I. The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Lezlie Labhard, in room #220 of the University Union at 3:15 PM.

II. All members were present except: Bill Krupp, Doral Sandlin, Leonard Wall, Max Wills, Hugo Hurtado.

Members with excused absence: Barton Olsen.

Guests in attendance: John Culver.

III. The minutes for the meetings of Nov. 18 and 25 were approved.

IV. President Kennedy's Presentation and Questions/Answers

President Kennedy first responded to three written questions from the Senate.

Question 1: It has been said that only 75% of the funds allocated for promotion at Cal Poly last year were actually used for promotions. Is this true, and if so, upon what basis was this action justified?

Answer: The report is not true. The facts for last year are these:

The 60/40 ratio was eliminated in April of 1974. The initial 1974-75 promotion allocation for Cal Poly was $55,320. We justified our request for more funds and were given an additional $8,196 for a total of $63,516. The total was used to fund promotions to 25 Professor and 63 Associate Professors, a total of 88 promotions, one of the largest promotion packages in the system.

For the current 1975-76 school year we received $67,058 for faculty promotions. This resulted in promotion of 35 to Full Professor and 47 to Associate Professor. (The $67,058 allowed Cal Poly to grant all recommended promotions at all levels plus two that were awarded as a result of grievance actions.)

The projected allocation for 1976-77 is $57,308 at this time. Only four campuses have received a higher allocation of funds for promotions in the 1976-77 cycle. Fourteen received less. A memo dated 12-5-75 containing faculty promotion budgeting information has been sent to campus administrators and the Academic Senate.
More information is to come from the Chancellor's Office regarding promotions. There is a systemwide task force, including statewide Senate representatives, that is studying promotion budget policy, in conjunction with the Department of Finance.

**Question 2:** Can Cal Poly upgrade the entrance requirements of entering students?

**Answer:** Not unless the Education Code and Title 5 are changed, affecting all institutions based on the State's master plan for higher education. Only when a program becomes impacted on a systemwide basis, such as in the School of Architecture and the department of Graphic Communications, can special procedures for admission, such as interviews during the selection process, be used.

**Question 3:** So long as student utilization hours per day remains the prominent criteria for facilities construction, what hope if any is there for unique facilities needed by programs such as agriculture to be expanded and improved, particularly in the light of limited budgetary support?

**Answer:** Facilities can be justified on a basis other than student utilization. For example, Cal Poly's projected faculty office building has nothing to do with student utilization. Proof of need must be made strong enough to justify the budgetary allocation, as was the case in the $6.5 million Life Science Building. I think we will get the faculty office building.

The President then answered questions from the Senate floor.

**Question:** (N. Eatough) What did you have in mind as alternatives to rank ordering for promotions?

**Answer:** I do not recall that I had any. I wanted to know if there were any.

**Question:** (N. Eatough) Was dollar allocation at the department or school level considered?

**Answer:** Basically it was done in that way. The money was allocated to schools. Each school was to develop its priorities. There was not enough money to fund promotions for everyone who was eligible, but there was a good chance that within the school framework there was enough to promote all of those recommended in the 1974-75 academic time frame.

**Question:** (P. Murphy) Can money be interchanged between categories of Full Professor promotions?

**Answer:** The total amount for 1976-77 is $57,308 with no breakdown. We don't know what the percentage will be.

**Question:** (R. Hutton) Will the promotion money be allocated to schools this coming year or will school committees have to worry about possible criteria that might be applied to develop their single university-wide list on promotion priorities?

**Answer:** We have to be concerned about the systemwide regulations. Our Cal Poly policy depends on that. The task force, the statewide Academic Senate, and the various faculty employee organizations will be making input into the systemwide decision.
Question: (B. Brown) Do you envision on this campus any tangible criteria creeping into promotion-retention considerations, such as, numbers of publications, numerical scores on student evaluations?

Answer: I hate to think that we would fall back on something that has been described by most critics of higher education procedures over the last hundred years as a pretty poor way of making decisions about promotions—when they measured the quantity of publications based on a so-called measured amount of research that the individual did. I think we have to be pretty careful that we don't fall into a trap of trading off something which, while subjective, is at least based upon what we value at this institution: teaching performance in the classroom.

Question: (B. Brown) Have you changed any of your original opinion regarding directives on student evaluations of faculty?

Answer: A properly conducted student evaluation, which can be quantified in some way, is and should be a help to the tenured faculty committee in evaluating the faculty individual.

Question: (D. Saveker) What is the most difficult task in maintaining a quality faculty at this university?

Answer: Budgetary concerns and workloads relative to overenrollment. While we are understaffed and we have a heavier workload than we ought to have, Cal Poly ranks eighth within the system on the student/faculty ratio. If the smallest campuses are excluded, Cal Poly would rank fifth of the remaining 16 campuses in terms of the most favorable student/faculty ratio. A special advisory committee on faculty staffing, including two members from Cal Poly, has been working to get back some semblance of a staffing formula recognizing different levels and modes of instruction. There are no objective standards for faculty budgeting in the system. For years we have used the faculty staffing formula in developing requests for faculty. We have not used the student/faculty ratio. Allocations to departments are made by the school deans on the basis of departmental requests and recognizing any funding reductions or shifts in enrollment that may occur.

Question: (T. Buffa) The student/faculty ratio keeps going up. I keep hearing the comment that we are comparatively about average within the system, and better off than before.

Answer: I have never said that we were better off than several years ago. We are at approximately 17.5 student/faculty ratio now. We have done better comparatively than many other campuses at retaining what we have; we have not lost as much as some of the others. The Department of Finance decided several years ago to go off the faculty staffing formula because auditors found the formula was being misused on some campuses. Subsequently, the simple student/faculty ratio was established by the Department of Finance and they dictate what the ultimate ratio will be. We have been fighting since 1971 to get back some objectivity in the formula.

Question: (L. Hughes) Do you feel that it is always necessary to defend your decisions when those decisions are criticized by a few public officials?
Answer: Yes. Not to provide a rationale or explanation leaves people with no other information to counteract whatever was said, which may be inaccurate or untrue.

Question: (J. Weatherby) Do you foresee a rollback of student enrollment due to community pressure?

Answer: A rollback means faculty and staff layoff. I have been told that it has been suggested by a local public official that enrollment at Cal Poly be cut back to 8,000 students. Obviously, I don't favor an enrollment reduction which would necessitate layoff of faculty and staff.

Question: (N. Jorgensen) Can we anticipate any kind of a budgetary freeze?

Answer: We don't know. The Department of Finance has decided that the next budget will maintain the present program. There is a real question whether any program improvements will be included in the budget. It was proposed that $10 million in Program Change Proposals be deleted from the budget at the October 22 Board of Trustees meeting. At the November 25 meeting, Chancellor Dumke presented a revision (acceptable to the Council of Presidents) which deleted $5.2 million from the total. I object to this kind of budget submission to the Department of Finance. The budget should be submitted based on the proper amount of funding for programs the Trustees believe are appropriate.

Question: (D. Saveker) In projecting budgets, do you see the possibility of shortfalls being made up by tuitions?

Answer: We are closer to that now that we have been at any time in the history of the system.

Question: (T. Kersten) Is it reasonable to assume that we are likely to have insufficient budget support for many areas of our institutional functions, especially professional support budget?

Answer: It depends on whether or not you think our budget is sufficient now. If you think the budget is insufficient, it will be difficult to beef it up when the political temper is as it currently is on increasing taxes. We are going to have to solicit as much private support as we can.

Question: (P. Murphy) Will the search for funds from private sources ever impede support from public sources?

Answer: I don't think you should worry about that. I am more worried about getting private funding support.

V. Reports

A. Statewide Senate (Murphy) - Next year there will be no transfer of promotion funds between campuses when one campus does not use its total allocation.

B. Administrative Council (Weatherby) No Report.
C. Academic Council (Saveker) - Business Items Passed:
   1. Final Report Following Sabbatical Leaves

D. Foundation Board (Labhard) (Attachment V-D)

E. President's Council (Labhard) - The architecture building is two months behind schedule.
   The Council was alerted to the dangers of the Highland entrance to campus.
   Computer registration is out for now for lack of funding. The foundation has been cited for safety regulations.
   The trustees have declared an "enrollment emergency" and have asked the department of finance for a $2 million allocation to offset this.
   Cal Poly would get about 7% of this money total.

F. Consultative Committee for the Selection of Dean of Science and Math (Eatough) The deadline for application has been extended to March 1.

VI. Committee Reports

A. Budget (Nielsen) - No Report.
B. Curriculum (Sullivan) - No Report.
C. Election (Buffa) - Election in progress, ballots to be counted at 5:10 today.
D. Instruction (Greffenius) - The committee will be making a recommendation on Credit-No Credit for graduate level programs with Internships. The committee will soon be distributing a random questionnaire on final examination policy. The committee has set aside until a later date the Statewide Senate Resolution on defining grades.
E. - N. No Reports.

VII. Business Items

A. Academic Promotions CAM 342.2 (After 60/40, What?) (Beecher) - It was M/S/P (Eatough) to refer the matter back to the Personnel Policies Committee for further study until the March meeting of the Academic Senate.
   It was noted that this action would make the proposed change in CAM 342.2 ineffective for this year.

The meeting was adjourned by the Chair, Lezlie Labhard, at 4:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Jennings
Foundation Board (Labhard)

The Board approved the following: monetary coverage of x-ray technologists on weekends (Health Center); reassignment of a foundation vehicle to aero-engineering (vehicle is too expensive for foundation to maintain); purchase of two used pickup vehicles for Foundation Facilities Services; acceptance of a cash gift from the Bank of America for youth debates; a leave of absence request by Clyde Hostetter, C/M/P; a cash gift from Finch for Biological Sciences (for graduate research in plant pathology); and purchase of a heat exchanger and two power regulators for the cafeteria. The following reports were received: gift report, comparison report of medical charges (Health Center, local hospitals, pharmacy charges), Auxiliary and Business Services Report - CSUC, and the Internal Audit Staff Report - Trustees Office ("The results of our review of the Cal Poly Foundation are encouraging in every respect."

The one item deferred was the proposed C/M/P CAM Policy Statement. The Cal/OSHA Foundation Hearing was held last week; it will be some time before results are heard.