I. Minutes: Approval of the May 28, May 30, and June 4, 1991 Academic Senate minutes (pp. 2-9).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
   A. Memo Koob to Ribeau re TESL Certificate (p. 10).
   B. Memo Whiteford to Distribution List re TESL Certificate Program (p. 11).
   C. Resolutions approved by President Baker (p. 12).

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair
   B. President's Office
   C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
   D. Statewide Senators
      1. Academic Senate of the CSU Resolution AS-2034-91/FA (p. 13).
      3. Academic Senate of the CSU Resolution AS-2038-91/FA (pp. 15-16).
   E. CFA Campus President
   F. CSEA Campus President
   G. ASI Representatives

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
   Resolution on Voting Membership of the General Faculty-DeMers, Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, first reading (p. 20).

VI. Discussion Item(s):
   A. Year Round Operation: Overview of YRO and charge to Senate committees.
   B. Suggested process for receiving recommendations to the Strategic Planning Document (p. 21).
   C. Continuing program review: How do we proceed from the work performed by the Program Review Task Force during Spring Quarter 1991.

VII. Adjournment:
Thank you for your recent response regarding the TESL Certificate. I am pleased to approve the certificate program effective Fall Quarter 1991 with the understanding that the program will address American born as well as foreign born students, and can be offered with existing resources in the School of Liberal Arts.
Dr. Koob recently approved the TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language) Certificate program effective Fall 1991. The certificate will be available to both graduate and undergraduate students.

The Evaluations Office does not monitor the progress of students pursuing certificate programs, so the department will need to notify Evaluations when students have completed the certificate. Completion of the certificate program will be noted on the transcript, but will not appear on the diploma.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me.

*Distribution List:

C. Allen    V. Herriman    R. Macias    C. Schuldt
D. Amos     D. Hinkle      W. Mark      H. Scott
D. Arseneau D. Hinkle      A. McMeans    P. Scott
P. Bailey   L. Julien      K. Mills      S. Sidah
B. Bazzani  E. Kennedy     J. Miravaglia D. Slack
W. Boyes    K. Lamorece    G. Monteen    K. Stubberfield
H. Busselen F. Lebens      P. Neel       J. Thoma
E. Doyle    P. Lee         J. Pieper     H. Vollmer
R. Equinoa  D. Lindsey     G. Punches    D. Walch
M. Friedman H. Linstrum    S. Ribeau     J. Williams
A. Gloster  J. Lloyd       P. Ringer     M. York
J. Gordon   R. Lucas       S. Roper      T. Zuur
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Resolution Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-355-91/GE&amp;BC</td>
<td>Resolution on General Education Curriculum Substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-356-91/LRPC</td>
<td>Resolution on Academic Program Review Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-359-91/IC</td>
<td>Resolution on Academic Probation and Disqualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-360-91</td>
<td>Resolution on Job Announcement Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-361-91</td>
<td>Resolution on U.S. Ethnic Pluralism Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-362-91</td>
<td>Resolution on Proposal to Establish the Agricultural Safety Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-363-91</td>
<td>Resolution on Budget Reduction for Intercollegiate Athletics Program (commitment to 20% reduction for Athletics during '92-93 cannot be made at this time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-364-91</td>
<td>Resolution on the Proposal to Establish the Coastal Resources Institute at California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-366-91</td>
<td>Resolution on Statement on Racism and Discrimination (approved with further review by the Academic Senate requested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-368-91</td>
<td>Resolution on Academic Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-369-91/EX</td>
<td>Resolution on Ethnic Diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2034-91/FA
September 5-6, 1991

THE DEFINITION OF "INDIRECT INSTRUCTION" IN THE
1991 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND THE CALIFORNIA FACULTY ASSOCIATION

WHEREAS, The new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA) contains language reducing faculty weighted teaching units (WTUs) for "direct instruction" by three units per term, on the average, phased in over a three-year period, for non-S factor courses and only for tenured or tenure-track faculty; and

WHEREAS, This reduction in direct instruction WTUs is being referred to as "indirect instruction," and beginning with the 1992-93 academic year, the workload of probationary and tenured employees in the CSU shall include one unit of such "indirect instruction;" and

WHEREAS, Representatives of the CFA and the CSU are developing a working definition of what constitutes "indirect instruction;" and

WHEREAS, The establishment of criteria and standards for evaluation of faculty is identified in HEERA as a joint responsibility of the Board of Trustees and the academic senate; and

WHEREAS, Any changes in the definition of faculty workload could affect the evaluation of faculty; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University, exercising its proper role in the establishment of criteria and standards for evaluation of faculty, urge the Chancellor and the California Faculty Association to define "indirect instruction" in positive, constructive terms that recognize its value in improving the quality of faculty performance, for example, as a means for faculty to become, and/or to remain, current in their professional disciplines.

SECOND READING - November 7-8, 1991
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FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY FOR CAMPUS DISCUSSION ON ISSUES OF CRITICAL IMPORTANCE TO HIGHER EDUCATION

WHEREAS, American institutions of higher education have an obligation to maintain a teaching and learning environment open to reasoned discussion even when the issues discussed may result in controversy and discomfort; and

WHEREAS, It is one of the primary responsibilities of university faculty to initiate discussions on issues of critical importance to higher education, such as suppression of viewpoints, the free expression of traditional and non-traditional values, and academic quality, fairness, diversity, and rigor; and

WHEREAS, Some California State University faculty have assumed the responsibility of promoting discussions and debates of critical issues of importance to higher education by sponsoring conferences and other events; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University encourage faculty to initiate through campus senates and other means discussions on issues of critical importance to higher education, recognizing that some discomfort may be a consequence in a climate of vigorous discussion.

SECOND READING - November 7-8, 1991
SUPPORT FOR EFFORTS TO OBTAIN JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AB 702

WHEREAS, The California Constitution, Article XVI, Section 17, provides for the protection of the public pension retirement system; and

WHEREAS, This Section defines the public pension retirement system as a trust fund held for the exclusive purposes of providing benefits to participants in the pension or retirement system and their beneficiaries; and

WHEREAS, This Article (XVI) mandates that the Public Employee Retirement System (PERS) shall exercise fiduciary responsibility for the maintenance and integrity of this public retirement system; and that this responsibility shall be exercised solely in the interest of, and for the exclusive purpose of, providing benefits to participants and their beneficiaries; and

WHEREAS, Assembly Bill 702 appears to violate the aforecited constitutional provisions in a number of ways, for instance, by authorizing the state to seize Investment Dividend Disbursement Account (IDDA) and Extraordinary Performance Dividend Account (EPDA) cost-of-living adjustment funds from the PERS fund; and

(OVER)
WHEREAS, Several organizations, including California State Employees' Association (CSEA), CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERFA), and Service Employees International Union (SEIU), have filed a lawsuit asking the Third District Court of Appeal in Sacramento to invalidate the allegedly unconstitutional provisions of AB 702; and

WHEREAS, Doubts about the integrity of the Public Employee Retirement System may impede efforts by the CSU to recruit and retain a diverse and high quality faculty; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University express its strong support of the efforts by various organizations, including CSEA, CSU-ERFA, and SEIU, to obtain judicial review of the allegedly unconstitutional provisions of AB 702.

SECOND READING - November 7-8, 1991
ACADEMIC SENATE 
of 
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY 

AS-2039-91/FA 
September 5-6, 1991 

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE CSU FORGIVABLE LOAN/DOCTORAL INCENTIVE PROGRAM 

WHEREAS, The CSU Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program has been in existence since 1987 as a lottery-funded program to increase the diversity of the California State University faculty by developing a pool of qualified ethnic minorities, women, and disabled persons with doctorates in disciplines where they are underrepresented in the California State University; and 

WHEREAS, The Telein Group Inc. has completed an evaluation of the CSU Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program; and 

WHEREAS, The evaluation documents that the program has been "well-received throughout the CSU" but also recommends many changes to effect administrative and programmatic improvements; and 

WHEREAS, The first of these recommended changes—to "reassign FLP coordination and administration to the Faculty Affairs Division" of the Chancellor's Office—is being implemented, and others are being discussed by the Chancellor's Office staff; and 

WHEREAS, There should be faculty consultation concerning several of the recommendations, including those which involve training and incentives for faculty sponsors, articulation with existing processes for recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty, and the establishment of a systemwide Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program Advisory Committee; and 

WHEREAS, The Telein Group Inc. also recommends that staff immediately begin to "develop a thorough understanding of how to get a lottery program moved to the State General Fund;" therefore be it
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University commend the CSU staff and faculty who are responsible for the initial successes of the Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program; and be it also

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to provide for extensive consultation with the Senate about those recommendations of the Telein Group Inc. which involve the faculty responsibilities, including commitments of, and incentives for, faculty sponsors, and articulation with existing efforts to recruit and retain a diverse faculty; and be it also

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to establish a systemwide Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program Advisory Committee, with a membership to be determined in consultation with the Academic Senate CSU; and be it also

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to initiate preparation for securing General Fund support for the Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program, including the collection of appropriate data and documentation, so that a comprehensive proposal can be presented whenever the budgetary circumstances of the State of California appear propitious for such an effort.

SECOND READING - November 7-8, 1991
Academic Senate Calendar for 1991-1992

All Senate and Executive Committee meetings are held in UU 220 from 3:00 to 5:00pm unless otherwise noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 16</td>
<td>Fall Conference: 1:30pm Academic Senate Standing Committees (UU 207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:45pm Academic Senate General Session (UU 207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 29</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9 through January 5, 1992 - finals and quarter break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 14</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 28</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 4</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 25</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16 through March 29, 1992 - finals and quarter break</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 5</td>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26</td>
<td>(NEW) Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2</td>
<td>(NEW) Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8 through June 21, 1992 - finals and quarter break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This results in:
- 10 Executive Committee meetings
- 10 Academic Senate meetings

The calendar is structured to have an Executive Committee meeting the Tuesday following each Academic Senate meeting. It also allows for 14 days between the Executive Committee and the next Academic Senate meeting for the completion and timely delivery of the agenda to the senators before the Academic Senate meetings.
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background Statement: Article I., Membership of the General Faculty, is somewhat vague which results in arbitrary identification of voting members of the General Faculty. Changes in Article I of the Constitution would assist in identifying voting members of the General Faculty.

AS-91/
RESOLUTION ON
VOTING MEMBERSHIP OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

WHEREAS, The current description of the General Faculty within the Constitution of the Faculty is vague; and

WHEREAS, The current description results in an arbitrary identification of voting members of the General Faculty; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Article I of the Constitution of the Faculty be changed as follows:

Voting members of the General Faculty shall consist solely of those persons who are full-time academic employees holding faculty rank and occupying a position in an academic department within the university. 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.1.b. of the Constitution, and full-time lecturers holding one-year appointments in academic departments are members of the General Faculty. 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. Voting membership of the General Faculty shall not lapse because of leave of absence. Nonvoting membership in the General Faculty shall include all temporary, part-time academic personnel not included in the voting membership.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws Committee
May 9, 1991
SUGGESTED PROCESS FOR RECEIVING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE STRATEGIC PLANNING DOCUMENT

ACADEMIC SENATE
(approved recommendations prepared and forwarded to Vice President for Academic Affairs)

Academic Senate
Executive Committee
(all recommendations compiled for Academic Senate deliberation)

Long-Range Planning Committee
(written recommendations)

Open Session
for Faculty Discussion
(verbal recommendations)

Caucuses
(prepare written summaries of school discussions)

School Discussion
(caucus-initiated)

Department Discussion
(sensor-initiated)
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

WHEREAS: The California Faculty Association (hereinafter referred to as "CFA") has filed a grievance dated July 31, 1991, on behalf of the faculty unit employees of the School of Science and Mathematics relative to a change in class sizes; and

WHEREAS: The CFA, and California Polytechnic State University, SLO, (hereinafter referred to as "University") are interested in a mutually acceptable resolution to unique circumstances which shall not establish precedence;

NOW, THEREFORE, the grievance will be resolved as follows:

Section 1. The University shall:

A. Agree that the Dean of the School of Science and Mathematics will send a memorandum to Department Heads/Chairs specifying that increasing class size involves a change in working conditions and shall be in compliance with the collective bargaining agreement.

B. Agree that there will be no unilateral changes in the conditions of employment for faculty unit employees.

C. Agree that the Vice President for Academic Affairs will notify deans and department heads/chairs that any decision affecting the conditions of employment, such as increasing class size, of faculty unit employees must be in compliance with the faculty unit contract. Department heads/chairs will be requested to share this information with all departmental faculty, including departmental schedulers.

Section 2. CFA shall:

A. Withdraw with prejudice as fully settled and resolved the grievance filed on July 31, 1991.

B. Fully release and forever discharge the State of California; Trustees of the California State University; California Polytechnic State University, SLO, and all their officers, agents, and employees from any and all claims, causes of action, judgments, and liabilities arising out of or relating to the occurrences underlying the grievance and complaint hereby resolved.
Memorandum

To: Department Chairs

From: Phil Bailey, Dean
School of Science and Mathematics

Subject: Class Scheduling 1991-92

Date: September 20, 1991

This memo will replace my memo of June 21, 1991 on class scheduling for the 1991-92 academic year.

As you are aware, we face extraordinary budget challenges during the 1991-92 academic year. We have met our allocated budget reductions with vacant faculty and staff positions and new equipment funds. It is imperative that we make the most efficient and effective use of remaining resources as we possibly can.

In scheduling classes please pay close attention to the following:

1. The university's budget allocation is based on 15,000 full-time equivalent students or 225,000 student credit units as an annual average. In the absence of official relief from this assignment, the university is obligated to teach at least at this level. The projected assignment to the School of Science and Mathematics is 42,660 SCU's and this allocation has been distributed to the departments. Each department must use the SCU allocation assigned as a minimum annual average guideline for its teaching obligation during 1991-92.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Initial Allocation</th>
<th>Revised Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>9,513</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>7,551</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>13,395</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>8,532</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>3,669</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42,660</td>
<td>147.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

138.82
2. Each department is instructed within reasonable limitations, to make every effort to meet student demand. The students are already here, they are expending time and resources for their education, and we should do whatever we reasonably can to help them progress. The more we can meet their needs, the faster they will go through their programs, and we will be able, as a consequence, to return to a more practical enrollment level.

Following are some ideas discussed in School Council for scheduling classes in a way to meet student needs and honor budgeted student credit unit obligations. It is up to the departments to employ these and/or other strategies:

1. Minimize low enrollment courses, especially low enrollment elective courses.
2. Carefully schedule electives in the major and graduate courses to ensure the strongest enrollments possible.
3. Decrease the choice of courses available to students.
4. Increase class size.
5. Consider changes that will streamline major curricula.

In devising and implementing departmental strategies it is critical that you consult with the faculty in your department. Implementation of Item 4, because it involves working conditions, shall be in compliance with the Collective Bargaining agreement.

Please meet with me periodically during the year so we can discuss the effectiveness of our resource utilization in meeting the needs of Cal Poly students.

Thank you.
With the first week of classes completed, I want to express my appreciation to you and the faculty for your diligent efforts in maximizing our resources to meet the needs of our students. Although it is always difficult to adjust our instructional program, the effects of the budget shortfall have been mitigated by the collective efforts of the collegial process. Thank you.

As we continue to evaluate and plan for operating with reduced resources in the future, questions have been raised about increasing class size. In addressing such issues, it is important to keep in mind that any decision affecting the conditions of employment of faculty employees must be in compliance with the faculty unit contract. It is critical that in evaluating alternatives and developing solutions to fulfill our instructional mission, that faculty must continue to be consulted and fully informed. In that spirit, please make sure that all faculty members receive this information.

Your continued cooperation is appreciated.