## Academic Senate Agenda

**Tuesday, August 5, 1986**

FOB 24B, 3:00-5:00 p.m.

### Copies:

- Baker, Warren J.
- Irvin, Glenn W.

### I. Minutes:

Approval of the July 8, 1986 Senate Minutes (attached pp. 2-10).

### II. Communications:

A. Communications (attached p. 11)
B. Reporting of Academic Senate Actions (attached p. 12)
C. Reporting Format of Discretionary Funds (attached p. 13)
D. Academic Senate Resolution on PCBs (attached p. 14)
E. Academic Senate Resolution on the Foundation (attached p. 15)
F. Academic Senate Resolutions on GE&B Requirements (attached pp. 16-18)
G. Actions taken on '85-'86 Resolutions (attached pp. 19-27).

### III. Reports:

- President/Provost
- Statewide Senators

### IV. Business Items-Consent Agenda:

B. Resolution on Faculty Early Retirement Program, Academic Senate CSU Bakersfield, Weatherby, Second Reading, (attached pp. 35).
C. Modifications to Amendments 4 and 5 of the UPLC Bylaws, Terry, University Professional Leave Committee, First Reading, (attached p. 36).

### V. Business Items:

C. Committee/Senate Appointments (vacancy list attached as p. 52).

### VI. Discussion Items:

A. Faculty Overload, Academic Senate CSU Long Beach, Kersten, (attached pp. 53-54).
B. Consideration of joint meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee and CFA Executive Committee for September 16.
C. Reformation of the President’s Council (attached pp. 55-59).

### VII. Adjournment:
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
    Academic Senate

Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
    President

Subject: REPORTING OF ACADEMIC SENATE ACTIONS

This will respond to your memo of July 9 in which you asked if it would be possible to notify Stan Bernstein of the actions which have been taken on Academic Senate recommendations so that they could be mentioned in the Cal Poly Report. I will be more than pleased to do so. However, I think it must be recognized that whether or not the recommendation and my action on the recommendation can be effectively covered in the Cal Poly Report will often depend upon the complexity of the issue as well as the space that is available in the Cal Poly Report. However, to the extent that it is possible we will be more than pleased to report upon the recommendations of the Senate and the actions which have been taken upon them.
MEMORANDUM

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
    President

Subject: REPORTING FORMAT OF DISCRETIONARY FUNDS
        AND OTHER AVAILABLE RESOURCES

This memo will respond to your May 9 memo and the discussion which we had on Thursday, July 10, on this issue. I am pleased that the Academic Senate finds that the work which Jim Landreth has done on the developing format for reporting of discretionary funds to be satisfactory. I am likewise concerned that apparently not all of the school deans are reporting to their schools generally on the allocation of resources within their respective schools as has been agreed to previously. By copy of this memo, I will ask Vice President Wilson to continue to work with Mr. Landreth and the school deans in developing an acceptable format that will provide the information desired and to have the materials distributed by the school deans in an appropriate manner. At the same time, I will ask Mr. Landreth to continue to work with the Budget Committee in the developing of a format that would report the resources available to other appropriate administrative offices and the manner in which those are allocated within their areas of responsibility.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate

FROM: Warren J. Baker
President

DATE: July 16, 1986

SUBJECT: Academic Senate Resolution on PCB's - AS-208-86

Following action by the Academic Senate, you forwarded to me Resolution AS-208-86 which dealt with replacing on campus on a high priority basis all old ballasts in fluorescent fixtures which may contain PCB, recommended that stronger communication measures be adopted to prevent inadvertent entry by campus personnel in areas where there may be ballast failures which contain PCB, and that periodic progress reports on replacing such ballasts be provided to the Academic Senate.

As a follow-up to the resolution, I have asked Doug Gerard, Executive Dean in charge of Facilities Administration, to provide a summary of facilities which have the old type fluorescent ballasts which may contain PCB, those that have been replaced to date, and the projected schedule and costs for replacing the remaining ballasts. In addition, I have requested James Landreth, in his capacity as Chair of the Public Safety Advisory Committee, to arrange for an independent Cal/OSHA consultant to evaluate the status of such ballasts and to provide the university with findings and recommendations. In addition, I have requested that the Director of Public Safety and the Director of Plant Operations re-emphasize and strengthen during the current school year the sensitivity to and proper responses by faculty, staff and students to any observed ballast problems. The university has in place policies, procedures, training, dispatch and response processes to deal with PCB problems which may involve transformers, switches, capacitors, and ballasts.

I have also requested that the Director of Public Safety follow-up with the Director of Plant Operations and the Executive Dean - Facilities Administration on the progress being made in replacing such fluorescent ballasts and periodically report that status to me, to you as the Chair of the Academic Senate, and to the members of the campus Environmental Health and Safety Subcommittee of the Public Safety Advisory Committee, which includes Senate representatives.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
    President

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION ON
         THE FOUNDATION ELECTION PROCESS
         (AS-216-86)

Date: July 17, 1986

This will acknowledge your June 10 memo with which you transmitted
the resolution adopted by the Academic Senate relative to the
membership, composition and the method of selection of the
Foundation Board of Directors. I am forwarding this resolution
to Vice President Wilson, Vice President Landreth and Howard West
asking Messrs. Landreth and Wilson to consult with Howard West,
the Chair of the Foundation Board of Directors, as they review
the recommendation of the Academic Senate and report to me on their
recommendations with regard to the structure and membership of the
Foundation Board of Directors.

As I do so, however, the Academic Senate needs to be aware that
the Trustees' Audit Staff has recently conducted audits of a number
of auxiliaries within the California State University System.
Results of audits of several of the campuses were presented at the
July Trustees' meeting, and it's anticipated that the results of
audits of other campuses' auxiliaries will be presented in September.
It's also anticipated that at the September meeting the Trustees'
Audit staff will present overall systemwide recommendations. While
it's not possible to determine at this time what those overall
system recommendations may be, based upon the comments of the
Trustees' Audit staff at the meeting in July, it is likely that
there will be some recommendations made with regard to the
membership and structure of all auxiliary organizations within the
system. Accordingly, the review which I am asking Messrs. Wilson
and Landreth to undertake with Howard West will have to be done
within the context of whatever recommendations are presented by
the Trustees' Audit staff and adopted by the Trustees. I do not
anticipate that we will have a ready answer to this question before
sometime well into the Fall Quarter and perhaps later.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
   President

Subject: Academic Senate Resolutions

Date: July 23, 1986

The following are my comments on recent Academic Senate resolutions:

General Education and Breadth Requirements (AS-188-85):

Formal response to this resolution was apparently overlooked. The courses have been included in the 1986-88 catalog and can be considered approved. I do have some reservations about those courses in Area F as noted in my comments below.

General Education and Breadth (AS-189-86/GE&B):

This resolution is approved with the exception of the two courses falling into Area F: NRM 101 and NRM 201. My comments regarding these and other courses in Area F can be found in the next section.

General Education and Breadth Course Proposals (AS-211-86/GE&B)

I concur with the non-approval of HE 203.

I do not agree with the Senate's approval of additional courses for Area F, either those in this resolution or in AS-188-85 and AS-189-86/GE&B as noted above.

My objection rests on the Knowledge and Skills Statements that were adopted by referendum of the faculty during the process of developing and implementing the new GE&B program. There continues to be some confusion between sections 7 and 9, both of which bear on the intent of courses admitted to Area F.

Section 7 requires that Cal Poly students in particular should "understand how technology influences and is influenced by cultural and environmental factors, the applications of technology to contemporary problems, and the potential of technology to both positively and negatively affect individuals and societies." It goes on to indicate that this can be achieved by including experiences in which students "gain an awareness of their increasing dependence on technology and how it is guided, managed, and controlled."
In addition, students "should be able to evaluate and assess questions of value and choice underlying technologies and how, in the course of their development, these questions have been addressed and answered."

Section 9 requires that Cal Poly graduates "be exposed to courses taught within the technological areas, so that they will have a basis for developing a better understanding of how technology influences and is influenced by present day cultures and other environmental factors."

Students should "develop an awareness of typical problems addressed by technology, such as methods of world food production, applications of the computer, or the production, distribution, and control of energy."

They should also "have an opportunity to learn the difficulties inherent in solving technological problems," especially in "the application of theoretical knowledge to practical matters such as:

(1) The consequences and implications of applied technology for environmental factors of climate, water quality, soil, and plant resources.

(2) Problems stemming from the interactions of population growth, technology and resource consumption, such as climate change, the energy crisis, world hunger and soil erosion."

Students are further expected to "develop an awareness of issues raised by the interaction of culture and technology."

These statements raise two immediate issues: What do we mean by "courses taught within the technological areas"? And what is Area F attempting to accomplish in the education of our undergraduates?

Up to this time, we have limited courses in Area F to those taught by the Schools of Agriculture, Architecture, and Engineering. This may be an artificial limitation; certainly there are faculty and departments in other schools of the university capable and interested in offering courses for Area F. The current Senate resolutions propose some courses for Area F to be offered by departments outside these three schools, and before a decision is made regarding their approval, I would like the statement "taught within the technological areas" clarified for the entire campus.

As I read Section 7 and Section 9, and as I consider my own thinking about General Education, I believe Area F should concern itself with providing the student an opportunity to consider the benefits of technology, and at the same time to reach some understanding of the "consequences and implications" of technology, both practical and ethical.

When I review the courses currently in Area F, I find only two courses of the approximately 33 listed which, at least on paper, appear to be consistent with the statements noted above: ENGR 301 and AG 301. To add more courses to Area F would only aggravate the situation and further dilute this area of General Education and Breadth.
As a result of these and other considerations, I am withholding approval of any courses for AREA F and requesting the Academic Senate to clarify the issues centering around Area F. This will need to be accomplished in time for the next curricular cycle so that necessary changes can be incorporated in the 1988-90 catalog.

**General Education and Breadth Course Proposals (AS-212-86/GE&B):**

Both recommendations are acceptable: The "Human Values in Agriculture" course is approved for Area C.3. and Math 201 is approved for Area B.2. However, I request a change in title for MATH 201. I would prefer the elimination of "Appreciation" and substitution of something more appropriate to the content and intent of the course. This course and all other math courses will have to be in compliance with the CSU policy on Baccalaureate Credit for Intermediate Algebra as outlined in GE&B Notes #8 (May 12, 1986) and in EP&R 86-32 (June 5, 1986).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>REFERRAL DATE</th>
<th>CONTENTS OF RESOLUTION/ REQUEST</th>
<th>FURTHER ACTION/ RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Resolution on Bachelor of Arts Degree in Music</td>
<td>4/25/83</td>
<td>J. Simmons notified WJB Academic Senate approved subject resolution in principle &amp; requested the Vice President Academic Affairs investigate the means by which a Music Major might be implemented without having a detrimental impact on other academic programs.</td>
<td>11/21/83 Dean's Council for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 150-83 (Principle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 151-83 (Impact)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Carry-over item for follow-up -- 1984-85 item #3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academic Calendar</td>
<td>2/29/84</td>
<td>Provost Fort asked Academic Senate's review of holidays and problems w/ classes which are scheduled to meet only once a week or on Mondays.</td>
<td>3/2/84 Jim Simmons to Chair, Instruction Committee requesting review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Carry-over item for follow-up -- 1983-84 item #6, 1984-85 item #5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strategic Planning</td>
<td>5/21/85</td>
<td>Identified list of important issues facing Cal Poly. Recommend a Strategic Planning Program.</td>
<td>5/28/85 Approved with amendment. President has endorsed and initiated planning process including plan for progress report to Senate in Spring 1986.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>REFERRAL DATE</td>
<td>CONTENTS OF RESOLUTION/REQUEST</td>
<td>FURTHER ACTION/RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Professional Leaves Committee Bylaw Change</td>
<td>5/10/85</td>
<td>Establish the University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC) as Standing Senate Committee; membership and responsibilities of committee. 10/1/85 Approved unanimously by Senate.</td>
<td>12/2/85 President generally approved principles and called attention to internal conflicts between the proposals as well as conflicts with existing bylaws and returned to Senate for consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(NOTE: AS 209-86/UPLC, referred 5/19/86, deals with elimination of discordant provisions of this resolution)

| 6. Leaves with Pay | 11/5/85 | Determination of Criteria/Procedures of Leaves with Pay Guidelines to be used by the UPLC. | 12/2/85 President generally approved principles and called attention to internal conflicts between the proposals as well as conflicts with existing bylaws and returned to Senate for consideration. |

(NOTE: AS 209-86/UPLC, referred 5/19/86, deals with elimination of discordant provisions of this resolution)


<p>| 8. Students with Disabilities AS 187-85 | 12/3/85 | Instructional and testing adaptations, alterations, and accommodations determined and provided between instructor and student; services to be kept private and confidential. | 1/10/86 Forwarded to Provost Fort with request that he share resolution with school deans. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>REFERRAL DATE</th>
<th>CONTENTS OF RESOLUTION/REQUEST</th>
<th>FURTHER ACTION/RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>12/3/85</td>
<td>Recommendation that certain specific courses be included in GE&amp;B requirements.</td>
<td>1/10/86 Forwarded to Provost and Vice Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS 188-85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1/14/86</td>
<td>Recommendation that specific courses be included in GE&amp;B requirements.</td>
<td>1/10/86 Forwarded to Provost and Vice Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS 189-86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1/14/86</td>
<td>Request Chancellor's Office to remove ceiling on replacement instructional computer equipment within instructional replacement allocation.</td>
<td>1/31/86 Forwarded to Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs, Dale Hanner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS 190-86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>1/14/86</td>
<td>Recommend the Foundation divest itself of holdings in stock in corporations which operate in South Africa.</td>
<td>2/5/86 Forwarded to Foundation Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS 191-86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2/11/86</td>
<td>Request that copies of proposals be distributed to library, deans, Acad. Senate when they are distributed to the Acad. Senate Curriculum Committee.</td>
<td>2/21/86 Forwarded to Provost/Vice Provost for reaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS 192-86</td>
<td>3/10/86 WJB approved resolution but Acad. Programs Office will distribute school sets of material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2/11/86</td>
<td>Request that list of changes in curriculum be prepared by Office of Vice Provost of Acad. Programs for Academic Senate review.</td>
<td>2/21/86 Forwarded to Provost/Vice Provost for reaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS 193-86</td>
<td>3/10/86 Pres. noted separate format of changes for Acad. Senate is not possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2/11/86</td>
<td>Request President, Chancellor and Board of Trustees ensure adequate time be provided for full and meaningful consultation between adminis. and faculty on all matters of importance to University.</td>
<td>4/29/86 President responded recalled that input on Lottery Funds for CSU Task Force was origination of concern. Academic Senate Chair sent resolution directly to Chancellor and Chair of Trustees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS-195-86/EC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>REFERRAL DATE</td>
<td>CONTENTS OF RESOLUTION/ FURTHER ACTION/ REQUEST</td>
<td>FURTHER ACTION/ RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Distribution of Assigned Time</td>
<td>2/25/86</td>
<td>Recommends division of Senate assigned time for Spring 1986 and '86-'87 fiscal year.</td>
<td>2/16/86 Provost notified WJB that resolution had passed. 3/5/86 Academic Senate requested 0.4 additional FTEF for Spring 1986. 3/25/86 Forwarded to Provost for recommendations. 3/26/86 Provost notified Academic Senate that additional 0.4 FTEF has been assigned for Spring 1986.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Facilitating Curriculum Planning</td>
<td>3/4/86</td>
<td>Curric. Committee to prepare memo encouraging interdepartmental consultation on curriculum planning (spring qtr) and meet with Vice Provost's Office, school and depts. re. catalog proposals each fall qtr.</td>
<td>3/26/86 Forwarded to Provost/Vice Provost for preparation of proposed response. 4/2/86 President approved resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Guidelines for Breadth in New Bachelor's Degree Majors</td>
<td>3/4/86</td>
<td>Academic Senate is to use the &quot;Policy Guidelines for New Bachelor's Degree Majors&quot; in all reviews of new degree programs.</td>
<td>3/26/86 Forwarded to Provost/Vice Provost for preparation of proposed response. 4/2/86 President approved resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>REFERRAL DATE</td>
<td>CONTENTS OF RESOLUTION/REQUEST</td>
<td>FURTHER ACTION/RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Academic Senate Assigned Time 3/4/86</td>
<td>Request President support 0.25 FTEF for Senate Chair with Provost for (effective Summer 1986) and 0.75 FTEF for Chair, 1.25 FTEF for other Senate Council opposed needs (effective F/W/S '86-87)</td>
<td>3/86 Discussions 3/18/86 Deans recommendation. Senate resolution authorized increase of assigned time to 1.0 FTEF for academic year and 0.25 FTEF for summer quarter. 4/10/86 Academic Senate requested 2.0 FTEF for academic year and 0.25 for Summer quarter. 5/2/86 WJB notified Academic Senate that '86-87 allocations have been processed and will not be withdrawn or held up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Accuracy in Academia 3/14/86</td>
<td>Recommend President condemn efforts of Accuracy in Academia and any external organizations attempting to interfere with academic freedom.</td>
<td>4/29/86 Forwarded to Provost and Public Affairs for recommendation for public announcement. 5/12/86 WJB approved resolution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Establishment of Standing Committee on Status of Women 3/14/86</td>
<td>Request establishment of Standing Committee whose focal point is to be issues of importance to women</td>
<td>4/16/86 Referred to Director, Institutional Research 4/23/86 President endorsed standing committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS-199-86/C 80 response
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>REFERRAL DATE</th>
<th>CONTENTS OF RESOLUTION/ FURTHER ACTION/ REQUEST</th>
<th>FURTHER ACTION/ RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Bylaws for the Status of Women Standing Committee</td>
<td>3/14/86</td>
<td>Request changes to Acad. Senate Bylaws establish membership and charge of status of committee</td>
<td>4/18/86 Referred to Director, Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/23/86 President requests clarification re. part-time faculty member and committee responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/23/86 President endorsed and approved bylaws, asked Acad. Sen. to review committee's charge in a year and to work closely with EOAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Use of Lottery Funds</td>
<td>4/8/86</td>
<td>Urge President to support seven, non-prioritized uses of lottery funds; process and procedures for allocation of lottery funds received by Cal Poly be determined by the Academic Senate.</td>
<td>4/14/86 Forwarded to Vice President for Business Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/16/86 Forwarded to Provost for recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6/86 WJB noted that conditions have been included in '86-'88 catalog; blanket changes will not be made in SP grades due to workload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Time Frame for Submission of Satisfactory Progress Grades</td>
<td>4/8/86</td>
<td>SP grades be converted to &quot;F&quot; if work not completed within one calendar year for undergraduate work and two-year limitation for Master's thesis work.</td>
<td>4/16/86 Forwarded to Provost for recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6/86 WJB noted that conditions have been included in '86-'88 catalog; blanket changes will not be made in SP grades due to workload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Support and Maintenance of a Teacher Effectiveness Program</td>
<td>4/8/86</td>
<td>Request that Cal Poly establish a program to assist teachers in developing instructional competence and encourage experimentation in teacher effectiveness</td>
<td>4/16/85 Forwarded to Provost for recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>REFERRAL DATE</td>
<td>CONTENTS OF RESOLUTION/ REQUEST</td>
<td>FURTHER ACTION/ RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Giving of Finals During Finals' Week</td>
<td>4/22/86</td>
<td>Request that CAM 484 be enforced and that a list of dean-approved exceptions be made available by fifth week of quarter.</td>
<td>4/29/86 Forwarded to Provost, Vice Provost and Inst. Research Director for recommendation. 5/8/86 WJB agreed w/ general policy. Noted that deans need to be made aware of infractions and importance of peer pressure. Noted that there may be need for granting of exceptions after fifth week of quarter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Procedural Changes for MPPP Awards</td>
<td>4/22/86</td>
<td>Procedures for Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards including eligibility, criteria, applications/ nominations, selection process, timetable and general provisions.</td>
<td>4/29/86 Forwarded to Director, Personnel and Employee Relations. 5/8/86 Approved by President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Amendments to the Bylaws</td>
<td>4/22/86</td>
<td>Charge Constitution &amp; Bylaws Committee to review operating procedures of standing committees in keeping with University regulations and MOUs.</td>
<td>4/30/86 Approved by President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. PCBs at Cal Poly</td>
<td>5/16/86</td>
<td>Replace old fluorescent lamps highest priority; better communication w/ Public Safety &amp; Plant Maintenance to prevent inadvertent entry into room contaminated w/ hazardous materials</td>
<td>5/21/86 Forwarded to Vice Pres, Business Affairs for review and recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>REFERRAL DATE</td>
<td>CONTENTS OF RESOLUTION/REQUEST</td>
<td>FURTHER ACTION/RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Eliminate Discordant Provisions of UPLC Bylaws, Leave with Pay Guidelines and Academic Senate Bylaws</td>
<td>5/19/86</td>
<td>Eliminate discordant provisions of resolutions #5 and 6 above.</td>
<td>5/21/86 Referred to Provost, Director of Personnel and Employee Relations; Deans' Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Modification of CAM 619</td>
<td>5/27/86</td>
<td>Delete language of CAM 619 and substitute new policy statement re. Candidates for Graduation.</td>
<td>5/29/86 Forwarded to Provost and Associate Provost, Enrollment Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. General Education and Breadth Course Proposals</td>
<td>5/27/85</td>
<td>GE&amp;B Proposals re. AE, CONS, FOR, HE, and Biological Sci courses with ENT or CONS prefixes.</td>
<td>5/30/86 Forwarded to Provost, Vice Provost for response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. General Education and Breadth Course Proposals</td>
<td>5/30/86</td>
<td>GE&amp;B Proposals re. HUM 302 and MATH 201.</td>
<td>6/3/86 Forwarded to Provost, Vice Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Distinction between Options and Concentrations</td>
<td>5/30/86</td>
<td>Changes to be made to CAM 411 and 1988-90 catalog.</td>
<td>6/3/86 Forwarded to Vice Provost, Provost. VP provost to prepare response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Free Electives</td>
<td>5/30/86</td>
<td>Curricula of majors need not include any free electives.</td>
<td>6/3/86 Forwarded to Provost, Vice Provost for response or additional review/consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Amendment to Bylaws for the UPLC</td>
<td>6/10/86</td>
<td>Dropping of ex officio members from UPLC to be in conformity with MOU.</td>
<td>6/12/86 Forwarded to Director, Personnel and Employee Relations to review and response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>REFERRAL DATE</td>
<td>CONTENTS OF RESOLUTION/ REQUEST</td>
<td>FURTHER ACTION/ RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Recognition of Deceased Faculty</td>
<td>6/10/86</td>
<td>Title of Honored Professor to any currently employed or retired w/in previous year faculty with at least 15 years of employment at CPSU; names of all employees and retirees who have died in preceding year be read at fall convocation.</td>
<td>6/12/86 Forwarded to Director, Personnel and Employee Relations for response and any followup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Proposed Conflict of Interest Policy for Principal Investigator of Nongovernmental Sponsored Research</td>
<td>6/10/86</td>
<td>Policy intended to implement CSU Conflict of Interest Policy.</td>
<td>6/12/86 Forwarded to Provost, Director of Research Development for response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Revised Enrollment Recommendations</td>
<td>6/10/86</td>
<td>Academic Senate position of holding to 14,2000 FTE Alter process of selection/election of membership of Board of Directors of Foundation.</td>
<td>6/12/86 Forwarded to Provost, Vice Provost and Institutional Studies Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Foundation Election Process</td>
<td>6/10/86</td>
<td>Academic Senate recognize Women's Week and urge all academic departments to support Women's Week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVS/17/86**

AS-217-86 6/10/86  
Recognition of Deceased Faculty
RECOMMENDATION ON USE OF INSTRUCTION FUNDS FOR SABBATICAL LEAVES

In response to inquiries from the UPLC and the Academic Senate, referencing President Baker's willingness to subsidize sabbatical leaves (per his memo dated May 30, 1986) at a maximum of positions allocated by utilizing instructional funds other than those designated for sabbatical leaves, the Personnel Policies Committee submits the following recommendations:

1. In determining the number of sabbatical leaves available, a one-quarter leave shall be considered as a one/third of a leave position instead of one/half of a position, which is the current practice.

2. The UPLC should work with the Budget and Personnel offices to implement this change of practice.

3. Sabbatical leaves shall be granted for the period of time requested in the original application. The only exception to this would be made by the UPLC in attempting to assure that all leaves allocated would be utilized.

4. Chairs/Department heads and Deans are to be informed as to the funding available for leave replacement purposes (funds are budgeted at assistant professor, step 3) and need to recognize this financial constraint in filling leave replacement positions.

5. This change in practice is an interim measure. There is to be an evaluation made for the years 1986-87 and 1987-88 to determine the amount of instructional funds other than those budgeted for sabbatical leaves used to implement this change. This evaluation is to be provided to the Academic Senate each year, and is to be completed before non-sabbatical leave instructional funds may be used to fund sabbatical leaves for 1988-89.
Memorandum

MAY 2 1986

To: Lloyd Lamouria
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: Sabbatical Leaves

Date: April 30, 1986

Copies: Jim Landreth
Jan Pieper
Tomlinson Fort, Jr.
Malcolm Wilson

I have raised a question regarding the formulas used to determine the number of sabbatical leaves to be awarded on the campus. In response to my inquiry, Mike Suess has provided me with an explanation which I have attached to this memorandum. It appears that our interpretation of the number of leaves to be allocated may not be completely consistent with the processes used on other campuses of The California State University system. On the average, for the period between 1982 and 1985, we have spent more on sabbatical leaves than have been allocated to us since the replacement faculty costs have been higher than the budget figure of Assistant Professor, Step 3. However, it appears that we might have been able to award more sabbatical leaves by accounting for positions rather than leave awards. If this is done, our expenditures for sabbatical leaves will exceed the budget by an even greater margin. However, it appears to be permissible, although by exceeding the budgeted funds for sabbatical leaves, we reduce the funds available for other purposes in the instructional budget. Considering the high priority we place on professional development and sabbatical leaves, it may be good policy to increase the subsidy which now occurs in the sabbatical leave program.

I would like to have the advice of the Academic Senate on the method of establishing the number of sabbatical leaves to be awarded.

Attachment
Memorandum

To: Tomlinson Fort, Jr.
   Provost

via: Jan Pieper
   Director, Personnel and Employee Relations

From: Michael H. Suess
   Associate Director, Personnel and Employee Relations

Subject: Sabbatical Leave Replacement Positions

Date: April 28, 1986
File No.: replcmnt
Copies: Warren J. Baker
         James Landreth
         Malcolm Wilson
         Frank Lebens
         Rick Ramirez

Pertaining to President Baker's memo of April 25, 1986, the following information is provided.

Cal Poly has relied on the CSU Budget Formulas and Standard Manual (Orange Book) for allocating Sabbatical Leave Replacement positions. Attached is a copy of Section 1.1.2 of the latest edition dated February 2, 1986. It is my understanding that this is the same formula used during the period in question -- 1982 through 1985.

According to the above referenced standard, the number of positions (allocated) is equal to half the number of leaves (example: 15 leaves are generated by 7.5 positions). In other words, if you double the number of positions allocated in the budget you get the number of leaves. The number of leaves are then allocated to the schools.

In reviewing the chart titled "Comparison of Budgeted vs Used Sabbatical Leave Replacement Positions" (specifically the 1st and 3rd columns for each year), the number of leaves is twice the number of allocated positions for Cal Poly, as summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Positions</th>
<th># Leaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In making the allocations, Cal Poly has not distinguished between a leave for one quarter versus a leave for two quarters or for an academic year. We allow the faculty the flexibility of developing a proposal compatible with their needs. They know they have a leave; they can change the duration of the leave after their initial proposal has been approved. One quarter leaves generate full pay; two-quarter leaves generate 3/4 pay; academic year leaves generate 1/2 pay (for the faculty member on leave).
Column 2 of the Chart treats a sabbatical for 1 quarter as 1/3 position and sabbaticals for 2 quarters or 3 quarters as 1/2 position. This corresponds more directly to the pay received by the faculty member on leave. When this model is used, then the number of positions budgeted is less than positions used, as detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budgeted Pos/(Lvs)</th>
<th>Number of Leaves (Positions) For</th>
<th>Total Lvs/(Positions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 qtr</td>
<td>2 qtrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>15/(30)</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18 (5.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>15.5/(31)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14 (4.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>14.5/(29)</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>17 (5.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This difference in positions budgeted and positions used is caused by the number of faculty taking leaves for one quarter.*

An important consideration is that replacement positions are funded at the Assistant Professor, Step 3 level. The University does not place any restrictions on the appointment level of the replacements. Although replacements range from Lecturer L, Step 1 to Lecturer D, Step 5 (full Professor equivalent), the average replacement level for the period 1982-85 is summarized below:

- **1982-83** Average Lecturer B 1** (equal to Assist. Prof, Step 1)
- **1983-84** Average Lecturer C 1 (equal to Assoc. Prof, Step 1)
- **1984-85** Average Lecturer C 2 (equal to Assoc Prof, Step 2)

**In 1982-83, several replacement positions were not filled because of a school freeze on positions. The faculty who were awarded sabbatical leaves used them, but replacements were not hired. The freeze was related to the Governor's 2% budget reduction and Executive Order to reduce expenditures.**

When budgeted replacement positions are converted to actual costs, the results are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positions Budgeted</th>
<th>Equivalent Positions to Pay Actual Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions:

1. According to the budget standard, Cal Poly is appropriately using sabbatical leave replacement positions. (The budget standards have always reflected applicable differentials for quarter system campuses when they exist, but a new differential has never been identified for sabbatical leave replacements.)

2. Vacant replacement positions are funded at Assistant, Step 3. Cal Poly hires replacements above that average and is responsible for generating the difference from other sources. If we expand the number of leaves, then the costs of hiring replacements will increase without additional funds. If we can award more leaves because many faculty take a leave for only one quarter, and we continue to hire replacements above the Assistant 3 level, then this could place a greater burden on balancing the budget.

3. For 1986-87, Cal Poly has been tentatively budgeted 13.5 positions, which generates 27 leaves as summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Positions Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 quarter</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 quarters</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 quarters</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 leaves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the model that a sabbatical for one quarter equals 1/3 position is used, then the 12 leaves for one quarter would only use four positions, leaving a balance of two positions to be reallocated.

The UPLC would need to be consulted if additional leaves are reallocated. It's possible they could recommend two more leaves for two quarters and three more leaves for one quarter. Since leaves already cost more than the replacement costs allocated, Vice President Landreth should be consulted about additional resources to compensate the replacements before leaves are reallocated. At current salary levels, the additional cost would be between $52,000 and $63,768.

Attachments: Section 1.1.2 of Orange Book
CSU Comparison Chart
PROGRAM
INSTRUCTION

SUBPROGRAM
Regular Instruction

PROGRAM CATEGORY
Instructional Faculty

ALLOTMENT
Sabbatical Leave Replacement

CODE
CC-0-01-1-1-0-1-2000-0013-1

GENERAL STANDARD

1.0 leave per 12.7 teaching faculty and librarians eligible for sabbatical leave, rounded to the next whole number (example: 181 eligible generate 181 ÷ 12.7 = 14.3 rounded to 15 leaves)

Number of positions is equal to half the number of leaves (example: 15 leaves generate 7.5 positions)

GENERAL FORMULA

\[ y = \frac{ELIG \times 0.5}{12.7} \]

For all campuses

Where: ELIG is rounded to next whole number
## Comparison of Budgeted vs. Used Sabbatical Leave Replacement Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAKERSFIELD</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHICO</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINGUEZ HILLS</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESNO</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULLERTON</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYWARD</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMBOLDT</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHRIFFD</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL POLY, POMONA</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACRAMENTO</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JOSE</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAL POLY, SLO</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONOMA</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANISLAUS</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>232.0</td>
<td>227.5</td>
<td>232.5</td>
<td>223.9</td>
<td>231.5</td>
<td>224.0</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by: Anthony J. Rove  Date: 4/22/86
Background statement:

During recent months there has been increasing pressure to end the present Faculty Early Retirement Program. Because this program is popular with faculty who wish to remain active during their retirement years, it is urged that the following resolution be adopted.

AS-___-86/___

RESOLUTION ON FACULTY EARLY RETIREMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, A large number of California Polytechnic State University faculty members support the Faculty Early Retirement Program; and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Early Retirement Program is beneficial to both the faculty and the university; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the California Polytechnic State University Academic Senate take a position supporting the continuation of the current Faculty Early Retirement Program; and be it further

RESOLVED: That notification of the Academic Senate's position be communicated by the Chair of the Academic Senate to all appropriate parties.

Proposed By:
Joseph Weatherby
August 5, 1986
Memorandum

To: Lloyd H. Lamouria
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: Proceedings of the Academic Senate, May 13, 1986
ELIMINATION OF DISCORDANT PROVISIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL LEAVE COMMITTEE (UPLC) BYLAWS, LEAVE WITH PAY GUIDELINES, AND THE ACADEMIC SENATE BYLAWS (AS-209-86/UPLC)

The Academic Senate Resolution, AS-209-86/UPLC, adopted May 13, 1986 and forwarded in your memorandum of May 19, 1986 has been reviewed. The above-named revisions are generally acceptable; however, before they are approved, the following modifications to Amendments No. 4 and No. 5 are suggested, as follows:

Amendment No. 4. "Postponements from one academic year to a subsequent academic year shall not be authorized." This would allow the postponement of a leave from one quarter to another quarter within the same academic year, which is not uncommon and allows faculty some flexibility between the time of their initial application and the commencement of that leave.

With regard to Amendment No. 5, it appears that the review of applications and the interview of the leave applicants must occur on the Wednesday of Fall Quarter finals week. It is recommended that this statement be modified to read:

"Wednesday of Fall Quarter finals week - SPLC's and the LPLC shall complete its review of applications and interview all leave with pay candidates on or before this date."

In addition, it is assumed that references to Provost will be changed to Vice President for Academic Affairs.

I believe these minor modifications would clarify the UPLC Bylaws. Please let me know if there is concurrence with these suggestions.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Charles T. Andrews, Chair
      Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee

Subject: Campus Smoking Policy

Based upon your memo of March 9, 1986, regarding the need for a smoking policy for Cal Poly, the Personnel Policies Committee is forwarding the attached resolution for consideration by the Academic Senate.
WHEREAS, There is an increasing awareness of the health hazards of smoking; and

WHEREAS, There is an increasing awareness by individuals to avoid the potential hazards of being in the presence of smoking materials at any time; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That California Polytechnic State University adopt the following policies in regard to when and where smoking may occur without the smoke being offensive to others:

1. Smoking is not permitted in department, school, or other administrative offices, classrooms, laboratories, theatres, restrooms, elevators, gymnasiums or enclosed stairways. Lobbies adjacent to these areas may be designated smoking areas. All hallways adjacent to faculty offices are nonsmoking areas.

2. Smoking will be permitted in enclosed areas other than those listed above only if posted 'SMOKING PERMITTED'. An exception is made for private offices.

3. Smoking is not permitted in the library, except where specifically permitted by posted signs.

4. In eating/drinking areas seating thirty (30) or more people, no more than fifty percent (50%) of the area may be set aside and posted as a 'SMOKING PERMITTED' area. The area shall be separated and well-ventilated.

5. Smoking is not permitted during formal meetings, which includes office hours. A formal meeting is defined as an assembly of two (2) or more persons by prior announcement for the purpose of conducting business. Individuals responsible for conducting formal meetings will, if possible, arrange for breaks at least every two (2) hours to accommodate those who smoke. If the meeting is small, with no more than four (4) persons involved, then by mutual agreement an exception may be made. No exceptions are permitted during interviews.
6. Smoking may be permitted during information meetings of two (2) or more persons in the course of daily work provided there is no objection by anyone present. Casual meetings or discussion does not constitute a basis for nonsmoking if within a private office of a person who smokes.

7. Each employee is encouraged to identify his/her individual work space as either a nonsmoking or a smoking area.

8. Supervisors/managers/administrators will pursue various options in an effort to accommodate everyone's needs in their respective work areas. However, if such accommodation is not achievable, the rights of the nonsmoker shall prevail.

9. These policies are applicable to all facilities on campus, including the University Union, with exception being made for the student rooms in the resident halls.

10. For those events which are organizationally self-operated and held in the University Union or in Foundation facilities, the individual organization may present a plan to ensure compliance with the intent of these policies to the responsible managers of these facilities. In the case where no plan is presented, these policies shall be assumed as being applicable.

11. These policies are applicable to enclosed areas only, including state automotive vehicles.

Proposed By:
Personnel Policies Committee
July 8, 1986
Memorandum

To: Deans P. Bailey, D. Bruley, H. Busseier, L. Carter, G. Ding, J. Ericson, K. Walters
Lloyd Lamouria

From: Malcolm W. Wilson
Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Revised OE Model Review Committee Report

Some of you have indicated that the original date set for your reactions to the Report and Recommendations of the OE Model Review Committee does not allow adequate time for consultation with constituents. Accordingly, I am revising the date by which you are to furnish your reactions to August 11, 1986.

This action will, of course, delay formal allocations of instructional operating expense funding, but it should not complicate spending plans for the 1986/87 academic year.
Report and Recommendations
June 26, 1986

Instructional Operating Expense Model Review

Presented to
Dr. Tomlinson Fort, Jr.
Provost

by

Instructional Operating Expense Model Review Committee

James Conway - Academic Senate
Lynne Gamble - Academic Senate
Frank Lebens - Provost's Office (chair)
Walter Mark - Academic Programs
Rick Ramirez - Business Affairs
Introduction

On October 16, 1985 the Provost initiated the process for review of the instructional operating expense allocation model (see Attachment A). A committee composed of Lynne Gamble (Academic Senate), James Conway (Academic Senate), Rick Ramirez (Business Affairs), Wally Mark (Academic Programs), and Frank Lebens (Provost's Office), Chair, have worked over the last eight months to evaluate the methods currently utilized to allocate instructional operating expense funding and to produce recommendations regarding possible improvements. This is in keeping with the Provost's charge to the Committee. The original target was to have the task completed by January 1986, however, the magnitude of the task precluded reaching closure prior to this time. We are confident that the additional time devoted to seeking input from operating units and evaluating those inputs has led to a better informed set of recommendations.

Following is a description of the information sources used by the Committee in reaching the findings and conclusions that are addressed later in this report.

Sources of Information

Initial efforts concentrated on collecting data relevant to the project. Specifically, the Budget Planning and Administration Department, and the Fiscal Operations Department provided data pertaining to:

a. Budget transfers from supplies and services allotments for the 1983-84 and 1984-85 fiscal years.

b. Broadly defined categorical expenditures including chargebacks by department for 1984-85.

c. Miscellaneous course fee income and expenses for 1984-85.

d. Concurrent enrollment distributions by school for 1984-85.

The Office of the Executive Dean supplied a listing of laboratory spaces by school/department.

Inquiries to other CSU institutions relative to the methods used elsewhere to allocate operating expense funding in instruction yielded five responses. Attachment B summarizes those responses and a complete description of the San Jose State approach is available in the Provost's Office.

Schools and departments were asked to provide responses to the questions raised in Attachment C. The focus in this information gathering attempt was on changes that have affected OE needs, an identification of unmet needs, and a request for comments on the existing allocation model.

A request categorizing supplies and services expenditures over a three year period (1984/85, 1985/86, and 1986/87) for the state support budget and over a two year period (1984/85 and 1985/86) for discretionary funds was forwarded to the schools/departments via Attachment D. Previous data collection activities clearly demonstrated the need for this quantitative data.
Sources of Information (continued)

An invitation was also extended to the Graduate Studies Committee to offer comment and provide input relative to recognition of the cost of offering graduate programs within the context of the OE Model. That Committee offered no specific suggestions, but did recommend that some differentiation be made in favor of graduate programs.

On receipt and review of this collection of information sources, the Committee conducted individual discussions with each of the seven schools. The deans designated the representation from the school. The discussions with each school were of a two hour duration and were designed to address the purposes outlined in Attachment E which is a sample of the type of communication sent to each dean initiating the meetings.

As the various information was received, the Committee embarked on its assessment activities leading to an identification of the following observations and findings.

Findings and Major Observations

The Committee operated on the initial premise that the total operating expense funding available to the instructional units of the campus was inadequate to meet the perceived needs of the instructional units. The challenge, therefore, is to optimize the distribution of an inadequate resource.

The Committee also concluded early in its deliberations that no allocation method could address all of the potential variables that might influence supplies and services expenditures. Further, complexity of a Model does not necessarily serve to achieve the variables defined at departmental levels, allocation at the school level affords the flexibility for the dean to address conditions within a school. Therefore, it was concluded that it is desirable to keep the model as simple as possible while still achieving an optimal and fair distribution of resources among schools.

Utilizing the data gathered and operating on these basic premises, the committee found that:

A. Transfers from supplies and services allotments to other allotments historically have not been of significant magnitude when viewed collectively. Further it is difficult to analyze these allotments in isolation and decisions/judgements need to be exercised in the departments/schools regarding the broad base of resources. However, the Schools of Architecture and Environmental Design and Professional Studies and Education have tended to transfer funding from operating expense allocations to other allotments. In contrast the trend in the Schools of Business and Science and Mathematics has been to transfer funding into operating expense allotments to meet instructional needs.
There was no historical pattern recognizable in the other schools. One needs to be cautious in deriving conclusions based on this limited analysis and it is prudent to view these findings in context with the remaining findings.

B. Data on chargebacks for the past two years suggest that approximately 28% of instructional operating expense funding is utilized to cover the cost of chargebacks for storeroom supplies, duplicating, copy machine use, theater use, audio visual, and plant operations. It is apparent that the multiplier of three in the current model does not reflect the increasing costs of charged back expenses. It was further noted that there is some confusion regarding the chargeback for plant operation non-maintenance services. While this is a mandated chargeback, some of the schools are of the opinion that they are being charged for maintenance items as well and that there is a varying pricing structure depending on who does the negotiating. This is an issue that merits discussion between the Provost's Office and that of the Executive Dean. The chargeback for the theater facility use is also a controversial charge and should be confined to the cost of technicians to operate the specialized equipment used in the theater facility.

C. Miscellaneous Course Fee income constitutes a substantial source of income in some departments. This income is to offset costs associated with the delivery of a tangible product or service. The Miscellaneous Course Fees provide the students with an enhancement to instruction not possible with the limited OE funding.

D. A review of concurrent enrollment funding suggests that this income is to cover the incremental cost associated with offering concurrent enrollment instruction. Further, the long term prospects for continued distribution of this funding source to the schools is not good given the position taken by the Governor and the legislature this past year.

E. The inquiries to other institutions yielded information of limited use to our effort. Most of the campuses are using a historical approach to allocating OE dollars. Some choose to go into each budget cycle with open competition for the funding with varying results. Unfortunately, this approach does not always result in the funding being distributed to the high priority need areas, but to those areas where the arguments are most eloquently stated. FTE taught in various forms appears to be the most frequently used variable among campuses using a mathematical method for allocation of OE funding, but no other campus polled has given the programmatic recognition that Cal Poly does through the use of a weighting factor. Historical influences accomplish this indirectly elsewhere. The CSU systemwide allocation method fails to recognize any programmatic differentiation and allocates strictly on the basis of FTE taught regardless of mode of
instruction or nature of program. Consequently, a campus with a preponderance of FTET in low cost programs can more adequately fund its high cost programs without penalty to the low cost programs on a $/FTET basis.

F. In addition to factors already mentioned (i.e., miscellaneous course fees, impact of graduate instruction, impact of chargebacks, and concurrent enrollment funds), data received from the schools suggested that other issues that merit review include faculty development and faculty recruitment costs, non-FTE generating facilities and activities, equipment maintenance and repair, inflationary influences, accreditation costs, impact of adding new facilities, possible need for base allocation for deans office, off-the-top allocations, and cost of computing across the disciplines. The Committee attempted to assess these as well as numerous other factors in deriving the conclusions outlined below.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As a result of the review of the multiple sources of information, the Committee concluded that:

1. The inflationary influences have had a detrimental impact on all of the schools. The fact that the support budget has provided for no price increase adjustment of substance since the Proposition 13 influences which began in 1978 have been encountered has exacerbated this situation. It is apparent, however, as was the case when the OE model was last reviewed, that any one school has suffered disproportionately as a result of inflationary influences.

2. Costs associated with meeting demands of the accrediting body were reviewed across the disciplines. Changes in terms of increased costs are most evident in the School of Business. There are very specific mandates by the accrediting body to materially improve computing capabilities within the School (this has been partially achieved this year and more improvement is planned in 1986/87) and improve the level of faculty professional development. Certainly, the OE budget cannot be looked to as the entire solution to these needs, but an attempt is made in the recommended model to address the attendant costs.

3. Faculty development costs have had an increasing impact in all schools, but aside from the above mentioned need in the School of Business, it is not apparent that the situation merits separate treatment by school. It is also noted that in schools where changes due to external influences demand aggressive pursuit of faculty development opportunities, there are more possible external sources of funding which should continue to be pursued.
4. The costs of faculty recruitment continue to create burdens in the schools with hard-to-hire disciplines. There is a need to complement the already augmented recruitment funding provided to these disciplines; however, the two schools where the problem is most pronounced also have the substantial capacity for generating discretionary funding. The Committee is of the opinion that this is a logical use of this source of funding and does not view separate treatment within the OE model as advisable.

5. Sources of income associated with concurrent enrollment income sharing and miscellaneous course fees were also considered. In that concurrent enrollment income distributions are in principle designed to cover the incremental cost of offering instruction to extended education enrollees in regularly scheduled classes, it is not deemed advisable to reduce the state support budget allocation to offset all or part of this source. Further, if the mandated reversion of these monies to the General Fund continues to be the rule, this source of funding cannot be anticipated. In fact, under these circumstances given the net burden on the instruction budgets (OE and others), the University should reevaluate its position regarding offering concurrent enrollment.

With regard to miscellaneous course fees, the intent is to provide students with enhancements to instruction that would not be possible given sole reliance on the support budget. Costs are to equal income theoretically. Therefore, it is not anticipated that miscellaneous course fee income would replace support budget funding and should, therefore, not be considered as a source to reduce OE allocations in selected disciplines. The use of the miscellaneous course fee mechanism is encouraged where appropriate.

6. The issue of added costs of offering graduate level coursework was also considered. After questioning all schools regarding this issue and seeking input from the Graduate Studies Committee, it is the opinion of the Committee that this issue merits monitoring but that the major added costs are in staffing not in operating expenses. In certain disciplines there were some apparent added OE costs, but they were not deemed material enough to merit special recognition in the broad-based OE Model.

7. Computing across the disciplines was the most often cited cause of additional demands on operating expense funding. Software expenses, computing supplies, installation and site preparation costs, and equipment maintenance and repair are all associated costs that many disciplines have heretofore not experienced. Consequently, the Committee has attempted to recognize the global impact of computing costs through a portion of the recommended increase in the weighting factor applicable to total FTE taught. Since in some cases there is
7. (continued)  
not a direct relationship between computing use and FTE taught (i.e.  
the students are not using the computing capability in a regularly  
scheduled class), the Committee concluded that there was not an  
adequately documented basis for recognizing the funding need in a  
fairer manner. In disciplines where computing influences have had a  
larger than normal impact on OE expenditures, the Committee has chosen  
to recognize the added funding needs by an adjustment in the weighting  
factor applicable to non-lecture FTE taught. Again, this is with due  
recognition of the fact that not all costs are directly identified with  
an FTE generating facility or activity.

8. Other non-FTE generating facilities and activities that could be  
identified as directly complementing the FTE generating coursework has  
been treated in the same manner as the extraordinary computing costs.  
Again, in the absence of a documented measure, it was Committee opinion  
that adequate and fair recognition could be provided in this manner.

9. The last major issue that emerged through a review of all sources of  
information available to the Committee was that of chargebacks. As  
previously mentioned, the multiplier for total FTE taught does not  
produce a weighted FTE that results in adequate recognition of  
chargeback funding needs in relation to the total need. The Committee  
concludes that the majority of costs associated with lecture  
instruction are typically of a chargeback nature and, therefore, there is  
a relatively weak argument for separate recognition of lecture FTET  
within the model. Further, as was acknowledged in the previous version  
of the model, chargebacks are incurred regardless of mode of  
instruction. Therefore, any model that is purported to recognize  
chargeback funding needs should provide for these needs across all  
modes of instruction.

The Committee therefore recommends that: (a) the separate recognition of  
lecture FTET in the model be eliminated; and (b) the weighting factor  
applicable to total FTET be increased from 3 to 5 partly in recognition of the  
global impact of the cost of computing across all disciplines and partly in  
recognition of the increasing proportion of instructional costs associated with  
procuring goods and services on a chargeback basis.

The Committee supports continued use of the principle of differential allocation  
based on the varying programmatic costs associated with non-lecture  
instruction. While a more definitive breakdown by mode of instruction was  
considered, the Committee concluded that the programmatic differentiation  
objective could be met by continued use of the present approach with some  
adjustment in weighting factors. The recommended changes and the rationale for  
the changes are as outlined in Attachment F. The resultant weighting factors  
represent an attempt to rank in a relative sense the varying cost of offering  
non-lecture instruction by discipline.
The recommended model produces for each school a share of operating expense funding based on a sum of the departmentally generated shares using the following formula:

\[
\frac{\text{Departmental Weighted FTET}}{\text{Total Weighted FTET all departments}} \times \text{Total $ Available for Allocation}
\]

Where:

(a) Departmental weighted FTET = \([(\text{Non-Lecture FTET for department}) \times X] + [(\text{Total FTET for a department}) \times 5]\); and,

(b) Total Weighted FTET all departments = sum of (a) for all departments.

The results of a model utilizing this approach are as displayed in Attachment G. For comparison purposes, the allocations produced using the current model are included on that display as are the variances. Note that to more closely approximate anticipated allocation levels, the one time supplement of $96,000 in 1985/86 from a reallocation of replacement equipment funding has been excluded in the calculations. Further, FTE projections for the School of Business have been adjusted to reflect the shifts to activity mode in certain disciplines.

It is still anticipated that the school dean would make intraschool allocations including a distribution of funds to cover schoolwide and dean's office needs.

It is recommended that the initial allocation remain at 90% of the total with the remaining 10% allocated in the following January to accommodate any changes in enrollment from that predicted in the original allocation would any allocations be made from the 10% withheld prior to the formula based allocation, schools should be so advised.

The Committee also recommends that within some schools, it would be prudent to adjust some practices that may have merit but do compete with direct classroom instructional needs. Specifically, faculty research projects (most often involving students) are in some instances funded with OE dollars. At least one school, where there is a great concern for the adequacy of OE funding, has seen fit to pay for one professional membership per faculty member in one of its department. The need for multiple subscriptions in some departments and in many cases duplicating library holdings should be evaluated by each school.

The Committee also urges that before special programs are initiated, full consideration be given to all of the long-term cost implications. Specifically, institutes, centers, and off-campus offerings such as the Urban Lab and the London Study Program are activities that have resulted in unplanned net costs that compete with traditional instructional offerings for limited resources. The question, "Can we afford it at the expense of what we are already doing?" needs to be asked in each case. At most, it is recommended that institutes and centers be given no more than one year of seed funding.
The following general comments are offered relative to the impact of the OE Model changes on the individual schools:

1. **School of Agriculture**

The existing model appeared to provide this School with a fair share of OE resources, however, the generation of OE funding by department within the school merited some adjustment based on the changes noted in Attachment F. The Committee is concerned with the potential impact of any federal budget cuts that may result in State Department of Education adjustments in the funding to the Agricultural Education Department. Should these materialize as a result of Gramm-Rudman, it is recommended that the impact of the model on this department be re-evaluated.

2. **School of Architecture and Environmental Design**

Modest x-factor adjustments yield a rather substantial net reduction in the allocation to this School. However, the majority of the laboratory costs are not substantial in contrast to consumable intensive laboratories in other schools. While the net reduction is the largest incurred by any school, the allocation per FTE taught is still the largest in the entire university at a $135.77 per FTET. This contrast with other high costs schools such as Agriculture at $129.85 per FTE taught and Engineering at $116.78 per FTE taught. While it is difficult to assess in advance, the ability of the School to absorb this magnitude of reduction without greater forewarning, it is recommended that the Dean and the Provost confer to evaluate the feasibility of immediate implementation. Should the evaluation suggest that it is not practical, the Provost may wish to consider a two-stage implementation of the model adjustments over the next two years. The Committee is concerned with the cost of the Urban Laboratory and the need to augment the School for continuation of this activity which to date has apparently not produced the results anticipated.

3. **School of Business**

This School has been severely underfunded as it moves into a computerized environment. The substantial percentage increase associated with the proposed model is easily justified in terms of the relatively modest net dollar increase. With an anticipated gradual increase in non-lecture mode of instruction, the School should stand to benefit even more in the long term. Given the problem experienced with OE funding, it is recommended that the Dean evaluate certain practices within the School relative to the number of subscriptions purchased by the School for journals and periodicals and the practice of providing a membership for each faculty member in the Accounting Department utilizing School OE funds. This latter practice appears to be confined to this school.
4. School of Liberal Arts

There was little to suggest the need for a substantial increase in operating expense funding to this School relative to the other schools. However, the School has made some moves into the computing environment. In keeping with the aforementioned treatment of centers and institutes, it is also recommended that the School absorb the OE costs associated with the Center for the Arts as opposed to making this an off-the-top allocation. The increase in dollars proposed by the new Model should enable the School to respond to this need. It is also recommended that the School evaluate the costs of the London Study Program as mentioned by the Dean. The Committee is not prepared to suggest whether or not the added burden is cost justified, but rather recommends that the Provost, in cooperation with the School, evaluate that issue. It is not recommended, however, that the Program be funded at the expense of the traditional offerings in the other schools.

5. School of Engineering

This School has probably incurred the greatest operating expense dollar pressures associated with maintenance and operation of computing equipment. While the recommended model results in relatively modest increases in operating expense dollars, these dollars combined with the School's greater than average ability to generate external sources of funds should facilitate addressing the increased cost of computing.

6. School of Professional Studies and Education

Funding for the Military Science Department outside the model should reduce the operating expense pressures on the School of Professional Studies and Education (see comments on page 10). At the same time, however, the Committee felt that with two major exceptions the School overall has probably experienced fewer operating expense dollar pressures than most of the other schools. It is noted that the cost of operating two programs, Graphic Communication and Industrial Technology, have resulted in a reduced flexibility in applying the operating expense dollars.

7. School of Science and Mathematics

While the recommended model suggests a reduction in operating expense dollars to the School, a factor not previously mentioned should result in a net increase in the flexibility of OE dollars within the School. It is highly recommended, after discussions with Business Affairs, that the costs associated with hazardous waste disposal be charged to the Utility-Waste Disposal Allotment of the University and no longer be charged to departmental and School operating expense budgets. This constitutes the elimination of approximately $28,000 in operating expense burden on the
School of Science and Mathematics resulting in a net increase in the ability of the School to fund instructional applications. It is also recommended that the costs of offering a set dollar amount per faculty member for research and projects be assessed. While the Committee is not conceptually opposed to such a practice, the flexibility seems to be confined to one School.

With respect to allocations of operating expense funding made outside the model, the Committee understands the rationale for the majority of these allocations and the levels appear to be amply justified. It is recommended, however, that the Center for the Arts no longer be funded through an operating expense allocation outside the model. Likewise, the Apple Laboratory, since it will fall under the purview of the School of Professional Studies and Education much like any other specific computer lab, should be funded by the School without a continuation of supplemental OE dollars. As previously mentioned, the Military Science Department, given its unique character, should not impose a burden on any specific school and should, therefore, be considered for funding outside the Model. Detail of non-model generated be made available in an annual report to the schools.

In closing, the Committee has given substantial consideration to each of these recommendations and urges their implementation. While it is understood that a quantitatively based Model cannot be wholly responsive to all of the unique characteristics of the various disciplines, the approach taken to date and particularly with the recommended changes, does provide a fair distribution of an extremely limited resource. The Committee wishes to thank those individuals in schools and departments who expended significant time and effort in responding to our inquiries. We feel that these inputs have led to recommendations that will be in the general interest of the instructional units on campus.

Frank T. Lebens - Chair date

Lynne Gamble date

Walter Mark date

Rick Ramirez date

James Conway date
## COMMITTEE/SENATE VACANCIES

### Senate Vacancies (appointed term 1986-87)
- **SSM**
- **SSM** 2 vacancies
- **ASI**
- **Academic Deans** 1 replacement for Richard Saenz
- **Temporary Faculty** 2 representatives (ex officio, nonvoting)

### Campuswide Committees (appointed term 1986-88)
- **Energy Conservation Committee**
  - 1 representative

### Academic Senate Standing Committees
(Appointed terms are 1986-88 for schools/1986-87 for others)
- **Budget**
  - SPSE
  - ASI
- **Constitution & Bylaws**
  - SPSE
  - ASI
- **Curriculum**
  - ASI
- **Disting Teach g Awards**
  - ASI (2 members)
- **Elections**
  - SSM
- **Fairness Board**
  - ASI (2 members)
- **GE&B**
  - ASI
  - Curriculum Committee Representative
- **Instruction**
  - ASI
- **Library**
  - SSM
  - ASI
- **Long-Range Planning**
  - ASI
- **Personnel Policies**
  - ASI
- **Research**
  - ASI
- **Status of Women**
  - SBUS
  - SPSE
  - ASI
- **Student Affairs**
  - SSM
  - ASI
  - Dean of Students or his Designee
June 5, 1986

TO: Bernard Goldstein, Chair
Academic Senate CSU

FROM: Hiden T. Cox, Chairman
Academic Senate

SUBJECT: Faculty Workload (AS-263-86/FLR)

At its meeting of May 15, 1986, the California State University, Long Beach, Academic Senate approved the enclosed resolution on faculty workload asking that direct instructional activity be reduced from 24 units per academic year to 18. You will note that item 2, of the resolved clause requests that the Academic Senate CSU adopt a similar resolution.

This request is being transmitted to you for your response as appropriate.

HTC:mm
Enclosure

cc: Local Senates/Councils
    Stephen Horn
WHEREAS, the recently revised mission statement for the CSU states that "the CSU provides an environment in which scholarship, research, creative, artistic and professional activity are valued and supported"; and

WHEREAS, the new Memorandum of Understanding for faculty is now being drafted; therefore be it

RESOLVED: 1. The Academic Senate of California State University, Long Beach strongly recommends that the faculty workload allocated to direct instructional activity be reduced to 18 units per year, and that the number of units in the reduction be allocated to scholarship, research, creative, artistic and professional activity.

2. This resolution shall be communicated to the Academic Senate CSU with the request that it adopt a similar resolution.

3. This resolution shall be communicated to the Chancellor of The CSU, the CSU Board of Trustees, and the California Faculty Association.
Memorandum

MAY 12 1986

To: Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
   President

Subject: Request for Reaction and Recommendations to a Draft Reformulation of the President's Council.

Several years ago we modified the multi-council structure of consultation to focus more on the collegial role of the Academic Senate in deliberations, advice, and counsel on matters of importance to the University.

The Academic Affairs Council and the Administrative Affairs Council were abolished, and the Student Affairs Council was reconstituted to include student representatives from each school student council along with ASI Executive representatives. Administrative liaison exists with the Academic Senate committees to foster collegiality, to provide information, to seek formal and informal advice on issues facing the University, and to provide an administrative perspective in committee deliberations.

It is my own view that the President's Council should be reconstituted in line with the changes described above to foster the goals of more timely and effective consultation, mutual understanding of processes, and more expeditious and informed decision making which we have often discussed during this past year.

The function as described in the attached draft would result in the preparation of a "calendar of consultation" which would identify all known items requiring consultation and decisions. The calendar I envision would indicate the specific point at which consultation should begin, the process by which the consultation will occur, and the date at which a decision based on that consultation is required. The object will be to provide the maximum amount of lead time possible for consultation and to achieve clarity regarding process and accountability.

You will note that under membership the chairs of a number of standing committees of the Academic Senate have been listed. This listing is not intended to be preemptive. You may well have in mind another configuration and I would welcome your suggestions in that regard. It will also be appropriate from time to time to include, by invitation, individuals whose area of responsibility and expertise is particularly germane to topics on the agenda. In determining membership, it is important to maintain the primary focus of coordination and information flow, and to hold members responsible for keeping their individual constituencies informed.

I believe the reformulation of the President's Council combined with an active agenda and meeting schedule will effectively move us toward improved collegiality. Please let me know at your earliest convenience your reactions and suggestions.
17. President's Council

a. Functions

This council serves as an information exchange forum and coordinating body. Particular emphasis is provided in scheduling of meetings and setting of agendas to provide for communication, understanding, and integration of consultation among campus constituent groups on planning and resource issues. The primary focus of the council is to assure that issues are raised in a timely manner and that all campus groups are aware of the timelines and consultative processes that will be utilized in reaching a decision on any given issue. Agendas for the council will include information which assures that constituent groups are aware of the outcome of the consultation.

In appropriate instances, the President may request advice and seek recommendations from the council.

b. Membership

members

President (Chairperson)
Vice President, Academic Affairs (Vice Chair)
Vice President, University Relations
Vice President, Business Affairs
Vice President, Information Systems
Dean of Students
Vice Provost (working title not yet determined)
Dean, School of Agriculture
Dean, School of Architecture and Environmental Design
Dean, School of Business
Dean, School of Liberal Arts
Dean, School of Engineering
Dean, School of Professional Studies and Education
Dean, School of Science and Mathematics
Director, Instructional Resources
Director, Personnel and Employee Relations
Executive Dean, Facilities Administration
Foundation Executive Director
Associate Executive Vice President (Secretary) (working title not yet determined) (non-voting)

Educational Equity Officer
Chairperson, Equal Opportunity Advisory Council
Chairperson, Academic Senate
Vice Chairperson, Academic Senate
Chair, Academic Senate Budget Committee
Chair, Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Chair, Academic Senate Long Range Planning Committee
Chair, Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
Chair, Academic Senate Research Committee
President, Associated Students, Inc.
Vice President, Associated Students, Inc.
Chair, Student Affairs Council, Budget Committee

Visitors on invitation
c. Meetings

At least monthly -- frequency dependent upon timing of agenda items.
Thank you for your memo of May 9 inviting comment on a Draft Reformulation of the President’s Council.

Since it is not clear from your memo that you are soliciting my recommendations directly, or that of the Academic Senate through me—and since I do not know the time frame, my comments are in the absence of Academic Senate consultation. If your proposal is expected to receive full Academic Senate review (which it should), would you please advise me at the earliest opportunity?

Based upon my participation in meetings relevant to this matter, and chaired by our Vice President for Business Affairs, and attended by our Budget Officer, Director of Operations; Chair of the Academic Senate Budget Committee and myself as Chair of the Academic Senate, I offer the following preliminary comments:

A. We have an acknowledged need for faculty consultation, and coordination of consultation received from all campus segments, to form the basis for a sound decision making process. Traditional roles are changing. For example, Academic Senate committees, such as the Budget Committee whose traditional role has been in the resource allocation area, are increasingly becoming involved in programmatic matters.
B. The objective herein is to develop an organizational model which will facilitate the coordination and allocation of responsibility in the collegiate governance of the University.

C. In light of the above criteria, which admittedly is not your criteria, the draft Reformulation of the President's Council appears to have the following serious weaknesses:

1. As a purely informational body, the proposed President's Council would have no end product responsibility, nor would it provide the Executive branch of our University a basis for determining its own accountability. With this being the case, it then has no basis for evaluating its own effectiveness.

2. With a membership of 31 persons, the proposed President's Council would provide an overbalanced representation of the major constituencies on this campus. To the best of my knowledge, there are approximately a dozen entities which could meaningfully contribute recommendations on any matter at this final level. In this regard, a membership of 30 persons, excluding the chair, is unnecessary, unwieldy and inefficient from the viewpoint of time commitment and cost to the campus.

3. It is my considered opinion that the Draft Reformulation of the President's Council would not solve the problem that has been identified in the decision-making process. Accordingly, the campus would be required to continue efforts directed at the establishment of an appropriate coordinating resource allocation council.

A calendar of consultation would prove useful. However, with all due respect, we do not need a body of 30 persons to develop the calendar. We can not afford false startups. In the true spirit of collegiality, I offer the full services of the Academic Senate in the development of an effective operational model.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Jens Pohl, Chair, Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Proposed New Budgetary Process Model for Cal Poly

The Budget Committee at its meeting on Tuesday, May 6, 1986, unanimously M/S/P that the attached resolutions prepared by the Ad Hoc Committee on Budgetary Process be "forwarded to the Chair of the Academic Senate as a preliminary report to initiate discussion within the Academic Senate and in conjunction with the President."

Attachment (1)
Background

In a memorandum dated December 13, 1984, the Chancellor transmitted the Board of Trustees policy that committees which include faculty and students should exist to advise the President on budget policy, planning, and resource allocation. This policy involved the total budget of the campus as well as the resource allocations of all programs.

The current resource allocation process at Cal Poly does not permit faculty and student input into the budgetary process prior to the approval of the University budget. This current process is neither an open nor a formal process. Furthermore, program evaluations as well as long range planning should be an integral part of this resource allocation process.
Resolution on the Budget Process

Whereas, The resource allocation process should be an open and formal process, and

Whereas, The faculty, staff, and students of the University should be permitted input into the budgetary process prior to the approval of the University budget, therefore be it

Resolved: That an Allocation Committee shall be established and shall be charged with the recommendation of a University budget, and further

Resolved: That a committee of the Allocation Committee called the Budget Development Committee shall be established and charged with preparing a University budget for consideration by the Allocation Committee, and further

Resolved: That the following approximate interim timetable be established:

Approximate Interim Timetable

OCTOBER: Program centers submit short-term and long-range priorities to the Allocation Committee.

NOVEMBER: Hearings held for selected program centers. Either the program center or the Allocation Committee may request a hearing.

DECEMBER: All program centers submit resource requests to the Allocation Committee.

DECEMBER/JANUARY: Allocations of faculty positions made to the schools excluding enrichment, new programs, research and development, and a reserve.

FEBRUARY/MARCH: Budget Development Committee prepares budget.

APRIL/MAY: Allocation Committee recommends budget to the President.

MAY/JUNE: President reviews budget.

JULY: President issues budget.
Resolved: That during the first year of the phasing in of the process that:

1) The following members shall serve on the initial Allocation Committee.

   Chair or designated member of the Academic Senate Budget Committee
   Chair or designated member of the Academic Senate Long Range Planning Committee
   Chair or designated member of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
   Chair of the Academic Senate or designated member of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
   Chair or designated member of the Program Evaluation Committee (if approved)
   Two members of the Faculty chosen by the Academic Senate
   Vice President for Academic Affairs
   One member of the Deans' Council
   Vice President for Business Affairs
   Executive Dean
   Dean of Students
   Vice Provost for Academic Programs
   Associate Provost for Information Systems
   Vice President for University Relations
   Director of Personnel and Employee Relations
   ASI President or Designees
   Controller of the ASI

2) The Allocation Committee and the President shall establish the Budget Development Committee.

3) The Allocation Committee shall determine policies and procedures for implementing this budgetary process.

4) These policies and procedures shall be subject to approval by the Academic Senate.

5) These policies and procedures shall be subject to approval by the President.

6) As much of the above approximate interim timetable be used as is practical and possible.
Resolution on Program Evaluation

Whereas, Program evaluations should be an integral part of University planning and resource allocation, and

Whereas, There is currently no formal program evaluation process, therefore be it

Resolved: That a committee be formed to establish policies and procedures for implementing program evaluations for all units of the University, and further

Resolved: That these policies and procedures be subject to approval by the Academic Senate, and further

Resolved: That these policies and procedures be subject to approval by the President, and further

Resolved: That these program evaluations be made available to the Allocation Committee and other committees as necessary.
Resolution on Long Range Planning

Whereas, Long range planning is an integral part of University planning and resource allocation, and

Whereas, There is currently no formal unified campus long range planning, therefore be it

Resolved: That a committee be charged to establish policies and procedures for implementing long range planning for all units of the University, and further

Resolved: That these policies and procedures be subject to approval by the Academic Senate, and further

Resolved: That these policies and procedures be subject to approval by the President, and further

Resolved: That any reports concerning long range planning shall be made available to the Allocation Committee and other committees as necessary.
1. Balance of 24.8 faculty positions were allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Coaching</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Health Emergency Leave Reserve</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Assigned Time</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Education</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost's Reserve</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Other Summer Quarter category allocations includes 15.0 quarter or 5.0 annualized positions to Provost's Reserve.

3. 213.9 FTEF Quarter positions equates to 71.3 FTEF annualized positions.

4. Balance of 20.1 Instructional Administrative positions allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Deans</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost's Staff</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Admin. Assignments</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Education</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies/Student Teacher Coord.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Athletics</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Other technical/clerical/student assistant include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Theatre Facility, Daily, Student Teacher Placement</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Information Systems</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Athletics</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Academic Affairs Offices</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) General Offices</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Academic Senate</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Student Affirmative Action</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Library</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Radiation Safety</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Other Admin.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Other supplies and services funding allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Academic Programs</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Educational Services</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Academic Senate</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) International Education</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Theatre (facility)</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Campus Service Cards</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Copyrights (BMI/ASCAP)</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Radiation Safety</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Center for the Arts</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) ELM Testing</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Hazardous Waste Disposal</td>
<td>2,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Apple Lab</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) Athletics</td>
<td>60,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) Provost Reserve for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$151,728</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

Academic Senate

To: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: July 29, 1986

From: Charles H. Dana, Associate Professor
Computer Science Department

Subject: Comments On Revision of Operating Expense Model

After I substituted for Bill Forgeng at last month’s meeting I took the liberty of reading the OE report before I passed it on to him. In my report to him about the meeting, I got a bit carried away with my comments on the Operating Expenses model -- I ended up dreaming up two possible alternative models. Bill and I thought that it would be useful for you to see this in preparation for your discussion next week.

Comments on Proposed Model

I think there is one fundamental flaw in the model. The report talks about the cost of introducing computers into the classroom and they change some X factors to take increased computer usage into account. The problem, as the committee recognized, is that the X factor is applied only to non-lecture units taught and much computer usage is not via scheduled labs or activities, but rather as an out-of-class assignment in lecture classes. The model does not have any mechanism to account for equipment that is shared in a walk-in basis by many courses whose individual usage of the equipment would not justify a whole unit of lab activity.

The problem is most obvious (to me at least) with computer usage, but it applies to other types of equipment, too. Say there is a language lab to help foreign language students that need extra help, stocked with tape players, maybe even video equipment or even computers(!). Not everyone in the class could use it so you can’t justify a lab unit as part of any one course, but the lab has expenses such as tapes, machine maintenance, printing instruction sheets on how to use the lab, etc. (I’m not a foreign language instructor so I don’t know all the costs such a lab could generate, but you get the idea).

The committee on page 6 of their report recognized this problem, but says there is no “adequately documented measure” of need. I think I have found a way to measure the need. The report says that “the students are not using the computing capability in a regularly scheduled class”. Actually, the students are using the equipment for a regularly scheduled class -- it just is a lecture class rather than a lab class. Computers are typically used to do assignments outside of class, more in the style of a homework assignment than a lab exercise with someone watching. The usage would be hard to document on a class by class basis, but if we look at the equipment itself we can find a well-documented
measure of where the costs are generated. Maintenance and repair of equipment is easily correlated with equipment cost and equipment cost is documentable (including fair market value of donations -- they compute that when we get the donations.) One could also argue that consumables cost more on expensive machines than on less expensive ones, but that is probably less strongly correlated.

The whole philosophy behind having a model is that it describes where the expenses are being generated and that distributions of expense money should be based on those areas where the expenses are generated. I think the current model's form was originally well constructed to fairly do just that. When the model was originally created the only places that had extra-ordinary expenses were the labs and activities. The model realizes that and deals with it well, even down to considering the different levels of consumables needed for a chem lab vs a physics lab (for example). The problem is that the use of equipment that has maintenance and consumables needs has spread beyond the lab and activity courses thus generating expenses beyond the model's assumptions. Not all the expenses are correlated to SCU taught. Reality has invalidated an important assumption of the model. Thus I feel that what the committee did is useless because the little bit across the board to everybody and the minor X factor adjustments don't match the actual sources of the expenses.

If the model does not reflect where the costs are coming from, then people will tend to bend the way classes are taught in order to fit the model. It would be much better to change the model to fit reality. The problem then becomes the formula to use. I propose two possibilities below -- I'm sure there are many others -- that take into account equipment-generated expenses. The recognition of equipment needs separate from lab courses is not unique to me: DIS has realized this for computer workstation space. They have circulated a draft standard for space to put non-SCU-generating computer workstations. The standard says that you should get such and such space based on the number of workstations you have.

The dollar implications of all this are most obvious in computer science -- we use computers more than any other department but our OE expenses are $30 below the campus average even after the committee's changes! However, the implications would be even MORE important to those non-traditional computer users that these changes are designed to help -- English for example. Computer Science after all has such a heavy load of computer usage we could justify, at least in terms of the number of hours students put in, converting most courses into labs. On the other hand, computer usage in a typical English course, for example, would usually not be extensive enough to justify an extra lab unit. Just looking at historical data will probably not show the need in these "non-tradtional" departments -- they are just now getting the computers so it would not show up in past dollar amounts spent. Computer Science's experience is just a magnified and early view of the troubles these other departments will soon be encountering.

While I'm on my soapbox, let me say that all these arguments apply to the other formulas used around here, too. Most notably, equipment needs space to put it (as DIS has recognized for computer workstations) and staff to install, maintain, and run it. Also, computers and other electronic equipment are showing up in many non-traditional places on campus. I have noticed even the library learning resources room has several computers
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now; has anyone thought of maintenance and replacement money for them? All budget areas should be reviewed to see if original assumptions of need have changed. (I’m not accusing anybody of not doing it, because I do not know if any such reviews have or have not been performed. I’m just saying they should be if they have been overlooked or postponed.)

Two possible formulas

Maintenance and repair costs are probably the biggest expense items that would be required by the equipment, but software, paper, toner for laser printers, tapes for video player (to expand beyond computer examples), etc. are also significant. I don’t know the best way of measuring the equipment differences but original dollar value of the equipment might be good since maintenance and repair expenses are usually correlated to the original cost of the machine. Note this must be for donated as well as state-purchased equipment since most donated equipment does not come with maintenance supplied. The biggest limit to accepting donated equipment is that we can’t afford the maintenance because it would have to come from our normal budget! Certainly the state is getting a good deal if it just puts up a small fraction of the equipment’s cost to keep it running and it should encourage such donations rather than being a hinderance to them.

Both formulas below are based first on identifying the original dollar value of equipment for which a department is responsible for maintenance and repair costs. Equipment that is maintained by other campus entities or for which maintenance and repair services were supplied as part of the donation would not be counted. This information should be readily available since equipment is already inventoried. Equipment in existing lab rooms with scheduled labs could be included in this sum if you adjusted the X factors to reflect only the relative cost of consumables used in labs and activities. Alternatively, equipment used in scheduled lab rooms could be excluded from the above sum and the X factors left as they are now. Equipment of a mixed nature, used partly for scheduled lab courses and partly by lecture courses would then be prorated based on the percentage of time used in each mode (lecture course time = time room open minus time devoted to lab time).

Both formulas are somewhat self-adjusting as opposed to a set of department by department weighting factors. As departments get more equipment (and as the equipment changes in complexity and expense over time) the equipment values will change and thus the proportions of the allocated expenses will change without administrative intervention to change X factors. There are one or two numbers that must be set, but they are set globally for all departments and it is, I think, easy to see what they represent. Like all models these would have to be monitored and reviewed periodically. Auditing may also be appropriate to verify that equipment used in the computations is actually in use rather than sitting in some storage room.
Formula 1:

- Use some percentage of the equipment value as the amount needed for maintenance and repair and some minimum amount of consumables.
- Sum up the totals from each department and school and then take that amount from the operating expense money, up to some percentage limit of the operating expense money (to prevent this equipment-oriented allocation from monopolizing all of the operating expense budget).
- Prorate each department’s equipment expense allocation according to its proportion to the total equipment expenses.
- Allocate the remaining operating expenses via the existing formula.

Numbers that can be adjusted:

1. percentage used to compute maintenance and repair expenses for the equipment. (from step a) This can be measured from historical campus and industry data on such expenses as well as examining service contract rates on various types of equipment.
2. percentage of total expenses allowed to be allocated via equipment as opposed to FTET (from step b). This is a somewhat political number so that no department is starved of resources and no department can monopolize them all via equipment.

Expenses still not clearly covered:

Consumables used in lecture sections that are more expensive per student than the average assumed in the model.

Example*:

If a department has $500,000 worth of equipment out of a total of $10,000,000 and we assume 4% of equipment value for maintenance and repair (step a) and a maximum of 25% of operating expense money can go for these expenses (step b) and total operating expense money is 1,362,734 (as used in the committee report) then

- the limit on equipment-oriented expenses is: $340,683 (.25 * 1,362,734)
- 5% of equipment value is: $400,000 (.04 * 10,000,000)
- the 25% limit applies and we prorate the dept’s share of equipment
- the department gets
  equipment-oriented expenses of: $17,034 (.05 * 340,683)
  plus: 75% of what existing model gives it
- the department gains if the existing model gives it less than $68,136

*all numbers are for illustration purposes only, I am not recommending any particular value for the adjustable numbers and I have no good idea of the magnitude of the departments’ equipment holdings.
Formula 2:

a. Sum up each department's equipment cost then compute each department's fraction of the total.

b. Multiply the equipment-cost fraction from step a by some number to scale them with the X factors and FTET used in the existing formula.

c. Use the number from step b as a weighting factor for the lecture FTET for each department similar to the X factors now used but they would be computed automatically based on the equipment inventories.

d. Use the modified formula in the same way that the existing formula is applied.

Numbers that can be adjusted:

1. Number used to scale a department's fraction of equipment into a factor for FTET weighting (from step b) Adjustment of this one number would be based on the cost of maintaining the equipment and how much of the operating expenses people are willing to allocate to equipment maintenance and repair. This one number would is roughly equivalent to the two number of formula 1, but the way to set it fairly is perhaps less clear.

Expenses still not clearly covered:

Consumables used in lecture sections that are more expensive per student than the average assumed in the model.

Example*:

If a department has 5% (1/20) of the total departmental equipment (as computed from step a) and the equipment multiplier of step b is 60 then the X units computed for that department would be (note: 3 = 60 times 1/20)

\[ 5 \times \text{Total-FTET} + 3 \times \text{Lecture-FTET} + \text{Dept-X-factor} \times \text{Non-Lect-FTET} \]

*all numbers are for illustration purposes only, I am not recommending any particular value for the adjustable numbers and I have no good idea of the magnitude of the departments' equipment holdings.