I. Preparatory:

A. The chair announced that there would be a meeting of the Science and Math caucus immediately following the Senate meeting. It was also announced that there would be an emergency meeting of the Executive Committee immediately following the Science and Math caucus meeting.

B. The minutes of the October 4, 1988 meeting were approved as submitted.

II. Communications:

A. The chair noted the list of materials available for reading in the Senate office.

B. The chair called attention to the Statewide Academic Senate Resolutions on propositions 78 and 102.

C. The chair announced that Senate resolution AS-246-87 on cheating and plagiarism has been approved by President Baker.

III. Reports:

A. President: none.

B. Academic Affairs: none.

C. Statewide Senators: none.

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

V. Business Items:

A. Resolution to Amend Procedures for Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards, first reading. This resolution addresses the issue of unsuccessful applications for MPPP awards. It provides for notification of those who apply or are nominated but who are not selected to receive an award. There was no discussion. This will move to a second reading item at the next Senate meeting.
Discussion Items:


The floor was opened for discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee’s preliminary report. A summary of the discussion follows.

Bailey: Pointed out that it is not clear whether the Curriculum Review subcommittee has the responsibility for curriculum. There is substantial overlap in the charges of the subcommittee and the Educational Policies Committee, and it is not clear where ultimate responsibility lies in some areas. She also pointed out that there is no assigned time recommended for the Curriculum Review subcommittee.

Kersten: Questioned whether the full Educational Policies Committee would review the subcommittee work before it was forwarded to the Senate. Harry Sharp responded that it was not the intention of the Ad Hoc committee to have the Educational Policies Committee involved in the routine curriculum matters. Some routine items might not even need to go before the Senate. Kersten said he thought it would be difficult to determine what curriculum issues would not be controversial.

Moustafa: Brought up the issue of the make-up of the Executive Committee. Asked if the chairs of the Standing Committees would be required to be Senators. Charlie Andrews said that chairs would not need to be senators, but would be required to serve on the Executive Committee.

Bailey: Referring back to the discussion of the Curriculum Review Committee, she noted that the existing committee was looking into ways to stream-line the operation of the committee. It may be better to try and make the existing committee more effective than to create two separate committees.

Smith: Noted that the proposal has committee chairs appointed by the Senate chair. He inquired whether this is the same as current policy. Harry Sharp responded that currently the committee chair is elected by the members of the committee.

Lord: Indicated that she is also concerned about the make-up of the Executive Committee. The proposal allows only three members that require the input of the faculty. All other members are either from the administration or are appointed by the chair.

Kersten: Agreed with Lord. The chair gets to appoint a majority of the Executive Committee.

Borland: Noted that the Senate gets to ratify the chair’s selections for committee chairs. The Senate could express disapproval of the choices at this point.
Moustafa: Also expressed concerns about the membership of the Executive Committee. He felt that it will reduce school participation. Harry Sharp responded that the Ad Hoc Committee had felt that this was desireable. They felt that the leadership body should be responsible to the whole faculty, and not only to a particular constituency.

Stanton: Stated that the Ad Hoc Committee gave a lot of consideration to the question of whether the chair should select committee chairs. The document states that the appointment will be made with consultation with the committee.

Murphy: Indicated that he feels that caucus chairs are important, and that they will be less effective if removed from the Executive Committee.

Bertozzi: Expressed concern that the ratification process for committee chairs could cause conflict in the Senate.

Borland: Stated that the Ad Hoc Committee gave careful consideration to the question of whether caucus chairs should be included on the Executive Committee. At some point the size of the Executive Committee becomes an issue, and the Ad Hoc Committee felt that it was more important to have the Standing Committee Chairs on the Executive Committee.

Seifoddini: Pointed out that the proposal gives leadership of an elected body to unelected people.

Simmons: Suggested that, in the interest of a smaller Executive Committee, the number of administrators could be reduced. He also questioned the need for the chair of the Research and Professional Development Committee to be on the Executive Committee. He also didn't see how the proposed structure would accomplish the stated goal of promoting a university-wide perspective. Harry Sharp responded that this was accomplished because the members of the Executive Committee would not be representing a particular constituency on campus.

Moustafa: Pointed out that it is unusual to have non-senators on the Executive Committee. Murphy also agreed that he saw a problem with non-elected, non-senators running the Senate.

Burgunder: Stated that he shared some of the concerns expressed about the membership of the Executive Committee, but feels that the Executive Committee, as described in the proposal, doesn't have that much power. Its stated function is to review and forward committee work to the full Senate.

Kersten: Stated that he thinks that having so many non-elected members on the Executive Committee makes the body less rather than more representative.
Zeuschner: Inquired as to the rationale for not having the committee chairs elected from the Senate body. Harry Sharp responded that they felt that the best strategy was to find the best person for the job. Requiring the committee chairs to be Senators may be restrictive.

Simmons: Stated that he felt the committee discipline can be handled without taking the selection of the committee chair from the committee itself. He has only four problems with the structure of the proposed Executive Committee: the size, the method of selection, the membership, and the rationale for the changes.

Lord: Said she was in favor of simplifying things, but caution must be taken not to make things so simple that the system can be abused.

Mori: Indicated that there may be a problem if the chair is appointed when it is required that the PLC be an elected committee.

McNeil: Feels that the caucus chairs should remain on the Executive Committee. Also pointed out that reducing the number of committee will increase the work to be done by any one committee. This may be less efficient in the long run. Borland pointed out that it would be possible to reduce the workload of the committees by making better use of Ad Hoc and temporary committees for dealing with specific issues.

The chair stated that he intends to call a general faculty meeting for sometime in November. The purpose of the meeting will be to provide further input to the Ad Hoc Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee will then prepare its final report. At that point the Senate will have to decide what changes it wants to make.

The chair thanked the members of the Ad Hoc Committee for their time and effort.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.