

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

Minutes of the ACADEMIC SENATE  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
Friday, May 7, 1993  
UU 219, 2:30 to 4:00pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 2:50pm.

- 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 Items:
- VI. Discussion:

**Discussion with President Baker regarding Charter Campus:** Dr. Baker requested a meeting with the Executive Committee to speak about the role he hopes the Senate will play in developing the Charter Campus idea. Some of the advantages would be (1) the university would not be as heavily regulated as it is now thereby eliminating many of the impediments that exist including those that regulate curriculum matters; (2) we would not be subject to legislative decision making wherein more and more people with less and less knowledge regarding higher education are making decisions for higher education; (3) and, as demand on government services increases, the public will be requiring more of higher education. Being a Charter Campus would allow Cal Poly to stay out of the wave of pressure and regulation that will affect the delivery of quality education. We should do what makes sense academically and not be regulated to do what doesn't make sense academically.

Baker asked that the committees which are being formed to discuss the Charter Campus idea, look at the policy areas we are presently governed by, and, one-by-one, determine which policies we want to keep in place and which ones we want to eliminate (Executive Orders, Title 5, etc.) He stated he'd like Cal Poly to be measured on outcomes--quality, retention, and diversity: (1) a good assessment process should be developed to measure the quality of programs offered, and available technology should be used to enhance and improve the quality of learning. The campus should develop a definition of "quality" as part of its assessment process by next year; (2) a successful retention rate; and (3) a well-diversified campus and working conditions that take care of faculty instead of burdening them (i.e., 12 WTU's should be the upper end of one's workload not the expected workload). Faculty should have more time for curriculum development, preparation, and research. He would like to see faculty engaged in matters that affect the faculty and improve where we are and what we can expect to occur in the CSU. As an example, if the campus decides that one-third of all curriculum should be general education, what should this one-third include for the total education of our students?

Being a Charter Campus would give us more control of student fees and allow us to notify students of their financial aid assistance sooner than is presently possible. Presently, financial aid commitments at Cal Poly cannot be made until June while other campuses are able to inform students sooner. We lose many students to other campuses because of this timing.

We would still be under the purview of the Board of Trustees, but we would establish our policies and then be governed by those policies. We need to determine what kind of model we would like to adopt.

Brown asked if the private money raised by Cal Poly has restrictions which would be eliminated under a Charter. Baker responded that donations are under no restrictions other than the restrictions (designation of use) placed on the money by the donor. There would, however, be more leverage in public/private relationships because there would be less approval time (going directly to the legislature) to obtain support for the use of funds in public/private partnerships. A Charter Campus would allow better use of faculty time in this respect because there would be more time to develop programmatic changes, put ideas in writing, and raise the money needed to fund the activities developed.

Mori asked about the role of faculty under a Charter. Baker responded that it would be the decision of the campus to decide what that role should be. There are available models to follow; i.e., UC Berkeley. The model used for academic governance should truly reflect the position of faculty. Many faculty members on this campus have expressed the feeling that the Academic Senate is powerless, often times meaningless, and that it does not represent their views.

Discussion was also held regarding calendaring systems we might consider as a campus. Baker introduced the concept of a 12-month faculty with a 12-month benefit and salary package. It could be designed so those who wanted to teach 12 months could do so, but those who wanted time off for a trimester could do that as well. This would provide flexibility and improved productivity without an increased workload. The productivity of students should also be addressed in discussions of calendaring systems. The opportunity for 12 months of compensation could be an attractive incentive in hiring new faculty.

All the issues need to be out on the table. The Academic Senate should engage itself with the development of policies it would like to see exist--what are the fundamental policies and principles we want to live by? A Charter Campus cannot work without the approval of its faculty.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:00pm.

Recorded by:



---

Margaret Camuso, Academic Senate