

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

Minutes of the
ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, October 27, 1992
UU 220, 3:00-5:00pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:15pm.

- I. Minutes: none
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair: none
 - B. President's Office: none
 - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: none
 - D. Statewide Senators: none
- IV. Consent Agenda: none
- V. Business Item(s): none
- VI. Discussion:

Program Discontinuance of the Engineering Technology and Home Economics Departments:

Discussion was held to determine whether the meeting should be held in closed session. According to CSU attorney, Bruce Richardson, the contents of today's meeting are not official business and therefore not subject to the Brown Act. In addition, meetings of the Academic Senate are considered advisory and can therefore be held as closed sessions. It was decided that the portion of the meeting dealing with program discontinuance would remain open. The remaining portion of the meeting (5 to 6pm) would be held in closed session.

(The resolution drafted by senator Botwin was distributed.) Botwin opened discussion by expressing his opinion that the administration had violated due process according to Administrative Bulletin 81-5, which states a proposal to discontinue a program must be filed with the Chancellor's Office before any action can be taken. According to conversations held between the Academic Senate Chair and Vice President Koob, the administration's view is that the programs were not discontinued, but that the departments these programs were housed in have been defunded. Mori pointed out that whatever the action is called, without funding to the program tenured faculty would be de hired.

Connely asked if the administration has unilateral authority to defund a program. The Chair stated no documentation exists giving the President explicit authority to defund; however, it is a part of the broad powers of the President. Mueller felt the intent of the program discontinuance document was one of protection, but now the procedure of defunding creates a loophole to this protection.

Kersten noted it is a Trustees' policy that any major budget decision requires close faculty consultation precisely because control of the budget is control of the institution. We need a budget group that is ahead of the budget decisions. Gooden did not feel a blatant violation of due process occurred. The university was repeatedly told that there was a budget crisis, and the Senate was asked for guidance on several occasions. Three different Senate committees recommended vertical (vs. horizontal) cuts and when the crunch came, the President acted in accordance with what information he was given. The action regarding the two departments which were defunded was not de facto but de jure. Gamble felt it was a de facto action because the programs are gone. Peach stated he had not heard any concerns specific enough to use the term "censure." He did not see any bad faith efforts in the administration's action especially in view of the magnitude of the

budgetary crisis. He felt it would not be useful to agendize this resolution.

Mori felt four points needed to be mentioned: (1) discontinuance procedures were not followed, (2) salary savings need to be realized to deal with this budget crisis, yet several Athletics personnel are being hired. Why are academic programs being cut when nonacademic programs are hiring? (3) why do program cuts always mean academic programs? and (4) this says to tenured faculty they can be fired whenever there's no money to pay them.

Vilkitis stated he was under the impression that colleges determine how to facilitate cuts to their areas. What we are discussing here seems to disallow the deans the latitude to decide whether they want to keep those programs or not. The administration has the power to defund. The faculty have the control of curriculum. If the faculty feel this programs should not be defunded, then they should not be. Kersten commented that the discussion continues to argue for a more careful procedure for the Senate to give advice to the President. Questions that need to be asked are (1) do we want to continue with vertical cuts forever? and (2) do we wish to be more participatory with the decisions to cut? If the Senate is to be involved, it needs to be a proactive and aggressive participant. If we wait, the decisions will be made without us.

(President Baker and Vice President Koob joined the Executive Committee for discussion of this matter at 4:15pm.)

The Chair asked President Baker and Vice President Koob to provide any information they felt important to the discussion. Vice President Koob shared his views regarding governance decisions of higher education universities. The university's authority comes from two sources: (1) the authority for the distribution of funds received from the state legislature is delegated to the Board of Trustees which in turn delegates this authority to the Presidents of each campus; and (2) the authority for curriculum development normally resides in the hands of the faculty. The money appropriated from the state is used to acquire faculty expertise. Once hired, faculty are given the authority for determining the best way to educate its students (within some broad policy guidelines held by the Board of Trustees). Faculty review and deliberation of curriculum (program) matters occurs through the governance structure of the Senate. There is a strong commitment to faculty consultation regarding curriculum/programs on this campus.

Koob continued to explain that there isn't a one-to-one relationship between programs and departments on this campus. There are also programs that have no departments supporting them (i.e., Computer Engineering). Program discontinuance DOES NOT speak to how to administer funds to departments. The decision to defund Engineering Technology and Home Economics was made because they no longer met the long-term goals of the university. This doesn't mean the programs won't be taught. For example, if CAGR would decide to keep Home Economics and can find a structure to teach Home Economics (if the program discontinuance committee recommends keeping same), it can do so with the funds allocated to that college. However, no additional funds will be given to support this program.

President Baker added that there is a procedure of due process when programs are being considered for discontinuance. This is accomplished through the program discontinuance review. Students were notified of the probable phaseout of these two departments but that they would be allowed to complete their degrees within three years. The idea behind this is that a permanent reduction in faculty needs to be made. Where that reduction will occur is not going to settle out for another three or four years. We may make a decision to phaseout one or more programs, but it will take time to shift those resources to other departments.

Russell recalled that the Academic Senate had been asked numerous times for input regarding programs during the last academic year. The Senate was asked by President Baker last May to review the process which led to the phaseout of these two departments. This is six months later and we're just now beginning to discuss it.

Koob summarized his efforts to obtain input from the Senate and the deans during last year regarding program evaluation. The deans were asked to consult with the faculty of their colleges regarding the mechanisms/recommendations proposed for vertical, budgetary reductions. The decision to discontinue certain departments was discussed at length with the deans of those colleges who were asked to consult with their college faculty about same. Administrative consultation

occurs through the administrative line. Programmatic consultation occurs through the programmatic line. Kersten responded he did not believe the decisions made last year regarding Engineering Technology and Home Economics were made in bad faith; however, meaningful faculty consultation is necessary in the process of making budget decisions that drive the functioning of academic programs. All of this information needs to be out on the table for discussion. He would like to see the Senate and administration together look at every program on campus--both academic and nonacademic--and make decisions jointly in a meaningful way. Kersten stated that the motion to censure was inappropriate.

Mueller asked how the decision to discontinue the two programs coincides with tenure. Koob responded that some faculty may lose their jobs if other departments would not accept them. If it is necessary to let faculty go, the one-year guidelines for giving notice will be adhered to. Baker added he would like to look at options for some retraining of these faculty to better fit them within other departments.

VII. Adjournment: This portion of the meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

Recorded by: Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate

CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES
MEETING HELD IN CLOSED SESSION

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

Minutes of the ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, October 27, 1992
UU 219, 5:00-6:00pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 5:15pm.

- I. Minutes: none
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair: none
 - B. President's Office: none
 - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: none
 - D. Statewide Senators:

IV. Consent Agenda: none

V. Business Items: none

VI. Discussion:

Information Systems: Neil Webre was asked to attend this meeting to give some background information on the situation which exists in Information Systems. Professor Webre was active in campus-wide computing for several years, past chair of the Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing (IACC), and has been heavily involved in decisions made regarding the services of Information Systems.

Webre explained that the IACC passed a Resolution of No Confidence for Gloster last year with regard to academic support. The members of the IACC felt that the computing needs of the administration and off-campus users were being met successfully, but academic computing needs were not.

Baker noted that the present structure of Information Systems came as a result of an Academic Affairs task force of several years ago. Whether this is still a valid structure (a computing service area headed by a vice president) is a legitimate topic for the Senate to discuss. Andrews added that it is a faculty responsibility to discuss support of academic services, but that discussion of personnel issues belongs under the purview of the President. Brown responded that it seemed the structure of Information Systems and the personnel issues were linked.

Gooden asked if it was something inherent in the demands of administrative and off-campus computing that puts the services of Information Systems in conflict with academic computing needs? Webre answered that administrative computing is production computing. Priority needs to be given to this almost out of necessity. Computing systems and equipment need to be responsive to this. The genesis of much of the friction between administrative/academic computing resulted because of the purchase of the particular mainframe chosen to meet these administrative needs. From the academic side, it's not that we can't justify a mainframe, it's that the computing power per dollar is just not there.

Koob stated that the administration is not asking for this review. If the Senate decided to do so, he would like to have at least a half hour to go over the history of this matter and what the alternatives might be. It's a very complex situation. "The general lay person in an effective computing environment will not understand that computing environment. If you have to understand it, it's not effective." A computing support structure requires extensive learning before a person can make decisions about it.

Webre restated that the restructuring proposed last spring was driven by the long-standing disagreement between the Vice President for Information Systems (Gloster) and the academic side of the university. We are forced to talk about it because it still remains a problem. Koob replied that the shift occurring over the summer appears to have been effective and it is felt to be a solution that works. Russell remarked that possibly an ad hoc committee could be formed to look at academic computing needs. It doesn't make sense to restructure a process that's O.K. if it's the individual that's the problem. However, he did not feel it was the Senate's responsibility to review the personnel issue.

Andrews stated he was unaware of a Vote of Confidence being taken by the academic community. There may have been a committee that decided this. He believes there may be a philosophical conflict that would exist regardless of who the Vice President for Information Systems is. That philosophical conflict has existed for five years and can be traced back to the CENG. Wilson asked what percentage of the mainframe is used by CENG. Webre responded it was fairly high. Mueller felt the IACC was the appropriate group to look at academic support. Connely felt enough concern had been expressed to warrant having an ad hoc committee look at the needs of the academic sector/student services and give advice to the Vice President for Information Systems as to what needs are not being met in these areas.

Baker stated the issue of resources and academic computing was an important one. Beyond our current resource capability, we need to do all we can do to meet the fluid needs of academic computing while seeking a stable environment for administrative computing. He felt a strategic plan for academic planning has been lacking and should be developed for the university, possibly through the IACC or through the Director of Academic Computing Services. He hopes it would be broadly based in the sense that there are different levels of computing capability that are required (i.e., needs for student design courses, connectivity to outside sources, etc.) We need an academic computing plan then resources will flow towards the plan. This would further identify where the gaps in service are. A strategic plan needs to be developed by every college and the IACC seems to be a good vehicle for coordinating this. There is a representative from each college on that committee, but each college should have a group working with that member to develop this. Webre also felt the IACC was well set up to accomplish this instead of setting up another committee. What is needed is a communication link, not a reporting link. Mueller stated this charge would be welcomed by the IACC.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 6:05pm.

Recorded by:

Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate