

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

Minutes of the Academic Senate
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, October 1, 1991
(continuation of September 24, 1991 meeting)
UU 220, 3:00-5:00pm

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

I. Minutes: none

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

C Andrews announced the formation of the Conference and Workshop Advisory Committee which calls for two faculty appointments made by the Academic Senate Executive Committee. Nominees must be available during Summer Quarter. Caucus chairs are to notify their schools of these vacancies and bring the names of interested faculty to the October 15 Executive Committee meeting.

III. Reports:

- A. Academic Senate Chair: none
- B. President's Office: none
- C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office: none
- D. Statewide Senators: none

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:

VI. Discussion:

- A. Draft Report of University Year Round Operation: This document has been sent to three committees--Budget, Instruction, and Long-Range Planning. J Murphy mentioned that the "Strategic Planning Document" also addresses this matter. J Vilkitis announced that a resolution is being formulated by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the statewide Academic Senate entitled "Pilot Program for Year Round Operation (YRO) at Selected Campuses Within the CSU." The concern of the resolution is that this program be tried "without fiscal penalty." J Vilkitis quoted G Irvin as saying that those campuses that went from the quarter to semester system lost their summer funding.

C Andrews defined YRO as 12 months of operation and a 12-month budget. Cal Poly presently has three quarters of full funding and a summer quarter with inadequate funding. J Murphy felt YRO allowed a full utilization of facilities with a minimum of breaks, whether that system be a trimester, four quarters, etc.

W Reynoso stated her concerns about the availability of student aid for attending summer quarters. C Andrews responded that this issue needs to be looked even if it may not "fit" with existing programs.

J Murphy said that the Instruction Committee looked at YRO from a scheduling prospective; i.e., sequenced courses. L Gamble also wondered how "lock-stepped" courses under a semester system would affect the length of time it takes to complete a degree. M Shelton stated that the School of Agriculture is dependent on year-round funding remaining at least at its present level.

C Andrews presented a charge to the Instruction Committee to examine what the appropriate number of units should be for the same course under the quarter system, semester and trimester systems. J Murphy responded that units-per-course was a more appropriate charge for the Curriculum Committee, not the Instruction Committee. D

Bertozzi asked if the Senate committees were looking at YRO for systemwide implementation or just for Cal Poly's implementation. C Andrews indicated for Cal Poly only.

J Murphy: One reason Cal Poly has budget problems is the cost of faculty. We have many high-rank faculty. C Andrews: We have high costs because of our programs, regardless of faculty ranks.

M Shelton: What is the charge of each committee? C Andrews: Long-Range Planning is looking at the long-run implications of YRO, Instruction is looking at the instructional implications, and Budget is looking at the financial implications. J Vilkitis: We need to outline what we want from these committees so the recommendations of each one can dovetail. Each committee needs to have the findings of the other committees to set a direction for their suggestions. C Andrews: I want the committees to work independently. I would like each committee to articulate their mission as they see it. J Vilkitis: It's necessary to have a time frame. The Executive Committee can put together the issues and then send back a newer and more specific charge to each committee. It was agreed that C Andrews and M Shelton would draft a specific plan (charge) to send to each committee. J Murphy/M Botwin: The committees need to come back to the Executive Committee with issues and concerns, not with answers. J Murphy: The committees should gather the data and provide options.

- B. Suggested process for receiving recommendations to the Strategic Planning Document: C Andrews explained the process outlined on this chart. Open sessions will be held for faculty at three different days/times of the week. In each department, the senator from that department will be responsible for insuring department discussion of the document. If a department does not have a senator, the caucus chair of that school will serve as the Senate representative to that department's discussion. D Bertozzi: The faculty session should not be limited to verbal recommendations, but written recommendations should also be accepted. L Gamble asked R Koob what will happen to those recommendations received by the Academic Senate from all the sources noted on the chart (p. 57 of the agenda). Koob responded that that three groups have been delegated to deliberate the document: the Academic Senate, ASI, and the President's delegated group. The input received from these three bodies will be sent to a conference committee when differences need to be resolved. We must agree on a vision for the university before we can adopt a plan to get there. D Bertozzi: After the conference committee works out the compromises, will these be sent back to the respective groups? R Koob: Yes.

C Andrews: March 3 should be the date the Academic Senate provides its compilation of recommendations received. To meet this time frame, departments --> schools --> caucuses need to complete their discussions by Friday, December 6, 1991. The faculty open meetings will be held the first three weeks of January 1992. The responses will be compiled and brought to the Executive Committee on January 28. It will come before the Senate on February 11 for first reading and March 3 for second reading.

M Botwin requested C Andrews to send a memo to each senator and dean asking them to start discussions and include the above-given time lines in said memo. C Andrews agreed to do so. M Botwin: Who calls these meetings? C Andrews: The caucus chair and the dean of the school will schedule the school-wide meetings. J Murphy: It will be up to the schools to schedule the earlier time frames for department and school meetings in order to meeting the December 6 deadline for having recommendations to the Academic Senate office. B Mori: The chart prepared for the agenda (p. 57) should be included in the memos to senators/deans with the time frames noted. D Bertozzi: Are extra copies of the "Strategic Planning Document" available? R Koob: Yes, in the deans' offices and in my office.

C Andrews: How do you feel the open sessions should be run? J Vilkitis: We need a recorder. Someone writing down the phrasing of each concern on a large flip chart so the exact wording of the person's concern can be seen by the audience and verified by the person stating the concern. R Koob: Yes, the recorder will check with the speakers to see if they have accurately summarized their views. Last year we would not accept verbal

comments because they would be subject to the interpretation of the person taking the notes. But recording the comments in this fashion would be good. B Mori: We could distribute at these open meetings, a copy of the issues already brought up by the schools as a place to start the discussions. C Andrews: I don't want the issues to be limited to what has already been brought up. D Bertozzi: A recorder is a good idea. The speaker should also be able to submit written comments. The open meetings will be held between January 6 and January 17, 1992 as follows: Thursday, January 9 from 11-12:30pm; Tuesday, January 14, 11-12:30pm, and Wednesday, January 15 from 3-4:30pm.

B Mori: How can we cover all departments in such a short time frame since several departments may not have a senator? C Andrews: Perhaps some senators can "double-up". (This will be stated in the memo to senators.) I don't want it placed on the department heads and deans. It should be a faculty matter. The caucus reports to be submitted should reflect how many faculty in their school shared a similar concern/view.

- C. Review of Academic Senate committee charges as described in the Senate Bylaws: C Andrews suggested this item be placed on the Executive Committee's work agenda for the year. Each committee's responsibilities and charges should be examined. J Murphy: Some charges are so broad they could include any issue. B Mori: an "exit report" at the end of each year would be very helpful--what was accomplished, what remains, etc. M Botwin: A log of what was sent to who, where it stands, and its progression should be prepared for the Executive Committee. J Murphy: Some committees receive information directly from sources outside the Senate office. The information is not passed to the Chair of the Senate or anyone else. L Gamble: Maybe we should require minutes from each committee. M Camuso: Each committee's charges are monitored by the Senate office. Each quarter a status report is requested. If a committee does not return a written status report, they are contacted by phone for the information.

C Andrews expressed his wish to have verbal reports given to the Senate by each dean and committee chair. It is important to bring the committee chairs into the Executive body so they are a part of it. Invitations to attend Senate meetings will be extended soon. L Gamble asked that these reports be kept brief. C Andrews asked whether CSU senators should give reports at both the Executive Committee meetings and Senate meetings or just at the Senate meetings. J Vilkitis: Each report updates developments from the last report. The reports given at Executive Committee meetings will be different than those given at Senate meetings. D Bertozzi felt it was informative to have full reports given at both meetings. It brings things all together. M Botwin/J Murphy suggested full reports continue to be given.

- D. Academic Senate committee eligibility: Should faculty on the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) or on pre-retirement reduction be eligible for committee membership: J Murphy: FERP's-no, pre-retireds-yes. Pre-retirement faculty are on campus for longer periods of time. M Botwin agreed and noted that FERP faculty are already receiving pensions. D Bertozzi: Both should be eligible. C Lomas: Sometimes FERP's have more time and are useful members of committee. D Bertozzi: Both should be allowed. If they are interested enough they will show up year round for meetings and have more time to give. M Botwin: This is an important issue in personnel matters. C Andrews: The Contract says the status of FERP's does not change. They are still faculty. J DeMers: The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is still wrestling with the definition of "faculty". There must be a coordination between the definition of faculty and who is entitled to serve on the Senate/committees. C Andrews: The resolution on the definition of General Faculty will come before the Senate at its next meeting. Committee membership should come from this discussion. M Botwin: FERP's and pre-retirement faculty were not sent ballots for the SAED dean selection committee. M Camuso: In order to have election labels available for the elections conducted in early winter quarter, they must be requested from the Personnel Office during late fall quarter. So, they will include FERP and pre-retirement faculty who taught in fall quarter, but not those teaching in winter quarter.
- E. AB 91-4, Administration of Conferences and Facilities Licensing: Nominees for faculty vacancies to this committee will be due at the October 15 Executive Committee meeting.

- F. Continuing program review: How do we proceed from the work performed by the Program Review Task Force during Spring Quarter 1991: C Andrews: Last year's Program Review Task Force did a budget review. How do we do a program review? Our five-year reviews are almost worthless in this respect. They only tell us how good we all are. J Murphy: We should have a new group to evaluate programs. R Koob: There are two types of review: (1) descriptive, and (2) evaluative. The Chancellor will be phasing out the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' position which will keep more evaluation on the campuses. M Botwin: Accreditation should be taken into account. C Andrews: Review and evaluations should be different but the calendars should be coordinated. Just because a program is accredited does not mean it is necessarily valid for our campus. D Bertozzi: Are we going to do something with last year's task force report? J Murphy: The memo sent last year to the Program Review Task Force by Murphy/Koob should be a starting point for the new review body. C Andrews: It was a budgetary review. I have received lots of calls asking what is happening with that report.

We need to develop a mechanism to evaluate and review. C Andrews felt that no program would be eliminated, but changes would probably occur. L Gamble asked Koob whether administration would do the review if the faculty did not. R Koob: We in administration will need to allocate budget resources. We need faculty input. We are in a fixed resource situation. The Senate has a planning committee that determines what it would like to see in the future. The Curriculum Committee determines what new courses and programs it wants, but we have no committee that evaluates or allows exit of a program. There is no one to advise on how to allocate fixed resources if we continue to add programs. Programs are not a gas, they don't compress. Koob said he would like the faculty to decide.

L Gamble: Part of the issue is how much a program costs. Is this type of budget information available? The information has been gathered once, so it's available to be used. M Botwin: This contradicts the philosophy behind program reviews. R Koob: First, one should ask does a program have academic quality? then, who will provide the resources. We need to separate academic quality from the source of funds at any time. No other school should have to support another school's new programs. Koob has informed the deans that no new resources are available for new programs. If a school wants to add a program, there must be an internal shuffle of funds.

M Botwin stated he did want to participate in program "ranking". If this group is being asked to order the priority of programs they want--this would be very divisive. If a program is weak, it should be able to be strengthened. C Andrews agreed. J Vilkitis: A polytechnic university is by its nature expensive. Cost is not a valid criteria. A comparison of cost per student within different schools cannot be made. You can't compare liberal arts classes with classes that require labs, equipment, and small bodies of students per class. So often we just need to decide what programs we want to support. It is a false look. W Reynoso: Are we asking for another review, a review of what the deans did? C Andrews: We are to form a committee to establish a program review process. We could use those programs already "hit" as guinea pigs to see if the process developed works. One question to ask is whether a program fits in a polytechnic university. D Bertozzi: Is there any linkage between the new committee and the old one? C Andrews: none. R Koob: The old committee provided a sample of how it could be done.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at _____.

/s/

Approved: Craig Russell, Secretary
Academic Senate

10/10/91

Date: _____