

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

Minutes of the
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, August 11, 1992
Room 220, University Union, 3:10-5:00 pm

Members present:

<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>
Andre, Barbara	StLf&Actvs	Mueller, Wesley	CropSci
Andrews, Charles	Actg	Palmer, Ken	STE
Botwin, Michael	ArchEng	Russell, Craig (Sec)	Music
Brown, Ron	Physics	Troxell, Patricia	English
Burgunder, Lee	BusAdm	Wilson, Jack (C)	MechEng
Dana, Charles	CompSci		
Gamble, Lynne (VC)	Library	Camuso, Margaret	Senate Staff
Gooden, Reginald	PoliSci	Conway, Jim (CFA)	Speech
Kersten, Tim	Econ	Koob, Robert	VPAA

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:14 pm.

I. Minutes: the minutes for May 12, May 19, May 21, May 26, June 2, July 14, and July 16 were approved.

II. Communications & Announcements: [see agenda]

A. Reading List

B. Consultative committees for the selection of deans (CBUS & CLA). J. Wilson observed some problems in past dean searches and asked how the process could be improved. T. Kersten felt that there is no sure-fire way to really "know" who you are getting. One can only shave 25% off the risk. M. Botwin urged that we get things going early.

II. Reports:

A.-[& C.] Academic Senate Chair & Vice President for Academic Affairs.: Wilson attended a meeting on June 17 with Chancellor Barry Munitz and the other Academic Senate chairs of the CSU. Munitz has been receiving mixed signals from Sacramento concerning the budget. Munitz and Molly Broad mentioned several times that down-sizing is in the works for higher education in California. Koob clarified that we cannot legitimately increase the cost or student-to-faculty ratio since we are not getting enough money [to maintain our present size], that means we will have fewer students. Instead of the present 270,000 students in the CSU, we are now targeting 234,000 students. That is a significant change—it's approximately 35,000 students that would have liked to attend CSU that will not have the opportunity. The real losers in all this are the students and the state of California. Gooden asked whether there has been talk of revising the master plan. Koob responded affirmatively, stating that it is clear to all parties that we have violated the present master plan. The question now is: "What do you do about it?" Koob felt that the decisions on most aspects of the budget are not well thought-out. We are seeing some very disturbing trends. One is we are likely to go to an average number of dollars per FTE with little distinction made with respect to quality or mission of campuses. Another trend pertains to this year's budget and the way decisions that have been made—you can come to the conclusion that the university would

be best served if it were to amplify its head count to the greatest number possible and offer its students only seven units. One is rewarded for sheer numbers: the larger the head count, the larger the fee becomes. At Cal Poly it is clearly not in our interest to have a large number of students taking low loads, because we are a residential campus. A student's major expense is coming here and living. For the students' sake, our own academic integrity, and from our point of view, we want to have full loads and students moving through in four years. Formulas also drive us in certain directions. There is comfort in formulas, but we are inclined to develop competing courses in different colleges for the same subject. It is a natural consequence of each college trying to amplify its own resource base. The lesson in all of this is that there is no simple formulaic solution to a problem as complex as funding higher education. The system needs to examine what our goals are and we provide our rewards in response to those goals rather than have some simple formula—because formulas will not work in this complex world. You have to know what your goals are, you have to assess your progress against those goals, and you have to reward against the goals that you propose.

Wilson commented that the Chancellor talked about streamlining. One of the four points of his plan was to give more autonomy to the CSU system. And he thought that would probably be the least successful with the legislature.

Koob stated the rumors he has been receiving is that CSU will be protected in that 7-8% cut range. All of the Chancellor's office funding is based on that scenario. That puts it in the planning range that Cal Poly has been using. He believes the Governor and the legislature have agreed to support the four-point plan. But if you examine the language in the bill compromise for the House and Senate this weekend, the 7.3% budget cut for the CSU system is itemized. It was not unallocated budget reductions as with previous budgets. For instance, there was a 4.66% pay cut across the board. Itemizing is *not* giving more autonomy to the [CSU] system.

Wilson commented that the Chancellor's office has many rules, some of them unwritten, and they are trying to streamline them. Koob concurred that the Chancellor is trying to decentralize some activities. Every decision by the Chancellor has reinforced that concept.

B. & C. President's Office & Vice President for Academic Affairs: Koob gave a list of topics he would be willing to address and discuss. They included budget developments, early retirements, and the way he should report to faculty with respect to deans' evaluations. He also wanted advice on 1) the formation of a governance committee for the campus; 2) the possibility of a faculty advisory committee for Koob's office; 3) the possibility of development of a faculty services center by relocating and consolidating into one location a variety of offices that are presently all over the campus; and 4) how to use the input of the Program Review and Improvement Committee.

Budget Issues: The Chancellor's office has developed some fairly complex guidelines for allocating the budget they don't have. Everything they send to us is in coded memo form, but it has "Draft" written on it, because it can't be effective until there's a formal budget. In order to create the funds that are associated with so-called unavoidable cost increases, the Chancellor's office wishes to collect from us prior to our collection of the student fees, the increased income that would result from those student fees as a result of the changing fee increase, by deducting it from the general fund allocation. They have a fairly complex formula which says your tax appropriation will be reduced by the amount that we think you will collect in fee increases. For a given number of students, they are assuming we will have a certain head count enrollment, and that head count enrollment will pay fees at the 40% increase level, but we only have the right to collect the amount of money that they would have paid at the old fee level. So the difference between the old fee and the new fee is now subtracted from our tax allocation in advance of any allocation, and then we get to keep all the fees we collect. So if we have exactly the number of students and head count that they project for us, we will break even

under this model. If we have more, we'll make a little extra money. If we have fewer, we'll lose some. This makes their book keeping easier. They are doing this at an assumed 8% reduction in funds which is taken at what they call the "marginal cost" rather than the full cost to the student, and therefore leads to a total reduction of our estimated enrollment of about 10.3%. So we are being held to a minimum student population which is considerably less than what we have estimated to be our actual student population. And the calculations are based on that, so if we make our original number of students we are assured of over enrollment in terms of head count. Or another way of looking at it: we estimated we had x number of students this fall. They have said you are going to have an 8% cut. Therefore, on a full-time equivalent basis we can allocate 8% fewer dollars to you. We are not assuming that every dollar in the total cost per student can be saved when you're only reducing at the margin. That means you have to reduce the FTES further in order to accommodate that same reduction in dollars. That is solid thinking because you still have your buildings to staff, janitors, etc. that don't go away—they don't change much whether you have 15,000 or 14,000 students. So the reduction in the profit as a result of the fee increase is smaller than it might otherwise have been. As a result of all this, we think we will actually come out with less than an 8% budget cut. But we'll also come out with more students than an 8% budget cut would have sustained, because we cannot get rid of students as quickly as an urban campus. And our early enrollment information sustains that: our enrollment is almost exactly where we projected it to be at this time. We managed for 600 fewer students than last year, and it looks like that is where we will be. Koob's guess is that we will be about as overworked this year as last year, but not any worse.

Koob also stated we have applied for some of the "academic recovery funds." Therefore, a portion of that money that they are capturing through the fee increase we are applying for in order to reopen some of the sections that we had to close when we calculated the 8% budget cut. We have requested 3.8 million dollars, which would allow us to rehire a significant number of lecturers.

The early retirement program offsets almost exactly the number of lay-offs we would have expected in tenure and tenure-track lines had we gotten the 8% budget cuts without any early retirements. The early retirement is a 4-year credit with a window that is quite short—August 15 through October 3. The Chancellor is receiving considerable political pressure to keep the window small and short. Gooden observed that there are severe restrictions on the early retirement program. If you use the early retirement program and then you want to get rehired, they have to prove that there is no other person available. Koob clarified, that if you take the 2-year credit instead of the 4-year credit, that restriction goes away. If someone want to maintain an affiliation with the university and volunteer services, that is completely allowed. There also is no restriction on rehiring faculty with funds from trusts or grants. Furthermore, the restriction itself is not a problem in many areas because there is not a qualified lecturer pool from which to draw.

D. Statewide Senators: none

IV. Consent Agenda: none

V. Business Items:

- A. Academic Senate/committee vacancies. Andrews moved (2nd by Kersten) that all nominees who are named in the agenda be approved. The motion passed unanimously.
- B. Approval of Assigned Time Allocations. It was agreed by consent to keep the same allocations as last year.
- C. Approval of Academic Senate Calendar for 1992-1993. Andrews moved (2nd by Gamble) that we approve the calendar [on p. 30]. The motion passed unanimously.

D. Determine dates for Gary Hart to address the Academic Senate. It was decided we will contact Senator Gary Hart and ask him to speak in the fall.

[E.] Emergency Sabbatical and Difference-in-Pay Leaves. Jim Conway stated that five people have been meeting weekly since the end of spring quarter with Jan Pieper and Mike Seuss of Personnel in order to alleviate lay-offs. One of the items mentioned in the contract is extra sabbatical leaves and difference-in-pay leaves. There might be five that would go through this process [this year]. They are putting together a process that would streamline the process of putting sabbatical leave applications through so that there can be a word of either "yes" or "no" on them from the Vice President's office before September rolls around so that people can be notified, because it was their belief that the majority of savings that would occur would be people taking full-year sabbaticals or difference-in-pay leaves. If there would be savings for winter and spring quarter leaves, they would put together in the fall quarter another process for leaves in those latter quarters of the academic year. T. Kersten asked if this proposed policy would only be for the coming year, and Conway responded affirmatively. L. Burgunder asked if this had been mentioned anywhere before. Conway observed that it had been proposed and explained in a memo, that went to all home addresses and to school deans. C. Andrews felt that applicants should not be allowed to apply for only one quarter leave since it would not result in any net fiscal savings. Conway agreed. R. Gooden asked if we have to resort to these [drastic] measures. Conway responded affirmatively: given the possibility of further cuts, it seems like a good idea. Koob observed that the system is unfair to an applicant's colleagues. As a result he felt the issue should not be decided by his office (since he is not given resources to hire a replacement)—instead, the departments and schools who are paying for it should have more of a say. Andrews moved (2nd by Kersten) that we approve the recommended policy with the modification that the leave applications be restricted to two quarters or the full academic year. The motion passed.

VI. Discussion Items:

A. Distribution & additional input from faculty on the "Cal Poly Strategic Plan." Koob observed that the latest version has been significantly streamlined. He expressed reservations with the mission statement: he clarified that he is not unhappy with the content—only with the way it is written. He offered an alternative version. Gooden felt there was a "vocational clang" to the phrase "learn-by-doing" and would just as soon alleviate the phrase. Koob stated that the mission statement will get more press than all of the rest of the document. Botwin suggested the whole document be brought before the Senate and then put before the faculty as a referendum. Gooden felt the students should have input as well. R. Brown concurred with Botwin, stating that if the faculty disagrees [with the mission statement] then the rest can't be accomplished or achieved. Wilson felt the document should be made available for the entire faculty to look at, and then have it debated on the floor of the Senate. Then the referendum would pass almost automatically. P. Troxel stated that one part of this is that we would like to set an example, instead of being behind the ball. We can take a leadership role here instead of acting after staff or students. Wilson stated that some of the recommendations for staff are revolutionary, so we certainly want to get staff input. Botwin recommended that we examine the document in the middle or by the end of the fall quarter. C. Dana concurred, stating that the faculty needs to act now. P. Troxel stated that if we wait until the end, then we are up against the wall with respect to the [referendum] vote. R. Brown suggested that we begin addressing it by the second or third meeting—we can continue discussion throughout the quarter. C. Russell reminded the Senate that we had let the procedure for the Program Review Committee drag on too long. We let the decisions happen at the tail end of the year.

L. Gamble moved (2nd by Botwin) that we put this on the agenda for the first Senate meeting as a first reading item. An amendment to the motion was then offered by M. Botwin, asking that the entire document be sent to the faculty as a referendum for approval or disapproval once

the Senate has acted on it. P. Troxel then offered a second to M. Botwin's amendment. B. Andre and L. Burgunder felt we did not need a referendum since we had already spent considerable time on the document. C. Russell spoke in favor of the referendum: just because faculty were asked for input does not inherently imply that their suggestions were heeded and incorporated into the document. L. Burgunder requested a restatement of the motion. The Chair replied, "that the document be brought before the Senate in two consecutive meetings, and that there then be a referendum on it after the Academic Senate decides on the document." The amendment modified the motion to "the first and third Academic Senate meetings." M. Botwin restated the motion and amendment to read, "that this be brought to the Senate as a first reading item. The document would be subjected to changes and voted on, and then the final document would be brought to the faculty for their approval in the form of a referendum." This last phrasing was approved.

- C. Implementation of a trimester at Cal Poly: R. Koob stated he intends to investigate the implications of instituting a trimester system at Cal Poly. He would like to form a joint committee to examine year-round operation (either four quarters or three trimesters). M. Botwin observed that this has been investigated in the past by several ad hoc committees. Student input is also necessary. R. Brown observed that it had been studied several years ago for pedagogical reasons. L. Gamble stated that James Simmons had chaired that committee. A subsequent committee was also chaired by James Murphy.

VII. Adjournment: the meeting was adjourned at 4:58pm.

Craig H. Russell
Secretary-elect of the Academic Senate

Date

DOCUMENTS ON FILE FOR READING IN THE
ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE

Fall Quarter 1992

Date

Document

9/10/92

Internationalizing the California State
University: Case Studies (CSU)