

**CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**San Luis Obispo, California 93407**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**Academic Senate Executive Committee**  
**Tuesday, February 25, 1997**  
**UU 220, 3:00-5:00 p.m.**

Preparatory: The meeting was opened at 3:10 p.m.

Members and Guests present: Bill Amspacher, Les Bowker, Johanna Brown, Margaret Camuso, Leslie Cooper, Reg Gooden, Harvey Greenwald, Tom Hale, John Hampsey, Hal Johnston, William Martinez, Tad Miller, Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Guy Welch

- I. Minutes: M/S/P (Hale/Miller) to approve minutes from the January 28, 1997 Executive Committee meeting.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair: no report
  - B. President's Office: no report
  - C. Provost's Office: no report
  - D. Statewide Senators: no report
  - E. CFA Campus President: no report
  - F. Staff Council representative: no report
  - G. ASI representative: no report
  - H. IACC representative: no report
  - I. Athletics Governing Board representative: no report
  - J. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
  - A. **Academic Senate/university-wide vacancies:** Myron Hood was M/S/P (Bowker/Martinez) to fill the CSM vacancy on the Graduate Studies Committee.
  - B. **Appointment of members to the Academic Senate Task Force on Diversity:**  
Greenwald gave introduction, including a summary of what President Baker and Legal Counsel would like the group to explore, and how names were obtained for appointment to the Task Force. Of the list of volunteers, no one had volunteered to chair the Task Force. Gish had declined, and felt that the group should convene first and then select a chair. Morrobel-Sosa suggested that McDonald be asked to coordinate the group. M/S/P (Hampsey/Martinez) to accept list of volunteers as proposed.

- C. **Appointment to spring quarter vacancies for (1) Academic Senate Vice Chair and (2) Academic Senate representative to the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee:** Greenwald report that Hampsey will be in London Study Program for Spring quarter. Therefore, vacancies exist in the Vice Chair position and representation on the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee. Greenwald reported that Morrobel-Sosa had indicated interest in serving as Chair in the Fall. It was felt that there were some advantages in having Morrobel-Sosa serve as Vice Chair during Spring, which would give her an introduction for Fall. However, it was also noted that there also existed an opportunity for Lutrin to move up from Secretary to Vice Chair. Hampsey spoke to Morrobel-Sosa as Vice Chair. Morrobel-Sosa was approved to fill Vice Chair vacancy for Spring Quarter by acclamation. Greenwald stressed importance of introduction to Steering Committee in Spring, which would make the situation easier for Fall. He also indicated that this was a time-consuming committee. CENG caucus recommended Morrobel-Sosa. Morrobel-Sosa was approved to the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee by acclamation.
- D. **Procedures for deliberations of Resolution on Proposed Model of Unit Distribution for GE&B at the March 11 meeting:** Greenwald gave introduction, and invited Amspacher to speak to the issue first. Amspacher did not feel that alternative reports will hold the same weight as the original resolution. He suggested that one complete document go forward, and was uncomfortable with the idea that no changes would be made to the document on the floor of the Senate. Hampsey felt that the system worked well for the previous resolution (Proposed Administrative Structure). He felt that debate on the floor was healthy, and remarked that previous debate did indeed change votes on the floor. Hampsey spoke against amendments to the major document being made on the floor. Johnston was also uncomfortable with the procedure of no changes on the floor, and noted the ad hoc committee's changes to the document since the first reading. Greenwald provided an analogy similar to the curriculum packages. Martinez was concerned with maintaining the 4-unit template and EO595. He indicated that the problem with voting on the floor may be that something will be approved that the CSU does not accept. Another question was raised asking if we are dealing with each area or the complete document; i.e. would one vote cancel another or do we increase the total units required. Miller thought that the alternative reports were going to be treated as individual separate documents. Greenwald questioned the group if they would like to open discussion of procedure to the full Senate at a special meeting on the Thursday before the Tuesday meeting. Greenwald spoke to the issue of the Executive Committee's responsibility to set procedures. Miller challenged if the Executive Committee has the right to change the rules. Greenwald's interpretation is that changing the rules will only require a simple majority of the Executive Committee. Amspacher felt that this issue is different and should be approved by 3/4 margin. Debate ensued. Hampsey indicated that this is a curricular issue. Amspacher and Miller felt that this is so different than the other curricular issues that it should be treated differently. Gooden agreed that the Executive Committee's purpose is to minimize confusion on the floor of the Senate. He also agreed that most issues and resolutions are different. However, when items need a wide variety of knowledge and background, the "open floor" method will be too confusing. Morrobel-Sosa agreed with Johnston, Miller and Amspacher that this item is different. She spoke to the example of the curriculum item. Recommendations from the Curriculum Committee are department/program specific. This proposal is more policy-oriented. CENG felt that the turnaround time was minimal, which was why there were so many "knee jerk" reactions. Morrobel-Sosa felt that the

memo accompanying the resolution was confusing, and that the rules had been changed. Morrobel-Sosa reminded the group that President Baker has the ultimate authority to interpret EO595. Greenwald responded that the discussion that occurred at the meeting before the vote on the governance structure focused on the pros and cons of voting the committee report up or down. The group had felt that someone would always find something wrong with some part of the document. Martinez addressed the differences between interpretation of the ad hoc committee's memo versus suspending the rules by the whole body. Johnston felt that timing on this issue is getting compressed, and felt rushed at the college level to deal with this. Gooden agreed. Miller proposed tabling the resolution and suggested revision if the Senate cannot reach a majority on the document. Hampsey responded by reminding the group that someone will always want more time, and the issue may never get resolved. Johnston felt that if the college had more time, they would feel better. Martinez voiced concern about tabling the issue. Greenwald responded that tabling would push the issue to the 2000 catalog versus the 1999 catalog if we deal with the issue now. Discussion took place on the number of people available for a meeting during Finals week. Martinez would like to get the procedures clarified. M/S/P (Martinez/Morrobel-Sosa) that alternative reports will be voted on holistically up or down. Greenwald asked about multiple alternative reports from one area. Gooden felt that there would be less support for those types of reports. Morrobel-Sosa indicated that the author a report may withdraw the report upon viewing the other alternative reports proposed. She also questioned if alternative reports could be amended. Discussion on the pros and cons of amending alternative reports on the floor ensued. Bowker questioned what would happen if multiple identical reports were submitted. Johnston questioned what would happen if the vote is postponed to next quarter. Hampsey responded that President Baker wants the committee to start deliberations during Spring quarter, and that the GEB Ad Hoc Committee is disbanded as of Spring Quarter. Greenwald felt that a lot of courses would be paralyzed until a conclusion is reached. He explained that many courses are ready to change from 3 to 4 units, but will wait until the whole GEB program is updated. M/S (Johnston/Amspacher) failed to postpone the vote on the resolution until the first meeting of Spring quarter. Martinez spoke against motion on the basis of the damage it would do to the student schedules - especially the Juniors and Seniors. Welch encouraged the group to vote in a timely manner. M/S (Hampsey/Bowker) failed to continue process as previously done. Gooden spoke against the motion, but encouraged adoption of a longer timeline. M/S/P (Gooden/Hampsey) to extend deadline for submission to the 11th, and move the Senate meeting to the 18th. Greenwald directed Camuso to change the dates for submission of alternative reports. Morrobel-Sosa suggested that the group change the dates on item "d". She also asked if there would be a "procedure meeting" on 3/13/97. Greenwald indicated that he would tentatively set up a meeting time and location for the 13th, and would cancel the meeting on the 11th. Martinez questioned if the caucus chair could send a substitute to the meeting on the 13th.

- E. **Revisions on (1) Resolution on External Review (AS-460-96) and (2) Resolution to Approve Procedures for External Program Review (AS-461-96):** Morrobel-Sosa reported that she had not heard back from all constituencies on this issue.


VI. Discussion Item(s):

**Guided Hunting at Swanton Pacific Ranch:** Morrobel-Sosa questioned whether hunting is currently going on at the ranch. Greenwald replied that no guided hunting is occurring, although pigs and deer were being hunted for control purposes. Amspacher explained the holistic management policy. Greenwald expressed concern about public relations, liability issues, logistics and obtaining insurance. Greenwald clarified that the University is looking at whether the guided hunting revenues will offset the problems. Further discussion was postponed to a later date.

Gooden questioned if there were any other big items coming up. Greenwald responded that the Senate would be dealing with Credit/No Credit, Research, and Intellectual Property. Hampsey questioned the level of follow-up on the PRAIC recommendations.

VII. Adjournment: M/S/P to adjourn at 4:55 p.m.

Submitted by:

  
Leslie Cooper  
Academic Senate