

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

Minutes of the
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, February 25, 1992
UU220, 3:00-5:00 pm

Members present:

<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>
Andrews, Charles (C)	Actg	Mori, Barbara	SocSci
Botwin, Michael	Arch Eng	Murphy, James	IndTech
De Mers, Gerald	PE/RA	Peach, David	Mgtmt
Devore, Jay	Stats	Russell, Craig (Secty)	Music
Gamble, Lynne (VC)	Library	Vilkitis, James	NRM
Gooden, Reginald	PoliSci		
Irvin, Glenn	AVP		
Koob, Robert	VPAA		
Lomas, Charles	EngrTech	Camuso, Margaret	Senate Staff

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:10 pm.

I. Minutes: The minutes for the meeting on February 4 of the Academic Senate Executive Committee were approved.

II. Communications and Announcements: Changes in the ELM Examination and ELM Procedures.

M.Botwin observed that there are a large number of students who are not qualified in math. C.Andrews said it was a statewide problem and that many CSU campuses actually want those students and want to do the remedial work because it gives them positions. Botwin observed that supposedly it is prohibited to do remedial work in the CSU system. He then expressed displeasure that we do not have money to do other things but then have money to do things we are not supposed to do. G.Irvin stated that the Chancellor's office is inconsistent: at one moment they state they want no campuses involved with remedial work—but then they proceed to fund it. On this and other CSU campuses we cannot deny them admission if they meet the CSU criteria in a non-impacted area. Gooden added that it is not so much CSU that is inconsistent but they are also up against the legislature. Some of the high schools cannot provide those kids with that [mathematical] background. Some of those kids can accumulate that class time—and the requirement is that they have so much class time—but that doesn't guarantee that they're going to come out qualified. So we have relaxed on some of those expectations as a result of some CSU admissions panels. Some of the students, through no fault of their own, aren't making it [with respect to quantitative skills]. And they also happen to be in some of those areas where we are trying to promote diversity. M.Botwin suggested that they go to junior colleges—that is their mission. G.Irvin reminded all that ELM is not an admission requirement. It is a placement test. What we are trying to do is identify students who have not taken that test by the time they get here, particularly with regard to first-time freshmen, and have an administration of the exam as part of their orientation program. We find what their skill level is and code their registration so that they are placed in the appropriate class. Also, we start that sequence quickly—rather than avoid that requirement and start late.

J.Murphy asked, in view of the reduction in FTE on campus and the impact it is having on certain programs, is that impact going to be felt across campus? We will be impacting more and more programs across campus, therefore fewer and fewer will be exempt from that impactation. Are we almost to the point where we are totally impacted?—if not, maybe we should share the wealth from the non-impacted to the impacted programs. R.Koob stated that universities do not move quickly, and we cannot always move resources as quickly as we would like. This year, for the first time, we are beginning to adjust school sizes. Previously there had been no mechanism for justifying current sizes or how to move from one size to the next: now that mechanism is in place. Among the factors that affect the future size of a school is the quality of its applicants. We have found a disproportionate reduction in slots in programs that are less attractive than others. We are down to a point now where we have only three programs on campus that are not impacted. The reason we didn't have a bigger cut is we dampened the effect of growth changes in recognition of the fact that you can't move resources around that fast. Koob's recollection for admissions is that the GPA and ACT are not broken down into math and verbal components but are considered as a whole. Therefore a good verbal score could compensate for low math scores. Koob felt that registration should not be allowed without taking the ELM. J.Murphy asked what Koob's long-term plans were for balancing impacted and non-impacted programs. Koob responded that low applicants will cause programs to shrink. This process is self-correcting. A program will shrink until demand starts to go up—at some point it will reach equilibrium. C.Russell recommended that interested senators consult Alan Holz's "Mathematical Connections" for its lucid analysis and interesting presentation of issues involving a well-rounded education. G.Irvin stated that Cal Poly has a long tradition of admitting students to programs as opposed to schools or to the university. That has some advantages, but it also has some disadvantages. We often find that students who are not accepted in one program because of who they are and what that program desires, are better qualified in traditional measures than students who did get into that program. It has been suggested with increasing frequency in the last years that we reexamine that admission policy since we are turning away extremely well-qualified students. M.Botwin interjected that the Admissions Office already does that by telling students what to go into even though they are not interested. B.Mori stated that the School of Liberal Arts has been discussing school-wide admission as opposed to program admission, and there has been support for that concept. R.Gooden asked whether or not there were any figures indicating how many students were trying to get into any particular program. G.Irvin responded that we do know how many students left one program and went to another, but that doesn't necessarily reflect the number who are lined up waiting. It doesn't give us an accurate picture. C.Andrews observed that one factor determining allotments to programs is the issue of internal transfers. L.Gamble asked if high school seniors can take the ELM test at their high school. Irvin said we are encouraging them to do so. Also, they can show equivalent levels through the SAT and ACT exams. C.Lomas asked whether junior college transfers are having problems with math and the ELM. G. Irvin answered affirmatively and added that he would like to change the way we admit junior college transfers: we should not let them in unless they have finished Gen. Ed. math.

In another communication item, C.Andrews summarized a note from Vice President Koob that indicated Laura Freeburg, Mike Wenzel, and Dwayne Head have been selected to serve on the Consultative Committee for Selecting the Director of Athletics.

C.Andrews strongly encouraged all faculty to take advantage of SIS PLUS (Student Information System) training for new users which will be available Tuesday, April 21 and Wednesday, May 20 from 9:00-10:30.

III. Reports

- A. Academic Senate Chair: .
- B. President's Office - none
- C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office - none
- D. Statewide Senators - J.Vilkitis noted that he had received no feedback concerning the draft executive order on GE&B. D.Peach explained GE&B is so complex that almost no one can understand it: he questioned whether it had to be so complicated. R.Gooden explained that the complexity arises from having to combine input from so many different sources: the 9 UC campuses; 20 CSU campuses; and 100+ community colleges. B.Mori stated that if we could come to some agreement regarding students' lower level GE, it would make it so much easier for faculty to help students get through the program.
On a second issue, J. Vilkitis reminded us that the resolution regarding year round operation will soon be a second-reading item. The main thrust concerns equitable funding for the summer term. Another issue that has cropped up deals with support, such as libraries and facilities on campus. Some felt that support should also be included in the resolution. D.Peach moved (2nd by Murphy) that we endorse this resolution. The motion passed unanimously.
A third item dealt with an action-item resolution dealing with reduced funding and maintaining the quality of education programs. The idea is that we want to maintain quality instruction—if we have to take budget cuts then we should decrease the enrollment. There are some suggested activities for enforcing prerequisites, tightening up or enforcing disqualification policies, etc. to reduce the student base so we can live within our budget. C.Andrews then interjected that the handout that was distributed at our meeting labelled "Criteria" is the restructuring document for downsizing at San Diego State. The San Jose State faculty took a slightly different approach: they were mainly discussing what did occur rather than how to address the future.

IV. Consent Agenda - none

V. Business Items

- A. Academic Senate/committee vacancies- no action.
- B. Appointment of part-time representative to the Academic Senate for Spring Quarter 1992. Lomas moved we approve ROBERT SATER. He was unanimously approved.
- C. Resolution on Research Committee Membership. M.Botwin moved (2nd by Mori) that we place this item on the consent agenda for the next meeting of the Academic Senate. The motion passed unanimously.
- D. Resolution on Committee Reporting. J. Vilkitis asked what is our procedure right now: do we get the minutes from the various committees? C.Andrews responded that it depends on the specific committee. M.Botwin moved that we place this item on the consent agenda for the next meeting of the Academic Senate. The motion passed unanimously.
- E. Resolution on Majority Vote. G.De Mers (Chair of Constitution & Bylaws) explained that in the past when there have been several candidates for a position, we have sometimes had to have a long string of run-off elections before someone gets a majority (i.e., over 50%) as opposed to a plurality of the votes. R.Gooden felt if there was an election where we were electing more than one person (for example, four from the School of Agriculture, three from Business, etc.) then a plurality is acceptable. C.Russell concurred and expressed the view that if the election is expected to turn out *only* one person, then the top two vote-getters in the initial election should then be placed in a run-off election where the winner will actually achieve a majority of the votes. M.Botwin suggested that we send this back to the committee. R.Gooden provided some guidance, specifically asking them to consider the policy:

- a) In elections where we are seeking one candidate, the winner must obtain a majority (i.e., over 50%).
- b) In elections where we are seeking several candidates (such as in a search committee for a dean), the open slots will be filled by those candidates that achieve a plurality of the votes (i.e., the most votes).

R.Koob then added that some senates have used a procedure that asks for a ranking of the candidates—such a system produces a winner on the first ballot. J.Murphy then proposed that this item be deferred until Vice President Koob can provide us that information. G.De Mers had no objections.

- F. Resolution on Appointment to Vacant Positions in the Academic Senate. It was decided by consensus to place this item on the consent agenda for the next meeting of the Academic Senate.
 - G. Resolution on Substitutes and Proxies. It was decided by consensus to place this item on the consent agenda for the next meeting of the Academic Senate.
 - H. Resolution on Repeating Courses for Credit. J.Devore asked clarification of the fourth "Whereas" clause [see p.11 of the agenda] which concerns itself with reasons for repeating a course. G.Irvin explained that students may repeat a course because they initially failed a course: but a student with a grade of "C" or even a "B" sometimes repeat a course in order to improve his or her chances of being admitted to medical school, graduate school, etc. Devore asked if we can simply prohibit them from doing that, and Irvin responded that we do not have the mechanism in place through CAPTURE to do that at this time. L.Gamble asked if we should state in the *Catalogue* that you cannot retake a course if you obtained a grade of "C" or better—then we simply would not count the course. R.Gooden expressed concern over allowing students to retake a course for purely cosmetic purposes since we have a resource problem. He suggested that we work out the mechanism to have CAPTURE identify these students when they try to register and place them as the lowest priority in registering for those classes. D.Peach observed that by clamping down in one area, often the problem simply manifests itself in another area: if we prevent students from retaking courses then there likely will be increased applications for drops at the the 7th week of any given quarter. B.Mori related that she counsels students who come from backgrounds that have not adequately prepared them for college work. Some of these students have trouble adjusting to the new college environment, and some have language problems. She felt it was imperative to allow them to repeat courses up to the 20 units, since their first quarter might be absolutely disastrous—after some adjustment to campus life, they often begin to perform up to their true abilities.
- C.Andrews clarified that the issue is really divisible into two parts:
- 1) those students who got below a "C-." They can take up to 20 units over to improve their grade point average.
 - 2) those students who received "C-" and above. They can retake courses and have their second grade averaged in [but not have it *replace* the earlier grade]. If we wanted to discourage these students, we have could state that the second grade will not be included in the average. That takes away the cosmetic aspect.

G.Irvin suggested we delete the second sentence of item 2 under the first resolved clause [p.12], thus removing entirely, "If the student repeats a course in which a C- or higher grade was earned . . . the duplicate earned units will not be counted." D.Peach then pointed out that a grade of "C" in some fields is unacceptable. We then, in effect, are placing a hardship on the student if we categorically forbid him or her from taking the course over. M.Botwin added that in such a system, a student who is trying to get into medical school might plead with a professor to give him a "D" instead of the "B" he is earning, so that he can retake the class for the "A".

R.Gooden moved (2nd by De Mers) that we agendize this item for the next meeting of the Academic Senate. The motion passed unanimously.

I. Resolution on Change of Grade. D.Peach felt the policy is not enforceable. B.Mori expressed the view that the problem does not come so much from the faculty but from the students. A student can be unhappy with a grade and exert a lot of pressure on a faculty member. This new proposal provides a clear statement to the student [and could discourage him or or her] not to ask. G.De Mers asked why the deadline was placed specifically at the 7th week. Murphy responded that it ties in with the withdrawal period. He then emphasized that the issue is not entirely whether or not a resolution is *enforceable*—there is value in a resolution that takes a stance that is *ethical*. G.Irvin stated that the grading system is "a sieve" and is being used to circumvent all sorts of regulations at the university. C.Russell moved (2nd by Mori) that we agendaize this item for the next meeting of the Academic Senate. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. Discussion:

[C.] Charge to the Academic Senate Budget Committee [See handout].

C.Andrews stated that in the last meeting of the Senate, R.Koob requested [financial] information from the Senate, and the appropriate body to do that would be the Budget Committee. Andrews spoke with the chair of the Budget Committee, and he thought that most of the information requested [on the handout] is available through Institutional Research. The committee will then come up with a format to provide that information to us for our perusal and use in advising the Vice President. Concerning "Faculty positions used and faculty positions generated" [found as item 1 of "Program Productivity"], M.Botwin observed that mode-and-level are no longer being used. He then asked how mode-and-level could be used to determine how many positions are being generated. Andrews responded that since we are looking backward to the past five years, that information is available. D.Peach stated he was distressed that we might not be able to provide any input into the budget process as a result of what happened at the last Senate meeting, although given the nature of the document we produced and the process we proposed, there is no other outcome possible. And failing to do so [i.e., provide input] is irresponsible. One of the things he does not see [on the Charge to the Budget Committee] is the demand—what is the application? We have data on applications for all programs. That seems to be a relevant factor yet it doesn't appear on this list. It ought to be added. J.Murphy concurred: he would like to see some information regarding student interest in a program?

Andrews asked whether or not we should ask the Budget Committee to draw any conclusions or merely format the data. J.Murphy thought we should pass it to them and give them a chance to respond. Andrews expressed concern that we didn't have that time. Our deadline is April 1, or April 15 at the latest. In addition, Andrews observed that the "Charge" was developed with the Budget Chair. Through him there has been input.

C.Andrews observed that item 6 on p.2 is incomplete: What is "Average annual _____?"

D. Peach asked if the Budget Committee would then bring their report back to the Executive Committee to review it—how would we actually go about doing [the review of their report]?

J.Murphy interjected (with the concurrence of B.Mori) that the Budget Committee should simply do it and then report to us. R.Gooden wondered whether we were examining purely budget issues here: is the Budget Committee not making evaluations on quality of programs.

Andrews replied that there is no qualitative information in the "Charge." It contains only quantitative numbers. Gooden then immediately asked, however, what are we going to derive from that? If it is all numbers, what is the relationship between applicants for a particular area and whether or not that ought to be area that ought to be expanded. He then expressed the desire to see the Budget Committee's report before it goes to the next level; he recommended that the Budget Committee report to us. Andrews clarified that the "Charge" already states that. The issue, Andrews reminded us, is whether we want them to come up with a set of recommendations. L.Gamble asked what kind of budget recommendations are we going to ask them to do. Are we asking them to make reductions based on this data? She felt the charge is unclear. M.Botwin expressed his view that if the Budget Committee comes

to report to us, they should also report to the full Senate. Andrews then stated that the Budget Committee is to report recommendations for the Senate through the Executive Committee.

D.Peach said the process was unclear. He asked whether the Committee is to frame their recommendations within the context of the 95% budget reduction that has been proposed by the Vice President. Andrews stated they are addressing that issue separately. In fact, the Committee is objecting to the 95% figure: they are recommending that the figure should have been 90%.

J.Devore asked what grade distributions have to do with the budgeting process. Andrews said it was added only because it was quantitative data that was available. That could be scratched, certainly. R.Gooden interjected that we should let the Budget Committee decide whether or not they wanted to include that issue. On a similar vein, J.Murphy asked what accreditation, demographics of faculty, specific qualifications appropriate to the discipline, etc. have to do with the budget. Andrews responded that from a philosophical point of view, it does concern whether or not the university will be willing to cut an accredited program. Murphy then asked if we were getting back to *program* review. D.Peach stated there is an additional philosophical concern here—do we make vertical or horizontal cuts? It is being assumed that we will make vertical cuts.

L.Gamble clarified she had no real objection to the Budget Committee looking at this data, but she urged the Budget Committee to look at the *whole* budget of the university—not just that of academic affairs. It has been pointed out over and over that there is the ability to transfer funds from one area of the university to another.

Andrews stated that the chair of the Budget Committee is a member of PACBRA which does look at the university budget as a whole. He then clarified that all areas of the university have been told to budget at 95%, not just academic programs.

Andrews summarized the discussion, stating he would make the necessary revisions in the "Charge" and send it to the Budget Committee so they can get to work as quickly as possible: they are to compile the data and come back to the Academic Senate with recommendations concerning budget considerations. As a matter of information, we will include a clean copy of this charge in the next agenda of the full Senate.

A. Strategic Planning Document. (deferred)


B.Mori moved (2nd by Gooden) that we defer discussion of the Strategic Planning Document and move directly to item B. given the urgency of the requested action.

- B. GLBU request for a "statement of support" regarding the draft City Ordinance entitled "Discrimination on the Basis of Sexual Orientation." B.Mori moved (2nd by Lomas) that the Executive Committee publicly express its support the passage of the proposed City Ordinance "Discrimination on the Basis of Sexual Orientation." G.De Mers asked if it was an accepted policy for the Senate or University to be involved in city government. He requested clarification as to whether or not this action would set a precedent. Andrews stated he had a concern as to the appropriate role of the Academic Senate—he felt, given the nature of the Senate, that an issue of such controversy [should be considered by the whole Senate]. R.Gooden perceived a relevant connection [between the Senate and city government] in that students and faculty would be affected. He expressed discomfort in representing the entire Senate without debate even though he personally did feel comfortable [supporting passage of ordinance]. D.Peach supported the notion of non-discrimination based on sexual orientation, but felt uncomfortable having the Executive Committee or Senate telling the city what ordinances to pass. In his view, it is a questionable precedent to get involved here. C.Lomas felt that a statement of support from the Executive Committee was appropriate. C.Russell agreed, stating that we could provide a disclaimer clarifying that the vote did not necessarily reflect the views of the full Senate. Andrews felt that such a course of action—where we provide a disclaimer stating we represent only eight or nine people and not the

University or the Senate—may not be doing them a favor. We might be damaging them. At this point we were informed that the City Council vote may be postponed, thus giving the Senate more time for the consultative process.

B.Mori moved (2nd by Gamble and Lomas) that this item be agendized as a discussion item at the next meeting of the Academic Senate.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 5:08.


Craig H. Russell, Secretary of Academic Senate

March 4, 1992
Date