CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California
ACADEMIC SENATE

ACADEMIC SENATE - MINUTES
Tuesday: September 23, 1986
UU 220 3:00 p.m.

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

Members Absent: Baker, Ball, Brown, Busselen, Fiorito, Papakyriazis, Rodger, Vigil

I. Preparatory
   A. The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.
   B. There were no minutes to be approved since the minutes of the last Senate meeting of Spring 1986 were approved by the Executive Committee during the summer.

II. Communications
    The Chair noted the presence of a number of important memos attached to the agenda package.

III. Reports
    A. Chair’s Report on Academic Senate Summer Activity
       The Chair promised to give the report at the next Senate meeting.
    B. President / Academic Affairs Office
       Glenn Irvin indicated that the Academic Affairs Office had no report.
    C. Statewide Senators
       The three statewide senators waived their customary reports so as to allow more time for Item IV.

IV. Discussion
    The Chair introduced Lee Kerschner, Executive Director, Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. Dr. Kerschner’s outstanding biographical record includes his having served as Chair of the Fullerton Academic Senate and also as member of the CSU Academic
Dr. Kerschner delivered a prepared set of comments concerning the organization of the Commission, its operating process and some issues to be taken up. His 30-minute speech was followed by a 45-minute question and answer period. A summary of Dr. Kerschner’s comments is available in the Academic Senate Office.

At 4:30 p.m. the Chair reluctantly halted the discussion and proceeded to Item V.

V. Business Items

A. Resolution on Proposed Dean Evaluation Form

1. M/S (Charles Andrews /Al Cooper) to adopt the proposed Resolution on School Dean Evaluations.

2. Jim Ahern and Al Cooper noted that they had recently received from the Academic Affairs Office copies of a set of guidelines for the performance of Deans.

3. Glenn Irvin was unable to shed any light on the existence or nature of this document.

4. Crissa Hewitt objected to the use of "never" as a response to questions a and b on page 1 of the Annual Evaluation Form. After some discussion she withdrew this suggestion in favor of another to rewrite the instruction preceding a and b as:

"Please indicate how frequently you have interacted professionally with your Dean during the past year."

5. Charles Andrews accepted this rewording as a friendly amendment.

6. Jim Ahern raised the question of how the statistical significance of the responses was to be determined. He pointed out the need to develop contingency tables to separate the subsequent responses based upon the answers to questions a and b.

Charles Andrews answered that how the responses to the form were to be used was up to the Academic Affairs Office.

Lynne Gamble suggested that no one intended to analyze the data statistically.

Charles Crabb doubted the need for questions a and
b unless a statistical analysis was to be performed.

7. Reg Gooden proposed amending "Annually" to "Once" in the responses to a and b. There was no opposition. He subsequently moved to amend the Annual Evaluation form by deleting the block beginning with "Please indicate ..." and ending with the response "Never" to question b.

The motion to amend was seconded but failed on a voice vote.

8. Susan Currier moved to amend the Annual Evaluation Form by adding the following items to the School Leadership category:

"L. Recognizes and rewards faculty service to the University"

"M. Recognizes and rewards excellence in teaching"

"N. Encourages effective student advising."

The motion was seconded by Joe Weatherby and carried by a large majority. It was also agreed to insert these three items between the existing items D and E and to relabel the resulting list.

9. Crissa Hewitt moved to amend the Annual Evaluation Form by changing Item J of the School Leadership category to read:

"Supports recruiting of high-quality support staff."

10. Charles Andrews declined to accept the amendment as friendly. It was subsequently seconded and carried by a large majority.

11. Bill Forgeng emphasized the need to use neutral expressions in the document; e.g. in V. B. (page 3 of the Annual Evaluation Form) "his" should be changed to "his / her" or to some other non-sexist language.

12. The amended Resolution was then passed on a voice vote.

B. Business Items B, C, D, E

1. The Chair noted the lateness of the hour.

2. Lynne Gamble proposed moving the remaining business items to a second reading on Oct. 7, 1986.
3. Reg Gooden objected to the movement of Item E to second reading status; Ray Terry objected to the movement of Item D to second reading status.

4. It was agreed by consensus that Items B and C would move to a Second Reading status on Oct. 7; Items D and E would remain at First Reading status on Oct. 7.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.