I. Minutes: The minutes from the October 2, 1990 Academic Senate meeting were approved with one change by T. Kersten. Under Statewide Senators Report, “the use of the Cyber computer will be severely restricted” was changed to “could be severely restricted.”

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair

J. Murphy reported on the Seven Hills Center meeting with the other campus Academic Senate Chairs. He said that Fullerton is asking that the shut down of the CCR be delayed. Apparently, Academic Senate attention is focused on the CCR problem and the impact of the recent budget cuts. If anyone has specific examples of the impact the budget cuts are making, please make the Chair aware so that this type of information can be passed on to the statewide Senate.

Sandra Wilcox, Statewide Academic Senate Chair, is urging that campuses support Proposition 143 which will allow funding for CSU and Cal Poly equipment and maintenance, as well as other things.

J. Murphy has a copy of the support budget for the CSU in the Academic Senate Office.

B. President’s Office

C. Vice President for Academic Affairs’ Office

R. Koob reported on the status of planning. So far, draft versions of the Cal Poly mission statement, a statement of values, an outline of issues, a summary of external factors which may impact Cal Poly, and a map of information available to describe the current situation at the university have been placed on reserve in the Library. Additionally, the deans all have copies which may be shared with interested faculty. Please review and provide input individually or through the Senate. Any issues relating to these documents may be brought before the Senate for review. The original deadlines in the planning process are still in place, mainly, (1) the draft set of goals will be finished by the end of Fall Quarter (2) the draft set of objectives will be finished by the end of Winter Quarter (3) the discussion will be finished by the end of Spring Quarter.
There are seven primary issues to be considered in the planning process.
These are being addressed by the Academic Planning Committee, the
Oversight Strategic Planning Committee, and the Educational Equity
Commission and are listed below:
Educational equity/affirmative action, growth, academic programmatic
structure, governance and collegiality, professional development, student
satisfaction, and university image.

D. State Senators No report.

E. CSEA President
B. Glnski, who has been invited by the Academic Senate to attend all future
meetings, gave a brief introductory report and thanked the Senate for an
opportunity to provide input from the staff of the university.

F. CFA President
J. Conway reported on the parking fee situation. He said that 70% of the
CSU faculty have not paid the retroactive parking fee. The faculty will be
billed one more time, but there is no penalty for nonpayment. Any faculty
unsure of what to do should contact him, and he will be able to advise them
on a personal basis. He also reported a new retirement advantage and that Bill
Crist, CSU faculty member, is running for reelection to the PERB Board.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
Resolution on Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty--M. Berrio, Chair of
the Personnel Policies Committee, Second Reading. M/S/P as amended.

An amendment which would leave the number of evaluations for part-time lecturers
to the discretion of the department was introduced. M/S/Failed.
(Pokorny/Balasubramanian). T. Kersten presented another amendment. Change
Item 4 to read as follows:
4. All faculty members who teach shall participate in this student evaluation
program for a minimum of two classes per year (preferably two different courses).
The original variations a,b,c, and d are deleted. M/S/P (Kersten/Botwin).

It was shown that the present policy was essentially the same as the one sent
forward to the President's office in 1988 which was subsequently not accepted by
Baker. However, if the present policy is not accepted, we do not fall back to the
previous CAM policy but to the MOU policy which calls for at least two
evaluations and consultation between the department head and the faculty
member if more evaluations are suggested.

Discussion centered around the key issues of added workload for faculty review
committees and departments in doing more evaluations (M. Riedlsperger), student
participation in the process of revising student evaluation forms (W. Reynoso, ASI
Rep. R. Fumasi, W. Amspacher), timelines for revision of forms (R. Grinnell),
and clarification of the MOU provisions and related issues. (L. Torres, J. Conway,
T. Kersten).

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.