I. Minutes

The Chair announced that there were no minutes subject to approval at this time. The minutes of the March 4, 1986 session and the March 11, 1986 session of the Academic Senate will accompany the April 1, 1986 Senate agenda package.

II. Announcements

The Chair announced that President Baker had informed him of his intention to effect a minor restructuring of the University in the aftermath of Provost Fort's July 1, 1986 resignation.

The President has decided to return to the organizational model under which the University was governed prior to Dr. Fort's appointment as Provost in 1983. The Provost's position will be replaced by that of a Vice President for Academic Affairs. The person occupying this position will be a senior Vice President who will act for the President when the President is away from campus.

The Academic Senate is invited to submit a list of nominations for the position of Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs by March 21, 1986.

III. Reports

There were no reports by the President, the Provost and/or the CSU Academic Senators.

IV. Business Items

John Phillips asked if a quorum existed. The Chair asked the Secretary who asserted that there was an "apparent quorum."

The Chair resumed action on the business items left unfinished at the last meeting with Item G.
6. Resolution on the Use of Lottery Funds

1. MS (John Phillips / Robert Bonds) that the Resolution on the Use of Lottery Funds be adopted.

2. The Chair recognized Robert McNeil (Chair: Ad Hoc Committee on the Use of Lottery Funds), who presented some of the background concerning the formation of the committee. He emphasized that the general statements and recommendations made in the Ad Hoc Committee’s Report are as important as the list of possible uses of lottery funds. The list is subject to review and change, is not prioritized and, in general, consists of items which are either not funded or insufficiently funded by the Governor’s Budget.

3. The Chair opened the topic to discussion. Reg Gooden asked for clarification of Item 1 of the list of uses. (Seven categories of uses are provided.)

4. Robert Bonds asserted that PCS was unable to participate in providing input to the Ad Hoc Committee due to inadequate timelines. He asked if the list had already been sent forward to anyone and if there were adequate time now for additional input.

5. Robert McNeil indicated that the Ad Hoc Committee were formed in such a way that all schools and all relevant standing committee’s were represented. The list contained in the Resolution has not been circulated beyond the Senate. Nevertheless, the Committee’s timelines have already been exceeded. Action should be taken now.

6. Robert Bonds proposed adding an eighth category of lottery fund uses to the Resolution, with 8-10 days being allowed for input into the new category.

7. Reg Gooden noted that including items on the list which lack any (or adequate) funding may result in those items never being funded as line items in the state budget.

8. It was established that items included in the list should not require ongoing support, due to the irregular nature of lottery funding. Reg Gooden suggested that lottery funds be placed in an endowment so that programs requiring continued support could be supported by lottery funds.

8. Ken Riener, John Phillips and others repeated the principle that since the Resolution is in its sec-
ond reading, it must either be tabled or amended. Robert Bonds declined to make a specific amendment at this time.

9. Ken Riener moved to table the Resolution until April 8. The motion passed with one negative vote and no abstentions.

H. Modifications to Cal Poly's Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws

1. The Chair introduced John Rogalla (Chair: C&B) who presented a proposed Resolution (distributed to the Senate during the meeting) which would give to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee responsibility to oversee the operating procedures of standing Senate committees.

2. Reg Gooden suggested an editorial change in the amendment included in the Resolution.

3. There was no further discussion. The Chair thanked John Rogalla for his presence at the meeting and asked him to provide the Senate Office with a revised version of the Resolution by April 3, suitable for inclusion in the April 8 agenda package.

4. The Resolution will automatically move to a second reading on April 8.

I. Resolution on Time Frame for Submission of Satisfactory Progress (SP) Grades

1. The Chair recognized C. Hewitt who read and commented on various aspects of the Resolution.

2. John Phillips made an editorial correction in the second whereas clause: "is replaced" should be changed to read: "is not automatically replaced".

3. John Phillips indicated his intention to propose an amendment changing the one-year deadline established by the Resolution to a two-year deadline when the Resolution reaches its second reading.

4. Rick Saenz noted that changing an SP to an F is not really final since an F can always be replaced by another letter grade.

5. Ken Scotto viewed the automatic change of grade from SP to F as punitive.

6. C. Hewitt explained that forcing a student to re-enroll for the senior project course sequence per-
mits a faculty member to receive credit for additional work done with a returning student. Moreover, often the original instructor is on leave and a new instructor guides the student through the completed senior project.

7. Robert Bonds argued that the time limitation should be uniform both for senior projects and Master’s theses.

8. Jim Ahern suggested that the SP grade be eliminated altogether.

9. Also speaking to the Resolution were Bill Forgeng, Stephen Hanes and Susan Currier.

10. The Resolution will move automatically to a second reading on April 8.

J. Resolution on the Support and Maintenance of a Teacher Effectiveness Program

1. The Chair recognized C. Hewitt to present the background and purpose of the Resolution.

2. Dr. Elie Axelroth asked for information as to how the course was taught in the past. C. Hewitt noted that ED 581 is entitled "Graduate Seminar in Education" and is taught quarterly with revolving subtitles.

3. Reg Gooden proposed the deletion of the fourth whereas clause and the second resolved clause.

4. Lynn Jamieson argued strongly for the course. She asserted that the Resolution may not go far enough toward its purpose. Also, the title "Maintaining Teacher Effectiveness" may be passe; "Excellence in Teaching" might be more appropriate.

5. The Resolution will move automatically to a second reading on April 8.

K. Resolution on Giving of Finals During Finals’ Week

1. The Chair recognized C. Hewitt who discussed the genesis of the Resolution.

2. Lynn Jamieson expressed her support for the Resolution, but also some dissatisfaction with the second resolved clause (pertaining to its enforcement).

3. Alan Cooper noted that finals in lab courses are normally given during the last week of classes. It
was established that these finals are not the ones which are the subject of the Resolution.

4. Ken Scotto defended the student’s right to complain if an instructor gives a final at a different time than scheduled. It was noted that an instructor’s change in the date of a final may be acceptable to his students, but still may inconvenience other instructors.

5. Susan Currier inquired as to the effect of the Resolution on the giving of take-home finals in courses (e.g., composition courses) where in-class finals are viewed as inappropriate.

6. Ray Terry indicated his intention to amend the Resolution (when it appears for its second reading) by including a third resolved clause to be inserted between the present two resolved clauses. The new clause would read:

"RESOLVED: That a list of all dean-approved exceptions (to CAM 484) for each quarter will be made available to each Department Head /Chair by the fifth week of the quarter."

The inclusion of this new resolved clause would shift the burden of enforcement from the student (who may be reluctant to complain about a teacher’s change in the date /time of a final) to the faculty members colleagues.

7. Charles Dana deduced correctly that the Resolution addresses faculty members who are scheduled to give finals during Finals’ Week, but who schedule finals for the last week of classes instead. It does not address the matter of not giving a final; nor does it apply to finals which are scheduled for the last week of classes.

7. C. Hewitt noted the use of the phrase “designated time” within the Resolution, instead of Finals’ Week. She also observed that the Resolution seeks to enforce a rule that is already in force, but poorly enforced.

8. John Rogers concluded that what we do about the issue is less important than the fact that we do something about it. Faculty members who give finals at non-designated times should realize that their actions outrage other faculty members. The second resolved clause, though somewhat distasteful, may be helpful in enforcing the requirement.
9. Robert Bonds also supported the Resolution.

V. Final Announcements and Adjournment

A. The Chair announced that ballots for the May Senate elections are now available and must be returned to the Senate Office by March 21, 1986. The Chair also informed the Senate that both he and the other two Officers intend to stand for reelection as Officers of the 1986-1987 Academic Senate.

B. Robert Bonds announced that on Friday, March 14 the Foundation Board would meet. One of its agenda items will be South African divestiture. The Board is expected to resist divestiture.

C. Al Cooper inquired as to the status of his Resolution on Senior Projects which had been referred to the Instruction Committee earlier this year. C. Hewitt announced that the Department Heads had been surveyed but so far only two opinion forms have been returned. The Committee will wait a little longer before proceeding.

D. The Chair expressed his appreciation to the group which was scheduled to occupy U.U. 220 beginning at 4:10 p.m. for their patience in waiting an additional ten minutes so that Senate action could be completed on all the business items on the agenda.

E. The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.
Background: Chairs of the Academic Senate have occasionally forwarded to the C&BL committee operating procedures for various committees for review. The C&BL committee has reviewed these for compliance with the constitution and bylaws to ascertain their conformance. On October 23, 1985, the Chair requested the C&BL committee to formally accept this oversight responsibility as a portion of the responsibilities of our own committee. This resolution will accomplish the task. It is presented in cross out (stricken wording) and underline (additional wording) format.

RESOLUTION ON
AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS FOR THE CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE

BE IT RESOLVED: Article VII Section I, Subsection 2b, be amended to read.

2. Constitution and Bylaws Committee

b. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee shall review periodically the Constitution of the Faculty and, the Bylaws of the Academic Senate periodically, and operating procedures of standing committees of the senate, and shall recommend such changes to the Constitution and Bylaws these as it feels necessary to keep these documents current to assure they are current and in agreement with University regulations and with the memo of understanding. The procedure involving amendments to the constitution shall be consistent with Article IV of the Constitution. The procedure involving amendments to the Bylaws shall be consistent with Article X of the Bylaws.