

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

Minutes of the
ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, January 7, 1992
UU 220, 3:00-5:00pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:12pm.

I. Minutes:

The minutes of the November 19, 1991 Academic Senate meeting were approved without correction.

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

The Chair read the President's approval of Resolution AS-370-91/PPC, Resolution on Faculty Suspension with Pay (with a minor modification). The modification included an additional sentence which reads as follows: "Delivery shall mean either personal delivery or delivery through the U.S. mail, certified return receipt requested." This added language is consistent with Unit 3 contract language related to Respond and File for Grievance Processing.

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair:

The Chair reported that the ad hoc committee on program review criteria setting has been doing an exemplary job. The members have been meeting several times a week including late evenings. They hope to have a final draft completed by the end of the week.

B. President's Office: none

C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office:

Dr. Koob shared some of the discussions held by the Deans' Council with respect to student population at Cal Poly. This year, while Cal Poly's budgeted population is 15,000 FTES, the actual population we are serving is somewhat larger than that--closer to 15,300 than 15,000. The dollars we have to serve that number of students is significantly less than what we would have had if the old formula allocation for 15,000 would have been used. The amount we did receive is closer to the number of dollars appropriate for 13,900 or 14,000 FTES. We are, in effect, serving roughly 1,300 FTES more than we have dollars for if we use the formula as a guideline.

At the CSU level, the Trustees' have proposed to the governor that we should get from the General Fund roughly the same number of dollars next year that we received this year and not be asked to teach any more students. This same proposal suggests that any incremental changes in student fees be decoupled from General Fund dollars so the Trustees' could raise student fees but it would not be used to offset reduction in General Fund dollars. It is an important step forward for the CSU if it happens.

At the same time, there has been some discussion about lowering the targeted number of students in the CSU by approximately 4%. For Cal Poly that would mean changing its cap from 15,000 to 14,400. I don't know what direction this might go, but I'm trying to lay background as to what kind of decision the Deans' Council has to make with respect to student populations projected for next year. The decision is that we should target 14,900 FTES for next year. It was hotly debated whether we should target that number or go to 14,700. There was a lot of emotional support for going to 14,700. 14,700 is almost impossible to do administratively, although it's not impossible for Cal Poly to do.

If you take the current incoming class (Fall, '91) and the one we would project to have next fall ('92) and pretend it behaves, in terms of retention, the same way the previous incoming classes have behaved (83% of freshmen here the following year, 80% still here the next year, and so many graduate on the average in 5-1/2 years). So there's some sort of

decay curve from the population that enters in year X. Transfer students have the some sort of decay curve but it's shortened up somewhat. If you start adding up these decay curves, you have the sum curve from those decays. The sum is the actual enrolled population at Cal Poly. We did this for the last incoming class (Fall '91), and if we do this for the next projected class (Fall '92), the population at Cal Poly, if we behave the same way into the future, would be about 10,000 students. In other words, and, in my opinion, we will have over-corrected at the front end to compensate for the fact that we have students already in the pipeline that are taking on the average 3-1/2 to 5-1/2 years to leave us. What we will see is a bubble in the way students select classes. There may be short-term advantages in places where we've had bottlenecks before, but at some point some lecturers will likely lose their positions because there won't be students there asking for that course. I don't know if that will happen, but it looks like that's what ought to happen based on what I've just said. A few years later, we will find people wondering where the class sizes went. They will be too small. The problem is we can't move resources around within the university at the same rate that we can move student populations around at the front end. If we really want to compensate in the long-term sense for the reduced budget that Cal Poly is operating under, if we really want to lower the student population, and if we really want to change the workload for the faculty, the only way we can do it sensibly--in addition to administrative changes--is to change the residency time for students currently in the system. That's not something administration can do.

It is my opinion that at the present time the only way we can change workload effectively within the university as a cooperative effort, is to administratively set incoming class size within parameters of reasonable rates of resource reallocation and to have a faculty decision about how long students ought to reside at Cal Poly. If the turnover time is going to be 5-1/2 years, it is always going to take a long time to respond to change when it occurs. If the turnover time shortens up to 4 years, then the turnover time will be less. We have the opportunity at this university to consider the length of the curriculum, the flexibility for transfer between majors, the number of requirements we have, etc. that set workload. It is not the failure to let in an incoming class that forces the current workload. The "workload" was set, in any reasonable way, by decisions made several years ago.

I just wanted to let you hear what kinds of problems we face as a university. One of the reasons universities have longevity is that we change very slowly in time and very deliberately. Legislators and budgets don't seem to understand this and they change rapidly. In good conscience, I don't think we can do any more with respect to incoming class size. If we want to shorten the cycle time for response to external factors, we will have to look carefully at our own curricular structure.

Brown: Part of the difficulty it seems is that we don't really know until late September how many of those accepted are going to come. Koob: Statistically, we understand very closely how many will come. The number we missed in the past was the retention rate. It went up a little higher than we had reason to expect from historical patterns. Hanson: With cutbacks in sections being offered, it seems like it would be harder for students to get through. Koob: That could be true, but we don't know if it's true. We have all the data in place but we don't have the information system that can tell us what the demand is for a section vs. the number of seats available. Gamble: Will we be working on getting students through Cal Poly faster? Koob: It's really up to this body to decide. This is a faculty decision. Gamble: There are many problem areas. It's complex and there are various things we can do. There are many things we haven't talked about yet. Koob: We now have the stimulus to try and find solutions to this problem. The concern is quality. Does it make sense to turn away qualified students now and in a few years accept students who are significantly less qualified than the ones turned away earlier? I'm more comfortable controlling the flow on the way in when we're taking the best fraction of those available classes each year. Control of the size is control of the returning rate. Bailey: I just wanted to mention that the Curriculum Committee has brought up this issue (maximum number of units for degree programs). Almost all programs on campus are at the maximum of 198 units. We did a study of minors two years ago. Our findings indicated that minors are not a significant reason why students are taking longer to exit. Heesch: Should we consider forming some kind of committee to start investigating this matter? Andrews: I believe the GE&B ad hoc committee is looking at the transfer issue.

Hopefully, some of these problems will come out when the Program Review Task Force starts looking at the programs on campus.

D. Statewide Senators: none

E. CFA Campus President:

Conway: (1) The latest bargaining on health care increases proposes that employees pay for six months and the CSU pay six months; however, pending the court's decision on this issue, we may end up paying nothing. (2) Flex cash - \$128/month will be offered to individuals who have medical/dental coverage out of the CSU. (3) OBRA (budget reconciliation act) will set up a retirement plan for individuals who are employed less than half-time in the CSU. (4) An initiative will appear on the next ballot to protect PERS retirement from raiding. (5) We should have office space on campus for CFA by the end of the month.

F. CSEA Campus President: none

G. ASI Representatives: none

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:

- A. Resolution on Full-Time Academic Employees, first reading. This resolution was moved to a second reading item with one nay. Brown: I have no objection on substance for this to go to second reading. My question is on procedure--we have tried to reserve the motion to go to second reading for things that have a time line reason for doing so. (J Murphy/Botwin) M/S/P unanimously to approve the resolution.
- B. Resolution on Academic Senate Bylaw Relating to Vacant Positions, first reading. This resolution was moved to a second reading item. Russell: I have to echo Ron Brown's statement. If there is no urgency, why rush the resolution through. Hanson: There isn't much to discuss on these resolutions. Mori: The intent of these resolutions is to bring the wording of the Bylaws in line with the wording of the Constitution. Brown: Then procedurally, next time, I would suggest that the Executive Committee make these Consent Agenda items. This would preserve the action of second reading. (J Murphy/Botwin) M/S/P unanimously to approve the resolution.
- C. Resolution on Reinstatement of Senators, first reading. This resolution was moved to a second reading item. Harris: How many members of the Executive Committee need to be present in order to vote on reinstatement? Andrews: A quorum of members would be needed to conduct the meeting and a majority vote of those present would be needed to move an item. (J Murphy/Botwin) M/S/P unanimously to approve the resolution.

VI. Discussion:

Paul Murphy: Brought the Senate's attention to the formation of an ad hoc committee to study athletics at Cal Poly. P Murphy was selected by the Academic Senate Executive Committee as its representative to this group. With the possible change to Division I, it is very important that the faculty become involved and knowledgeable about the impact athletics has on the academic program. This means there are dollars to be considered. While the athletics program here on campus has been proposed as a cost-contained program, it is almost always the case that an out-of-control athletic program happens because of indifference on the part of faculty. One of the first things the committee will consider will be how athletics will be governed at Cal Poly. If anyone has comments on this, Dr. Murphy would be happy to speak to them. Andrews: This raises a serious point. There is a university-wide Athletics Advisory Committee and an Athletics Task Force which have been repeatedly bypassed in the past few years as the bodies to make oversight decisions regarding athletics. Athletics has become a nationwide problem and faculty need to take a stand in exercising their oversight responsibility of the athletic program. Murphy: The charge of this recently formed ad hoc committee is very general. We are not overseeing athletics. We're trying to look ahead and make suggestions for a workable governing system for athletics.

The Chair announced that there are three faculty open meetings scheduled for response to the Strategic Planning Document: January 9 from 11-12:30, January 14 from 11-12:30, and January 15 from 3-4:30 in Fisher Science 292.

Botwin: I'm concerned about the kind of work we're doing on the Senate. Over the last couple years we've sent dozens of assignments to the committees and I don't see them coming back. Over a year ago, I brought up the issue of 'votes of confidence for administrators.' Where is it? It was agreed that a list of all committee assignments will be brought to the Executive Committee on January 14 and to the Senate on January 28. Senator Brown stated that by bringing committee charges to the Senate body, committees could receive senators' input before the resolutions were finalized.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:16pm.

Approved: _____
Craig Russell, Secretary
Academic Senate

Date: _____