The minutes of the October 1, 1985, meeting of the Academic Senate were approved as written (and distributed with the agenda of this meeting).

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS:
A. Malcolm Wilson Commendation
Prior to the July 16, 1985, meeting of the Academic Senate/Executive Committee, Reg Gooden had distributed a copy of a Resolution he had drafted commending Malcolm Wilson for his extra-ordinary service to the University. After some discussion by the Executive Committee, the Resolution was approved unanimously.

Reg Gooden was recognized for the purpose of reading the Resolution to the Senate (copies distributed at the Senate Meeting) and to Malcolm Wilson. He prefaced his remarks with some statements concerning the background of the resolution and the reasons for the delay in bringing it before the Senate.

Malcolm Wilson was introduced, expressed his gratitude for the commendation and his respect for the Senate.

B. Ray Terry announced that, due to the Officers' need to have more frequent consultation with the Executive Committee, the Executive Committee would, henceforth meet twice per month: on the Tuesday prior to each Senate Meeting and on the Tuesday following each Senate Meeting. A revised calendar of meetings would be distributed as soon as the additional meeting dates had been finalized. Caucus Chairs were urged to use their one meeting - free week per month to schedule a meeting of their caucuses.

III. REPORTS:
A. President's Report
1. The President announced that post-Convocation meetings with School Councils, etc. will soon occur.

2. The President urged support for the Mission Statement (Cf. the October 29, 1985 Executive Committee Minutes.). He hoped that it would have some impact on the Committee to Review the Master Plan of Higher Education. He also referred to another committee, headed by John Vasconcellos, which will write the legislation needed to implement the recommendations of the Committee to Review the Master Plan of Higher Education.

3. If the Mission Statement is approved, Trustee policy will be to pursue doctoral programs in education, as the Trustees see fit.
B. Statewide Senators’ Report

1. Reg Gooden noted that when the Chancellor addressed the Statewide Academic Senate, she indicated that the doctoral programs mentioned in the Mission Statement would be limited to education, that California did not have the resources, nor the will, to pursue doctorates in any other areas.

Gooden also noted that the Trustees were divided in their assessment of the future funding situation for higher education. One group feels that the economy is stabilizing and may be heading toward a recession, with concomitant budget restraints on education. Another group is more optimistic and asserts that the priorities of the Legislature will be education and crime.

2. Barton Olsen noted the absence of microphones in the Senate Meeting Room, but went on to discuss the reaction of some other campuses to the Mission Statement.

3. Tim Kersten noted some changes made in the Mission Statement by the Statewide Academic Senate. He said that the debate over the Mission Statement was the longest in his memory. The Statewide Senate recommended (30-15) that the Trustees add a clause indicating that stand-alone doctorates be supported by individual line items. The amended Mission Statement will probably be adopted by the Trustees with few changes.

Beginning Fall 1988, the CSU entrance requirements for high school applicants will be: 4 years English, 3 years mathematics, one year Social Science, one year of science (with lab), 2 years foreign language, one year visual/performing arts, one year college preparatory course.

Additionally, the Statewide Academic Senate is preparing a resolution concerning Article 12 of the CFA Agreement, relating to part-time faculty. It may attempt to define professional development in the CSU System in such a way as to distinguish it from professional development in the UC System. It may try again to formulate and implement a policy concerning professional responsibility and sexual harassment.

Tim invited other senators to indicate their reaction to these questions and thanked the many individuals who had provided him with input concerning the Mission Statement since the October 1 meeting.

4. The Chair recognized a number of Senators for on-the-floor questioning. The questions primarily concerned the Mission Statement. Tim discussed the rationale for the inclusion of stand-alone doctorates in the CSU Mission: (1) There is a need for such doctorates, a need which is not being met completely by private institutions, nor by the UC System; (2) There are a number of CSU campuses (e.g., San Jose, San Francisco and San Diego) where the proper mix of faculty and resources already exist so as to make such an offering easily possible.

Barton Olsen conjectured that education was the only area in which the Legislature would agree to allow CSU campuses to grant doctorates. Joe Weatherby agreed that Olsen’s guess was true now, but that 20 years from now doctorates in other areas may be desirable and permissible.

IV. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. Recommendation for the Appointment of a Manager for Computer Services

The Chair indicated that he was withdrawing this item from today’s agenda. He discussed the history of the item, which was also discussed in the October 29 meeting of the Executive Committee, and indicated that he was now satisfied that no
action is needed at this time. Yet the announcement of the appointment of an Interim Manager for Computer Services just two and one-half weeks before the Task Force is scheduled to report is unsettling.

B. Disabled Students Resolutions (FIRST Reading)

Bill Forgeneg (Chair: Student Affairs Committee) presented the Resolution on Disabled Students supported by his committee. This resolution reflected the suggestions made during the October 29 Executive Committee Meeting. He acknowledged some continuing dissatisfaction with the resolution and acknowledged that Susan Currier's amendment to it would be discussed in the next Executive Committee Meeting. Forgeng indicated that a representative from Disabled Student Services would be present for the second reading of the resolution.

1. Susan Currier stated that DSS could act as a mediator between the instructor and student without forcing a particular instructional adaptation, alteration or accommodation on the instructor.

2. Joe Weatherby announced his support for the Currier Amendment indicating that it would protect faculty rights without weakening the intent of the Resolution.

3. Barton Olsen asked what would happen if an instructor did not wish to adopt a particular instructional adaptation, alteration or accommodation suggested by DSS.

4. Susan Currier suggested that there was a Statewide Academic Senate Resolution concerning the rights of disabled students, however, she had been unable to locate, nor to get any information from Long Beach.

Tim Kersten indicated that there was such a resolution, but it was ten to fifteen years old. He further expressed his belief that tape-recording a professor's lecture without permission constituted a copyright infringement.

5. Robert Bond indicated that in many years of work with faculty and disabled students, no major problem had occurred. He indicated that there were faculty members on the DSS Board.

6. AI Cooper asked what would stop DSS from requiring an instructor's lectures to be videotaped if the student felt that was necessary for his learning.

7. Charles Andrews asserted that the Fairness Board was the appropriate place to seek redress if a disabled student had a complaint about a faculty member. Moreover, the faculty member's Department Head would no doubt try to resolve the matter before the case would go to the Fairness Board.

C. Criteria and Procedures to be used by the UPLC (SECOND Reading)

Ray Terry (Chair: UPLC) announced that his committee had met on October 11, 17, 24, and 31. During the October 24 meeting a breakthrough resulted in the UPLC's adoption of Amendment No. 3, as distributed with the minutes of this meeting. The October 31 Meeting of the UPLC ended with a reaffirmation of the previous week's work, subject to a few clarifications and one change. The resulting proposal, labeled Amendment No. 4, was distributed at the November 5 Senate Meeting. This amendment is to be viewed as an internal amendment by the UPLC.

Ray Terry moved the adoption of the revised UPLC Report "Leave with Pay Guidelines." Tom Rice seconded the motion.

Reg Gooden introduced an amendment to the motion. The text of the amendment had been distributed on the Senate floor prior to the call to order.
[Cf. The People Shall Judge (Volume 1), pp 289-294, University of Chicago Press (1965)] and using political science jargon, Reg Gooden provided an in-depth analysis of possible abuses in the distribution of sabbatical leaves by quota among the several Schools and the Library. He put forth three arguments in favor of his amendment.

Tim Kersten asked for clarification on whether Reg was seeking to amend Amendment 3 or 4. Barton Olsen asked Reg to summarize his three points, in ten words or less for each point.

The principle argument was that, within a School, the proposals of a particular Department may be passed over due to the predominant bias of that School. When the sabbaticals are considered by a University-wide committee, the predominant bias of each School is reduced to an equal footing with the predominant biases of the other Schools/Library.

Another argument in favor of the Gooden Amendment is that some Schools with small quotas have a large number of excellent proposals. Under the quota system, many excellent proposals would be passed over, while mediocre proposals from a School with a larger quota and/or less applicants will be funded.

1. The following spoke in favor of the Gooden Amendment: Susan Currier (English), Joe Weatherby (Pol. Sci.)

2. Reg Gooden noted that the ratio of funded sabbaticals to faculty eligible is now 1:12.7 whereas a few years ago the ratio was 1:12.

3. Ken Riener noted that many good proposals will always be passed over. The problem is the lack of sufficient funding at the Chancellor's level.

4. The following spoke against the Gooden Amendment: Crissa Hewitt (Art), Jim Ahern (Chair: SAGR), John Phillips (Crop Science).

5. Eugene Fabricius (EL/EE) indicated that the School of Engineering is opposed to the whole concept of a University-wide committee to review sabbaticals and would soon be forwarding a memo to the President conveying their views.

6. Ray Terry indicated that the UPLC considered the idea embodied in the Gooden Amendment at its October 17 meeting, but were generally opposed to having school control over 50% (67% or 75% or 90%) and UPLC control over 50% (33% or 25% or 10%).

After more than sufficient discussion had taken place, Lezlie Labhard (Home Economics) called for the question on the Gooden Amendment. The Academic Senate voted: 16 Yes, 32 No, 1 Abstain. The Academic Senate then adopted the UPLC Report "Leave with Pay Guidelines" by the vote: 35 Yes, 12 No, 2 Abstain.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.
Memorandum

To: Academic Senators

Date: 12/2/85

File No.: 

Copies:

From: Raymond D. Terry

Subject: Corrections to the minutes

Due to inadequate proofreading of the minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of November 5, 1985 a number of typographical errors have occurred. For your convenience, I list them below:

Page 4, Line 5: Change "Forgeneq" to "Forgeng".

Page 4, Line (-1): A sentence and a portion of a sentence were inadvertently deleted from the minutes. The bottom two lines of page 4 should be three lines and should read:

"Reg Gooden introduced an amendment to the motion. The text of the amendment had been distributed on the Senate floor prior to the call to order. /Reg Gooden spoke at length in support of the amendment. Citing Federalist No. 10 /"

The rest of this sentence is continued at the top of page 5.

Page 5, Line 9: Change "principle" to "principal".