

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California
ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - MINUTES
Tuesday: October 14, 1986
UU 220 3:00 p.m.

Chair: Lloyd H. Lamouria
Vice Chair: Lynne E. Gamble
Secretary: Raymond D. Terry

Members Absent: Kersten, Weatherby

I. Preparatory

- A. The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. upon achieving a quorum.
- B. The minutes of the September 30, 1986 Executive Committee meeting were approved as mailed.
- C. The Chair directed the Executive Committee's attention to the Communications section of the agenda package.
 - 1. Malcolm Wilson informed the Executive Committee that the November 1, 1986 deadline (mentioned in the Oct. 1 memo from Vice Chancellor Vandament to the Campus Presidents) for each campus to submit a brief description and budget for the use of lottery revenue funds had been extended to Dec. 1, 1986.
 - 2. Projects proposed under the Instructional Development and Technology Program are not restricted to computer-related activities.
 - 3. Project funds may be used to purchase assigned time but may not be used to compensate faculty for work on a overload basis during the academic year.

II. Reports

- A. President /Academic Affairs Office
 - Cf. Item I.C. above.
- B. Statewide Senators

There were no reports as two of the three CSU Senators were absent and the third arrived shortly after this item had been dispensed with.

III. Business Items

A. Appointment of the Academic Senate's Part-Time Representative

1. The Chair announced that Gail Wilson had withdrawn her name from consideration for the appointment.
2. The Chair further announced that Steve Hook had not indicated any further interest in the position, but that Sandra M. (Saunny) Dills (English), who held the position during the 1985-1986 academic year, was now willing to have her name placed in nomination.
3. By consensus, the Executive Committee approved the appointment of Saunny Dills as part-time representative for Fall 1986.

B. Five Year Review of Business and Liberal Arts Programs

1. The Chair recognized Charles Dana (Chair: Curriculum Committee) who highlighted the content of his October 14, 1986 memo, jointly authored with Steve French (Chair: Long Range Planning Committee).
2. Representatives of the two committees have examined a summary of program reviews prepared by Glenn Irvin. According to French and Dana, the summary is reasonable and accurate in its presentation, but lack the proper background and information for extensive critical review. Moreover, the statement of goals is vague and does not address the issue of requisite resources for implementation.
3. Ken Riener noted the School of Business' pursuit of interdisciplinary programs, e.g., a joint M.B.A. in Business and Agriculture.
4. In reply to a question from the Chair, Malcolm Wilson expressed disappointment that the five-year program reviews receive little attention from the Chancellor's Office and scarcely more on-campus. He expressed optimism that the faculty and Administration can work together to establish procedures that will address the questions raised by the LRP and Curriculum Committees.
5. The Chair noted that the Long Range Planning Committee contains three administration representatives and the Curriculum Committee has one.
6. Reg Gooden expressed his belief that the Academic Senate lacks the proper machinery to provide a meaningful and substantive academic program review

at the present time.

7. Marylinda Wheeler expressed the view that it is futile to "spin our wheels" trying to meet deadlines imposed by five-year reviews if the reviews are not put to use later.
8. Malcolm Wilson chided accreditation teams for their attention to detailed comparisons of programs to a minimal set of standards while avoiding the issue of the quality of a program in itself.
9. The Chair proposed sending the issue of the evaluation of program reviews back to the two committees with instructions to develop a meaningful set of procedures for our campus.
 - a. Susan Currier, as Devil's Advocate, suggested that the writing of program reviews interfered with the development of the programs themselves.
 - b. Charles Crabb protested that the time was ready for the committees to receive input and begin work.
 - c. Charles Dana observed that the Curriculum Committee was in a cycle year and should not become involved in a time-consuming study that would interfere with its primary goal.
10. By consensus, the Executive Committee authorized the Chair to refer the issue of the evaluation of program reviews to the Long Range Planning Committee for study and recommendations.

C. Resolution on Concentrations

1. The Chair recognized Charles Dana (Chair: Curriculum Committee) who reviewed the background and wording of Senate Resolution AS-213-86 which was accepted by President Baker on July 23, 1986 with some conditions.
2. The proposed Resolution on Concentrations recognizes President Baker's concerns and endorses the changes in CAM 411.D.4 and 411.A.5 recommended by the President.
3. By consensus, it was agreed that the Resolution on Concentrations shall receive its first reading on Oct. 21, 1986.

D. Resolution on the Bicentennial Anniversary of the Adoption and Ratification of the Federal Constitution

1. The Chair recognized Carl Lutrin (co-sponsor of the Resolution).
2. The Chair asked Carl if the endorsement of the Resolution by the Executive Committee would be sufficient in lieu of sending it to the full Senate.
3. After some discussion it was decided to place the Resolution on the consent agenda of the Oct. 21 Senate meeting.

IV. Discussion Items

A. AIMS Funding

1. The Resolution on AIMS Funding, which was originally on the Sept. 30 Executive Committee agenda, was withdrawn from the Oct. 7 Senate agenda and placed on today's agenda. President Baker, who had been invited to attend today's meeting, was unavoidably out-of-town on business. Representing the Administration were Jim Landreth and Frank Lebens.
2. Bill Forgeng began the discussion by stating his basic premise that alternative funds are available for AIMS funding.
3. Messrs. Landreth and Lebens distributed a fact sheet entitled "The AIMS General Fund Financial Plan" and a chart outlining the intended sources of AIMS funds for the three fiscal years. They spent considerable time explaining the general plan. Then they entertained questions. The alternative sources of funding were discussed one by one. (Attached)
4. At the conclusion of the discussion, the Chair opened discussion on whether to send the Resolution on AIMS Funding to the Oct. 21 Senate meeting.
 - a. Bill Forgeng declined to withdraw the resolution but left its fate up to the Executive Committee as a whole.
 - b. Charles Crabb spoke in favor of withdrawing the Resolution; Mike Botwin favored sending it to the Senate floor.
 - c. Reg Gooden compared the development of collegial government on CSU campuses to the development of constitutional law in the United States. According to Gooden, there will be

ample opportunity to evolve precedents for collegial government. The Resolution on AIMS Funding is not a clear test case. The Administration's commitment to the AIMS Project results from an honest difference of opinion and should not be viewed as a rejection of collegiality. Moreover, our own notions of collegiality must evolve. We must come to an agreement as to when faculty input is essential, when it is only incidental and when it is unnecessary.

- d. Ken Riener noted that the Senate had already gone on record as supporting the AIMS Project, but not the specific funding method. Perhaps this is all that we can agree on.

5. By consensus, the Executive Committee agreed not to send the Resolution on AIMS Funding forth to the Oct. 21 Senate session.

B. Are FERP's considered part-timers?

The Chair called the Executive Committee's attention to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee Chair's interpretation of the MOU that faculty on a reduced time base and faculty on the early retirement program are indistinguishable from full-time faculty.

C. O/E Model: Progress Report from the Budget Committee

1. Jim Conway (Chair: Budget) could not be present for the meeting.
2. A hand-written memo from Jim Conway was distributed to the Executive Committee reporting on the Budget Committee's latest meeting (Monday: Oct. 13 at 2:00 p.m.). (Attached)

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m..

The AIMS General Fund Financial Plan

1. Fund Cal Poly's one to three contribution for AIMS by means of any campuswide year-end budget savings which may develop during the fiscal year; ie., unspent program allocations, excess staff benefits, excess salary savings, excess revenues.
2. Fund the Budget Year (i.e., 1986/87) from savings/resources in the current year (i.e., 1985/86). In other words, advance funding by one year.
3. Commit annually \$65,000 of the campus Contingence Reserve to funding of AIMS.
4. Commit for at least the next three years the campus Special Project Fund of \$50,000 to funding of AIMS.
5. Develop a contingency plan whereby if year-end savings were not to materialize the four program areas (Instruction, Academic Support, Student Services and Institutional Support) would be assessed an amount necessary to fund AIMS in proportion to their program budget allocations. This would mean approximately 70% of any such assessment would be funded by Instruction and 30% by the other three Support Program areas.
6. Reallocate to Instruction the first \$100,000 of any campuswide year-end savings in order to offset the AIMS assessment made from that program area.
7. Reallocate to the three Support Program areas any campuswide year-end savings in excess of \$100,000 up to the amount of their assessment.
8. Reserve to fund a subsequent year's AIMS requirement and/or reallocate to fund other campus priority needs any campuswide year-end savings in excess of those needed to fund AIMS in the Budget Year.

10/14/86

California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo 10/14/86

GENERAL FUND AIMS FUNDING PLAN AS OF 10/01/86

RESERVE\AIMS9

	FY 1986/87		FY 1987/88		FY 1988/89	
	Original	Revised	Original	Revised	Original	Revised
=====						
USES OF FUNDS (Cal Poly's 1/3 contribution):						
CSU/DIS Estimate	(\$241,000)	(\$241,000)	(\$235,000)	(\$235,000)	(\$216,000)	(\$216,000)
Cal Poly-SLO Estimate	\$252,978	\$252,978	\$259,143	\$259,143	\$250,336	\$250,336
=====						
SOURCES OF FUNDS:						
FY 1985/86 Utility Savings*	\$220,000	\$252,978	\$0	\$83,377**	\$0	\$0
Pro-rata reduction from Fin Aid and Admiss & Records	\$32,978	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Partial redeployment of Contingency Reserve (\$150,000)	\$0	\$0	\$65,000	\$65,000(1)	\$65,000	\$65,000(2)
Total redeployment of Special Projects Fund	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000(1)	\$50,000	\$50,000(2)
Pro-rata assessments from program budgets:						
Instruction (approx 70%)**	\$0	\$0	\$100,900	\$17,523(1)	\$94,735	\$94,735(2)
Support programs (approx 30%)	\$0	\$0	\$43,243	\$43,243(1)	\$40,601	\$40,601(2)
=====						
TOTALS, SOURCES OF FUNDS	\$252,978	\$252,978	\$259,143	\$259,143	\$250,336	\$250,336
=====						

* FY 1985/86 utility savings were \$336,355.

** The first \$100,000 of year-end savings would be used to reduce the AIMS assessment from Instruction.

(1) Pro-rata allocations from the FY 1986/87 budget.

(2) Pro-rata allocations from the FY 1987/88 budget.