CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, January 24 2012
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: The minutes of January 3, 2012 were approved as presented.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: FernfLOres announced that Ruth Black, Director for the new CSU
      Online Initiative, is scheduled to attend the February 28 Academic Senate meeting. In
      addition, details are being worked out for possible visits from Faculty Trustee Bernadette
      Cheyne and Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom.
   B. President’s Office: Kinsley reported that CSU Trustee Margaret Fortune will be visiting
      Cal Poly on April 10, 2012. The CSU Student Trustee will be attending the CSSA meeting
      in May. On February 29, all students will be asked to vote on the student success fee in a
      referendum. More information and the schedule of forum dates is available at
      www.my.calpoly.edu.
   C. Provost: Koob announced that the Academic Senate Budget and Long Range Planning
      Committee met with staff from the Provost’s Office to discuss and identify elements of a
      new budget model. In addition, Provost Koob thanked everyone for their commitment and
      civility in which Academic Senate business is conducted and reiterated what a pleasure it
      has been to serve on the Academic Senate.
   D. Statewide Senate: Foroohar reported that due to a reduction in assigned time of the
      statewide senators, two statewide senators have resigned and several others have chosen to
      reduce their participation in standing committees. There has been an ongoing debate
      between the CSU and the Chancellor’s Office on the role of faculty in initiatives with
      major impact over curricular issues. The majority of senators have voiced frustration with
      top-down management style and lack of consultation with faculty over curricular issues.
      The Chancellor’s advocacy for more secrecy in the selection process of campus presidents,
      despite ASCSU opposition; and his refusal to accept the ASCSU constitutional amendment
      to strengthen the protection of academic freedom, are other issues adding to the frustration.
      The CSU Faculty Affairs Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee had drafted
      resolutions of vote-of-no-confidence on the Chancellor’s leadership. The ongoing debate
      in standing committees and the senate plenary resulted in several developments:
      (1) The Chancellor agreed on a base budget for the ASCU for 2012-13 that fully supports
      two senators from each campus. (2) The Chancellor and two of the vice-chancellors
      admitted their responsibility in mishandling ASCSU constitutional amendment on
      academic freedom, and all apologized for the mistakes. (3) The Chancellor’s Office legal
      counsel, Christine Helwick, met with the Faculty Affairs Committee and offered to work
      with the members to rectify the problems in handling the constitutional amendment and to
      work with them to propose a language acceptable to both the faculty and the Board of
      Trustees. (4) The newly hired Executive Director of Cal State Online, Ruth Black, met
      with the senators at the plenary and expressed her intention to look to faculty to provide
      leadership on the curriculum, and work closely with the online initiative’s board of
directors, which includes three statewide senators, to develop the program. (5) The ASCSU met in a Meeting of the Committee of the Whole and decided to form a subcommittee to discuss the future of shared governance in the CSU and make recommendations to the senate. The next ASCSU plenary is scheduled for March 15 and 16.

LoCascio announced that the statewide Academic Affairs Committee has finished a white paper on the on-line initiative. Full report of the January 18-20 meeting is available at:

http://academicsenate.wcms.calpoly.edu/sites/academicsenate.wcms.calpoly.edu/files/minutes/11-12_minutes/statwide_senate_012412.pdf

E. CFA Campus President: Thomcroft reported that contract negotiations continue without a timeline. A meeting will be schedule with George Deiehr, Vice President CalPERS Board of Administration, to discuss retirement and benefits.

F. ASI Representative: Titus reported that ASI is working with various student groups on a document that explains the principles and values that guide decisions and actions of Cal Poly Mustangs. The ASI Alumni Association is holding its First Annual ASI Leadership Forum on February 25 and 26 to present the new ASI Alumni Association, Mentorship Program, and Leadership Fund. President Armstrong will be attending a portion of the event. ASI has created the Find Your Connection Campaign with the hope to educate students on all that ASI has to offer and how to become involved in different areas of ASI, including Student Government since every student is a member of ASI.

G. Caucus Chairs: none.

H. Other: Feroflores reviewed the report from the Instruction Committee on its charge to discuss the merit of grade inflation and the implementation of student ranking is available at

http://academicsenate.wcms.calpoly.edu/sites/academicsenate.wcms.calpoly.edu/files/minutes/11-12_minutes/grade_inflation.pdf

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

V. Business Item(s):

A. Academic Senate/university committees and task force vacancies for 2011-2013: The following appointment was approved:

GE Governance Board Bruno Giberti, Architecture

B. Resolution on General Education C5 Elective (General Education Governance Board): Machamer presented this resolution, which requests that the Academic Senate approve the proposal for a defined C5 Elective Area for majors within CAFES, CAED, CSM, and OCOB allowing students to receive GE credit for intermediate courses in language other than English that have a substantial cultural component. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.

C. Resolution on Academic Senate Executive Committee Attendance and Voting Provision (Executive Committee): Fernflores presented this resolution, which allows the college caucus to designate a substitute to serve on the Executive Committee. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.

D. Resolution on Corporate Relations in the Classroom (Instruction Committee): Lertwachara presented this resolution, which request that instructors ensure that guest speaker’s presentations are pertinent to the course content and that students are communicated that the presence of the guest speaker does not imply endorsement by the instructor or Cal Poly of the guest speaker’s opinions, views, or affiliation. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.
VI. Discussion Item(s):
   A. **Report by the Disbanding Policies Task Force**: Greenwald reported that the task force was charged with the development of a resolution that sets out a process for disbanding policies put in place by the Academic Senate that the university no longer abides by. The charge was broken down into three areas: (1) consultation, (2) implementation of approved resolutions, and (3) faculty code. Neill reported that developing a faculty code would build awareness for faculty and could be a resource for faculty to consult when ambiguous situations arise. It was decided that the task force would continue to work on the issue of faculty code. The report is available on pages 31-35 of the January 24 agenda.

VII. Adjournment: 5:04 pm

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
The Academic Senate of the California State University met January 18th-20th:

I. Communications and Announcements

A. None

II. Reports

7.1 Chair's report focused on budget and shared governance.

7.2 Standing Committees. The committee chairs announced senate resignations.

A. Academic Affairs (AA):
   i. Online white paper.
   ii. Western Governor's University (online model).
   iii. A vote of no confidence in the Chancellor.

B. Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committee (APEP):
   i. CTE and education code.
   ii. Consequences of failure to participate in Early Start.
   iii. CA Subject Matter Standards.
   iv. Successor to CPEC.
   v. A potential "supercommittee" dealing with EAP, Early Start and Graduation Initiative.
   vi. Streamlining of EAP and Early Start.
   vii. SB 1440 implementation. There is a glaring need for electronic tracking if the transfer AA is to be effective in facilitating transfer.

C. Faculty Affairs (FA):
   i. Academic Freedom.
   ii. Faculty rights in sponsored research.
   iii. Faculty involvement in systemwide initiatives.
   iv. Faculty profile/commitments in Access to Excellence/faculty climate survey.
   v. Unfortunate language in the Board Statement on Academic Freedom in need of revision.
   vi. Investing in faculty excellence.
   vii. The future of shared governance in the CSU.

D. Fiscal & Governmental Affairs Committee (FGA):
   i. Met with AVC Yelverton-Zamarripa and got an update on legislative developments.
   ii. Met with AVC Turnage and got an update on the budget.
   iii. Discussed shared governance.
   iv. Looked at SB 640 (Rubio) dealing with the use of student fees—we will look to CSSA for guidance.
   v. Discussed the LAO report requesting oversight of higher education—we will continue to monitor developments.
   vi. Have a resolution on investment in faculty excellence.
   vii. Have a resolution on enrollment management.
viii. Have a resolution opposing SB 755 and SB 967 dealing with faculty compensation.

ix. Planned for in-district lobbying this year in lieu of ASCSU lobby day.

7.3 Faculty Trustee: Trustee Cheyne reported on the aborted BOT meeting held in Long Beach in November. When the issue of another tuition increase began there was pandemonium. She noted that Lt. Governor Newsom had called for a revote and that was denied. She reported on the progress of TMCs to the BOT.

7.4 Other Committees and Committee liaisons: None

7.5 Charles Reed, CSU Chancellor: The Chancellor reported [1] There are five new presidential searches which is being hampered by the perception that California has stopped supporting higher education while other states such as NY and cities like NYC are increasing their support of higher education [2] The budget for the CSU has been cut from 3 to 2 billion dollars since 2008. Next year’s budget will also have an additional 200 million trigger cut for the CSU if the voters turn down new taxes. The system must plan for this cut. [3] Campuses are reporting structural deficits labor contracts are a problem and the chancellor does not want to play the K-12 pink slip game. [4] The BOT wants better student management. This is a problem because you cannot just turn on and turn off enrollment numbers. The path of least resistance is to cut off transfer students in January of next year. That is not fair to CCC students who were told if they do everything correct they would have a spot. [5] Governor Brown has offered the CSU 80 million for new students, while in the past that number was 250 million. In addition the Governor has made the following changes, the CSU must now pay for [a] pensions [b] health care [c] pay for debt service. [6] In the past if you cut students you saved money; now that tuition is at $6000.00 that actually pays for the instruction, not other costs. Unfortunately the graduate tuition does not cover cost of instruction and that is a fast growing area for research to help faculty succeed in the teacher scholar model. [7] The Chancellor pointed out that there is no pressure that he can bear on the legislators because the only discretionary money spent is higher education, prisons, K-12 and old, sick and children’s programs. [8] Shutting down any campus is not politically possible. [9] The Chancellor said “I am sorry for not being more vigilant with regards to the ASCSU resolution on academic freedom. [9] The does not appear to be any way to increase funding except by raising tuition.

7.6 Ben Quillian, Executive Vice Chancellor, Business and Finance. Dr. Quillian repeated much of what was said by the Chancellor. He did report that there are five presidential committee to address budget [1] removal of quarters [2] common management systems [3] review self-imposed restriction found in Title V and EO’s [4] review category II fees [5] Cal State Online as a way to deliver education without the overhead of physical buildings. It was also noted that consolidating services among campuses such as HR and police dispatchers. LoCascio asked about consolidation of sports.
Report: Academic Senate of the California State University  
January 24, 2012  
By: James G. LoCascio

7.7 Ruth Black, Cal State Online Executive Director: Ms. Black informed us that she reports to the Cal State Online committee chair. The first programs offered will be through extended education of existing online programs. Cal State Online will not be limited to California residents. She is going to visit all campuses and invites all faculty input.

7.8 Ephraim Smith, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer reported on good results from [1] early start will begin this summer for math and English [2] SB-1440 TMCs are being reviewed and the CCC system cannot find enough faculty work on this project [3] the new degree data base is being visited at a brisk rate [4] the graduate initiative is improving retention rates.

7.9 Ron Vogel, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs: no formal report on academic affairs but took responsibility for the error's in the past ASCSU resolution on academic freedom. He also help broker a fix to this year’s and next year’s ASCSU budget.

7.10 John Travis, CFA: The contract is in mediation.

7.11 Jeremy White, CSSA Liaison; no report.


III Committee Recommendations (Resolutions).

8.1 Distribution Lists as Part of Senate Resolutions. (AS-3045-11/Goldwhite) Second reading; Failed.


8.3 Action in Response to Education Code Section 66205.8 Regarding the Applicability of High School Career Technical Education Courses Toward CSU Eligibility. (AS-3052-12/APEP. First Reading.

8.4 Enrollment Management in the CSU. (AS-3053-12/FGA) First Reading.

8.5 Investing in Excellence in the CSU. (AS-3054-12/FGA) First Reading.

8.6 Opposition to 755(Liu) and SB 967 (YEE). (AS-3055-12/FGA) First Reading. These are legislative bills to limit the salary of CSU presidents.

8.7 Recognizing the Integration of Sustainability into California State University Academic Endeavors. (AS-3056-12/AA) First Reading. Cal Poly is a leader in this area, and the hope is head off yet another mandated course.

8.8 Calling for the Creation and Review of Online Education. (AS-3057-12/AA) First Reading.

8.9 Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Pertaining to Sponsored Research. (AS-3058-12) First Reading.
I) Consultation
With a new president and a soon to be new provost, the issue of consultation is of unusual importance. We have an opportunity to strengthen our commitment to shared governance.

It would be helpful to obtain a clear statement by the President regarding his views of consultation, collegiality, and shared governance. It might also be helpful to have a Senate resolution that would codify the President’s views regarding consultation, collegiality, and shared governance, along with the Senate’s agreement.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that the Senate Chair meet with the President to obtain such a clear statement by the President regarding his views of consultation, collegiality, and shared governance. For shared governance to be truly effective, there should be a clear understanding between the President and faculty of the areas where consultation is required, where it is highly desirable, and where it is not necessary.

II) Implementation of approved Resolutions
There have been several cases in which resolutions approved by the Senate and the President have not been implemented, or were loosely followed, or were changed.

For example, Resolution AS-689-09, Resolution on Mergers and/or Reorganization of Academic Programs, passed in June 2009, was ignored when the College of Education was moved into the College of Science and Mathematics without Senate consultation.

As a second example, Resolution AS-619-04, Resolution on Preface: The Cal Poly Shared Reading Program, passed in June 2004, and signed by the President, as well as AS-619-04 above, were ignored when Preface was discontinued without Senate consultation.

As a third example, Resolution AS-582-02/IC, Resolution on Process for Change of Major, was never fully implemented, depriving many students of a potential benefit.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that the Senate Executive Committee on a yearly basis review resolutions that have been approved by both the Senate and the President within the previous five years for compliance. It is further recommended that the Chair of the Senate meet with the President, as appropriate, to discuss those approved resolutions that have never been implemented, or whose implementation was not in compliance with the resolution. As a result of discussions with the President, the Senate may choose to rescind resolutions, revise resolutions, resubmit resolutions, or leave resolutions as is.

There would be too much effort and too little to be gained from reviewing all resolutions approved by both the Senate and the President. For exceptional cases
outside this five-year period, the Senate Executive Committee may recommend appropriate action.

III) Faculty Code

Cal Poly would benefit from a written faculty code that describes the rights and obligations of the faculty; i.e., curriculum/academic programs, admission/graduation requirements, scholastic standards, tenure/appointment/promotion criteria. A review of the Curriculum Handbook, Faculty Handbook, Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Evaluation (RPT) Documents, Academic Policies, and Constitution of the Faculty and Academic Senate Bylaws indicates that this information exists; however, it is stored in a number of different locations and formats. Bringing these resources together into a single authoritative document ("Faculty Code") would offer several benefits:

- increase awareness of faculty roles and responsibilities
- provide guidance on matters of faculty governance at the campus, college, department and individual levels
- clarify designation of authority by referencing source materials (e.g., statements/resolutions/orders from Board of Trustees, Chancellor, President CSU Academic Senate, or Cal Poly Academic Senate)

Additionally, a review of source material may reveal gaps in governance; e.g., consultation procedures between administration and faculty; structure/organization of campus units; faculty governance at different levels (campus, college and department); appointment of faculty, faculty qualifications and workload; discontinuance of academic programs; resolution of differences; procedure for amending faculty code; etc. This would also facilitate the review of Academic Senate resolutions and codification of future resolutions.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee or a task force be assigned the task of drawing up a Faculty Code.

Submitted by:

Helen Bailey
Harvey Greenwald
David Hannings
Stern Neill

November 22, 2011
Resolutions passed by Academic Senate that have had a loose adherence or have been eliminated without Senate consultation/approval.

(October 20 2011)

Although this resolution is old, there have been several resolutions regarding “consultation” on policy and budget matters throughout the years. Sometimes we’ve been consulted, sometimes not. This was just the first of many such resolutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Category/Department</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-7-76</td>
<td>Resolution Regarding Policy and Procedures Revisions in CAM</td>
<td>President to consult with faculty re revision of policies and procedures as well as their initiation.</td>
<td>2.17.76</td>
<td>Consultation; Policies, Campus</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I’m not sure how well this resolution has been followed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Category/Department</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-34-77</td>
<td>Resolution Regarding University Hour</td>
<td>Scheduling of classes during the University Hour to be kept to a minimum.</td>
<td>12.6.77</td>
<td>Campus Events; Instruction (University Hour)</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pretty sure this hasn’t been followed closely:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Category/Department</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-78-80</td>
<td>Resolution Regarding Teaching Overloads</td>
<td>Faculty and administration should seek ways of reducing workloads.</td>
<td>2.12.80</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs (faculty workload)</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, being followed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Category/Department</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-82-80</td>
<td>Resolution Regarding Sabbatical Leaves</td>
<td>Sabbatical leaves are for the purpose of study and travel, not for meeting RPT requirements.</td>
<td>2.19.80</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs (RPT)</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interesting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Category/Department</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-98-80</td>
<td>Resolution on Drinking Policy on Campus</td>
<td>Beer and wine be allowed on campus after 5 p.m. where the consumer’s age can be monitored.</td>
<td>6.3.80</td>
<td>Policies, Campus (drinking)</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The decision to no longer allow full fee waiver or automatic acceptance to employees’ relatives was changed without Senate consultation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Category/Department</th>
<th>Approval Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS-261-87</td>
<td>Resolution on Definition of “Close Relative”</td>
<td>Defines who a “close relative” of a CPSU employee is for purpose of admittance.</td>
<td>10.27.87</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs (“close relative”)</td>
<td>APPROVED (with qualification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Approval Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-293-88</td>
<td>Resolution on Initial Appointments of Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>5.24.88</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs (RPT)</td>
<td>APPROVED (with qualification)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-313-89</td>
<td>Resolution on Graduate Programs</td>
<td>3.7.89</td>
<td>Curriculum (graduate programs)</td>
<td>APPROVED (with qualification)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-361-91</td>
<td>Resolution on U.S. Ethnic Pluralism Program</td>
<td>5.14.91</td>
<td>Curriculum; Diversity</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-408-93</td>
<td>Resolution on Priority Registration</td>
<td>6.8.93</td>
<td>Registration (priority registration)</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-619-04</td>
<td>Resolution on Preface: The Cal Poly Shared Reading Program</td>
<td>6.1.04</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS-689-09</td>
<td>Resolution on Mergers and/or Reorganization of Academic Programs</td>
<td>6.2.09</td>
<td>College Reorganization; Consultation (academic structure)</td>
<td>RECEIVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The USEP program was changed from a program/requirement to a department without Senate consultation:

AS-361-91  | Resolution on U.S. Ethnic Pluralism Program | 5.14.91 | Curriculum; Diversity | APPROVED |

Policy re priority registration changed without Senate consultation:

AS-408-93  | Resolution on Priority Registration | 6.8.93 | Registration (priority registration) | APPROVED |

Preface discontinued without Senate consultation:

AS-619-04  | Resolution on Preface: The Cal Poly Shared Reading Program | 6.1.04 | Miscellaneous | APPROVED |

The College of Education was moved into CSM without Senate consultation:

AS-689-09  | Resolution on Mergers and/or Reorganization of Academic Programs | 6.2.09 | College Reorganization; Consultation (academic structure) | RECEIVED |
### Cal Poly Faculty Code

#### Contents and Source Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Source Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization of the university faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation procedures between administration and faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution of the academic senate</td>
<td><strong>Constitution of the Faculty and Academic Senate Bylaws</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure/organization of campus units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty governance (e.g., admissions, curriculum and graduation standards and requirements)</td>
<td><strong>Curriculum Handbook</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment, promotion and tenure of faculty, faculty qualifications and workload</td>
<td><strong>Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Evaluation (RPT) Documents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuance of academic programs</td>
<td><strong>AS-689-09</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure for amending faculty code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum
To: Faculty Senate Office
From: Kevin Lertwachara, Chair, Instruction Committee
Date: January 23, 2012
Re: Grade inflation and the implementation of student ranking

The Instruction Committee met and discussed the issue of grade inflation and the possible implementation of student ranking. We discussed at length the merits and demerits of grade inflation, both at Cal Poly and in higher education. We also explored potential benefits and problems with including student rankings as part of the grading process. The committee concluded that it is unclear what impact student ranking would have on grade inflation and on our students. For example, for a student receiving an 'A' from a class with 'generous' grading, would reporting student ranking unfairly penalize the student? Since students do not have any control over grading policies, should they be held responsible for enrolling in a class with a generous grading policy? In addition, from the faculty perspective, some departments and colleges have already used class grade average (i.e., a numerical average of letter grades assigned to students) as part of faculty evaluation, presumably to help identify grade inflation among faculty members. Furthermore, the committee has been told in the past that since we are part of the CSU system, we need approval by the Chancellor’s Office in order to institute a new grade on students’ transcripts.

For the reasons cited above, there is not enough support among the Instruction Committee members to proceed with the implementation of student ranking.