

FILE COPY

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

Academic Senate
Executive Committee Agenda
May 20, 1993
11-210 3:00-5:00 p.m.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>
Andre, Barbara	StLf&Actvs	Murphy, James	IndTech
Andrews, Charles	Actg	Mori, Barbara	SocSci
Brown, Ronald	Physics	Russell, Craig (Secty)	Music
Dana, Charles	CompSci	Vilkitis, James	NRM
Gamble, Lynne (VC)	Library	Wilson, Jack (C)	MechEngr
Gooden, Reginald	PoliSci	Copies: Warren Baker	
Johnston, Harold	ConstMgt	Glenn Irvin	
Kersten, Timothy	Economics	Patricia Mulligan	
Koob, Robert	VPAA	Howard West	
Mueller, Wesley	CropSci		

5-7 and 5-11-93
minutes were
removed

- I. Minutes: Approval of the May 7 and May 11, 1993 Executive Committee minutes (pp. 2-6).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair
 - B. President's Office
 - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
 - D. Statewide Senators
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. ASI resolution on teaching evaluations-N Brown, ASI representative to the Academic Senate (p. 7).
 - B. Resolution on Charter Campus-Executive Committee (pp. 8-42).
- VI. Discussion:

Summer consultative body for possible budget reduction planning.
- VII. Adjournment:

Associated Student, Inc.
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo

RESOLUTION 93-

- WHEREAS: ASI is the recognized spokesperson for the Cal Poly students, and
- WHEREAS: The students at Cal Poly are the consumers of their education and have the right to educate themselves on what they are receiving for their money, and
- WHEREAS: The Cal Poly student body has expressed a need and a desire for a student-teacher evaluation program, and
- WHEREAS: ASI has conducted two pilot programs which have demonstrated the students' desire for this program, and
- WHEREAS: The evaluations would be used for student purposes--as a means to "know" about their future professors, and
- WHEREAS: ASI would like the help and support of the faculty in the coordinating process of the program.
- THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED: ASI and the Academic Senate create a joint task force of students and faculty to develop and implement an evaluation instrument and program,
- THEREFORE
BE IT FURTHER
RESOLVED: So named evaluations would not be used for tenure, promotion or lay-off of faculty members, but used solely for the benefit of educating the students about future professors and their teaching styles.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON CHARTER CAMPUS

- Whereas Fiscal support for higher education is eroding and shows little sign of abating.
- Whereas The declining fiscal support is beginning to have a serious, deleterious effect on our programs and threatens to destroy the integrity of the Academy.
- Whereas The threat posed by decreasing state support to the quality of our programs as well as the requirement to respond to growing needs is real and serious
- Whereas Cal Poly is uniquely positioned because of the excellent reputation of its programs to consider a Charter Campus model
- Whereas The objective of a Charter Campus is to minimize bureaucracy thus enabling the campus to have greater control of its destiny so that it can position itself in the most positive way to maintain high quality programs while meeting the growing needs of the state
- Whereas A Charter Campus would promote collegiality and respect for the rights of all of its constituents
- Whereas The Academy must seek ways to respond to the crisis in a manner free of fear
- Whereas The ability to respond to the fiscal crisis is restrained by the over-centralized, highly bureaucratic system under which the university labors
- Resolved That the financial support given to the university be relatively free from bureaucratic attachments regarding budgets, curriculum and other educational programs
- Resolved That Cal Poly establish its own internal governance along non-hierarchical lines
- Resolved That Cal Poly needs to remain a state-funded institution, accountable to the Board of Trustees and the requirements of state and federal law
- Resolved That Cal Poly would want to maintain personnel employment agreements, collective bargaining, membership in the state wide Academic Senate, and other such beneficial connections or opportunities associated with the CSU
- Resolved That faculty involvement in the drafting of a Charter Campus model be major and grass-roots in nature
- Resolved That faculty must vote on the Charter Campus model developed through the grass-roots process
- Resolved That the vote be done on a section by section basis
- Resolved No section of the Charter Campus model involving academic programs and governance receiving less than a majority vote of the faculty be sent to the Board of Trustees for approval

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2138-93/FA
March 4-5, 1993

FACULTY ROLE IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CHARTER CAMPUSES

- WHEREAS, The Chancellor is proposing to establish at least two Charter campuses; and
- WHEREAS, The establishment of a charter campus or charter campuses has immediate and far-reaching implications for the California State University; and
- WHEREAS, The Charter concept is not generally understood or clearly defined, nor are the criteria that would guide the selection of these charter campuses; and
- WHEREAS, Significant faculty participation is required in deciding whether to have charter campuses and, should there be Charter campuses, in determining their governance, employee relations, and funding structure; and
- WHEREAS, The "CSU Statement on Collegiality" assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for the educational functions of the University in accordance with basic policy as determined by the Board of Trustees; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of the California State University is the appropriate consultative body for the establishment of systemwide policies regarding the Charter campuses concept; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to work with the Academic Senate CSU in defining the concept of Charter campuses; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to keep the Academic Senate CSU involved in those aspects of planning for any Charter campuses that may affect the stability and integrity of other campuses; and be it further

(Over)

ACADEMIC SENATE CSU
Page Two

AS-2138-93/FA
March 4-5, 1993

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the CSU Board of Trustees that any decision to reconfigure a CSU campus as a charter campus be made only after a positive recommendation from the campus' academic senate.
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the campus Academic Senates which may be addressing the desirability of assuming charter status to develop policies providing for appropriate faculty involvement in employee relations and funding structure as well as in the development of the charter campus' mission statements and academic master plans; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to withhold support for any proposed Charter campus legislation until such proposed legislation has been reviewed and approved by the Academic Senate of the California State University.

APPROVED -- May 7, 1993

Charter Campuses/FA



-11-
HUMBOLDT STATE
UNIVERSITY

APR - 1 1993

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

March 31, 1993

President Alistair McCrone
Siemens Hall
Humboldt State University
Arcata, CA 95521

Dear President McCrone:

The members of the Humboldt State University Charter Campus Study Group wish to thank you for inviting us to work together on this most exciting and important project. By creating such a diverse and representative Study Group and by allowing each member a voice in these beginning deliberations, you fostered the philosophical essence of our Charter Campus discussions and recommendations.

Many of the ideas in our report are not at all new and stem from seeds planted or actions taken over the years by our colleagues, both present and past. We gratefully acknowledge our debt to these people as well as to your leadership, and extend thanks to the many others, faculty, students, staff and community members, who contacted us by phone or letter to share their suggestions for the design of a Charter Campus. Energized by the concept, by your trust, and by the thoughtful exchanges we had amongst ourselves and with others about the possibilities of HSU becoming a Charter Campus, we present this document and stand ready to serve this cause in any way we can.

To you and all members of the University community, we make this most enthusiastic recommendation: Let us build on the extraordinary history and spirit of Humboldt State University, take confidence in our collective strength, integrity and imagination, and move forward vigorously in our design and implementation of a Charter Campus.

Yours sincerely,

Karen Carlton

Karen Carlton

Gail Fults

Gail Fults

Sherry Jones

Sherry Jones

David A. Somerville

David Somerville

Ken Combs

Ken Combs

William Herbrechtsmeier

William Herbrechtsmeier

Terrie Jordan

Terrie Jordan

Julie Stenger

Julie Stenger

Fred Cranston

Fred Cranston

Phillip Humphreys

Phillip Humphreys

Burt Nordstrom

Burt Nordstrom

Laurie Takao

Laurie Takao

Arcata, California 95521

The California State University

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE CHARTER CAMPUS CONCEPT

The concept of transforming HSU into a Charter Campus presents members of our community with an extraordinary opportunity. Rather than continuing to submit to the ongoing erosion of our programs by a fiscal crisis that shows little sign of abating and that threatens to destroy the integrity of the academy and the values it serves, we--students, faculty, staff, administration, and community members--may now assume a more active stance in reshaping the future of HSU.

To make clear that we intend this document to initiate free and frank discussion, those of us on the HSU Charter Campus Study Group wish to introduce our report with a series of questions:

- What will it mean to be a truly educated person in the 21st century?
- Whom are we at HSU attempting to educate?
- How does learning best occur?
- What are the means by which students can be empowered to become competent, lifelong learners?
- What can be done to better emphasize the teaching of a student-centered curriculum?
- What human and technological resources are needed?
- How can the University be restructured so that it best fulfills the highest potential of all its members?

The HSU Charter Campus Study Group realizes that HSU's limited monies and growing needs must be met with a most imaginative and creative response. We understand that changes in our structures, organization, curriculum, and procedures are inevitable. Moreover, we also believe that such changes ought to be shaped by HSU students, faculty, staff, administration, and community members rather than imposed from without. Thus, by regarding the Charter Campus concept as an opportunity for HSU students and personnel to actively and boldly participate in the University's transformation, the Study Group hopes to allay some of the fears that always surround change.

The aim of our document is to sketch a new picture, one more reflective of the realities of our world and our economy, yet one which will produce more learning for more students. And like all sketches, we have made no attempt to present a finished product. Rather, we have attempted to provide a preliminary definition of "Charter Campus," to examine CSU System opportunities and constraints, to explore some of the issues to be considered in developing a Charter Campus, to reflect on the benefits of such an enterprise, to address some concerns surrounding it, and to suggest ways of proceeding in the design of a Charter Campus petition.

In all of our deliberations, we turned again and again to Humboldt's strengths and to ways they might be enhanced. We reflected on HSU's unique student population, its

exceptional faculty and staff, its extraordinary geographical location. If positioned and organized effectively, HSU stands to enjoy great gain from the conjunction of its strengths with national as well as international concerns. Few institutions offer so much to people interested in teaching, business, environmental studies, and multicultural education. It is therefore with confidence in Humboldt's present and future reality, in the power of its history, spirit and vision, that we offer our ideas.

II. DEFINITION OF THE CHARTER CAMPUS CONCEPT AT HSU

The Charter Campus concept rests on the idea that locally controlled institutional communities can operate more efficiently and with greater imagination than those institutions bound by the administrative regulations that govern large bureaucracies. The intention behind this concept is to free selected campuses from the worst aspects of an over-centralized, highly bureaucratic system while preserving the best features of state support. Specifically, a CSU Charter Campus would be free from the constraints of the centralized system but would remain a state-funded institution. With increased flexibility and self-determination, such a campus could respond to challenges and take advantage of opportunities in the most timely and effective manner.

The designation of HSU as a Charter Campus would allow us as a community to institute exciting and innovative programs, to provide a model for state funded education into the 21st century. It would enable us to make the best use of available funds (from both state and non-state sources) to educate the people we serve. Together we could define our vision of education and determine how that vision would be carried out in the everyday activities of the institution and larger communities. Together we would write our "charter," decide how it would be enacted, and determine how we would evaluate our progress.

The Study Group regards the following features as essential to the character of an HSU Charter Campus:

- The financial support given to the school would be relatively free from bureaucratic attachments, both as regards the disbursement of funds for goods and services necessary for the running of the institution, and also for the establishment of curriculum and educational programs.
- Being free from the bureaucratic hierarchy of the CSU, HSU would establish its own internal governance along non-hierarchical lines. The managerial style would support an institutional culture based on consultation, encouragement, and mutual support; campus administrators would see themselves as servants to the students, staff, and faculty. As a part of the CSU system, and as a state-funded institution, HSU would remain accountable to the Board of Trustees and state and federal laws.
- Recognizing that certain reforms can be accomplished only gradually with the collaboration of many groups in the campus community, the restructuring of programs, curriculum, and administrative structure would take place over a minimum of five (5) years, during which time funding would remain (at least) constant. Only with this stability could intelligent and inclusive planning take place.

III. CSU SYSTEM OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS

The Charter Campus Study Group discussed the importance of holding to the positive dimensions of the HSU/CSU relationship. Clearly, a Humboldt Charter Campus would need to remain a state-funded institution, accountable to the Board of Trustees and the requirements of state and federal laws. In addition, we would want to maintain personnel employment agreements, collective bargaining, membership in the Academic Senate, and other such beneficial connections or opportunities associated with the CSU.

A few of the constraints of the system that would be removed, were HSU to become a Charter Campus, are as follows: (The list is not inclusive.)

- Budget policies would be changed to remove restrictions on fiscal affairs. A Charter Campus would use funds in a manner that would best serve its needs.
- Admission policies would be altered to permit HSU to determine its benchmark student population, to require confirmation deposits from admittees, to determine admissions criteria (graduate/undergraduate).
- The calendar year would be modified to allow HSU year-around operation, weekend and between-term mini-courses, as well as summer field work.
- Curriculum regulations and requirements stemming from the Post-Secondary Commission on Higher Education and from the Legislature as well as from the CSU system would be dissolved, allowing HSU to design and implement its own criteria for curriculum, degree programs, and grading system.
- The definition of faculty work-load could be made more flexible, in order to reflect accurately the demands of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, committee assignments, advising and special projects.

IV. ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS OF AN HSU CHARTER CAMPUS

A. Financing

Throughout the country and especially in California, state and federal funding for universities is being reduced by millions of dollars each year. Since many of the costs associated with higher education are increasing faster than inflation, the typical public-funded institution is now in an uncertain state. Humboldt, like most other universities facing budget cuts, has reacted by restructuring, eliminating programs and classes, reducing services, deferring maintenance, and freezing salaries. All of this has been done just to survive each coming academic year. Every decision associated with the University budget is evaluated, debated, and reviewed; then recommendations are written and sent on to the next administrative level. This process entails thousands of hours of faculty, staff and student time, hundreds of meetings at all levels of the University, and untold volumes of program justification reports. Could this time be better spent?

The key elements necessary for Humboldt to create sound fiscal management are State general fund support, research grants, development, and independence to use funds in a manner which is in the best interests of Humboldt. Education does not need to be extremely expensive. It takes good teachers, eager students, decent classroom space, adequate labs, and a first-rate library to provide a quality, learning environment. And yet the annual budget crisis which Humboldt endures has become such an imposing distraction to the University community that we are losing sight of our primary purpose, which is to educate and to serve the students.

Should HSU choose to become a Charter Campus, we could have less crisis management; we could develop a consistent plan of fiscal action; we could focus better on our educational responsibilities and opportunities. Such financial discretion and freedom would allow HSU to budget two or four years into the future by making reasonable assumptions about the University's general fund support, development, inflation, and enrollment. With this information the campus could set its own priorities to map the future and avoid the destructive atmosphere of the annual budget exercise.

The Study Group concluded that a Charter Campus designation would allow the HSU community to avoid the waste inherent in a central system bureaucracy and to properly manage University funds. It suggested the following changes in existing fiscal policies and procedures:

- Develop a two-year budget cycle that includes long-term plans and goals five to ten years into the future.
- Review all purchasing procedures, especially the "low-bid awarded" policy, and purchase locally whenever possible.

- Allow the campus more freedom to manage its own construction projects from beginning to completion.
- Save money over the long term by placing a priority on campus recycling.
- Allow Plant Operations to set its own maintenance priorities without strings attached to the funds or site review by the Chancellor's Office.
- Maintenance funds should be returned to the University based on size and age of the physical plant.
- State general fund money should be sent to the campus in one lump sum based on enrollment. The campus would have total discretion on how the funds would be spent.
- The University President would be responsible for overall University performance and accountability. There should be an independent audit of the campus Fiscal Affairs every two or three years.
- Student fees could be assessed on a differential scale, based upon program demand, delivery costs, or a student's ability to pay.
- Develop a state-of-the-art Financial Aids Office that is properly funded with quick processing abilities and more one-on-one financial counseling.
- Emphasize a customer-service philosophy throughout the University service and support units.
- Review all paper work and reporting procedures in order to eliminate all duplication or unnecessary work.
- Give the campus more autonomy in the selection of engineers, consultants, and other professionals.
- Increase funding for Special Repairs (deferred maintenance). Allow the campus to select the priority of utilizing the money to address deferred maintenance.
- Increase the allowable level of funding for Major Capital Outlay projects to reflect higher construction costs on the North Coast.
- Relax or eliminate the CSU formulas which drive space utilization and major capital outlay funding to recognize the liberal arts emphasis and high quality of the instructional experience at HSU.

- Allow appropriations to carry over to become two-year funds instead of one.
- Provide State support over a five-year transition period for the funding of development activities to allow the campus to identify and cultivate donations from foundations, corporations and individuals donors.

B. Governance

The removal of state regulations would give HSU much more structural freedom than it has at present, requiring its members to establish guidelines for self organization and regulation. As a campus community we would have to agree on a constitution and/or other foundational documents that would define our institutional framework. We would need to develop procedures for the regulation of our interactions on campus, and systems for guaranteeing accountability of the University to our local community, to the CSU, and to the taxpayers of California. The preliminary questions we would need to consider include the following:

- What does autonomy imply for our own self-governance?
- How would (or should) power be distributed, regulated, and contained?
- What sorts of governance structures and procedures would promote a favorable institutional culture?

In discussing possible responses to these questions, the Study Group agreed that:

- The design for our system of self-governance as a Charter Campus should be created by a committee (or committees) representative of every segment of the University community, including administration, faculty, staff, students, and people from the local area. Perhaps a preliminary organizing committee should be formed to decide how such a group would be composed and what sorts of procedures it should follow.
- As a community we should feel free (but not obliged) to revise the current administrative structure radically, including not only the existing chain of command, but even the idea of hierarchy itself, in order to create the kind of self-governance that would best facilitate our goals as a charter campus.
- The process of establishing governance should be directed towards the creation of an open and democratic campus in which every member of the campus feels included and represented. Likewise, the process through which the governance system is designed and ratified should operate according to these same principles.

Administrative Style. The Study Group envisioned the institutional culture of a Charter Campus as one in which openness, participation, consultation, dissent, and self-control would be encouraged at every level of campus life. Administrators and supervisors in all areas of University life would respect the professional commitment of the people whose work they coordinate and provide them with every opportunity for self responsibility and governance.

The Study Group agreed that the powerful on campus should embrace the most inclusive managerial style so that those people who often feel excluded would participate in creating a more democratic atmosphere on campus. In short, students and staff should be able to work in an environment where their intelligence, responsibility, and creativity are respected and applied; administrators, supervisors, and faculty should see themselves as servant-leaders.

With regard to any future planning of a Charter Campus, the Study Group recommends to the President that he actively encourage and protect the participation of all members of the University community. Specifically this means that staff be allowed to participate on committees as a part of their work schedule, and that students be allowed to miss class in order to participate in the process.

Personnel. With full awareness that the strength of HSU resides in its members and that the methods for selecting people for inclusion in the University are critical, the Study Group discussed the importance of designing admission, hiring, and retention policies that would facilitate wise personnel decisions.

Similarly, we emphasized the need for encouraging quality participation of personnel in the University through evaluation policies that offer positive incentives rather than the threat of punishment. Such policies would also provide a means for helping to reform those individuals who take their responsibilities too lightly or who are otherwise a negative influence on the campus.

The general principles governing evaluation, retention, promotion, and dismissal from the University should apply equally to all members (administration, faculty, staff, and students), though, of course, specific standards and procedures for evaluation would vary from area to area.

Form of Self-Governance. The process of converting HSU to a Charter Campus would involve two stages of self-governance, and the form of both, the Study Group agreed, should be decided as part of a deliberative, consultative, and democratic process. First, the HSU community would need to define itself and its Charter Campus constitution for Chancellor Munitz and the Legislature. Should we receive a mandate from the Legislature to proceed, the HSU community would next begin to implement its constitution and the form of self-governance articulated therein. The Study Group observed that any system of self-governance would help meet two general needs:

- , It would safeguard the democratic, consultative, creative environment we would create and maintain at HSU through the regulation of our own interactions on campus.
- It would provide a means of establishing accountability for University operations as a whole to the local community, the CSU, and the State of California.

C. Admission

As a Charter Campus, HSU would be free to decide how and which students are admitted. Rather than being constrained or limited by the CSU criteria (four years of English, three years of math, one year of science w/lab, two years of foreign language, one year of visual or performing arts and three years of electives), HSU could adjust admission standards and requirements to reflect its own unique goals and values.

Because academic standards vary widely within the California school systems, grades are not equivalent, making standardized criteria less than effective. More important, current standards serve to reduce the richness and diversity of our constituency, the students. Should HSU become a Charter Campus we would have the opportunity to revise admission standards so that they would allow for the acceptance of:

- older students whose outdated records do not reflect their current abilities;
- students who do not perform well on standardized tests or whose abilities are not reflected by grades;
- students who are poorly prepared academically but who are highly motivated to learn;
- students with significant life experiences (travel, work, artistic or scientific accomplishments) who may be lacking in test scores, grades or school credits;
- alternatively prepared students, such as students from foreign countries; and,
- all minority students dedicated to pursuing a high quality education.

In short, admission to an HSU Charter Campus could be based on materials other than or in addition to a student's GPA and standardized test results. We could invite students to present alternative evidence of their educational readiness, such as videos, interviews, or a portfolio of work.

D. Technology

In order to maintain the high quality of education presently offered at HSU, a commitment to the acquisition, training, and incorporation of information technology for the entire campus community is critical. Responding to this reality, the Study Group agreed that any restructuring of HSU into a Charter Campus would require the best in information and computing technology. In addition to helping instructors from all disciplines keep current in their studies, good technology would enable the University to succeed in efforts to recruit a diverse faculty and student body. Other benefits of improved technological resources include:

- greater access to computing technology for students, faculty, and staff;
- multimedia access and design facilities to encourage creative instruction and alternative study methods;
- information dispersal and collaboration opportunities through electronic connections;
- enhanced connections with the world community; and,
- increased productivity and "smarter" work.

E. Educational Program

Given the high quality of instruction and curriculum at HSU, the Study Group discussed both how a Charter Campus might preserve the integrity of existing academic programs and how it might make HSU an even more productive place for all its members. We agreed that instruction and curriculum should be student-centered and that the primary focus of restructuring efforts should be on improving teaching and learning. We agreed that an HSU education should be about creating culture in addition to knowledge acquisition. Our collective thinking amounted to a call for more:

- challenging content and standards for all students;
- active recruitment of minority students and faculty;
- responsiveness to the diversity of our students;
- learning opportunities and educational choices;
- effective class size and student/teacher ratio;
- inclusive and innovative teaching methods;
- emphasis on international education and languages;
- performance based accountability systems;
- problem-solving and critical and creative thinking;
- learning for understanding, rather than for grades;
- faculty development and improvement;
- student/faculty designing of courses and curriculum;
- integration of subject fields and team-teaching; and,
- community service, partnerships, internships.

The Study Group observed that if HSU were to become a Charter Campus, it would have the freedom to design and implement (or abandon) degree programs without the approval of CSU or the Post-Secondary Commission on Higher Education. It could design and implement the general education program without Legislature or Chancellor's Office interference. Without restriction, HSU could determine its calendar year, expand its instructional days to include weekend workshops, and develop innovative summer programs that would attract not only HSU students but other populations, such as teachers returning to school for in-service training (building on the established California Math and Writing Projects as well as on the Summer Arts Program), and exceptional high schools students wishing to take courses for college credit.

As a Charter Campus, HSU could offer short courses during Winter and Spring breaks; it could increase the offerings of evening and extension courses; it could extend credit for travel and work experience, community service, and artistic or scientific accomplishments. Optional unit awards could be given for the same course; for example, a 4-unit course in which a student is about to obtain a D grade could be reduced to a 2 unit course for the grade of C.

Most important, perhaps, HSU Charter Campus could award academic credit to students for what they already know, providing they pass their knowledge on to others. For example, HSU has 52 foreign students from 22 countries enrolled for the 1992-93 school year, all of whom could be encouraged to participate for course credit or fee deferment in classes with a focus on multicultural or global perspectives. In these ways, HSU could offer students greater flexibility in course and schedule selection, in earning credits, and thus provide many people with the opportunity to graduate in three years.

F. Relations to UC/CSU/Community Colleges/High Schools

The Study Group explored ways in which HSU as a Charter Campus could allow for more active partnerships with other educational institutions. Through curricular cooperation and portfolio assessment, for example, college credits could be given to students taking designated courses taught at local high schools. Similarly, strong high school students could be encouraged to enroll in HSU courses, particularly lower division G.E. courses in Languages, English, Math, or Speech Communication. In short, students who are worthy could apply their tuition and time wherever they might get the most benefit and thus take advantage of the broad range of fine courses, programs, and instructors available in the county. To support such educational mobility, HSU could provide free transportation between campuses and workplaces involving internship or apprenticeship programs.

To further strengthen HSU relations with local schools, including our local community college, there might be more teacher exchanges and three or four-way partnership programs with the community (i.e. service-oriented projects involving literacy, health, refugees, the homeless, or even sister city programs in other countries.)

Because the Study Group envisioned a Charter Campus as extremely active in helping students prepare for the workplace or for graduate school, close working relations with UC and CSU campuses would be imperative.

In all its relations with other institutions, an HSU Charter Campus would attempt to be as flexible as possible without compromising its academic standards. That is, HSU would wish to maintain the high level of reciprocity that presently exists, in terms of the transfer of courses and credits, and, if possible, increase the ease with which students can transfer in and out of the University.

G. Student Affairs

Student Affairs is integral to the mission of HSU and the educational experiences of its students. In concert with the faculty, it promotes the growth and development of the whole person, enhancing all aspects of student life. HSU has an obligation to provide more extensive support services than most other CSU campuses because of its distinctive character as a rural, residential campus with a unique sense of community, one which draws students from great distances and from a wide variety of backgrounds. As a Charter Campus, HSU could rethink and positively restructure Student Affairs services in the following ways:

- reestablish our psychological services and thereby act on our concern for each student's total well being;
- promote a student employment link with the community to help some students remain in school;
- strengthen peer support opportunities for students, including advising, government, clubs and organizations;
- enhance and expand learning support services for the entire student population, including remedial classes, tutoring, learning centers, and workshops;
- establish a common data base containing basic information on students which could be shared by all student services programs;
- enhance and expand programming, including trips, recreation and outdoor activities which foster a sense of participation and community and promote social, cultural and aesthetic development.

The Study Group agreed that restructuring Student Affairs for a Charter Campus would be dependent upon the restructuring of the rest of the campus and would respond to and reflect any new definition of the "Humboldt Experience."

H. Community Relationships

The University community is one which includes not only students, faculty, administrators and staff, but members outside campus boundaries—local professionals,

businesspeople, parents, public school children, residents and others who contribute to, participate in, and benefit from the activity which occurs near or on University grounds.

With this in mind, the Study Group emphasized the need to make representative community members a part of all decision making processes involving the design of a Charter Campus and to encourage their participation in the various stages and facets of implementation. We discussed the importance of providing the community with frequent updates on the University's transformation, and of University representatives reporting to different community boards responsible for community planning. In addition, alumni and parents should be informed of and invited to participate any decisions to design and implement a Charter Campus.

Partnerships. A Charter Campus designation might encourage more corporations, foundations and individuals to approach the University with socially responsible, environmentally sound educational ventures. Using the University's foundation guidelines, an HSU Charter Campus would seek partnerships with various organizations and individuals both inside and outside our community and state. Because an HSU Charter Campus would reach a much larger constituency than before, one which would include the participation of international, national as well as state students, the University would cultivate global connections that would serve both its academic purposes and fiscal needs.

Internships and Apprenticeships. As a Charter Campus, HSU could establish internship and apprenticeship programs which would allow students to work in industry or for the community in exchange for wages and/or for academic credit. Because the local area might not be able to handle all students involved in such programs, students would be allowed to participate in similar activities outside the area. Work-study programs abroad would be encouraged. Campus or community service programs could be made part of the HSU curriculum and required for graduation.

Teachers. A Charter Campus designation would give HSU the flexibility to allow community members with unique skills to teach in areas that are appropriate.

Learning and Cultural Center. An HSU Charter Campus would continue the University's work of providing educational and cultural activities for the community. It could increase its usefulness, however, by embracing the latest technology and by providing classes that would help community members in their job related fields. A Charter Campus could more actively associate itself with professional societies and groups that require continuing education.

Investment. As a Charter Campus, the University should try to become as efficient and cost effective as possible. Operations historically administered and procured by the University might be more efficient if acquired and operated by the private sector. This would require proper controls over the bid and cost benefit analysis process. Additional benefits would be possible if contract procedures were flexible. Local providers should be evaluated for their cost versus benefit, as compared to providers outside the area.

V. CLEAR BENEFITS OF AN HSU CHARTER CAMPUS

The most important benefit to be derived from designing and implementing a Charter Campus would be the coming together of the University community for the purpose of making HSU even stronger than it is at present. Ultimately, this would mean that the University would be in charge of its own destiny rather than having its future dictated from above. The non-hierarchical structure and inclusiveness of such an endeavor would insure that every group is given a voice; any sense of disconnection or fear felt by previously voiceless groups could give way to an experience of integration and empowerment.

Another major benefit would be the more efficient use of funds, resulting from an increase in the productivity and effectiveness of programs and operations, from a reduction of needless work or rework, and from the elimination of redundancies. Money saved could go to preserve the positions of the people who already work here, to enhance programs that have proven success, and to implement new creative ideas.

Finally, the Charter Campus concept offers us the opportunity to "experiment in excellence." We can define more particularly who we are, in a language we all share. With renewed commitment and a clarity of purpose, we can focus better on working together and compassionately serving our constituents in their pursuit of intellectual, spiritual, and physical wholeness.

VI. MAJOR CONCERNS THAT REMAIN UNRESOLVED

The members of the Study Group wish, again, to acknowledge the limitations of this document. Our short time together prevented us from addressing responsibly the numerous and complex issues surrounding the Charter Campus concept. But most importantly, we feel that the discussion and resolution of problems associated with the Charter Campus should be worked out by the campus community as a whole.

Below are listed a number of concerns that will need to be addressed during HSU community deliberations on the Charter Campus concept. While some of these issues are addressed in the document above, others are merely listed in the form of questions so that everyone in the University community will understand the importance of dealing with these problems comprehensively.

1. Employment Rights and Benefits. We recognize that the design of a Charter Campus petition must provide for faculty and staff benefits and rights currently in the contract or in the Education Code. We would hope that the Charter Campus might be able to improve on certain of these, but every effort should be made to retain current rights and benefits. Some concerns might be:
 - How will leave benefits be affected (e.g., sick leave, leave for bereavement and personal necessity, including the right to unlimited accumulation of sick leave)?
 - Will Student, Staff, and Faculty Union affiliations still be possible? How will contract agreements be negotiated? Is this an attempt on the part of the state (or Chancellor) to break the unions? What will be the long term affects of the Charter Campus on collective bargaining for staff and faculty?
 - Will faculty and staff retain membership in PERS, and will other retirement benefits still be available (e.g., Social Security benefits)?
 - What will the salary schedule look like? Will we be forced to take a cut in salary?
 - Will the Charter Campus create a group of second-class, lower-paid employees?
 - Will jobs be lost with the implementation of a Charter Campus?
 - How will our health, dental, vision and welfare benefits be affected?
2. Institutional Finances. We advise careful consideration of revenue issues. We suggest that a Charter Campus petition insure maximum state funding and actively encourage private support that is socially and environmentally responsible as well as educationally sound. Whatever plan is put forward, we must be certain that we do not jeopardize what little financial security we now enjoy.

3. Local Community Concerns. Members of the local community will also be affected by whatever changes are made at HSU. A few of their questions might be:

- Will the University be asking the local community for more monetary support to meet its budget?
- Will local students still be able to qualify for admission, and will they be able to afford the cost?
- Will there be cut-backs that will ripple through the local economy? Or will there be an expansion that will stretch the community's abilities to meet the needs of the University?
- Will the University continue to produce graduates who meet the needs of the local economy?
- Who will insure that our tax dollars are being well spent?

4. Student Concerns. Below are questions which might be representative of student concerns.

- Will a Charter Campus give the President total power over campus wide decisions?
- Would the President be able to spend University funds any way he wants?
- Will the administration have the power to raise fees as high as they see necessary?
- Can we be assured that the quality of HSU's educational program will not diminish?
- Can any academic major program be cut at any time?
- How will autonomy from the CSU system affect our financial support?
- Will there be more effective ways of evaluating tenured professors to insure that they continue to be good teachers?
- How will student services be affected?
- Would a Charter Campus be a more exclusive, "elitist" university?
- Will HSU still be accredited?
- If students decide they do not approve of the charter campus format, can they take their CSU admission elsewhere?
- What will a degree from an HSU Charter "experiment" look like to other schools and employers?
- How will a Charter Campus change HSU's existing relationships with local, state, national and international community?
- When would this Charter Campus program go into effect?
- Will it effect the graduation of existing students, or will there be grandfather clauses to protect graduates involved in the change?

5. Some Other Unanswered Questions:

- If HSU becomes a Charter Campus, how would it negotiate its relationship with accreditation agencies?
- How will legal matters be handled? Who will assume the liability risks of faculty, staff, administration? Who will be responsible for defense against law suits? How will conflicts be handled? Who will handle them?
- If we engage in a process of this magnitude to establish a Charter Campus, will the CSU system guarantee us the right to operate for a sufficient time period to warrant the investment of time and effort?

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER PLANNING

Should the HSU community decide that it is committed to the Charter Campus concept, it must first write a petition which would articulate in detail all components of the charter. Next, the petition would have to gain approval from the Chancellor and Legislature in order for implementation to begin.

The Charter Campus Study Group feels it unwise to make specific recommendations for the implementation of the Charter Campus beyond those that would apply to the next stage of deliberations. We have purposely addressed issues of a general nature (e.g., our vision of an inclusive, democratic, self-regulated campus), in order to allow those who are engaged in the next stage maximum freedom to consider the whole range of options and impediments.

Our specific recommendations are two:

1. The President should determine whether there is adequate *interest* in HSU becoming a Charter Campus. We stress the word "interest" here, since most people will surely be undecided as to whether they "support" the Charter Campus concept until a full discussion of possibilities, impediments, and specific proposals has taken place. It is our belief that if the campus community has sufficient interest in exploring this idea further, the President should implement a process that would both examine in greater detail our hopes and fears in making such a change, and (if interest and support intensifies) generate specific written proposals that could be included in a petition to the Chancellor.

We trust in the wisdom of the President to determine whether there is adequate interest on campus at this point to justify further deliberations.

2. If the President finds such interest, we further recommend that he establish committees, composed of representative members, to study every major area that needs to be addressed in a charter petition to the Chancellor. We feel that these committees should move thoughtfully yet swiftly so that, should the University community support the concept, a petition may be drafted with all due speed.

The headings of our document (under "Section IV, A-H") might be used as a framework for committee organization. If so, we recommend that a steering committee be established to coordinate the work of the various individual units. Or, the President might choose to establish a committee to study the matter further, and to make recommendations regarding committee structure. However such a network of committees be established, we urge the President to be as inclusive as possible in establishing the membership of these committees, and to allow these committees freedom to act as their conscience, creativity, and intelligence compel them. We are concerned that certain constituencies on campus, particularly students and staff, feel

Warren J. Baker
President

March 3, 1993

B. Koob
W. Mark

Howard West
Executive Assistant to the President

Exemption from Executive Order Regulations

As a follow-up to your request that I review various executive orders issued by the Chancellor's Office from which we might seek exemption as a part of the Charter Campus process, I have completed this review. I am listing below in sequential order the executive orders by number and title from which we might seek exemption. One note of caution: A number of the executive orders make reference to *Title 5* sections. I have not attempted to cross check these references with *Title 5* and therefore do not know whether or not the *Title 5* sections are in place as a result of legislation or whether they are there as a result of the Trustees exercising their authority to establish various policies, rules, and regulations. As I shared with you, some portions of *Title 5* are there because of legislation and may simply be a repeat of restrictions imbedded in legislation, or they may be expanded detailed rules and regulations based on legislative intent. And in other instances *Title 5* rules and regulations are there by Trustees exercising their legislative authority.

Executive Order 79	Faculty Obligations to Meet Classes
Executive Order 90	Admissions--Non-Resident Undergraduate-- Upper Division Transfers--Grade Point Average
Executive Order 148	Student Disciplinary Procedures
Executive Order 167	Transfer Credit
Executive Order 191	Transfer Extension Credit
Executive Order 213	Academic Renewal
Executive Order 268	Grading Symbols

Warren J. Baker
March 3, 1993
Page 2

Executive Order 276	Policy and Procedure for Acceptance and Installation of Exterior Artwork on CSU Campuses
Executive Order 298	Regulations Governing Extension Students Enrollment in Regular Session Offerings
Executive Order 313	Financial Management of Continuing Education
Executive Order 362	Establishment, Increase, Decrease, or Abolishment of Instructional Materials, Activities, and Facilities Charges (this executive order actually delegates to the campuses, with limitations, this authority--total exemption would be desired)
Executive Order 365	Systemwide Credit by Evaluation
Executive Order 366	Evaluation of Non-Traditional Credits and Grades in Determining Eligibility for Admission
Executive Order 369	ASI Budgets
Executive Order 393	Scholastic Probation and Disqualification
Executive Order 405	Graduation Requirements in U.S. History, Constitution, and American Ideals
Executive Order 413	Admission of Adult Applicants
Executive Order 421	International Student Exchanges
Executive Order 432	Additional Grade Points for High School Honors Courses
Executive Order 466	Special Sessions
Executive Order 469	Measles and Rubella Immunizations--Health Screening Program
Executive Order 491	Procedures for Fee Waiver

Warren J. Baker
March 3, 1993
Page 3

Executive Order 514	Competency in Student Writing Skills
Executive Order 523	Applicability of Eligibility Indices
Executive Order 533	CSU Risk Management Policy
Executive Order 539	Graduation and Diploma Fees (need further exemption from the \$20 limit)
Executive Order 546	Test Materials Fee (further exemption from \$25 limit)
Executive Order 547	Requirements for Admission to Teacher Education Basic Credential Program, Student Teaching, etc.
Executive Order 550	State Funded Campus Based Study Abroad Programs
Executive Order 551	Delegation of Fiscal Authority (need further delegation than provided in Executive Order 541)
Executive Order 563	Impacted Programs and Campuses
Executive Order 565	Policy and Procedures for Administration of Capacity Space
Executive Order 570	Extension Course Fees
Executive Order 582	Entry Level Mathematics
Executive Order 589	Summer Session Courses and Fees
Executive Order 590	Student Air Travel
Executive Order 595	General Education Breadth Requirement

CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS

Title 5. Education

Division 5. Board of Trustees of the California State Universities

The following list is a view of the Articles and Sections of Division 5 of Title 5 from which a Charter University would need exemption from in order to operate more efficiently and effectively. The review is a cursory review and merely points out some areas of concern. The listing is not necessarily complete, nor has it been reviewed by a wide audience for consensus building. Ultimately a desirable approach with the Trustees would be exemption from all sections with restoration done for those which can stand and a submission of substitute language for those that need modification.

Chapter 1.	California State University	
Subchapter 1.	Definitions	All OK
Subchapter 2.	Education Program	
Article 1.	General Function	All OK
Article 2.	Curricula	Exempt Following
40102	Procedures for Establishing Curricula	
40103	Definition of Units	
Article 3.	Special Sessions	Exempt Following
40201	Credit Allowance	
Article 4.	Extension Courses	All OK
Article 5.	General Requirements for Graduation	Exempt Following
40401	Election of Regulations	
40404	Requirements in US History, Constitution and American Ideals	
40405	General Education Objectives	
40405.1	CSU General Education-Breadth Requirements	
40405.4	Procedures for Implementing Programs to Meet General Education Requirements	
40407	Extension Credit	
Article 6.	Undergraduate Degrees	Exempt All
Article 7.	Graduate Degrees	Exempt All
Subchapter 3.	Admission Requirements	All OK
Subchapter 4.	Student Affairs	All OK
Subchapter 5.	Administration	
Article 1.	Community Relations Responsibilities	All OK
Article 2.	Facilities and Services	All OK
Article 3.	Fees	Exempt Following
41800	Payment of Fees	
41800.1	Application Fees	
Article 4.	Nonresident Tuition	Exempt Following
41900	Amount of Tuition	
41901	Nonresident Tuition, Amount and Time of Payment	
41903	Residence Determination Date	
41904	Residence Requirement	
41912	Tuition Determinations	
Article 5.	Housing	Exempt Following

42004	Schedule of Fees	
Article 6.	Meals	All OK
Article 7.	Parking	Exempt Following
42201	Campus Parking Fees	
Article 8.	Gifts, Donations, and Bequests to CSU	Exempt All
Article 9.	Use of CSU Buildings and Grounds	All OK
Article 10.	Disposition of Lost Property	Exempt All
Article 11.	Means of Collection	All OK
Article 12.	State College Specoa; Projects Fund	All OK
Article 13.	Emergency Meeting	All OK
Article 14.	Privacy and Personal Information Mgmt	All OK
Subchapter 6.	Auxiliary Organizations	All OK
Subchapter 7.	Employees	Exempt Following
Article 2.	Staff Org & Appointment of Employees	Exempt Following
42713	Work Assignments	
Article 2.2	Management Personnel Plan	
Article 3.	Compensation and Pay Plan	
Article 3.	Compensation and Pay Plan	
Article 16.	Authority to Meet and Confer with Employee Organizations	
Article 16.1	Public Notice of Initial Proposals of Exclusive Representatives and CSU	
Article 16.2	Bona Fide Associations	
Subchapter 8.	Environmental Quality	All OK
Subchapter 9.	Contracts and Purchases	Exempt All

RECEIVED

APR 7 1993

Academic Senate

TO: The Cal Poly Faculty and Staff

DATE: April 5, 1993

FROM: Warren J. Baker
President



SUBJECT: Charter Campus Report

Attached for your information is a copy of the Charter Proposal report as developed by the Campus Task Force as well as the letter transmitting the report to Chancellor Munitz.

April 1, 1993

Chancellor Barry Munitz
The California State University
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802-4275

Dear Chancellor Munitz:

As a follow-up to our conversations, I am forwarding to you the results of the work of Cal Poly's Charter University Task Force, as well as a number of other related documents. As I have shared with you, there is considerable enthusiasm for this concept on the campus. The ultimate goal, of course, is to free the University from rules and regulations that impede innovation and efficiency, with the provision that we submit our goals for your approval and agree on timely reporting of our progress towards these goals. In addition, we expect to fulfil whatever other accountability requirements may be established as we seek exemption from legislation and other administrative rules and regulations.

As you will note from the Task Force's summary report, we believe the first of several required steps to turn this concept into reality is to grant Cal Poly the authority to develop campus policies to replace current regulations. We believe this can best be achieved by requesting that the Board of Trustees delegate to you the authority to

exempt proposed charter campuses from all Board rules and policies that may have a negative impact on innovation and efficiency, i.e., all Executive Orders and *Title 5* requirements that are not required by legislation. Action by the Trustees will provide the necessary authority for the campus to initiate the development of replacement policies upon which exemption requests to you would be based.

In addition to initiating the first steps to a charter campus, this process also has the advantage of helping to identify legislation that may be needed. During this period, we will need to conduct a careful review, which would include intensive discussions with the Offices of General Counsel and Employee Relations, regarding the authority required to deal with fees and employee relations issues and to identify what legislation may be required. I would like to note that with regard to employee relations, it is not our intent to seek exemption from HEERA. However, we would like the campus faculty and staff to be in a position to decide whether or not they want collective bargaining and, if so, the form that collective bargaining would take, i.e., the principles and processes that would preserve the autonomy granted to a charter campus by the Board of Trustees. It is expected that issues such as compensation and working conditions would be subject to ratification/approval by the Board of Trustees or by authority delegated to you.

In summary the following steps are proposed:

1. Presentation to the Board and action by the Board delegating to you the authority as Chancellor to exempt proposed charter campuses from rules, regulations, and policies over which the Trustees have legal authority. May 1993
2. Approval of replacement policies upon which exemptions would be based. May 1994
3. Identification of legislative actions required to implement the charter campus concept fully, particularly in the areas of student fees and employee relations. March 1, 1994
4. Development of a plan to promote the establishment of charter campuses. March 1, 1994

Once we have been authorized to proceed with the development of policies for a charter campus, following the recommendations of our Task Force, we will establish a broad-based representative set of task committees to develop our proposal and seek campus endorsement.

For your information and background the following materials are enclosed:

1. Charter Proposal--a summary report of the Cal Poly Charter University Task Force.
2. The Charter University Task Force membership.
3. Summary minutes of the six meetings of the Task Force held between February 10 and March 10.
4. A March 9 memo from the Cal Poly Labor Council regarding its current stance on the charter campus hearings.
5. A minority report signed by the four collective bargaining unit representatives on the Task Force.
6. A preliminary review of Executive Orders from which exemption might be sought prepared by Howard West, Executive Assistant to the President.
7. A preliminary review of *Title 5* from which exemptions might be sought prepared by Dr. Walter Mark, Director of Institutional Studies.

With regard to enclosures 6 and 7, I would emphasize that these were not exhaustive reviews, and it is possible that some of the Executive Orders and *Title 5* sections identified may be based upon legislation as contrasted with policies and regulations adopted by the Trustees.

Should you need any additional information in preparing the proposed action by the Trustees, presumably at the Board's May meeting, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Warren J. Baker
President

Enclosures

CHARTER PROPOSAL

I. Preface

A deep commitment to the people of California motivates Cal Poly to submit a proposal to undertake a unique role within the CSU. This University firmly believes that higher quality, more responsive education of California's citizens is possible in a goals oriented environment than can be achieved in a highly regulated environment. Cal Poly's well-defined mission and strategic plan position it well for transition to a governance structure where performance is measured rather than activity controlled. This proposal expresses our beliefs and achievements possible (including continuous quality improvement, access, success, and graduation of students), and requests that we be allowed to develop our own policy structure. Through this proposal Cal Poly commits to providing measurable progress toward its goals in a prescribed time frame. These measures will demonstrate conclusively that dependence on local initiative and innovation leads to higher quality, greater satisfaction for both students and employees, and more cost effective delivery while maintaining fiscal viability.

II. Statement of Values

Cal Poly makes the offer to explore ways to reinvigorate higher education because of a number of deeply held beliefs.

Cal Poly believes in the value of higher education for the individual student. Higher education is a known route to personal intellectual growth. This growth includes learning skills and approaches, developing talents, becoming independent as well as learning the value of collaboration, learning to question and evaluate, to assimilate information, synthesize ideas, and gain approaches to problem solving. Higher education offers direct benefit to the state in the form of better educated, more creative, more productive and more tolerant citizens.

Cal Poly believes in the principles of the California Master Plan for Higher Education. In particular, it wishes to assure accessibility to higher education for qualified California high school graduates and provide the opportunity for all students to pursue their educational goals as far as their abilities allow.

Cal Poly believes in its own mission statement which reads in part:

"As a predominantly undergraduate, comprehensive, polytechnic university serving California, the mission of Cal Poly is to discover, integrate, articulate, and apply knowledge. This it does by emphasizing teaching; engaging in research; participating in the various communities with which it pursues common interests; and where appropriate, providing students with the unique experience of direct involvement with the actual challenges of their disciplines."

The polytechnic nature of this University makes it an invaluable contributor to the evolving social and economic needs of a modern California.

Cal Poly believes in the rights and responsibilities of all people and our need to help all associated with the University to develop to the fullness of their potential.

Cal Poly believes in the value of a continuing quest for excellence. It is because of this belief that we welcome the considerable burden of re-examining all we do. Examination is the first step toward improvement.

Cal Poly believes in collegiality and a trust for one another. This trust must be based on the integrity of all students and employees. If all associated with the University behave with integrity, then honesty and openness will characterize all activities.

Cal Poly believes in its responsibility to meet the needs of the State of California. While its first responsibility is to help prepare productive and conscientious members of society, it also has a responsibility to be aware of other forms of service it may provide.

III. Summary of Goals

This set of beliefs leads naturally to goals that we set for ourselves. Cal Poly's strategic plan contains a carefully developed set of goals and may be examined separately. A few of those goals are paraphrased here.

Cal Poly wishes to achieve high quality in all of its endeavors. The commitment to pursue quality means that specific objectives will be set for each of our stated goals. To us, objectives are comprised of statements of measurable performance accomplished in a stated time. By regularly revising objectives, continuous improvement in performance is possible, and higher quality is achieved. Cal Poly begins this quest from a considerable base of success. The University will build upon that success in a manner that assures continued commitment to its students and employees.

Cal Poly wishes to graduate people educated to meet the changing needs of society. This recognizes the world is now characterized by a global, competitive economy. It requires that students acquire skills in critical thinking, team work, communications, analysis and synthesis, as well as job skills based on a state-of-the art awareness of the professions we prepare students to enter.

Cal Poly pledges to develop a student body and employee work force that is reflective of the rich diversity of California's population. We believe that through the vast resources of our different cultures, we can take a leadership role in creating an environment in which diversity is valued and appreciated as a critical element in the higher education experience.

Cal Poly wishes to have satisfied and successful students. Cal Poly admits only students who are predicted to be successful in the University. However, our services must be designed to help them realize this potential. We must assure that each student has timely access to any class required for appropriate progress toward the student's stated educational goal. We must develop our support services to assure that each student's needs are met promptly and with courtesy. We must provide necessary and appropriate opportunities for each student's socialization.

Cal Poly wishes to have satisfied, successful, and productive employees. All employees must understand the goals of the enterprise and the value of their role in achieving those goals. They must be empowered to do their jobs in a way that allows them to achieve a sense of satisfaction and productivity. Each employee must be treated with the respect due a valued person, and each employee must be given the opportunity to develop full professional potential.

Cal Poly wishes to achieve optimum use of our human and other resources. This includes taking leadership in the application of new technology and pedagogy to higher education.

IV. Opportunity Sought

In order to achieve these goals, Cal Poly believes it must have the opportunity to develop its own policies affecting its students, employees, and other resources.

A student's formal education is directly affected by the academic programs of the University, its curriculum, graduation requirements, enrollment management practices, and class calendar. The equally important informal education that occurs outside the classroom is affected by opportunities for socialization, personal and professional support, recreational and organized club activities, and other extra-curricular activities.

Employee concerns include well defined terms and conditions of employment including the reward structure, working conditions, benefits, protection of rights, and availability of employee assistance. Employees also wish to have a role in the governance structure of the University and the ability to contribute thoughtfully to decisions that affect their situation.

The University also wishes to have the right to supplement its income stream. This includes the authority to set fees and prices, access to general fund and lottery revenues, access to proceeds from bond sales, income from real and personal property, and formation and use of auxiliaries and enterprises funds.

The University must also concern itself with the optimum use of its other resources. These include administration of costs, real and personal property, infrastructure, auxiliaries and enterprises, professional consultation services, and the authority to perform the treasury and bursar functions.

To sustain the public trust and confidence to undertake this opportunity, we warrant fiscal viability, performance, and regular reports (positive and negative) of measurable progress toward our goals.

V. Implementation

From the time Cal Poly is granted flexibility to develop its own policies in any given area, one year will be necessary to develop and validate the metrics for the variables contained in that policy. The periodicity of measurement and reporting will be described as a part of the policy.

Cal Poly proposes the following evolution toward implementation:

- A. July 1, 1993. Cal Poly is empowered to develop a proposal for the Board of Trustees describing its policies, metrics, and reporting schedule in all areas currently regulated by Title 5 and Executive Order which the Trustees have the authority to delegate. This proposal will be developed with full participation by all members of the Cal Poly community.
- B. July 1, 1994. Cal Poly switches formally to new policy framework in these areas. Cal Poly is empowered to develop policies in areas regulated by State law.
- C. July 1, 1995. Cal Poly completes transition to self governance with continued reporting to the CSU Board of Trustees.

M e m o r a n d u m

Date : March 9, 1993

To : President Warren Baker
Cal Poly State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Copies: Chancellor Munitz
Board of Trustees
CSU Govt'l Affairs Office
CSU Labor Council Govt.
Relations Ofcs.

From : Charter University Task Force Members

Re : Minority Report-- Opposition to SB 1448-Type Legislation for the CSU

President Baker, on February 2, you announced the formation of a Charter University Task Force to consider the applicability of recent legislation (The Charter Schools Act, effective January 1, 1993) at Cal Poly. The Task Force met approximately once a week for two hours from February 10 through March 3. Including Vice President Robert Koob and staff support, the Task Force was composed of roughly 15 managers, 7 faculty/staff, and 1 student.

The first meeting was a brainstorming session where Task Force members were asked to discuss the ideal--what we would like Cal Poly to be--and barriers to that vision. Two "ideals" offered by authors of this report were: "Solidarity of Cal Poly labor force" and "Trust via a strong contract where employee rights are clearly articulated and respected." Dr. Koob's transcription to the board altered these ideals to read: "Solidarity among campus employees" and "Trust for each other." HEERA, PERB, and labor law were identified by authors of this report as closely connected issues, not barriers. Dr. Koob, however, placed them along side the barriers being identified. They were included as barriers in the notes distributed at the next meeting, where correction was requested.

At the second meeting, February 17, the Task Force broke into subcommittees: Students; Employees; Funding; Governance. In the following week, the Employee subcommittee (3 managers, 3 faculty/staff) met for approximately eight hours, but were asked to refrain from any discussion of collective bargaining for the first four hours, in order to accommodate the availability of the staff personnel officer. Two of the subcommittee members wanted a strong statement for collective bargaining in the report and gained committee consensus with the words "collective bargaining options." The words were excluded from the final Task Force proposal.

During the same week, the Governance subcommittee reviewed articles in the California Education Code and reported back to the Task Force specific articles a campus charter might retain. Other articles, articles covering CSU personnel--including procedures for LAYOFF--were identified for exemption. In the event Cal Poly did not have collective bargaining, these articles (including the sections on personnel and LAYOFF) were characterized as problematic. They could "inhibit" the

necessary "flexibility." The subcommittee was told that state law from which Cal Poly would seek exemption could be added at a later date. Thus the Task Force was not apprised of specific law from which exemption might be requested. Nonetheless, the subcommittee's documents speak for themselves. Numerous employee protections in state law were deemed cumbersome regulation.

At the third Task Force meeting, February 24, we members of the Task Force began asking more pointed questions regarding the urgency of this matter--less than one month to draft a proposal of unprecedented magnitude for the CSU. We questioned the wisdom of dismantling in ten hours the legislation of a century. Our request for more time, more discussion, more campuswide involvement was met with visible impatience by at least one Task Force member.

At the fourth meeting, February 26, Dr. Koob stated that some sort of charter approval process would have to be worked out, but "how it would function or what it would look like is too complex for now; it would have to be decided later."

At the fifth meeting on March 3, we members of the Task Force expressed inability to support a recommendation jeopardizing employee protections. Our position remains steadfast; we can not endorse a proposal that endangers rights Cal Poly employees are granted by state law. We can not request Cal Poly's exemption from state law protecting employees, without knowing with certainty what will replace those laws. At this same meeting we provided Dr. Koob with a written statement expressing our neutrality on the charter issue. The statement was prepared after learning that Dr. Koob had portrayed unanimous Task Force support for the concept in a meeting with CSU personnel the prior Monday. We support discussion of the concept; we have not rejected it out of hand. But we have not endorsed the concept.

At that last meeting the issue of TRUST was a recurrent theme. Dr. Koob assured us that this proposal asks only for the freedom to dream. We too take pleasure in dreaming. Our dreams are grounded in reality.

Senate Bill 1448 was written to address the crisis in California's K-12 public schools. According to Gary Hart, the bill's author, "Too many of our schools are failing . . . too many of our students are disillusioned." **The same does not apply to the CSU.** The crisis in the CSU is budgetary. We members of the Task Force would urge Chancellor Munitz to direct scarce CSU Governmental Affairs' resources away from dreams of autonomy and toward the important business of saving our System from budget destruction.

While we invite further exploration of the charter concept, we cannot support the Task Force proposal, for lack of specificity. We oppose any request for SB 1448-type legislation that would provide Cal Poly exemption from unspecified state law governing the CSU. We can not in good conscience endorse a proposal that could repeal employee protections without knowing what would replace those protections.

Thank you for accepting this minority report.

Mem - Exec Com 5/10/93

TO: Executive Committee

May 19, 1993

FROM: Ron Brown

SUBJECT: The Calendar Resolution

I think that we should offer to the Academic Senate a resolution that not only receives the report from the calendar committee, or maybe even accepts it, but also makes a recommendation.

My personal preference for an academic calendar is less important to me than that whatever decision we collectively make is carefully thought out and based on how it will improve the quality of the education offered by Cal Poly. If we make the decision on reasons other than that, we are doing a disservice to the entire university community.

The substantive issues that distinguish the two most favored calendars can generally be distilled to a question of whether breadth or depth in academic programs is preferable. Neither the faculty nor the students favored a trimester system - but there may well be some real merit to it that was not carefully considered by those responding to the survey. The president clearly has a preference - and there may be some reasons behind the preference that should be given a more thorough hearing. The point is, any change (or even the decision not to change) should be made based on carefully considered reasons that relate to what we are trying to accomplish at this university.

I don't want to tie the calendar discussion directly to the charter discussion, but my feeling is that part of the reason for the charter discussion is for the university community to identify what it is trying to accomplish and how it can best do that. If that discussion were to lead to a clearly articulated set of guiding principles for the university (for example, that curricular decisions should be made favoring depth over breadth - I just made that up, no one has yet suggested it), it might also drive a calendar decision. In any event, if the university were to endorse the concept, develop a charter, and thus be identified in the system as being "different", it might then be more palatable to consider the vision that the president has for a full-year trimester calendar since we would be free to explore academic calendars that do not necessarily fit with those of the other campuses.

The calendar decision can be made independently of a charter decision, but should not establish a constraint on constructing a charter before that discussion has a chance to develop.

no later than

I propose that the Executive Committee offer to the Senate a resolution that accepts the committee report and states that it will make a formal recommendation on what calendar to adopt following one year of discussions of the calendar options by the Instruction Committee, Student Affairs Committee, Curriculum Committee, and the various charter campus committees.

Resolved
The report be accepted and further study of the implications of the various calendar systems be studied by the appropriate committees with a recommendation to be brought before the next session of the Academic Senate, 1994.

Exea - 5120.93

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-1829-88/FA (REV.)
September 8, 1988

FACULTY ROLE IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW CAMPUSES

- WHEREAS, The California State University will establish new campuses in the immediate future; and
- WHEREAS, It is likely that the CSU Board of Trustees will determine at its November meeting whether immediately to establish a new CSU campus at San Marcos; and
- WHEREAS, Significant faculty participation will be required in such matters as the selection of new campus presidents, the recruitment of other administrators and faculty, the formulation of mission statements and academic master plans, the determination of curricula, and the design of physical facilities, especially teaching and laboratory space; and
- WHEREAS, The "CSU Statement on Collegiality" assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for the educational functions of the University in accordance with basic policy as determined by the Board of Trustees, including responsibility for curriculum and policies for hiring, evaluation, and retention of faculty; and
- WHEREAS, By CSU Trustee policy, three faculty members serve on the Presidential Selection Advisory Committee for each campus presidential search, and
- WHEREAS, Systemwide policy should make clear that, prior to the establishment of a new campus, appropriate representatives appointed by and from the CSU faculty should participate in the selection of the president and other administrators of a new campus; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of the California State University as the representative of the CSU faculty on systemwide educational issues, is the appropriate faculty consultative body for the establishment of policies regarding new campuses; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to work expeditiously with Academic Senate CSU to develop and adopt policy for the establishment of new campuses, including appropriate faculty involvement in (1) the selection of the president, other administrators, and faculty, (2) the formulation of mission statements, academic master plans, and curricula, and (3) the designing of educational physical facilities; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to keep the Academic Senate CSU fully informed at all stages of planning for new campuses and to involve appropriate faculty representatives in the development of new campuses and the selection of new campus leadership and faculty.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

October 27, 1988