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

Members Absent:

I. Minutes

The minutes of the April 1, 1986 Academic Senate meeting had not been distributed with the agenda package. Both the April 1 and April 8 minutes will be distributed with the April 22 agenda package.

II. Announcements

Lane Page (acting for Bill Kellogg, Chair of the Elections Committee) solicited nominees for the 1986-1987 Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary of the Academic Senate.

III. Reports

A. President /Provost

Neither the President nor the Provost were present at this meeting.

B. Statewide Senators

Tim Kersten presented a brief report of the activities of the CSU Senate.

1. PCP's for faculty development (including travel and research) have not fared well this year. The Chair of the CSU Senate is making a trek to Sacramento to argue the case for faculty development PCP's before the Budget Committee. There is little support to date. It will be an uphill fight.

2. As Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the CSU Senate, Tim Kersten steered the collegiality document through the Senate last year and later worked with the Trustees in developing their collegiality policy. The Trustees are now forming a Committee on the Implementation of Collegiality Policy, which will be a first reading item on the Trustees' agenda at their next meeting. Tim will be one of three CSU Senate representatives on this committee.
3. The CSU adopted a resolution opposing the activities of AIA. Cal Poly’s Academic Senate adopted a similar resolution in March.

4. The CSU Senate took action on a resolution defining the Senate’s role under HEERA.

5. The Faculty Affairs Committee is preparing a resolution on the appropriate probation period for faculty members (formerly four years, now six years). Both he and the Committee would appreciate thoughtful input and suggestions on this issue.

6. Another item of concern is the role of student evaluations in considerations of retention, tenure and promotion.

IV. Business Items

A. Resolution on the Use of Lottery Funds (3rd reading)

1. The Chair emphasized the importance of this topic by reading a breakdown of the way in which lottery funds received this year (circa $876,000) have been spent (without faculty input). May 16 is the deadline for requests for 1986-1987 lottery fund money.

2. MS (Mike Stebbins /Tom Rice)

3. MaryLinda Wheeler wanted to know if the category of replacement instructional equipment could be added to the list of uses enumerated by the resolution.

A partial reply to this concern was: Since that item is being funded, it is not included on the list of items to be funded through lottery dollars.

4. Larry Gay referred to Page 4a (available at the door), an amendment to the Resolution, proposed by Robert Bonds.

5. Elie Axelroth introduced the Bonds’ Amendment but indicated only partial support of it.

6. Charles Andrews indicated support of items 1 and 2 proposed by Bonds, total opposition to item 3; with regard to item 4, he noted that the Resolution addresses what happens to lottery funds when they reach the Department level. It does not address the issue of what happens to the funds when they first reach the campus; i.e., how are the funds distributed among the schools, etc.?

7. An issue soon emerged: Will the inclusion of many
examples of possible uses of lottery funds strengthen or weaken the effect of the Resolution?

8. Opposed to the inclusion of a list (however complete) of examples were Reg Gooden, Joe Weatherby and others. The rationale: A list, however complete, will omit something. Despite the disclaimer that the list is not all-inclusive, administrators will act as if it were.

9. Supporting reasons for opposing the enumeration of examples of lottery fund uses include: (1) The Resolution is too specific; (2) Some of the items included may be presumptuous and/or involve continued funding; (3) Many Departments have less grandiose needs than those listed in the Resolution.

10. A motion was made to delete all the sub-items contained in the Resolution. The motion carried.

11. Tim Kersten suggested that the list of items deleted from the Resolution be included as an addendum to the Resolution when it is sent forward. The Chair agreed to do this. There was no objection from the Senate.

12. MS (Elie Axelroth/Bill Forgeng) that the four items listed in the Bonds' memo be included in the Resolution as a second resolved clause.

13. The need for a systemwide process for the planning, budgeting and expenditure of lottery funds was approved by numerous senators including Charles Andrews, Tim Kersten, John Phillips and Tom Rice.

14. Bill Forgeng withdrew the motion to incorporate Robert Bonds' suggestions in the Resolution in favor of a simpler statement drafted by Charles Andrews and Reg Gooden:

"Be it further RESOLVED: That the process and procedures for the allocation of lottery funds received by Cal Poly shall be determined with the participation of the Academic Senate."

15. Tim Kersten proposed strengthening the statement by changing the phrase "with the participation of" to "by". Charles Andrews accepted this modification as a friendly amendment. The Andrews/Gooden/Kersten Amendment then read:

"Be it further RESOLVED: That the process and procedures for the
16. Tom Rice called the question. The Chair reminded the Senate that a 2/3 affirmative vote was required. Indeed, the vote was unanimous.

17. The amended motion was adopted by the Senate with two abstentions.

18. The Chair assured the Senate that the Resolution would be sent to the President this week and would also reach the Budget Committee by the end of the week.

B. Procedural Changes for MPPP Awards

1. This item was taken up next due to the temporary absence of Clarissa Hewitt (Items B, C and D) from the Senate floor and the absence of John Rogalla (Items E and F).

2. The Chair recognized Charles Andrews (Chair: PPC) who summarized the differences between the revised procedures (pp. 20-21) and those that were in effect last year.

3. A question from Tom Schumann prompted Charles Andrews to clarify the conditions under which an MPPP Award needs the approval of the President; viz., if there is non-concurrence by a Dean in the granting of an award recommended by a School committee.

4. Jan Pieper confirmed that in the last two years no disputed cases had arisen. If there had been any disagreement between the Deans and the School committees, the disputed cases would have been forwarded to the President, then to the UPLC, with the UPLC’s positive recommendations forwarded back to the President for his decision.

5. Reg Gooden, referring to the second paragraph of the preamble, noted that "nouns have gender; people have sex." The discussion of the MPPP procedures concluded on this playful note.

C. Resolution on Time Frame for the Submission of Satisfactory Progress Grades

1. Clarissa Hewitt moved the adoption of the Resolution. The motion was seconded by Larry Gay.

2. A discussion ensued as to what were the changes be-
tween this version of the Resolution and that presented at its first reading.

3. John Phillips remarked that he was still disposed to amend the Resolution to provide a single two-year time limit on the removal of SP grades.

4. Ken Riener argued in favor of greater flexibility and argued for a provision to allow Departments to extend the time limit with cause.

5. Larry Gay proposed deletion of the second resolved clause. He also supported the inclusion of additional permissive language to handle exceptions.

6. Reg Gooden asserted that the possibility of future difficulties in dealing with exceptions to a time limit should not prevent the Senate from establishing such a limit.

7. The differences between the "SP" grade and the "I" grade were slowly revealed to the Academic Senate in response to a question from Jim Ahern.

8. A motion to limit debate carried by the vote: 27 Yes, 8 No, 3 Abstain.

9. The Chair ruled that the motion to adopt the Resolution passed on a voice vote. There was no challenge to the ruling.

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

1. MS to adopt the Resolution. Discussion ensued as to the improvement of teaching through the acquisition of additional knowledge in one's area of expertise, as well as through the improvement of one's pedagogical skills. Exception was taken to the use of the phrase "faculty development" in the fifth whereas clause.

2. The phrase "and be it further" was removed from the resolved clause with the preceding semicolon changed to a period.

3. The word "This" in the fifth whereas clause was first changed to "The" and then back to "This" again as the clause was viewed in the context of the four preceding whereas clauses.

4. At the suggestion of Barbara Weber (who held the proxy of Lezlie Labhard), the repetition of the title of the Resolution at the top of page 7 of the
agenda package (Page 2 of the Resolution) was deleted as unnecessary and misleading.

5. John Phillips moved to amend the Resolution by changing the phrase "faculty development" to "teacher effectiveness" in the fifth whereas clause. The amendment was seconded by Ray Terry and Jim Ahern. Reg Gooden spoke against the amendment and after some time had elapsed, it was agreed to amend the fifth whereas clause by changing it to read:

"WHEREAS, The absence of a program for the development of pedagogical skills is contrary to the best interests of the university in maintaining a quality undergraduate program; and".

6. Clarissa Hewitt acknowledged the Phillips / Gooden Amendment as friendly, under the circumstances.

7. The Phillips / Gooden Resolution passed with one no vote and one abstention.

8. The sixth whereas clause was deleted due to the action of the Academic Senate earlier in the day in deleting all sub-items in the Resolution on the Use of Lottery Funds.

9. A discussion of alternative ways of improving teacher effectiveness brought the discussion of the Resolution to a close.

10. The amended Resolution was adopted by the Academic Senate with one abstention.

V. Adjournment

A. The Chair announced that the Executive Committee would consider the Budget Committee recommendations on PCP's in a meeting on Thursday: April 10, 1986 at 11:10 a.m. to 12:00 noon.

B. The Chair announced that the time line for nominations to serve on the Advisory Search Committee for Vice President for Academic Affairs will be extended for all schools and the Library.

C. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.