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

Members Absent:

I. Minutes

The minutes of the January 14, 1986 meeting of the Academic Senate were approved as mailed.

II. Announcements

A. The Chair announced that Items IV. H and IV. I would be the first items of business to be conducted since John Rogalla had to leave the meeting before 4:00 p.m.

B. The Chair noted the absence of the President and the Provost.

III. Reports

A. Vice Provost Glenn Irvin declined to make a report in the absence of the Provost.

B. The three Statewide Academic Senators yielded their reports to the long agenda.

IV. Business Items

A. Resolution on Lead Time for Consultation

1. The Chair recognized Tim Kersten to speak in favor of the Resolution which was proposed and passed by the Executive Committee on January 21, 1986.

2. Tim asserted that the Resolution was a reminder to the Trustees that adequate lead time is necessary for full and meaningful consultation.

3. Ken Scotto asked if the Resolution were purposefully vague and simply a request for courtesy. Tim Kersten acquiesced.

4. Mike Stebbins noted that the background statement which appeared with the Resolution when it was on the agenda of the Jan. 14, 1986 meeting had been
removed. He reviewed the contents of that statement.

5. Charles Andrews proposed that the Resolution be moved to a second reading. This was done with only two abstentions.

6. The Resolution was then adopted with two abstentions.

B. Resolution on Senior Projects

1. The Chair recognized Al Cooper, the sponsor of the Resolution. Al elaborated on the background of the Resolution and on the content of the preamble. He also provided additional reasons why the senior project should be made optional.

2. Joe Weatherby defended the senior project in principle, but suggested that it be made meaningful. He did admit that a Department should have the option of substituting some other rigorous project in its place. Finally, he opposed giving the appearance that different schools will have different standards.

3. Lynn Jamieson indicated her opposition to the Resolution on Senior Projects. She questioned the level of rigor of the survey that Al Cooper had taken concerning the mediocrity of senior projects in general. She took pride in the praise given by out-of-state campuses to the Senior Project Manual prepared by the School of Professional Studies and Education.

4. Susan Currier defended the right of a Department to keep or drop the requirement.

5. Ken Riener noted that it would be more appropriate for the Senate to pass a resolution requiring that senior projects not be supervised as an overload.

6. Al Cooper insisted that the issue was the lack of quality of senior projects in general, not the fact that they result in overloads.

7. David Kaminskas (ASI Representative to the Academic Senate) said that he was appalled at Al Cooper’s lack of concern for the student; he asserted the graduating senior’s need for a “culminating experience.” If the senior project requirement is to be dropped by a Department, it should be replaced by some other “culminating experience.”
8. Bill Howard voiced mixed feeling about senior projects. He indicated that he supervised senior projects as an overload without complaint. The primary concern is the need of the student.

9. Ken Riener said that his requirement for a good senior project is not good writing, but original research on the student’s part.

10. Lynn Jamieson protested that she had not said or meant that "what is good for SPSE is good for the campus." She called for a poll of the campus.

11. Tim Kersten moved to refer the Resolution to the Instruction Committee. Ray Terry pointed out that the Instruction Committee had a backlog of unfinished work. Perhaps the Curriculum Committee would be able to act more quickly. The Chair ruled that the Instruction Committee was the proper place for referral.

12. By a voice vote the Resolution on Senior Projects was referred to the Instruction Committee for study.

C. Resolution on Facilitating Curriculum Planning

1. The Chair recognized Dan Williamson, Chair of the Curriculum Committee.

2. Reg Gooden recalled a similar resolution having been passed a few years ago.

3. Charles Andrews proposed moving the item to a second reading.

4. David Kaminskas protested establishing a precedent of moving items from first to second reading. Perhaps the body needs a month to think about the matter.

5. Reg Gooden asked if passage of the Resolution were urgent. Dan Williamson replied that it was not really urgent; passage of the resolution in March would be adequate. Tim Kersten probed the matter of urgency further.

6. The motion to go to a second reading failed for lack of a two-thirds vote.

D. Resolution on Distribution of Copies of Catalog Materials

1. Dan Williamson discussed the resolution.
2. Charles Andrews proposed moving the item to a second reading. The required two-thirds vote was obtained.

3. Reg Gooden proposed a friendly amendment to insert the underlined phrase in the second resolved clause so that it now reads:

"That copies of the proposals be distributed to the Library and to the deans and the Office of the Academic Senate at the same time they are distributed to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee."

4. Joe Weatherby spoke in favor of the Resolution.

5. The Resolution was passed.

E. Resolution on Guidelines for Breadth in New Bachelor’s Degree Majors

1. Dan Williamson spoke in favor of the Resolution.

2. When discussion ceased, the Chair announced that the item would be moved to a second reading in March.

F. Resolution on List of Proposed Changes in the Curriculum for New Catalogs for Use by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee

1. Dan Williamson indicated that the Resolution was a response to a procedural problem that has plagued the Curriculum Committee for a number of years.

2. The need for a summary statement of curriculum activity is felt both by the Curriculum Committee, the Academic Senate as a whole and the Office of the Vice Provost.

3. Mike Botwin questioned the need for a detailed compilation of editorial changes in curriculum matters.

4. The Chair announced that the Chair of GE&B would receive 0.2 released time, beginning next year. Reg Gooden pointed out that the Curriculum Committee generally receives released time during a year in which a new catalog is approved.

5. Joe Weatherby pointed out the relation between the Curriculum Committee and the budget process.

6. Reg Gooden proposed moving the resolution to a second reading. The motion was seconded and
subsequently passed.

7. It was established that the Resolution would take effect next year.

8. The motion passed with an overwhelming majority.

9. The Chair thanked Dan Williamson for his presence at the Senate meeting.

6. Resolution on Accuracy in Academia

1. Tim Kersten was recognized to guide the Resolution through its first reading. He announced an editorial change. In the first "whereas" clause, the phrase "The California State University system" should be replaced by "The California Polytechnic State University;".

2. Tim Kersten noted the danger of non-academic persons attempting to evaluate something that they are not qualified to critique.

He noted the widespread publicity that AIA has been recently receiving in academic publications and in the Mustang Daily.

Anything that inhibits the free statement of truth must be opposed.

3. Reg Gooden expressed the fear that by opposing the AIA, we would be giving it more credence than it deserved and creating the illusion that it is taken seriously. "I don't want to get the AIA the chalk off my fingers," were his exact words.

4. Mike Botwin noted that while we may disagree with AIA's motives and tactics "organizations outside the University do have the right to know what is going on" in the classroom.

5. Nishan Havandjian noted that AIA has engaged in coercing professors at other universities. They even have a toll-free number for students to report suspect faculty. The AIA promises quick action to such calls.

6. Elie Axelroth proposed making the Resolution stronger by (1) indicating opposition to all organizations like AIA; (2) indicating the ways in which we will oppose AIA.

7. Susan Currier expressed the view that opposition to AIA should not be viewed as a right/left issue.
We are opposed to any organization that claims to have a "unilateral notion of truth."

8. Barbara Hallman disagreed with both Sen. Axelroth and Sen. Currier. She felt that AIA should be named specifically and must be taken seriously.

9. Tim Kersten indicated that the Resolution was just a preliminary measure. It was not meant to be all-encompassing.

10. To facilitate completion of the agenda, discussion was terminated. Items J and K were then taken up.

H. Resolution to Establish Standing Committee on the Status of Women [This item and Item I were actually the first items of business of the meeting due to John Rogalla's need to leave the meeting by 4:00 p.m.]

1. The Chair recognized John Rogalla who announced two editorial changes, thus changing the third "whereas" clause to read as follows:

"There is a need for a more complete program of counseling and advising women reentering the work force or to prepare alumnae for entry into non-traditional fields; therefore, be it."

2. John Rogalla answered a number of questions posed by senators.

He defended the inclusion of a part-time faculty member on the Committee since many part-time faculty on-campus are women.

He defended the additional recommendation that specifies how the committee shall be constituted for its first year of existence. After that, the method of selection shall be accomplished in the traditional manner for all standing committees.

John Rogalla noted that only three persons from the Ad Hoc Committee were to be members of the standing committee.

Lynn Jamieson pointed out that she had not been asked to serve on the committee.

As a standing committee, the new committee will elect its own Chair on an annual basis. John Rogalla expressed full agreement with the need for the Chair to be a woman.

3. Charles Andrews and Susan Currier both expressed
the view that it was an undesirable precedent to set to have the Ad Hoc Committee recommend the membership of the Standing Committee.

4. It was agreed to let the caucuses make the recommendations as usual.

I. Resolution on the Bylaws for the Status of Women Standing Committee.

Discussion on this item took place with discussion on Item H.

J. Resolution on the Use of Lottery Funds

1. The Chair recognized Robert McNeil, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Use of Lottery Funds, to guide the Resolution through its first reading.

2. Due to the fact that there were only ten minutes left before mandatory adjournment, Bob's presentation was rushed. He outlined the background and the guidelines established by the committee. Just as important as the actual recommendations of the Resolution is the content of the "General Statements and Recommendations."

3. The Chair thanked Bob McNeil for his quick presentation of the Resolution and assured him that it would move forward to a second reading in March.

K. Resolution on Assigned Time

1. The Chair passed the gavel to the Vice Chair so that he could present the Resolution which he was proposing.

2. He announced that the last "whereas" clause should be deleted and that Item 1 of the "resolved" clause should, likewise, be deleted. Items 2 and 3 must then be renumbered as Items 1 and 2.

3. After a short presentation, Sen. Lamouria retrieved the gavel from the Vice Chair.

V. Discussion Items

The agenda did not provide for, nor did time permit, any discussion items.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.