

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

Minutes of the
ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, March 31, 1992
UU 220, 3:00-5:00pm

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

- I. Minutes:
The minutes of the February 25, March 10, and March 12, 1992 Academic Senate Executive Committee meetings were approved without correction.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
The Chair brought the Executive Committee's attention to the Communications and Announcements:
- A. A copy of the attached "Documents on File in the Academic Senate Office" was distributed to the Executive Committee.
 - B. The "Current Charges of Academic Senate Committees 1992-1992, Winter Quarter" was included in the agenda.
 - C. President Baker approved Academic Senate Resolution AS-378-92/IC "Resolution on Visibility of the Policy on Cheating and Plagiarism."
- III. Reports:
- A. Academic Senate Chair: none
 - B. President's Office: none
 - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: Vice President Koob discussed the status of the CSU/Cal Poly budget. At the present time, the official budget items we have to make decisions from are the governor's budget, a Trustees' action requesting a 40 percent fee increase, and an Assembly Ways and Means Committee which has put a cap of 10 percent on the fee increase. The rumor is that the Senate will pass something closer to the governor's budget but it will have to go through a conference committee. The Department of Finance Office has asked state agencies to prepare scenarios for 5-10-15 percent budget cuts. The CSU will not have to provide this, but it has been asked to go through the exercise.
- Cal Poly was told it would have the same dollars as last year. The deans have been doing a good deal of budget planning, especially converting their budgets from the traditional position-base to a dollar-base so comparable units can be used for the cuts and the allocations. The next step will be to take the dollars we think we have and allocate them on a 95 percent base. If we get a reasonable budget back from the Legislature, then we can reallocate at a number greater than the 95 percent base. No school would be cut below the 95 percent base. That implies an approximate 24 percent fee increase. In the event more than a 95 percent cut might be necessary, we would need to turn to the Academic Senate for program information. At present, we only have planning figures. We do not have any real numbers or allocations for next year. We won't know what dollars are available before May.
- The CSU continues to follow the strategy that the Phase I budget is the base from which we will build, Phase II will be added to that when the fees are passed, and a Phase III might be possible if growth dollars are approved. The current student population we can presently support, should we not get the 40 percent increase or the 420 FTES increase, is 13,850 FTES. We don't believe we can achieve a number that small in one summer, but we felt we needed to go on record saying that we could not conscientiously support our current

level of expenditure and our current level of students unless we got the additional funds. We will average out to 15,300 FTES for this year. With a 10 percent increase, no growth money, but no catastrophic additional cuts, we think we can cut to 14,500 with mandatory disqualifications. We do not believe we can cut to 13,850 by any means in the short run. But we wanted to state this as our intent. If we have to make vertical cuts, the Academic Senate will be asked to give its best estimate of where that verticality ought to occur. It would have roughly 60 days to make those decisions.

Gamble: I have two questions; one on mandatory disqualifications and two, whether we are the only campus moving into Division I. Koob: (Re mandatory disqualifications) We are presently out of compliance with the Executive Order regarding disqualifications. At the present time, we indicate to the schools who's eligible for academic disqualification and the schools decide whether to disqualify or not. For the most part, they decide not to disqualify. Mandatory disqualification means when the school is notified of a student's eligibility for academic disqualification, a hold is placed on that student's registration and the only way the school can get it off is to appeal for same. This changes the action the school has to take and requires justification as to why that student should be in class instead of a well-qualified student.

Koob: (Re athletic situation) As far as I understand it, I don't know of any other local institutions that have decided to make the move to Division I from Division II. Some are looking at it. The President's position is that he asked the students opinion as to whether this was what they wanted to do and they voted to do it. There are no increased costs to the university, in state dollars, to move to Division I from Division II. In fact, we will be operating a program which is less expensive than the one we operated under Division II rules.

Devore: To what extent is the system as a whole looking at the possibility of vertical cuts instead of allocating horizontal cuts to campuses. Koob: That's an excellent question and I wish I had a positive answer for you. Of the campuses I'm familiar with, Cal Poly is the only campus planning for the current cuts. For the most part, the system has behaved by just accommodating the cuts as they've come. The system machine that used to determine allocations is broken (formerly SCU's generated dollars). A new machine is needed and the attempt to rebuild it is occurring, but we can't tell what it will look like. The CSU is not in the habit of taking control of its own future. Peach: Is the primary aim in planning for budget cuts to avoid layoffs? Koob: Yes. The divestment of a particular program from an institution is an important step. When you make a vertical cut, you're taking a step towards specialization at the expense of diversity. Institutions must move in small steps. If we retain our approximate level of funding, we can keep the programs we have without moving tenure-track or tenured faculty out of the system. But if we have to cut any deeper, then the decision to have diversity is taken out of our hands. We will have to become less diverse just to maintain an acceptable level of quality in the remaining programs. Under the current scenario, I think of certain programs as changing over time. But if we lose flexibility, then we don't have the opportunity to give those programs the freedom to change. Programs slated for change will have to be eliminated. If we have the money, we will be able to redesign the mission of certain programs. If the resources aren't there, they'll have to be cut.

Andrews: A related question regarding the budget which I continue to get inquiries on is why we are filling administrative positions if we really have a budget crunch. Koob: At the administrative level, there have been a number of positions removed. Budget cuts for administration do not mean that a position will be cut just because it happens to be vacant. Critical positions need to be refilled when vacant. In Student Affairs, there were other places where cuts were made rather than having the position referred to left vacant. The cuts made to Management Personnel are mandated to be equal to, or exceed, those made to other parts of the budget. Last year permanent cuts to Management Personnel exceeded academic cuts by 2-1/2 percent.

D. Statewide Senators: none

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:

- A. Academic Senate/committee vacancies:
(1) Additional vacancy: A replacement for Gerald Farrell is needed in SSM. (2) Roger Conway has expressed concern that there is no Academic Senate representative on the University Union Advisory Board.
- B. Determination of Academic Senate election results for the Schools of Agriculture and Liberal Arts: DeMers: The Constitution and Bylaws Committee did not feel it had the authority to make the decision of department representation vs. majority vote for this last election, so it has been referred back to the Executive Committee. Andrews: It is my understanding that the Elections Committee felt department representation took precedence over majority vote. The Chair asked for a vote of the those in favor of breadth of representation over majority of votes. M/S/P 10-0-2.
- C. Strategic Planning Document (SPD) - procedure for finalizing the Faculty Response to the Strategic Planning Document: The Chair announced that Vice President Koob has asked that the Mission Statement and Goals of the planning document be looked at initially, then the Objectives. The Chair asked how the Executive Committee wished to proceed in finalizing this document. Peach: How do we get to the end product? Koob: The reason for carrying out the planning has always been to create a campus forum on issues of concern to the campus. To the degree that we could get a set of goals agreed upon by the Senate, the student body, and the staff that were nonconflicting, these would then be published as the goals that were agreed upon. Those goals which conflict with one another will be given to a conference committee which would try to find some resolution and return its suggestion to the appropriate bodies for final ratification. The Strategic Planning Document is not intended to replace CAM or to become the campus bylaws. It is intended to be the reflection of the will of the campus as to what its future should look like.
- J Murphy: There are several dean's committees looking at separate sections of the SPD to integrate the responses. Should the faculty responses go back to the original drafting committees? Koob: Would the Senate feel it retained ownership over what resulted? Is that an action perceived to be an administrative action or a faculty action? Gooden: I would like to move this to the agenda as it is and recommend it go through two readings on days other than those regularly scheduled for Senate meetings. At these two meetings, members of the drafting committees can be present to speak to the original document. A faculty position can come from this discussion. Botwin: That seems like a very cumbersome way of doing things. Maybe it should go back to the original committees, but the faculty should see the final document. I can't imagine the faculty addressing all these comments at one or two meetings. Maybe a conference committee should look at the whole document since there are issues in one section that affect matters in another section. If groups are working on one section only, those problems will never be resolved. Andrews: There is another option; setting up an ad hoc committee (of the Senate) to go through the document and put it in the form they think it should be in to submit to the Senate. Peach: I don't think the conventional first and second reading forum will ever get this finalized. Gooden: I don't think this is any more controversial than our exercise in G.E. It was difficult, but we finally came to a decision. Peach: If we really want to exhaust the discussion on this, we'd better schedule a lot of time for it. J Murphy: I think it's important that the faculty, through the Senate, have an opportunity to respond. Then I'd like to see the comments taken from our discussions in the Senate (limited to one or two hours) and the Faculty Response sent back to the original committees for finalization. Andrews: We can do that, but we don't have any control over that committee. The motion to have two special meetings of the Academic Senate to discuss the Faculty Responses to the Strategic Planning Document (Goals Only) was approved 6-4-0.
- D. Athletics Governing Board - determination of process for selection of nominees: The Chair stated that six nominees are to be submitted to the President who will select three of the six to serve on the new Athletics Governing Board. He asked the Executive Committee whether the determination of these nominees should be made by the full Senate or the Executive Committee. J Murphy: The Executive Committee has the authority to make those decisions. Andrews: It will be announced at the next Senate meeting that the

Executive Committee will be making this selection.

- E. Resolution on Review of Proposal for Graduate Studies at Cal Poly: (The original Graduate Studies Proposal was handed out at the meeting.) J Murphy: In view of the budget situation, should we be expanding our graduate programs? Lucas: The Graduate Studies Committee is looking for endorsement of the idea of developing graduate programs and recognizing it as a priority for the university. We are looking for external support (grants, etc.) for our graduate programs. We will find more opportunities to build a base with outside funds than from state funds. The committee's report and the original Graduate Studies Resolution/Proposal will be agendized for the next Senate meeting. Botwin: I'm still unclear as to what we're approving? Lucas: All of the major recommendations suggested by the document will be brought forward to the Senate as they are developed. Mori: This document still doesn't give any sense of what makes a viable graduate program. Andrews: The program review process will incorporate graduate program review.
- F. Resolution on Revision to Budget Process: Jens Pohl introduced the resolution noting that the Budget Committee has not traditionally made fiscal decisions. However, it was felt at this time that it should be involved in the current budget situation. The essence of the resolution--considering the severity of the cuts--states that it be essential that budget cuts be implemented on a vertical basis. In the past, cuts have largely been made on a horizontal basis. The first step the committee felt the university should take was to establish an accounting procedure, called a Faculty Position Bank, as follows: The Faculty Position Bank "shall consist of faculty positions" wherein schools without tenure/tenure-track lay-offs will "lend" to the Faculty Position Bank "only positions held by..temporary appointees." Another school faced with faculty reduction may "borrow" from the Faculty Position Bank if all temporary appointees from that school have been released. "When resources become available, those schools that have borrowed from the Faculty Position Bank must repay those positions before positions may be filled by the borrowing school." During periods of budget expansion, new positions can be placed into the Faculty Position Bank. Schools seeking new positions or the return of borrowed positions, can do so by submitting a Budget Change Proposal.

Peach: I think it's conceptually a good idea, but I'm not sure I understand it totally. Are we banking dollars or positions? And I'm not sure we all agree/understand what vertical cuts are. Pohl: Budget cuts would be applied to programs (after program assessments), not across the board. We are talking about 10 percent cuts. We can't maintain strong programs with a 10 percent cut. Andrews: This proposes selection cuts vs. percentage cuts.
It was moved to agendize the resolution (with one nay).

VI. Discussion:

- A. Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2062-92/AA&FA "The Student-Athlete in the CSU": The Chair asked for a position statement to recommend to the statewide senators for their discussion at the next statewide meeting. Cal Poly has no statement or policy regarding Athletics. This needs to be addressed by the faculty. Gooden: The initiative for this resolution came from the Division I schools. They have experienced many problems with the ways in which Athletics is budgeted and played. What they have tried to do is get some kind of collection of principles paralleling the Knight Report and other recommendations. This document is attempting to generate conversation on a matter we haven't given much thought to before. Andrews: I think the issue here is whether we feel the system has to take a position. It was agreed that the Executive Committee support the approach suggested by this resolution.
- B. The Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP): A petition has been circulated in the School of Liberal Arts regarding the recently filled ACIP position. The petition asks that the procedure used to select to this position be declared null and void since it was not in keeping with the procedures outlined in CAM 451.6. Koob: By presenting the petition to me, a formal protest regarding procedure was made. I feel if a formal protest has been made, I need to reopen this matter and follow the given procedure. I would like some advice as to how we can resolve this. Gooden: As I read CAM, this is more than a procedural question. CAM is explicit in stating that this member has to be a university faculty--a teaching faculty or administrative appointment with retreat rights into an

academic department. Andrews: The ACIP Bylaws do not make clear what "faculty/administrative" appointment means. Peach: We did it wrong, a complaint was made, I think we need to go back and do it according to CAM. The motion was made and approved to request the Vice President for Academic Affairs reopen the selection process for a ACIP representative according to the procedures outlined in CAM 451.6.

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

Recorded by:
Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate Office

Approved by:
Craig Russell, Secretary
Academic Senate

Date:

Date: