

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

Minutes of the
ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, April 17, 1990
UU 220, 3:00 - 5:00 pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:14 pm. **Business Item D and the Discussion Item on Independent Doctorate for the CSU were not addressed due to the lack of time.**

- I. Minutes: The minutes from the March 13, 1990 Academic Senate meeting were approved without change.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
Attention was directed to the Academic Senate Reading List.

R Zeuschner announced that an intersegmental conference on general education will be held at Bass Lake this summer. Applications are being accepted. Contact R Zeuschner at 756-2289.

Resolutions on Enrollment Growth (AS-329-90/LRPC) and the International Baccalaureate Program (AS-331-90/IC) were approved by President Baker.

Attention was directed to nominations for academic senate vacancies. Elections will be held this week with ballots counted on April 20, 1990. Please note that there will be vacancies after the elections. Senators are encouraged to seek out colleagues to fill positions.

Nomination forms for Academic Senate Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary for 1990-91 are available in the Academic Senate Office. Deadline for nominations is May 1, 1990.

- III. Reports:
 - A. President's Office
 - B. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
P Bailey announced that proposals for reorganization of teacher education at Cal Poly are with LRP Committee, and that he would like to address the Academic Senate regarding MCA II when that Business Item came to the floor. There was no objection to this request.
 - C. Statewide Senators
 - D. ASI Representatives
M Gates responded to J Weatherby's March 13, 1990 question by stating that students were not banned from the Chancellor's office.
 - E. Ray Geigle, Chair of the Academic Senate CSU, congratulated Cal Poly's statewide senators for their leadership, and shared his perspective on the budget, status of the independent doctorate, growth plan and process, and the Academic Senate structure and size. As the representative of the faculty, Ray Geigle presents a range of faculty interests, issues and concerns when queried. He stated that the budget is the worst in recent history. The problem is complex but begins with revenues. It is important for long term relief to support Propositions 108 and 111. Short term relief is only possible if there is a

substantial upward revenue revision by the legislature in May. This is not likely. The budget situation may not be clear this year. There are many unresolved issues regarding Proposition 111. Next year's budget will be ambiguous.

It is believed that the proposal from the Board of Trustees to establish an independent doctorate in education will require statutory change to implement. The position of the statewide Senate is to slow down the process and consult with faculty. It does not appear that there will be a legislative hearing on this issue until sometime next year. An agenda item on the July 1990 Board of Trustees meeting asks whether the CSU should seek legislative change to pursue the doctorate in education. The statewide Senate will not respond until campuses have had an opportunity to respond to the issue.

The growth plan is also caught up in the university political turmoil in Sacramento which makes our recommendations much weaker than in previous years. The legislative budget language has prohibited CSU from planning. Planning can be conducted but the plans must be annually submitted to the legislature for review. In a normal year this type of language could be revised. The posture of the legislature weakens the university's role as a player in future growth plans of the state. In addition the growth planning process within the university has also caused concern since the Academic Senate was not involved until very late. Campuses did not have time for review. Presently, the faculty are reviewing the growth plan. We do not expect the Board of Trustees to take action on Cal Poly's growth plan until President Baker has made a recommendation based on faculty consultation. It will be at least a year before the growth plans are finalized. They will not become public policy until there is a legislative review and approval.

Your advice is requested regarding constitutional change to the Academic Senate structure which would allow representation of part time faculty. The constitution does not prohibit part time faculty from seeking election. However, candidates should have a full time university responsibility. The constitutional question is whether to allow an individual the right to serve with less than that responsibility.

In addition advice is sought regarding the physical size of the statewide Senate. If the university system continues to grow, the size of the Senate based on representation will double in 10-12 years. Should the constitution be changed to fix membership? Discussion followed.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):

- A. Resolution on Audit Policy (first reading). Moved to a second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting. Ray Terry, chair of the Instruction Committee, stated that this resolution was developed at the request of the Computer Science Department. The issue is whether the audit grade carries some obligation on the part of the student or is simply a procedure to allow a student to attend a class. W Reynoso commented that the W grade implies the student was enrolled for credit. John Butler, ASI Representative, stated that the NG would more fairly represent the situation. W Boynton informed the Senate that the catalogue requires both registration and participation. C Andrews commented that there appears to be some intentional deception on the part of the student and that the faculty should have control to maintain academic integrity.

- B Resolution on Academic Minors (first reading): Moved to a second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting. T Bailey summarized the Curriculum Committee's report which addresses issues raised by the Academic Senate during the 1988-89 academic year. The resolutions reflect the Curriculum Committee's concerns regarding minors. J Weatherby stated that the data presented in Table 1 may not be an accurate representation. In addition, in the School of Liberal Arts which supports diversity, there is pressure to reduce the number of major courses to allow students the opportunity to complete a minor. The situation may reverse in schools that do not support diversity. G Hewitt stated that if it is intended that the minor be completed along with the bachelor degree, then there is an additional issue that needs to be addressed. Students that have obtained a degree cannot be recognized for additional work after graduation. Ray Terry recommended that the "student's transcript and diploma certify completion of the minor" instead of the transcript as identified in the Resolved. S McGary questioned why "Two-thirds of all units counted in the minor must be in courses graded A to F." T Bailey stated that since the minor is part of the curriculum it should be graded rather than credit/no credit.
- C. Resolution on Multi-Criteria Admissions (first reading): W Boynton, Caucus Chair for the SBUS, reviewed the concerns of the caucus in developing the resolution. The main issues revolve around consultation and governance, and efficacy of MCA II admission system and the process for application. The Vice President for Academic Affairs was called upon to describe the emergency measure taken to overcome problems created by the MCA II model and to describe how the over enrollment problem will be solved. A copy of W Boynton's presentation is available in the Academic Senate office. P Bailey, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, reviewed the Admissions Supplemental Questionnaire criteria for freshman and transfer students. The MCA II model had minor problems with awarding bonus points. More students were admitted with bonus points than originally intended. An imbalance occurred across campus in which 150 students were not admitted due to bonus points. These students, about 3.75% of last year's incoming students, were identified and sent letters of acceptance. Although MCA II needs some modification it admits students based on Academic Qualifications. The students selected last year in the Architecture Department was used as an example. , School of Business, stated that compared to last year the SAT scores in the acceptance class for freshman in the SBUS has been reduced from 1208 to 1071 (11%); and the GPA from 3.98 to 3.75 (6%). These are considered significant reductions. Admissions seems to be directing the schools' acceptance rather than the schools setting the admissions standards. W Boynton questioned whether MCA II was submitted to Long Beach for approval before being implemented and whether there is a timetable for submitting a revised model to Long Beach. The Chair charged the Senate to review the resolution and discuss it with their respective faculty. This item will be brought back as a first reading item for further discussion.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

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