

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

Minutes of the
ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, January 23, 1992
FOE 229E, 3:00-5:00pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:21pm.

I. Minutes:

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

III. Reports:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:

VI. Discussion:

- A. Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2064-92/AA "Support for Executive Order on CSU General Education-Breadth Requirements (Supersedes Executive Orders 338 and 342): J Vilkitis explained the intent of this resolution. GE&B courses, transfer provisions, full and subject area certification policies, and interdisciplinary courses are discussed in this document. He has requested members of the Academic Senate to review this revision of EO 338 and return any comments, in writing, to him before the next statewide meeting when this will come up for second reading.
- B. Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2061-92/FA "Year Round Operation (YRO): J Vilkitis distributed the most recent version of this resolution. This resolution does not focus on all aspects of Year Round Operation. The resolution addresses only the four CSU campuses that presently have four-quarter operations, and it requests that these campuses be given adequate financial support for the summer quarter by funding faculty salaries at existing levels instead of Step 12.

Botwin: Do the university presidents support this resolution? Vilkitis: I don't know.
Andrews: President Baker does. Peach: It seems Year Round Operation is the only alternative when buildings are not being added to accommodate increasing enrollments.

- C. Policy Statement for UCTE Committee Representation: Andrews: The program review committee's proposal for selection/ad hoc committees recommended that UCTE choose a school to be associated with for purposes of Senate representation. A natural alliance would be with a single-subject school (i.e., SLA, SSM). There are 15 to 17 faculty in UCTE. Mueller: Will this only apply to Senate committees or extend to university-wide committees? Andrews: This can be presented as a position. I will advise Dr. Roper of the position the Executive Committee has taken until we draft a policy statement.
- D. Report of the Task Force on Retroactive Withdrawal: Andrews: The Student Progress Committee will be coming forward with suggestions on this. Start discussing this matter with your faculty. Botwin: My concern is that the faculty member who gave the grade is **not** involved in the withdrawal process. If the person gave the grade, s/he should be part of the withdrawal process. Andrews: I will bring this to the attention of the Student Progress Committee. Mori: Faculty should have an opportunity to determine whether a retroactive withdrawal should be granted. Andrews: If full withdrawal from the university is asked, the individual faculty would not have a place in the decision. Botwin: Then the form should go to each faculty member that gave the person a grade in that term.

- E. Report from Program Review Criteria-Setting Committee: J Weatherby was present to answer any questions regarding the program review document. Devore: SPS has been listed twice and SSM has not been listed on page 2 of the Selection of Programs document. (This was a typo.) Devore: Does using "random selection" to set out the programs to be looked at mean a program could be reviewed more than once within the five-year cycle? Weatherby: No. Peach: One of the problems with randomness is that there are some programs that should be looked at together. Weatherby: We didn't want to unduly harass a department by making the whole school have to review all their programs at the same time. We also wanted to allow programs to align this review with their accreditation review. The Executive Committee was instructed to bring in any comments, in writing, to Tuesday's Senate meeting (January 28).

Weatherby: There are two things I think are important in selecting members to the program evaluation committee: (1) how the members of the committee are selected. These should be some of the most senior people on campus, and (2) the membership should be appointed by the Executive Committee and not elected by the schools. This will allow selection of senior faculty. This committee will become a very strategic committee and the Executive Committee should judge who is to be on it. In the reporting process, the Senate should only comment on broad issues involving this process, not on specific recommendations involving a department. Since the committee will have already recommended, the Vice President for Academic Affairs should act on those recommendations.

Weatherby: The committee felt that last year some departments did not have a chance to confront the initial observations of the review committee. They should have the opportunity to respond to any recommendations made. Botwin: Any critical study will have positive and negative recommendations. I'm afraid the VPAA will only act on the critical recommendations. I would like something in writing from the VPAA as to his intended treatment of information received--how will responses be treated with regard to allocation of funds? There are two ways to look at a weak program. Strengthen it or eliminate it. Both have to be considered.

Mueller: If you want senior persons on this committee, this could be set up in the criteria for members and schools could still elect from among those nominated. Andrews: In the process for selecting a task force, caucus chairs identify the nominees, so faculty have input to that. The Executive Committee would make sure that no program-specific advocates would be appointed to the committee. Botwin: Caucuses should have the right to appeal an Executive Committee decision. Devore: I'm concerned that schools with more faculty will get less representation since the selection is one from each school. This committee may warrant one member per/# represented. Andre: If this instrument is to be used to strengthen curriculum programs, then it should be clear what the role of the evaluation committee is and what Dr. Koob's role is in using the committee's finding. Mori: I am uncomfortable that only academic programs are being looked at. Andrews: This is our only jurisdiction. Administratively, programs suggested for discontinuance must go through a series of steps beyond the recommendations of the evaluation committee which takes about two years.

Andrews: I propose that a resolution be drafted to accompany the program review document, and I would like the assistance of two others in drafting this. Botwin: I would like a formal comment regarding the use of the committee's recommendations. Vilkitis: Any program that needs to be strengthened in times of budget crisis will be at-risk. This brings up an interesting issue which should come up for Senate discussion. Cal Poly is unique because it has so many lab classes. It takes more money to support these needs. Should we be given different budget considerations than a liberal arts college?

The names of two faculty from each school are to be brought to the February 4, 1992 Executive Committee meeting for election to the program evaluation committee.

- E. NASULGC's effort to litigate the Department of Defense's exclusionary policies based on sexual orientation: This item was provided for information. No comments were made.

- F. Intercollegiate Athletics Program: Faculty Review: Andrews: We will probably have recommendations for more faculty oversight of Athletics by the end of this year.
- G. Draft Statement of Commission Policy on Diversity: This is being looked at statewide. There is concern over WASC becoming a proscriptive body.
- H. Regional Faculty Discussions on Academic Program Priority: No discussion was held on this matter.
- I. Academic Senate Committee Assignments and Status Reports: No discussion was held on this matter.
- J. A ballot was distributed to the Executive Committee with the names of nominees chosen by the schools for possible appointment to the Selection Committee for Athletic Coach. The ballot is to be returned to the Academic Senate office by 12 noon on January 28, 1992. The names of the two (or three) individuals receiving the most votes will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for his appointment of one member to the committee.
- K. Process for Recruitment and Appointment of Vice President for Business Affairs: Caucus chairs are to bring in the names of three nominees from their school for selection to this committee at the next Executive Committee meeting on February 4, 1992. Any comments on the draft of a Process for Recruitment and Appointment of VPBA are to be submitted on February 4.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:41pm.

Sms 1.23.92

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2061-92/FA
March 5-6 1992

FUNDING OF YEAR ROUND OPERATION (YRO)
WITHIN THE CSU SYSTEM

- WHEREAS, The economic future of California is directly tied to meeting the educational needs of the next generation; and
- WHEREAS, There is a shortage of facilities within the California State University (CSU) system to accommodate the projected increase in CSU enrollment of between 29 and 49 percent by the year 2005; and
- WHEREAS, At some CSU campuses, new or expanded Year Round Operations (YRO) may be a viable means for accommodating some of the projected enrollment growth; and
- WHEREAS, There are four campuses in the CSU system (Pomona, Hayward, Los Angeles, and San Luis Obispo) which operate state-funded summer quarters (YRO); and
- WHEREAS, Some campuses now offering YRO are deterred from offering full programs and other campuses may be deterred from initiating YRO because of the fiscal penalties imposed by the absence of full and equitable funding; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge that Year Round Operation (YRO) receive full and equitable funding on campuses that are willing and in a position to implement such programs, that decide through their governance process (Academic Senate) to request YRO, and that receive authorization to do so; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) encourage the Chancellor's Office to inform the CSU Board of Trustees of the need to provide adequate support for Year Round Operations (YRO) and to identify YRO as a fully funded program in their budget request; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) encourage the Chancellor's Office to advise appropriate legislators of the need to provide full financing for Year Round Operations (YRO) at CSU campuses with YRO.

Wm 1.23.92

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

B A L L O T

**TO ELECT
TO THE SELECTION COMMITTEE
FOR APPOINTMENT OF ATHLETIC COACH**

Vote for no more than one (1):

_____	Joe Glass	Agricultural Engineering
_____	Steve McGary	Agribusiness
_____	Virginia Walter	Ornamental Horticulture
_____	John Lindvall	Business Administration
_____	Nancy Clark	History
_____	Laura Freberg	Psychology/Human Development
_____	Bernard Strickmeier	Mathematics

**RETURN THIS BALLOT TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE BY
TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1992, 12 NOON.**

1/23/91