

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

Minutes of the
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, January 12, 1993
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	Mori, Barbara	SocSci
Brown, Ron	Physics	Russell, Craig (Sec)	Music
Burgunder, Lee	BusAdm	Vilkitis, James	NRM
Dana, Charles	CompSci	Wilson, Jack (C)	MechEng
Gamble, Lynne (VC)	Library		
Gooden, Reginald	PoliSci	Camuso, Margaret	Senate Staff
Johnston, Harold	ConstMgt	Irvin, Glenn	AVPAA
Kersten, Tim	Econ	Koob, Robert	VPAA
Lund, Mike	AnimSci	Conway, Jim (CFA)	Speech
		Ray Terry	Math
		Bud Beecher	History
		Edgar Carnegie	Head of AgEng

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

I. Minutes: the minutes for November 10, 17, 19, 24 and December 8 were approved with the sole correction that the meeting on November 19 was held in Business Administration 341, not in UU220.

II. Communications & Announcements:

Jack Wilson welcomed Craig Russell back to the Executive Committee Senate.

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair: none.

B. & C. President's Office & Vice President for Academic Affairs. R. Koob stated there are still many uncertainties with respect to the status of the budget for this year. If the CSU is asked to endure a 4.5% cut, then we may have to assume as much as a 6% cut since many of the university expenses are not flexible. Some of the uncertainties concern funds from the federal government and a possible fee increase which might be authorized by the Board of Trustees. A fee increase would require legislation to be sponsored in Sacramento. In his opinion, that would not necessitate the lay-off of tenured faculty. C. Andrews stated there are rumors that Fort Ord may be turned into a CSU campus. Koob has heard some of the same rumors: it might become part of the CSU or even be established as a separate charter campus. In any event, the legislature would have to enact legislation to fund it. C. Dana asked what were the inflexible parts of the budget that could not absorb a budget cut. Koob responded the main item is general obligation bond payments.

D. Statewide Senators: none

IV. Consent Agenda: none

V. Business Items:

A. Academic Senate/committee vacancies. The following nominations were submitted:

Academic Senate

CAED Margot McDonald

Academic Senate Committees

CBUS Terri Swartz
CSM Randy Knight
PCS Nancy Loe

Status of Women Committee
Research Committee
University Professional Leave Committee

Program Review and Improvement Committee

At-large Jim Bermann

Student Throughput Committee

Administrative Representative Glenn Irvin [for info./does not require Senate approval]

University-Wide Committees

David Peach

University Union Advisory Board

Andrews moved (2nd by Russell) that all nominees be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

- B. Resolution on Promotion Eligibility: Ray Terry. James Vilkitis offered a friendly amendment that the phrase "The 1992-1993 budget" in the opening background statement be altered to read "The 1992-1993 CSU budget." Terry accepted the alteration. C. Russell asked if there would be a gradual gap in salaries if someone were promoted to a rank and ascended a step each year—but retained the same salary as before. The net result would be that two professors of the same rank and step could actually be receiving different salaries if one of them had reached that step before the budget crisis and the second professor obtained that rank only after implementation of this resolution. Koob clarified that on this campus we have jumped those individuals to their legitimate step as they have been promoted. We have taken those funds "out of the hide of the university." R. Brown & C. Russell then asked for clarification—what would happen if someone were promoted to a new rank and then rose to new step levels *within* that rank? Would they continue to get a raise in salary commensurate with their new step level? Koob clarified that everyone else is presently frozen at where they were in rank, so no newly promoted individual is worse off than his or her colleagues. B. Mori stated that she was one of the individuals that had been promoted to a higher rank. She asked if as she ascends in step-level, if she will eventually get a pay raise? Koob said that has not been decided yet. Andrews added that this issue gives CSU an opportunity to do away with the present salary schedule. Andrews moved (2nd by Burgunder) that this item be agendized on the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously.
- C. Resolution for Double-Counting of General Education and Breadth Courses: Vilkitis. B. Mori asked if by double-counting a course in order to fulfill simultaneously two graduation requirements a student will still be deficient in units? The general consensus was that a student still needs to accumulate the required number of credit units even though the graduation requirements were satisfied. L. Burgunder asked why it was objectionable or inappropriate to triple-count a course. G. Irvin explained that on some places on the campus the concentrations were taking up classes in both the major column and support column. It happened that in some majors it contained some electives in the support & major columns. Students were realizing that if they chose an elective that satisfied GenEd they could, in effect, get a triple-count. Burgunder responded that it did not seem to be a GenEd issue. Discussion ensued. C. Andrews offered a friendly amendment that the second resolved clause [p. 17] be altered to

read: "RESOLVED: That a General Education and Breadth course cannot be used to satisfy a major and support and General Education and Breadth requirement." Vilkitis accepted the amendment. C. Dana moved (2nd by W. Mueller) that this item with the friendly amendment be agendized. The motion passed with one dissenting vote.

- D. Resolution for Department Name Change for Animal Sciences and Industry Department: Mike Lund, Interim Department Head. M. Lund explained that Poultry Science will probably go from being a major to a minor. He stated the department refers to itself as the Animal Science Department. Andrews moved (2nd by Russell) to agendize the resolution on the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously.
- E. Resolution on Establishing Employee Assistance Program: Bud Beecher. B. Beecher explained his committee has spent three years deciding what kind of Employee Assistance Program (EAP) would be best. They did a workshop with an outside consultant and a subsequent workshop. Baker asked the committee to draw up a formal proposal. Beecher is asking the Senate's endorsement of their proposal. He explained the need for an EAP and the cost benefits. Gooden asked if only two people could handle the counseling on the campus. Beecher responded that the director of the program would not be involved in extensive psychotherapy or counseling but instead would do things such as crisis intervention: he or she would try to stabilize a given situation and make an intelligent referral. Also, workshops on problems such as stress or how to deal with aging parents would fall within the purview of the EAP. Burgunder felt that the proposal does not make that function clear: he requested that the proposal more visibly clarify that the EAP's function is referral and intervention—not one-on-one counselling. B. Andre supported the general concept but expressed concern with the cost of the program. C. Andrews expressed concern with the second sentence in the referral paragraph [on p. 23]: "The program will also accept referrals of individuals made by their fellow employees, family members, or supervisors." He felt there would be co-workers referring people they haven't gotten along with through the years. Andrews further explained that such referrals would become a part of personnel action files—if not in writing at least as part of the discussion. Beecher felt that the referral statement should not be taken out of context and that the presence of an EAP would not encourage unscrupulous behavior among colleagues. C. Dana felt that the money might be better spent on counseling. Beecher replied that it is much more efficient to have an EAP responsible for changing the work-place environment of the organization and doing crisis intervention than to have someone devoted to one-on-one counselling. One-on-one psychotherapy is terribly expensive. From an institutional perspective, the money is better spent on an EAP. T. Kersten expressed his support and stated that the office of the EAP should be off-campus. The referral aspect is better if the EAP office is off-campus because no matter how carefully one guards referrals, "it gets around." He shared concern with Andrews over the second sentence of the referral section. Beecher replied that many substance abusers *want* help and are hoping that someone will actually intervene. Intervention at the job site has been shown to be very successful. W. Mueller observed that EAPs have been shown to be useful in industry but was concerned with the lack of data on EAPs in the university environment. Mueller also had severe reservations with a budget transfer of \$120,000 in these fiscally austere times. Koob stated that the "classification" can be adjusted so that it doesn't "read wrong" and falsely appear that the EAP is just "part of the Administration." Koob responded to Mueller that we have to decide whether or not we believe the projections that we lose "x" number of dollars through lost productivity due to substance abuse or stress. Mueller and B. Mori requested specific data with regard to lost productivity on this campus. Beecher stated that productivity cannot be demonstrated until *after* the fact. Such cost-effective statistics cannot be shown through projection—but only after the program has been implemented. It is a leap of faith. Beecher did state, he would try to obtain data from other campuses. Kersten moved (2nd by Gooden) to agendize. The motion passed unanimously.

F. Strategic Plan: drafting of the preamble. Vilkitis liked the shorter preamble [authored by Margaret Camuso] and offered the following revision:

Cal Poly's Strategic Plan was developed as a functional tool to guide the direction of the university over the next several years. It establishes a direction for achieving the mission of the university by setting forth the goals and priorities which will direct future planning, resource allocation, and decision making in obtaining the mission.

B. Mori moved (2nd by Andrews) that we agendize this proposal as modified by Vilkitis. Dana proposed the amendment (2nd by Gooden) that we send both versions to the Senate—both the Vilkitis version and the longer version [p.25]. The amendment failed. The motion passed.

G. Policy and Review Procedures for Discontinuance of an Academic Program. J. Wilson explained that the revised procedures is an attempt to come up with a program discontinuance policy for Cal Poly that "nails things down very explicitly." He expressed flexibility on time frames—they need to be decided here [by the Executive Committee and Senate]. Gooden felt the issue of *quality* is presently absent and that worried him—*quality* should be emphasized. Gooden stated that he was divorcing program discontinuance from the budget crisis. Presumably, discontinuance was begun because of findings in the Program Review Committee. Discontinuance would be a way for us to winnow our own programs. Mori felt this new procedure is an improvement in the way it sets things out. The procedure should be in place before we start dealing with specific programs. J. Vilkitis stated that last quarter the Executive Committee had contemplated developing a resolution that uncoupled defunding from discontinuance. Koob saw two issues: 1) in addition to ignoring the quality issue, nowhere does the plan address the long-range planning issue, and 2) some of the statements that are made (for instance, on page 7) are at odds with AAUP or the MOU. We need to make certain that we do not inadvertently subvert the contract. Koob also contended that it is possible to continue a *program* without it necessarily being a *department*. It is not a one-to-one correspondence. For instance, with respect to the two programs that are presently being eliminated as department structures, Koob has opened up discussions with Cuesta on the possibility of continuing the programs without the funding, where they do the vocational aspects of the program and some of the GE&B, and we offer the other classes that would yield a comparable graduate with significantly reduced price. "So there is a difference between an academic program and an academic output and how you get there. And to say that changing a departmental structure or reducing the funding to a college explicitly for a specific department means the program is automatically discontinued does not compute for me." We need to ask *what* do we want to achieve and then *how* are we going to get there? They are fundamentally different issues. C. Andrews felt "defunding" should be removed from the scene since it is budgetary decision as opposed to a programmatic decision. T. Kersten suggested we appoint a committee to view this issue.

VI: Discussion: [no time].

VII. Adjournment: the meeting was adjourned at 5:03.


Craig H. Russell, Secretary of Academic Senate

1/19/93
Date