in the Catalog have been deleted and the ELM Exam has been substituted. These are editorial changes only. This matter was agreed to unanimously.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.

Recorded by: Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate Office

Approved by: Craig Russell, Secretary
Academic Senate
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