

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

Academic Senate Executive Committee Agenda
Tuesday, January 20, 1987
 UU 220, 3:00-5:00 p.m.

MEMBER:	DEPT:	MEMBER:	DEPT:
Botwin, Michael	ArchEngr	Kersten, Timothy	Economics
Cooper, Alan	BioSci	Lamouria, Lloyd H.	AgEngr
Crabb, Charles	CropSci	Riener, Kenneth	BusAdm
Currier, Susan	English	Terry, Raymond	Math
Forgeng, William	MetalSci	Weatherby, Joseph	PolSci
Gamble, Lynne	Library	Wheeler, Marylinda	P.E./RecAdm
Gooden, Reg	PolSci	Wilson, Malcolm	Interim VPAA
Nancy Jorgensen	Cslg/Tstg	Copies: Baker, Warren J.	
		Irvin, Glenn W.	

- I. Minutes:
Approval of the January 6, 1987 Executive Committee Minutes (attached pp. 3-12).
- II. Communications:
- III. Reports:
 - A. President
 - B. Academic Affairs Office
 - C. Statewide Senators
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Items:
- VI. Discussion Items:
 - A. Monitoring the academic progress of student athletes-Mike Wenzl, Faculty Athletic Representative. Because of Mike's class schedule, discussion will occur following Reports. Also invited are our Academic Senate representatives on the Athletic Advisory Commission: Kathy Barthels, V. L. Holland, and John Snetsinger (attached pp. 13-14).
 - B. Study of equity in the employment of women faculty-Nancy Loe, Chair of the Status of Women Committee (attached pp. 15-17):

Questions:

1. Should the Status of Women Committee be the recommending body?
2. Should an ad hoc committee with representatives from more than one standing committee be appointed? Example: Status of Women, Personnel Policies, and Long-Range Planning.
3. Should an at-large ad hoc committee be appointed jointly by the Academic Senate and Administration?

*1-6-87
minutes
removed*

- C. Study of the Educational Implications of the Use of Lecturers-Reg Gooden, CSU Senator/Sauny Dills, Senator representing Lecturers (attached pp. 18-19):

Questions:

1. Should the study be assigned to Sauny Dills as senator representing lecturers?
2. Should one standing committee be the recommending body?
3. Should an ad hoc committee with representation from more than one standing committee plus our senator representing lecturers be appointed? This action may affect Budget, Long-Range Planning, Personnel Policies, and Status of Women as well as our Ad Hoc Committee on Measures of Effectiveness of Instruction and Sauny Dill's function.
4. Should "3" above be adopted but jointly appointed with Administration to ensure Administration membership?

VII. Adjournment:

Revised June 19, 1984

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo

STATEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITIES FOR
FACULTY ATHLETIC REPRESENTATIVE

I. INTRODUCTION

The Faculty Athletic Representative, appointed by the President of the University, is the principal link between the Intercollegiate Athletics Department and the instructional program of the University. The individual in this position has the responsibility of insuring that all students participating in the Intercollegiate Athletics program satisfy the academic eligibility requirements of the University, the California Collegiate Athletic Association, the Western Football Conference, The Pacific Coast Athletic Association, and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The Faculty Athletic Representative must serve as an advocate with the coaches and those responsible for the Intercollegiate Athletics program to insure that students participating in intercollegiate athletics satisfactorily continue to make progress toward meeting their academic objectives.

At the same time the Faculty Athletic Representative serves as an advocate on behalf of athletics as an integral part of the University's program. In this regard, the Faculty Athletic Representative is expected to report periodically to the President, the Provost, the Executive Assistant to the President, and the Director of Athletics on his/her perceptions of the overall academic performance of student athletes, the manner in which the University is operating its Intercollegiate Athletics program and is maintaining the academic integrity of the University, and to make any recommendations deemed appropriate for modification of University policy and procedures.

II. SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES

The Faculty Athletic Representative, working closely with appropriate personnel in the Office of Admissions, Records and Evaluations, has the following responsibilities:

- A. Certifying on appropriate NCAA and conference forms the academic eligibility of students participating on both the men's and women's Intercollegiate Athletics teams.
- B. Determining through interpretation of NCAA and conference regulations the eligibility of specific individuals about whom there might be some question and notifying the Director of Athletics, the coach and other appropriate individuals of such determinations.

- C. Monitoring the quarterly unit verification forms processed through the Records Office to assure that student athletes are enrolled and making satisfactory progress in the minimum number of course units and informing the Provost, the Executive Assistant to the President, and the Director of Athletics of any instances of concern.
- D. Certifying, in instances where a student athlete is originally declared ineligible, a student athlete's eligibility, after review of appropriate materials, including grade changes and other related documents which might make the individual eligible.
- E. Representing the faculty and the President of the University at appropriate NCAA and conference meetings involving Faculty Athletic Representatives of other institutions with whom the University is affiliated through the Intercollegiate Athletics program.
- F. Meeting with the Athletic Advisory Commission and recommending to the Commission as well as to the University President, modifications in University policy relating to academic performance of students participating in Intercollegiate Athletics.

III. TERM OF APPOINTMENT

The term of appointment for the Faculty Athletic Representative is two years with the individual eligible for reappointment for additional terms.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BERKELEY - CHICO - DOMINGUEZ HILLS - FRESNO - FULLERTON - HAYWARD - HUMBOLDT
MADERA - SACRAMENTO - SAN BERNARDINO - SAN DIEGO - SAN FRANCISCO - SAN JOSE



LONG BEACH - LOS ANGELES - NORTHridge
SAN LUIS OBISPO - MINERVA - STANISLAUS

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

(11) 590.

RECEIVED

September 10, 1986
DEC 22 1986
1986

Academic Senate

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

MEMORANDUM

TO: Presidents

FROM: W. Ann Reynolds *W. Ann Reynolds*

SUBJECT: Representation of Women in Mathematics, Sciences, and Engineering

Enclosed are two copies of the final report of the Task Force on Representation of Women in Mathematics, Sciences, and Engineering. The observations and recommendations found in the report are eminently worthwhile and deserve your close attention.

It is my desire that the campuses begin to incorporate the action plans suggested in the report into their on-going activities and programs. To this end, I suggest that you review the task force report in consultation with the campus academic senate and determine strategies appropriate to the characteristics of the campus for addressing the problems of underrepresentation of women in mathematics, sciences, and engineering.

For your information, Provost Vandament and Academic Affairs staff are exploring ways to establish model programs that would alert pre-service and in-service educators to the importance of creating a positive learning environment for young women enrolled in mathematics and science courses in junior high and high school.

Finally, I plan to have a discussion of the task force report during one of the Executive Council meetings later this fall. In the interim, should you have questions about the report, I suggest that you contact Dr. Vandament.

WAR/slw
Enclosures

cc: Dr. William E. Vandament
Dr. John M. Smart

x.c. M. Wilson - please handle, note requests of campuses
stand on all matters related to addition of this at

July 15, 1986

FINAL REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE
REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN IN MATHEMATICS,
SCIENCES, AND ENGINEERING

In January 1985, the Statewide Academic Senate of the California State University resolved to work with the Chancellor to appoint a special task force to investigate the underrepresentation of women faculty and women students in mathematics, sciences, and engineering. The task force was also charged with recommending specific remedies to the Chancellor and to the Board of Trustees should a finding of underrepresentation result.

The Task Force met over a period of ten months to study system-wide, state, and national data and to hear testimony from faculty women, state and national experts, affirmative action personnel, and directors of various professional associations and agencies. Task force members also reviewed and studied the current literature in the fields and various research reports by other institutions and agencies dealing with the same or similar problems. Subsequently, the Task Force was divided into subgroups to develop proposals for action plans in the following areas:

- a) K-8: teacher education/preparation
- b) 9-12: program for high school girls
- c) Regional centers to support CSU efforts
- d) CSU women students
- e) CSU women faculty

The format of the action plans includes specific proposals for action and assignment of responsibility for their implementation.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

- It is the unanimous conclusion of the Task force that there is a severe underrepresentation of women in the CSU in mathematics, sciences, and engineering and that this underrepresentation places the CSU in serious professional, ethical and legal jeopardy.
- The sources of the problem are so numerous and complex that the CSU cannot be held solely responsible. Nevertheless, the problem is so severe and the consequences so far reaching that immediate action must be taken.
- The underrepresentation is a manifestation of the cycle created by the interaction of socio-cultural forces and educational systems. This cycle needs to be broken.

- The extent and pervasiveness of the causes of the problem require cooperation and concerted action by all segments of the educational establishment and the community.
- Competent instruction and positive attitudes in the elementary and high schools are essential for providing girls with access to a broad spectrum of career opportunities when they begin working.
- The paucity of available data suggests that underrepresentation of female students and faculty has not been dealt with or perceived as an important issue. Research needs to be done and data need to be collected.

from
CSU AS-1703-84/112
Nov 6-7, 1986

RECOMMENDATIONS
=====

1. THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE SHOULD START WORK IMMEDIATELY RELATIVE TO CONSOLIDATING PART-TIME POSITIONS INTO TENURE-TRACK POSITIONS. IN A PACED AND PLANNED WAY, CAMPUSES NEED TO IMPLEMENT INTERNAL CAMPUS MACHINERY TO CONSOLIDATE SUCH POSITIONS WHEREVER IT IS ACADEMICALLY FEASIBLE AND THEN SET IN MOTION THE PROCESS OF HAVING THOSE POSITIONS FILLED WITH TENURE-TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS.
2. CAMPUSES SHOULD DEVELOP SPECIFIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REGARDING THE HIRING OF LECTURERS. THESE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES SHOULD INCLUDE, BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO, INFORMATION SUCH AS THAT PERTAINING TO APPLICATION, ADVANCE NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENTS, WHERE CLASSROOMS ARE LOCATED, AND COURSE OUTLINES. SOME 62% OF THOSE RESPONDING INDICATED THAT THERE WAS NOT ADEQUATE ORIENTATION AT THE TIME OF INITIAL EMPLOYMENT.
3. LETTERS OF APPOINTMENT FOR LECTURERS SHOULD COVER THE DETAILS OF EMPLOYMENT INCLUDING INFORMATION ABOUT SALARY, LENGTH OF APPOINTMENT AND DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES. COMMENTS ON THE RESPONSES INDICATED A REAL NEED FOR SUCH INFORMATION.
4. ALL LECTURERS SHOULD BE EVALUATED AT THE DEPARTMENTAL LEVEL BY PEERS. THE DATA INDICATED EVALUATION BY STUDENTS BUT ONLY 41% INDICATED THEY WERE EVALUATED BY FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT. PROCEDURES REGARDING THIS EVALUATION SHOULD BE DEVELOPED BY EACH CAMPUS AND EACH CAMPUS DEPARTMENT.
5. CAMPUSES SHOULD DEVELOP A HANDBOOK FOR ALL LECTURERS. THE HANDBOOK SHOULD INCLUDE SUCH INFORMATION AS A DEFINITION OF LECTURER, RESPONSIBILITIES (HOURS, ADVISING AND TEACHING EXPECTATIONS, CURRICULAR AND COMMITTEE WORK), PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT, INFORMATION RELATIVE TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICIES, USUAL LENGTH OF TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT, RETENTION PROCEDURES, SALARY ADVANCEMENT, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REGARDING CHANGE OF STATUS, AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES. INFORMATION SHOULD ALSO BE INCLUDED SUCH AS ACCESSIBILITY

OF UNIVERSITY CATALOGS, SCHEDULES OF CLASSES AND THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU).

6. FULL-TIME LECTURERS SHOULD TEACH 12 WTU'S AND RECEIVE 3 UNITS OF CREDIT FOR RELATED DUTIES SUCH AS CURRICULAR AND COMMITTEE WORK. PART-TIME LECTURERS SHOULD BE COMPENSATED IN PROPORTION TO THEIR PERCENTAGE OF A 12 WTU TEACHING LOAD, E.G. 3 UNITS WTU SHOULD EQUAL 25% OF FULL PAY AND BENEFITS.
7. EACH CAMPUS PRESIDENT SHOULD WORK WITH INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS AND THE LOCAL ACADEMIC SENATE/COUNCIL IN GATHERING DATA NECESSARY FOR THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUE OF LECTURER EMPLOYMENT ON THE CAMPUS AND THE IMPACT SUCH A PROCESS MAY HAVE ON THE ACADEMIC QUALITY OF THE CAMPUS' EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS. IN CONJUNCTION WITH THIS ACTIVITY, THE PRESIDENT SHOULD DEVELOP AN ACADEMIC SENATE/ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER THE COLLECTED DATA. THE CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE SHOULD BE TO RECOMMEND TO APPROPRIATE CAMPUS CONSTITUENCIES POLICIES OR CHANGES IN POLICIES THAT SUCH DATA MIGHT SUGGEST.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 1
January 13-14, 1987

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

SUPPORT BUDGET STATUS

1986/87 Budget Reduction

Background:

On December 22, 1986 a meeting was called by the Governor and the Director of Finance of representatives from all State departments. At that time, as a result of a revised revenue forecast, State departments were directed to reduce their General Fund expenditures by two percent for fiscal year 1986/87. An exception was made for 24-hour care programs. It was anticipated that \$100 million would be saved as a result of this reduction. The two percent calculation amounts to \$27.4 million for CSU and \$35.5 million for UC. Each agency was advised to submit a plan to either their Agency Secretary or the Director of Finance by January 15, 1987. In the case of the CSU, the submission requirement is to the Director of Finance.

Upon notification of the above savings assessment, the Trustees, faculty, students, presidents and collective bargaining units were informed of the situation. In addition, the Chancellor's Office issued a temporary moratorium on expenditures until a reduction plan was developed. Over the past two weeks, there has been continuing discussion with the Department of Finance, Governor's Office and UC over the magnitude, equity and impact of the assessment.

An examination of alternatives has taken place during this same period involving consultation with Presidents and a System Budget Advisory Committee. However, several factors limit the alternatives available. These factors include an initial salary savings requirement for 1986/87 of over \$26 million; an additional unallocated savings target of \$7,000,000; an enrollment of 4,600 FTE students in excess of budgeted levels; and the fact that there is less than five and a half months remaining in the fiscal year.

Examination of Alternatives

Given the magnitude of the reduction suggested and what is feasible for the balance of the year, the alternatives essentially fall into three categories, all of which would have a negative impact on CSU programs and the students served:

1. Systemwide Unallocated and Savings. This category includes any funds not yet allocated. Major examples are the deferral of planned staff benefit improvements, and the deferral of needed Special Repair projects plus minor special program balances remaining in systemwide accounts. This category also includes anticipated surpluses or savings.

2. Prorated allocation by Campus and Systemwide Offices. An additional amount would be achieved by prorating a reduction to the systemwide offices and campuses. Depending on the magnitude of the amount remaining and each campus's financial status, this reduction would require, at a minimum, the campuses and systemwide offices to hold non-faculty positions vacant, to reduce travel, to defer purchases, contracts, reclassifications, etc. If the amount prorated is at a higher level, it could ultimately affect classroom instruction involving cancellation of classes, inability to accommodate student enrollment and potential layoff of faculty and staff.
3. Student Fee Increase. This last option, and one which has been implemented in the past, is that of a "fee surcharge". Such a surcharge would be a one time assessment of all students in the Spring term. A review of current law relative to fees indicates that such a fee surcharge could be implemented on an "emergency" basis and remain consistent with the provisions of the law and the policy of the Board of Trustees.

Budget Plan for Achieving Reduction of \$16,489,992

As a result of the review of alternatives and negotiations with the State administration, the amount of the assessment to The California State University has been modified downward to \$16,489,992. The modification of the assessment from \$27.4 downward to \$16.5 million is in recognition of the special nature of the academic needs and obligations associated with accommodating existing enrollment. As a result of the above modification of the assessment, the option of a fee surcharge is no longer considered necessary.

The following Budget Plan is being implemented dealing with the first two options noted above.

I.	<u>Systemwide Provisions</u>	\$10,528,607
1.	Deferral of Benefit Improvements	\$ 2,816,000
2.	Surplus Compensation Increase funds	552,262
3.	Unallocated Instructional Equipment Replacement Funds	750,000
4.	Various Systemwide Unallocated Funds	210,345
5.	Deferral of Special Repairs and Maintenance Projects	5,000,000
6.	Inclusion of Projected Surplus of Nonresident tuition receipts	1,200,000
II	Campus and Systemwide Offices Proration	<u>\$ 5,961,385</u>
	Total Expenditure Reduction	\$16,489,992

The Chancellor's Office will be submitting the above plan to the Department of Finance and proceeding with the implementation of the plan.

1/20/87

**FY 1986/87 General Fund
Mandated Budget Reduction
Proposed Campus Allocation/Plan**

I. Methodology

- A. Partially reduce Cal Poly's \$393,054 pro-rata share by \$225,000 from the campuswide allotments for AIMS (\$150,000) and the General Fund Contingency Reserve (\$75,000).
- B. Pro-rate the remaining 43% of the reduction (\$168,054) to program areas. Pro-ration will be made on the basis of the Final Budget plus Salary & Benefit Increases, less excluded allotments.

II. Administration

- A. Program Administrators may exercise discretion in making reductions within their organization. Pro-rata distribution can be used as a guide.
- B. The Chancellor's Office prohibits the use of the following budget allotments for the reduction plan:
 - 1. Salary Savings
 - 2. Utilities
 - 3. Non-Resident Tuition

(campuses are discouraged from using Staff Benefits allotments.)
- C. CSU moratorium on expenditures and employee hires was lifted upon approval of CSU budget reduction plan at Trustees January 13-14, 1987 meeting. Notification to campuses is forthcoming.

III. Post-Reduction Assumptions

- A. Year-End Savings, if any, will be pro-rated back to program areas.
- B. AIMS project budget will be reinstated in FY 1987/88 by use of the annual Contingency Reserve process (amount of AIMS budget to be determined).
- C. Legal settlement (\$155,000) to be paid from FY 1984/85 CSU appropriation or FY 1987/88 Cal Poly budget.

California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo 01/20/87 RMR
 FY 1986/87 GENERAL FUND
 SUMMARY OF MANDATED BUDGET REDUCTION AND ALLOCATIONS

\REDUCTN\8687\TABLE1A

Cal Poly's pro-rata share of the CSU \$16.5 million reduction	\$393,054
AIMS Project--reduce from \$336,355 to \$186,355	\$-150,000
General Fund Contingency Reserve--reduce from \$150,000 to \$50,000	\$-100,000
Postage--projected deficit 06/30/87-- to be covered from Contingency Reserve	\$25,000
Net, Contingency + Postage	\$-75,000
Initial offsets to Cal Poly total	\$-225,000
Reduction to be pro-rated to Cal Poly's Program Areas (see attached spreadsheets)	\$168,054
=====	
Information Only:	
Campus Budgets Administered as Systemwide Allotments (i.e., deficits or balances are either offset by or accrue to Systemwide accounts):	
Utilities--projected 06/30/87 balance*	\$250,000
Non-Resident Tuition--projected 06/30/87 deficit	\$-100,000
net total	\$150,000

* BP&A staff estimate--subject to review by Plant Opns staff.

California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo 01/20/87 RMR
 FY 1986/87 FINAL BUDGET (+ Salary & Benefit Increases)
 BUDGET BASE AND PRO-RATION OF BUDGET REDUCTION
 Summary by Organizational Area

\REDUCTN\8687\TABLE6

	Budgeted Positions (Info)	Adjusted Base for Allocations	Allocations as % of \$ Base	Amounts Allocated
Academic Affairs	1453.30	\$71,349,339	.18%	\$-130,681
Student Affairs	150.30	\$5,814,926	.18%	\$-10,651
Information Systems	42.40	\$2,755,469	.18%	\$-5,047
University Relations	2.50	\$101,342	.18%	\$-186
Personnel & Employee Rel.	11.50	\$464,164	.18%	\$-850
Facilities Administration	205.30	\$6,051,468	.18%	\$-11,084
Business Affairs	113.10	\$3,893,209	.18%	\$-7,131
Other	24.00	\$1,328,637	.18%	\$-2,434
Totals, General Fund	2002.40	\$91,758,554		\$-168,064

California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo 01/20/87 RMR
 FY 1986/87 FINAL BUDGET (+ Salary & Benefit Increases)
 BUDGET BASE AND PRO-RATION OF BUDGET REDUCTION-By Organizational Area
 \REDUCTN\8687\TABLES

	Budgeted Positions (Info)	Adjusted Base for Allocations	Allocations as % of \$ Base	Amounts Allocated
Instruction	1243.00	\$62,637,165	.18%	\$-114,726
Library	84.70	\$3,188,032	.18%	\$-5,839
Books & Periodicals	.00	\$1,194,365	.18%	\$-2,188
AV Services	24.70	\$973,967	.18%	\$-1,784
TV Services	1.00	\$46,981	.18%	\$-86
College Farm-School Ag	30.00	\$1,197,275	.18%	\$-2,193
Student Admiss & Records	67.90	\$1,977,409	.18%	\$-3,622
Student Affirm. Action	2.00	\$60,388	.18%	\$-111
Faculty Recruitment	.00	\$73,757	.18%	\$-135
Academic Affairs.	1453.30	\$71,349,339		\$-130,683
Social & Cult Dev	10.80	\$417,925	.18%	\$-765
EOP	15.00	\$484,009	.18%	\$-887
Counseling	17.50	\$823,051	.18%	\$-1,507
Testing	5.60	\$193,670	.18%	\$-355
Placement	13.30	\$463,150	.18%	\$-848
Financial Aid	32.20	\$1,084,146	.18%	\$-1,986
Health Services	42.70	\$1,934,409	.18%	\$-3,543
Housing Services	4.50	\$166,048	.18%	\$-304
Disabled Students	8.70	\$248,518	.18%	\$-455
Student Affairs	150.30	\$5,814,926		\$-10,651
Computing Support	34.10	\$2,058,832	.18%	\$-3,771
CAP Lab	8.30	\$696,637	.18%	\$-1,276
Information Systems	42.40	\$2,755,469		\$-5,047
University Relat. (Comm Rel)	2.50	\$101,342	.18%	\$-186
Employee Personnel & Rec.	10.50	\$415,205	.18%	\$-760
Employee Affirm Action	1.00	\$48,959	.18%	\$-90
Personnel & Employee Rel.	11.50	\$464,164		\$-850
College Farm-Plant Opns	7.20	\$266,230	.18%	\$-488
Plant Operations	198.10	\$5,785,238	.18%	\$-10,596
Facilities Administration	205.30	\$6,051,468		\$-11,084
Financial Opns	50.40	\$1,581,986	.18%	\$-2,898
Support Opns	36.90	\$1,259,619	.18%	\$-2,307
Public Safety	25.80	\$1,051,604	.18%	\$-1,926
Business Affairs	113.10	\$3,893,209		\$-7,131
Executive Management	24.00	\$1,328,637	.18%	\$-2,434
Totals, General Fund	2002.40	\$91,758,554		\$-168,064

California Polytechnic State University - San Luis Obispo 01/15/87 RM
 FY 1986/87 FINAL BUDGET (+ Salary & Benefit Increases)
 BUDGET BASE AND PRO-RATION OF BUDGET REDUCTION-By Program Category
 \REDUCTN\8687\TABLE4A

	Budgeted Positions (Info)	Adjusted Base for Allocations	Allocations as % of \$ Base	Amounts Allocated
Instruction	1243.00	\$62,637,165	.18%	\$-114,719
Library	84.70	\$3,188,032	.18%	\$-5,839
Books & Periodicals	.00	\$1,194,365	.18%	\$-2,187
AV Services	24.70	\$973,967	.18%	\$-1,784
TV Services	1.00	\$46,981	.18%	\$-86
Computing Support	34.10	\$2,058,832	.18%	\$-3,771
College Farm-School Ag	30.00	\$1,197,275	.18%	\$-2,193
College Farm-Plant Opns	7.20	\$266,230	.18%	\$-488
CAP Lab	8.30	\$696,637	.18%	\$-1,276
Academic Support	190.00	\$9,622,319		\$-17,623
Social & Cult Dev	10.80	\$417,925	.18%	\$-765
EOP	15.00	\$484,009	.18%	\$-886
Counseling	17.50	\$823,051	.18%	\$-1,507
Testing	5.60	\$193,670	.18%	\$-355
Placement	13.30	\$463,150	.18%	\$-848
Financial Aid	32.20	\$1,084,146	.18%	\$-1,986
Health Services	42.70	\$1,934,409	.18%	\$-3,543
Housing Services	4.50	\$166,048	.18%	\$-304
Disabled Students	8.70	\$248,518	.18%	\$-455
Student Service	150.30	\$5,814,926		\$-10,650
Executive Management	24.00	\$1,328,637	.18%	\$-2,433
Financial Opns	50.40	\$1,581,986	.18%	\$-2,897
Student Admiss & Records	67.90	\$1,977,409	.18%	\$-3,622
Student Affirm. Action	2.00	\$60,388	.18%	\$-111
Employee Personnel & Rec.	10.50	\$415,205	.18%	\$-760
Faculty Recruitment	.00	\$73,757	.18%	\$-135
Employee Affirm Action	1.00	\$48,959	.18%	\$-90
Support Opns	36.90	\$1,259,619	.18%	\$-2,307
Public Safety	25.80	\$1,051,604	.18%	\$-1,926
Plant Operations	198.10	\$5,785,238	.18%	\$-10,596
Community Relations	2.50	\$101,342	.18%	\$-186
Institutional Support	419.10	\$13,684,144		\$-25,062
General Fund	2002.40	\$91,758,554		\$-168,054

California Polytechnic State University - S L O 01/14/87 RMR
 FY 1986/87 General Fund, Final Budget + Salary & Benefit Increases
 BUDGET ALLOTMENTS EXCLUDED FROM THE BUDGET BASE FOR MANDATED BUDGET REDUCTIONS

\REDUCTN\8687\TABLE2

Budget Allotments	Instruction	Academic Support	Student Service	Institutional Support	Totals
Instructionally Related Act.	\$36,488				\$36,488
College Workstudy			\$275,944		\$275,944
State Educ. Oppor. Grants			\$270,875		\$270,875
State University Grants			\$608,590		\$608,590
Accreditation				\$16,495	\$16,495
Physical Examinations				\$23,101	\$23,101
Telecommunications				\$757,216	\$757,216
Postage				\$290,165	\$290,165
Utilities (Systemwide Allotment)				\$2,782,860	\$2,782,860
Faculty & Staff Services*				\$1,221,052	\$1,221,052
Printing-Catalogs				\$31,200	\$31,200
Totals	\$36,488	\$0	\$1,155,409	\$5,122,089	\$6,313,986

*Overtime, Shift Diff., Mgt. Compensation Adjustments, Unemp. Comp.,
 and Non-Faculty Reclassification allotments (includes Staff Benefits).
 These funds are allocated to program areas at the onset of the fiscal year.

11/1/86 1:20:57 ex 107

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-1703-86/FA (REV. 2)
November 6-7, 1986

THE EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF
THE USE OF TEMPORARY FACULTY IN THE CSU

5 2nd REV
1/8/87
REVISED

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate CSU Committee to Study the Educational Implications of the Use of Lecturers in The California State University has submitted its final report, dated May 1986, following a thorough study of the issues, including a survey of department chairs, tenured faculty, and temporary faculty; and

WHEREAS, The number of temporary faculty in the CSU has increased considerably since 1972, while the number of tenure-track faculty has remained more or less constant during the same period; and

WHEREAS, Certain educationally sound program needs which may be met by the use of temporary faculty include:

- Supplemental to
the main body of the
report*
1. temporary replacement of tenured and probationary faculty on leave (sabbatical, administrative, medical, etc.);
 2. temporary assignment to meet program needs when a full search to fill a tenure track position has not occurred or been completed successfully;
 3. assignment to teach special courses which are not regularly offered and which existing regular faculty are not qualified to teach;
 4. assignment to satisfy urgent needs resulting from sudden and short-term curricular demands;
 5. employment of visiting or exchange faculty;
 6. assignment to teach sections of basic skills or remedial courses for which a long-term need is not projected;
 7. assignment to teach specialized courses or specialized skills (e.g. performance, clinical, or applied);

and

WHEREAS, The employment of large numbers of temporary faculty raises serious problems both for the quality of education and for academic freedom and responsibility:

1. There is concern among faculty and students that temporary faculty are sometimes exploited;
2. Many positions filled by temporary faculty would be better held by tenure-track faculty with greater long-term commitment to university teaching, while expanding the opportunities for academic freedom;
3. Temporary faculty are not normally expected to contribute to the critically important faculty functions of advising, instructional research, curriculum planning, and academic governance, resulting in an increased responsibility and workload in these areas for tenure-track faculty, and lowered morale for all faculty;
4. The use of temporary faculty in positions which should be converted to tenure-track positions limits the educational opportunities which should be available to students;

and

WHEREAS, The increase in the number of temporary faculty dilutes the ranks of tenured faculty to the point where the maintenance of academic tenure and academic integrity is threatened; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University receive the final report of the Committee to Study the Educational Implications of the Use of Lecturers in The California State University, and discharge the Committee with its thanks; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge that the campus senates adopt the following policy recommendations:

1. That the local campuses and individual departments study their current use of temporary faculty to determine whether such use is educationally sound, and consider adopting goals for the proportion of temporary faculty in the mix of faculty; and
2. That departments identify positions currently filled by temporary faculty which do not conform to educationally sound uses of temporary faculty, and which should be converted to tenure-track positions consistent with sound academic planning; and
3. That generally departments should not be required to utilize temporary faculty as a continued means of coping with externally imposed budgetary constraints; and
4. That campuses and departments should adopt or continue procedures identified in the Final Report of the Committee to Study the Educational Implications of the Use of Lecturers in The California State University to facilitate a fuller participation by temporary faculty in the community of scholars and to provide the support necessary for them to offer an education of quality to CSU students;
5. That campuses and departments not request or require temporary faculty to perform instructionally related duties without compensation.

on campus graduate students