

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

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

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:10pm. The Chair announced that discussion of budget issues would begin at 3:30pm, time certain.

- I. Minutes:  
The minutes of the April 14, 1992 Academic Senate meeting were approved without change.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):  
The Chair brought the Senate's attention to the items under Communications and Announcements.
- III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair: none
  - B. President's Office: none
  - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: none
  - D. Statewide Senators: none
  - E. CFA Campus President: none
  - F. ASI Representatives: none
- IV. Consent Agenda:  
Resolution on Election to University Professional Leave Committee: Approved by consent.
- V. Business Items:
  - A. Resolution on Review of Proposal for Graduate Studies at Cal Poly, second reading: There was no discussion of this resolution. M/S/P unanimously.
  - B. Resolution on Budget Process, second reading. This item was pulled by the Budget Committee.
  - C. Resolution on Graduate Studies at Cal Poly, first reading: A revised Graduate Studies proposal was distributed at the meeting. Since the Curriculum Committee had not had time to review the revised Graduate Studies proposal, it was requested that after its review, a determination be made by the Executive Committee, at its next meeting, as to whether the proposal should come back to the Senate on May 26 as a first or second reading item.
  - D. Resolution on Time Limit to Obtain Degree, first reading: The resolution was moved to a second reading item at the next Academic Senate meeting.
  - E. Resolution on Curriculum, first reading: The chair of the Curriculum Committee summarized the content of the resolution. The resolution attempts to clarify and modify some degree requirements in CAM regarding the number of total units acceptable in the Major (vs. Support) column of a program. It would reduce requirements by removing some of the 'lids' that have existed in the Major column. This gives more latitude to more programs. The resolution was moved to a second reading item at the next Academic Senate meeting.
  - F. The election of officers was moved to 4:45pm, time certain.
- VI. Discussion:  
The Chair announced that during the following budget discussion, the only speakers would be senators unless a senator moved to suspend this rule. In addition to the items previously identified on the agenda attachment, a request was made that 'across-the-board pay cuts' be added to the discussion.

President Baker gave an historical review of the budget reductions over the past few years. Both the Chair of the Academic Senate and the chair of the Budget Committee have been invited by President Baker to be part of administration's budget discussions. He indicated that a significant

structural change had occurred in the State's economy and its repercussions would be felt for several years.

Conway: CFA's position is that the actions being "proposed" by Cal Poly's administration are premature actions. In Article 38 of the faculty contract, it says people can be laid off for only three reasons: lack of work, lack of funds, or programmatic changes. There is no lack of work, and we don't yet know what the budget situation is to be so lack of funds cannot be demonstrated. CFA feels programmatic changes are being made and disguised as budget cuts. Programmatic changes must go through a lengthy set of processes before being discontinued. One cannot "plan" by permanently eliminating programs.

Amspacher: How is cutting faculty in place of O&E justified? Koob: Over the past few years, \$3 million from O&E has been cut to meet the budget shortfalls. This \$3 million in O&E needs to be replaced in order to maintain/restore the tools and laboratories necessary for (quality) hands-on learning at a polytechnic university. What happens if all the numbers in the newspapers come to be true? If we don't adjust the budget before getting the final figures, twice as many people are at risk than if preparations were made in advance. It is difficult in California to do excellent budget planning because it has to be done before knowing what the budget is. This worked fairly well as long as the budgets were always increasing. Something must be in place if a catastrophe is anticipated. If the plan is carried out depends on what actually happens. The mistake is to not plan at all.

P Murphy: The expected cuts for the schools are available, but it is important to faculty to know what the figures are for the other areas of campus. When can we expect this information?

Andrews: That information has been requested. As soon as it is received, it will be distributed to senators. Baker: I have instructed Dr. Koob that those cuts made within instructional programs should be smaller than those cuts made within administration.

Morris: Speaking for the Home Economics Department, we are very concerned with the process used to target our program for elimination. We don't feel democracy has been evident, no rationale has been given for the proposed cut of our entire program, and we don't feel the information given by the task force last year was used because our department was not identified for cuts by that committee.

Pokorny: We are still carrying an Athletics program that has a budget of \$1.2 million, and a hidden budget that is significantly higher, while cutting academic programs. We must (critically) look at our nonteaching overhead. Wilson: The Athletics Referendum passed, but I think if students had been informed of what was to come, that the vote may have come out differently. It is the job of the Academic Senate to look at the academic and nonacademic sides of campus to see where the dollars are being spent. Let's cut the state funding for Athletics before cutting into academic programs.

DeMers: In talking to faculty on campus, a number of points keep coming up. One point is that we are uninformed--we haven't been involved in the process. We don't understand why certain programs have been targeted because we haven't been involved in the process. Another point is that we should do everything possible to save tenure/tenure-track faculty. Losing junior faculty does a lot of damage to a department that is very hard to rebuild. Koob: The opportunity for a formal program review was available. The State did not give us the time to put in place the process of review that was agreed to by the Senate.

Koob: We understand the campus' sensitivity to State support for Athletics. I think we should devote a series of Senate meetings to the value of the various units on the campus. It would be extraordinarily valuable for this body to spend its time talking about what a whole university looks like. In the meantime, we have continued to reduce the State funding for Athletics at a rate equal to or greater than anything else on campus. We have not said that in the long run we intend to phase it out because there is a tremendous number of interactions between that program and other things on campus. The proposed dollar reduction in support of Athletics from State funds this year is the same as that which is proposed for either of the targeted programs suggested to be unfunded. That reduction is 26 percent of \$1.2 million.

Gamble: I would like to suggest a practical set of choices for meeting the need for budget cuts:

(1) eliminating intercollegiate Athletics, and (2) instituting a hiring freeze while tenure/tenure-track faculty are being laid off. Koob: That's not an uncommon set of suggestions. Upper administration is asked to try and take the long view. How will this campus look five years from now? A hiring freeze sounds humane in the short run but it may not be in the long run. In the long run, faculty and students are likely to suffer if appropriate action to preserve quality is not taken.

Mueller: Why not eliminate the hard-to-hire pay designation? Since it was put in place, things have changed. These areas are no longer hard-to-hire. Baker: We can't do that unilaterally. J Murphy: There should be a process in place to stop the hiring for new programs at the same time we are talking about cutting old ones.

Koob: I need to remind this group that when information came forward from the faculty program review process, administration was extraordinarily sensitive to that. Last year, the recommendations of the faculty task force were followed dollar for dollar in the profile that was submitted, with the exception of Athletics where the cut made was 28 percent instead of 50 percent. We asked most sincerely for help in making those kinds of decisions this year. When this faculty, in whatever form, is willing to put on the table, information about programs, administration will use that information to guide its decisions. Any kind of budget reductions have to be congruent with academic decisions.

Burnett: I have been asked about the implementation of the new Music and Philosophy majors when we are cutting existing majors. Koob: Those new majors were passed by the Senate on the assumption that no new money would be allocated to the programs. Baker: The question of why we approved a Music and Philosophy major at a polytechnic university has come to me several times as well. The Academic Senate debated these majors and their importance on a polytechnic campus over a lengthy period of time.

Gooden: One of the issues we were going to address is vertical vs. horizontal cuts. It's difficult to address this issue in the abstract when specific departments have been targeted for elimination. I wanted to know if there was still interest on the part of the body to discuss this matter so we can at least get its opinion to see if it differs from the suggestions of the three Senate committees that recommended vertical cuts. [No discussion ensued.]

Peach: What if the budget is worst than that planned for? Koob: We are presently planning for a 0 to 7-1/2 percent reduction in funding this coming year, but when planning for budget reductions, we have a traditional, long-term inflexibility that the President has recently requested we be released from in the event of more severe budget reductions. That is the inflexibility in the way we are funded for and have to offer the summer session. We have repeatedly requested from the Chancellor's Office the opportunity to earn those student credit units on an annually basis and use the funds on an annually basis instead of the 3 + 1 we are presently constrained to operate under. The current operations goes to 7-1/2. If it goes down to 10, we have to find other things.

Discussion was ended at 4:45pm in order to conduct the election of Academic Senate officers during the remaining time.

V.F. Election of officers: The Chair of the Elections Committee announced that written nominations were received by Charles T. Andrews for the position of Chair and Lynne Gamble for the position of Vice Chair. No nominations were received for Secretary.

Jack Wilson was nominated on the floor by C Lomas and seconded by C Pokorny and B Mori. Wilson gave background information on his administrative experience and what his concerns were for the university and faculty during the coming year. Andrews also expressed his concerns. The following individuals were elected to the Academic Senate for the 1992-1993 term:

Chair	Jack Wilson
Vice Chair	Lynne Gamble
Secretary	VACANCY

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.