

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

**Minutes of the Academic Senate**  
**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**Tuesday, September 24, 1991**  
**UU 220, 3:00-5:00pm**

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:13pm.

- I. Minutes: The minutes of the May 28, May 30, and June 6, 1991 Executive Committee meetings were approved with one correction: The day of the minutes for May 30, 1991 should be "Thursday" instead of "Tuesday."
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Items A, Retroactive GPA Changes, and B, Academic Probation and Disqualification, were brought to the committee's attention. Both items address recommended GPA changes which have been sent to the Academic Senate Instruction Committee for review. The recommendations and committee's comments will be forwarded to the Academic Senate for its approval. M Botwin suggested a committee response date of early January. J Murphy, as chair of the Instruction Committee, will ask the committee to address these items as soon as possible.
- III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair: The Chair of the Academic Senate was pleased with the turnout of committee members at the first meeting of committees held during Fall Conference week.

Comments were made concerning the Chancellor's address at the Fall Conference General Session. Several positive comments were made regarding Chancellor Munitz's remarks. M Shelton stated his department felt very encouraged by the content of his talk.

- B. President's Office: none

- C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office: Vice President Koob addressed two matters. (1) Recommendations from last spring's Program Review Task Force were needed so budgetary decisions could be made based on programmatically relevant information. This was not an academic, curricular process. There aren't sufficient resources to sustain all present programs. We may be closing programs that are the best in California but have the lowest priority on our campus. It is the Academic Senate that is to establish a process to review and prioritize programs on an ongoing basis. The Senate will decide, as much as possible, what the priority of programs are on this campus. The Academic Senate is asked to prepare its recommendations for the coming year before April 1992 and to periodically update its recommendations. If the Senate makes its wishes known, funds will be deployed in accordance. If not, budgetary decisions will be made without Senate input. No final programmatic decisions have been made to date--only budgetary.

It was mentioned that strategies must also be developed to get the State to release more resources to the CSU. M Botwin asked if cutting programs was obligatory or would "cutting back and trimming" be acceptable? Vice President Koob responded that reductions were acceptable. The Senate chooses. J Murphy felt a broader base than the Senate should provide input regarding what programs to add/discontinue. J Vilkitis asked if review of new program budgeting would be a charge given to the Academic Senate Budget Committee. Dr. Koob responded that there are two reviews the Academic Senate has responsibility for. Decisions regarding the academic merits of a program are made by the Senate. Decisions regarding the budgetary merits of a program are recommendations the Senate makes, through its Budget Committee, to the President. These two reviews are different but complementary. The Budget Committee acts in an advisory capacity. Academic and budgetary concerns are complementary but not equal in weight or role.

To demonstrate the severity of the budget reduction, Dr. Koob noted that a reduction of one WTU equals an 8 percent program cut in staff/faculty/operating budgets.

(2) Two deans were added over the summer: William Boyes in the School of Business and Paul Neel in the School of Architecture and Environmental Design. Susan Roper was also appointed Director for the University Center for Teacher Education. We are now in the process of forming a search committee for the School of Agriculture dean. Nominations are due in the Academic Senate office by October 16, 1991.

- D. Statewide Senators: T Kersten reported that the central administration of the CSU is shrinking. Positions are being eliminated. More duties and powers are being delegated to the individual campuses. As more responsibility is placed on the campuses, the Academic Senate of each campus will become more crucial as the voice of the faculty regarding a wide range of matters.

R Gooden: The position of Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations is going to be cut. This could mean faculty relations will be less important, or it could mean that there will be a closer relationship to faculty collective bargaining. T Kersten: A new position for collective bargaining is being created and is high in the hierarchy. Collective bargaining is not being diminished. (June Cooper is presently in that office.) Collective bargaining issues will be more closely overseen by the Chancellor in the future. Some important functions will have to find new homes. For example, Faculty Development Programs and the Affirmative Action Development Program. W Reynoso commented that as president of the Unit 4 bargaining unit, she has seen more willingness to deal with grievances at the campus level instead of escalating them to Level III which places them in the Chancellor's Office.

R Gooden brought the committee's attention to the Academic Senate CSU Agenda for November 1991. In particular, Resolution AS-2035-91/FA entitled "Faculty Responsibility for Campus Discussion on Issues of Critical Importance to Higher Education" requests campus senates and faculty to initiate "discussions on issues of critical importance to higher education, recognizing that some discomfort may be a consequence in a climate of vigorous discussion." How do issues of politically correct speech, affirmative action requirements, etc. impinge on Academic Freedom?

J Vilkitis brought three statewide resolutions to the committee's attention: (1) AS-2039-91/FA "Improvements in the CSU Forgivable Loan/Doctoral Incentive Program," (2) AS-2038-91/FA "Support for Efforts to Obtain Judicial Review of AB 702," and (3) AS-2034-91/FA "The Definition of 'Indirect Instruction' in the 1991 M.O.U. Between the CSU and the CFA." Any comments regarding these three resolutions should be made to J Vilkitis so he can bring them to the meeting in November.

- IV. Consent Agenda: Items will be placed on the Consent Agenda, for Executive Committee approval, when the Chair feels it is appropriate.

V. Business Items:

- A. Academic Senate/committee vacancies:  
SAGR: Robert Rutherford will substitute for William Amspacher on the Senate during Fall Quarter. Bill Kellogg was appointed to the University Professional Leave Committee for the '91-93 term.  
SBUS: John Dobson will remain on the Elections Committee for the '91-93 term.  
SPS: Patricia Engle was appointed to the Research Committee for the '91-93 term.

- B. Academic Senate Calendar: approved unanimously. It will appear on the Consent Agenda for the next Academic Senate meeting.

- C. Academic Senate assigned time: the following assigned time distribution was approved:

Chair	25 WTU
Vice Chair	to be granted by Dean of Library
Secretary	3 WTU
Budget Chair	8 WTU
Curriculum Chair	9 WTU

GE&B Chair(s)	6 WTU
Fairness Board Chair	3 WTU
Long-Range Planning Chair	4 WTU
reserved for future distribution	<u>5 WTU</u>
total	63 WTU

J Vilkitis, co-chair of the General Education and Breadth Committee, stated that some units might be returned from this committee. M/S/P (Murphy/Botwin).

- D. Amendments to the Academic Senate requiring adoption by the General Faculty: two resolutions, passed during Spring Quarter 1991 (AS-353-91 and AS-365-91), should have gone to the General Faculty within 45 days of their approval. However, the academic year ended with less than 45 days to send same to the General Faculty. Before going to the General Faculty for voting this Fall Quarter, the Chair wanted to bring these resolutions to the Executive Committee for any last comments.

R Koob noted that Resolution AS-353-91 (p. 19 of agenda) shows Cooperative Education faculty as members of Professional Consultative Services (PCS); however, Cooperative Education is to be discontinued within the year. It was agreed to leave the wording as it was since it was not a substantive change. Discussion occurred as to whether AS-353-91 needed to go to the General Faculty since the intention of the resolution was to clarify what classifications comprised PCS. T Kersten stated that if the resolution suggested changes considered to be "editorial emendation" (a revision which does not change the meaning of the phrase), then a General Faculty vote would not be required.

Dr. Koob also mentioned the possibility of a staff senate being formed which would take PCS out of the Academic Senate and place it in the staff senate. W Reynoso stated she knew of no PCS members who wanted to have a staff senate instead of Academic Senate representation.

Discussion regarding AS-365-91 centered around the representation issues of this resolution. J Vilkitis expressed concern about the possibility of double representation if members who taught in both a school and a center would be counted twice when representation was determined. J DeMers explained this would not happen because only faculty solely affiliated with a center would be counted when determining representation.

A motion was made by W Reynoso to consider the changes proposed by AS-353-91 as editorial emendations and only send Resolution AS-365-91 to the General Faculty for passage. The motion failed 4 - 7.

J Murphy made the motion to send both AS-353-91 and AS-365-91 to the General Faculty for passage. The motion passed with two abstentions.

- E. Selection of Nominees to the Intersegmental CAN Course Description Committees: C Russell was nominated by R Gooden and J Murphy as a nominee representing the discipline of Music. C Russell declined the nomination due to prior commitments. The Chair will solicit individuals for these positions.
- F. Resolution re Faculty Suspension with Pay: This resolution was sent back to the Personnel Policies Committee for modification. J Murphy suggested time frames be included for (1) faculty receiving a notice of suspension to request specific details of charges, and (2) for the President's response to said request. The committee agreed to put this on the Academic Senate agenda when it is returned from the Personnel Policies Committee.
- G. Resolution re Selection Committee for Instructional School Deans: R Koob mentioned the Alumni Association had asked that they be allowed a representative on administrative selection committees. G Irvin noted that when the University

Center for Teacher Education search committee was formed, the Superintendent of Schools wanted to participate. This was granted, but voting privileges were not extended.

M Botwin opposed the resolution but felt it should go to the floor of the Senate for debate. He felt the implications of urging women/minority members on selection committees assumes rational decisions would not be made without these individuals. It may encourage placement of "single-issue" individuals on selection committees. M Berrio: The resolution doesn't say there has to be a women/minority member, only that the Executive Committee pay attention to achieving a balance. J Murphy: There have been problems in the past getting women/minorities to run for election to selection committees. M Botwin: The wording places minority representation exclusively on faculty. The President could also select women/minorities to these committees. The burden should not be on the Senate to do so. W Reynoso: The change proposed by the resolution gives the Executive Committee more freedom to make its selection. J Vilkitis: Faculty should elect the members to these committees. It should not be the EXCLUSIVE responsibility of the Executive Committee. T Kersten: (re second Whereas clause) Should the "responsibility for achieving such a balance [of women and minorities]" belong to the Executive Committee? The language is prejudging the outcome. B Mori: What is the resolution requesting? Is it addressing the balance of women/minorities on selection committees or whether the current process is effective? W Reynoso: If enough names [of women/minorities] are not submitted, the Executive Committee should have the opportunity to appoint someone who's not on the ballot. C Andrews: The resolution should be held until the SAGR selection committee is formed to see if we still have a problem. L Gamble: I feel search committees should have elected representatives, but I think this resolution should go to the Senate because it opens up the problem of representation for discussion on the Senate floor.

Gamble/Reynoso made a motion to present this resolution to the Senate as is. The motion failed 4-8. Suggestions regarding this matter are to be sent to Mark Berrio, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee.

The meeting was recessed to Tuesday, October 1, 1991 from 3-5pm in UU 220.

VI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:02pm.

/s/

---

Approved: Craig Russell, Secretary  
Academic Senate

10/10/91

---

Date: