

FILE COPY

Academic Senate  
Executive Committee Meeting  
July 20, 1993

Agenda

*minutes of and  
7.2, 7.13, and  
6.1. 93 were  
removed*

Charter Campus:

1. Oversight group to oversee the process and development of a charter campus model
2. Selection of faculty for charter campus planning committees
3. Proposed process for charter campus planning

Diversity:

1. Committee to develop resolution addressing diversity issues
2. Make available:
  - a. copy of EOAC resolution
  - b. list of 4 or 5 suggested points to address vis-a-vie diversity issues at Cal Poly
    1. curriculum - make GE&B requirements more liberal
      - EX 1: enable substitution of courses other than those dealing with Modern World History for HIST 315
      - EX 2: encourage development of courses meeting the U.S. Cultural Pluralism requirement
      - EX 3: others
    2. hiring and RPT of faculty
      - a. endorse EOAC proposal
      - b. others (bicultural requirement?)
    3. work with ASI, cultural clubs, Cultural Relations Committee, Multicultural Center, etc. to seek ways to infuse interest in diversity throughout the student body
    4. "air" issues on diversity
      - a. student issues and concerns
      - b. faculty issues and concerns
      - c. faculty hiring, RPT
- through
  - a. workshops
  - b. other
3. "Diversity" education is not limited to ethnic diversity

## Diversity Proposal for RPT

To enhance the University's commitment to diversity and to encourage faculty to become more involved, the EOAC proposes that diversity considerations become an integral part of the retention, promotion and tenure (RPT) process. Currently, faculty are asked to show competence in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and University or community service. It is proposed that within each area, diversity-related activities be specifically noted. It is not intended that faculty must fulfill diversity requirements in all three categories. However, diversity-related activities should appear in at least one category.

Diversity, in this context is defined in terms of "differences in age, country of origin, creed, economic background, ethnicity, gender, physical disability, race, and sexual orientation" (Educational Equity Commission, 1992). Diversity-related activities encompass any activities (broadly defined) included within the three areas of RPT consideration (i.e., teaching, scholarship, and University or community service). For example, if one adds materials related to diversity into lectures or teaches a course dealing with diversity, this would be a diversity-related, teaching activity. Scholarship would include research on diversity topics, attending diversity-related conferences/workshops, making presentations at such conferences/workshops, and similar activities. University or community service would include serving on committees associated with diversity, volunteering for organizations that are diversity related, etc. In essence, the definition of what types of activities fit within each of the three categories of evaluation is to be broadly defined.

The purpose of this proposal is not to be punitive, but to facilitate faculty awareness and involvement in this important issue. Because the omission of information dealing with diversity is an omission of knowledge itself, such activity should lead to better teaching, better scholarship and, in the greater humanity for both faculty and students alike.

*Final - Exec 7-10-93*

# Memorandum

To : Pres. Warren Baker

Date : July 14, 1993

From : Cal Poly Labor Council

Copies : All Employees in Bargaining Units  
2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9  
Irene Cordoba, Employee Relations  
Specialist, Chancellor's Office  
John Howard, SETC  
Teven Laxer, CSEA Senior Labor  
Relations Representative  
Barry Munitz, Chancellor  
Bob Negranti, Human Resources  
Pat Nichelson, CFA President  
Ed Purcell, APC Senior Labor Relations  
Representative  
Lisa Rothstein, CSEA Labor Relations  
Representative  
Frank Rowan, CFA Regional Service  
Coordinator  
Wiggys Sivertsen, APC President  
Mike Suess, Director Faculty Affairs  
Brian Young, CSEA President  
Board of Trustees

Subject: Charter University

As you may recall, Lisa Rothstein, CSEA Labor Relations Representative, and Jim Conway, CFA President, both met with you regarding the Charter University concept.

You know that the employees represented by the exclusive bargaining agents, CFA, CSEA, APC and SETC, are concerned about the impact of Charter. Specifically, people are afraid that it could diminish wages, benefits, and employee rights that have already been won through collective bargaining and/or the legislature. Employees are very concerned that the University might try to undermine collective bargaining rights or seek exemptions from key pieces of legislation including HEERA, Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations and the California Education Code.

While some administrators have denied any such goals, others have suggested such things in writing. As a result, there is a great deal of confusion. Some employees have been assured that there will be no negative impact on employee rights and have even been termed paranoid or obsessive for continuing to bring up concerns. It is this situation that leads us to write to you.

If the University has no plans to alter employee rights or diminish wages, benefits, or conditions of employment, then why does the Administration refuse to give us guarantees in writing? We request written guarantees that:

- 1) Current wages, benefits and terms and conditions of employment will not be diminished.
- 2) The University will not seek exemption from HEERA.

- 3) The University will not seek exemption from those sections of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations or the sections of the California Education Code that deal with employee rights and working conditions.
- 4) The University will not terminate collective bargaining rights with any of its employees.
- 5) The University agrees to the principle of binding arbitration in accordance with Article 8 Section 3589 of HEERA.

Please respond with specifics in writing to each of these five points. All employees will be impacted by it. They have a right to know how their jobs may be affected.

We respectfully request a written response within two weeks. If we do not hear from you, we must assume that the University is not prepared to guarantee continued employee rights as part of the Charter University.



*Mins - Exec 7-20-93*  
**CALIFORNIA FACULTY ASSOCIATION**

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY CHAPTER

**TO:** Warren Baker, President  
California Polytechnic State  
University, San Luis Obispo

**DATE:** July 19, 1993

**FROM:** Jim Conway, *JCC* President  
Cal Poly Chapter of the  
California Faculty Association

**cc:** R. Koob  
M. Suess  
Members of CFA  
Executive  
Committee  
PACBRA Members

**CONCERNING:** Improved Budget Situation and Engineering Technology Layoffs  
of Tenured Faculty Members

I am writing this memo on behalf of the four faculty members in the Engineering Technology Department that received layoff notices before the end of Winter Quarter 1993. With the improved budget situation the CSU and Cal Poly now faces for the 1993-94 academic year is it now possible to rescind those layoff notices. Can we find some way to keep these faculty at the University? One way would be to have them take a position with them to any new department willing to accept them, so that accepting them would not be a cost to the department.

If homes were found for these faculty at Cal Poly, then Cal Poly would not be the campus in the CSU that has laid off the most tenured and tenure track faculty, a dubious distinction. I hope that similar arrangements can be made for faculty in the Home Economics Department, should the occasion arise to layoff tenured faculty in that department. It seems that the University needs to protect loyal employees, who want to teach at Cal Poly.

Miss - Exec 7.20.93

To: \*Presidents,\*Board,\*Staff  
From: Gerie Bledsoe  
Subject: Budget News  
Date: 7/09/93 Time: 4:29p

As many of you already know, the CSU received \$50 million in unanticipated funds from the state and a 10% increase in fees. It is calculated that this will reduce the actual cut in campus budgets to 1.5-2.5% from last year. We are also aware that the CSU has approximately \$15 million "extra" in health care cost funds that may be allocated for other purposes.

According to responsible sources in the Chancellor's office, the Chancellor has "instructed" the presidents that, given the budget news, there will be no need to terminate the appointments of any tenure track faculty next year for reasons of financial exigency. The Chancellor's staff is also anticipating bargaining over MSAs and salaries. Funds have been set aside by the Chancellor, we have been led to believe, for a part-year MSA for all eligible faculty, and there are hints of additional funds for a small cost-of-living increase--raising the pay scale for all. There is also loose talk about some new way of rewarding "merit." Regardless, these are all questions that will go to the bargaining table. Throughout the effort in Sacramento this spring, the CFA position did not budge--MSAs for all eligible faculty, first, and then a general increase for all, as the best way to remedy the problems confronting the faculty and their institutions. We have some reason to believe that the Chancellor accepts the basic wisdom of the CFA's position.