

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

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**Academic Senate Executive Committee**  
**Tuesday, March 11, 1997**  
**UU 220, 3:00-5:00 p.m.**

Preparatory: The meeting was opened at 3:11 p.m.

Members and Guests present: Bill Amspacher, Les Bowker, Margaret Camuso, Leslie Cooper, Linda Day, Jay Devore, Reg Gooden, George Gowgani, Harvey Greenwald, Tom Hale, John Hampsey, John Harris, Myron Hood, Dan Howard-Greene, Hal Johnston, Doug Keesey, George Lewis, Jim Locasio, Sam Lutrin, William Martinez, John Maxwell, AnnA McDonald, Margot McDonald, Tad Miller, Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Tim O'Keefe, Don Ryujin, Mike Suess, Guy Welch, Jim Zetzsche, Paul Zingg

- I. Minutes: none
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): **A tentative Executive Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 13, 3:00-5:00 p.m., in 25-229E to discuss the organization of alternative reports to the Resolution on GE&B Model.** You will be informed by email on March 12 as to whether the meeting will be necessary.
- III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair: no report
  - B. President's Office: no report
  - C. Provost's Office: no report
  - D. Statewide Senators: Gooden reported that he would be going to Long Beach tomorrow for a meeting.
  - E. CFA Campus President: Zetzsche reminded the group how important proxies were to this body.
  - F. Staff Council representative: no report
  - G. ASI representative: Welch thanked Keesey, on behalf of the ASI, for the Credit/No Credit Resolution.
  - H. IACC representative: Bowker questioned if the IACC had sent an alternative report yet. Greenwald replied that nothing had been received from the IACC, but that Joe Grimes is well aware of the deadline.
  - I. Athletics Governing Board representative: no report
  - J. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
  - A. **Academic Senate/university-wide vacancies:** Duane Head was M/S/P (Bowker/Martinez) to fill the CSM vacancy on the Graduate Studies Committee.

- B. **Resolution on CR/NC Grading:** Keesey indicated that this is compromise proposal. It provides a balance between the courses as Cr/NC and allows transfer students to take courses in exploration mode for Cr/NC. Keesey indicated that some committee members wanted to provide for departmental decision on which courses could be taken Cr/NC. Harris questioned if there was preferential treatment for transfer students. Keesey clarified. Gooden questioned if community colleges allow Cr/NC. Keesey responded that yes, some do. Amspacher questioned students as to how they feel about the importance of classes being taken Cr/NC. Welch indicated what had been discussed the ASI Board of Directors meetings and some scenarios that seem to warrant Cr/NC grading. Miller asked how many units currently can be taken Cr/NC. Greenwald responded that up to 45 units could currently be taken Cr/NC. Maxwell questioned how many students would actually be affected. Greenwald questioned why Cr/NC couldn't be used in free electives. Keesey responded that it was developed for fairness. Some committee members felt that some departments did not want more than 16 units as Cr/NC. Morrobel-Sosa questioned the difference between "free electives" and other electives. Martinez questioned if this was truly an issue. Greenwald urged focus on resolved clauses, rather than whereas clauses. He also indicated that some universities actually look at Cr/NC on a course-by-course basis. M/S/P (Martinez/Bowker) to agendize resolution. Morrobel-Sosa was concerned with the whereas clauses. Keesey explained that the committee felt that explanation of the history of the resolution was necessary. Gooden suggested using a rationale statement, rather than a whereas clause.
- C. **Resolution on Censure of Administration:** Greenwald wanted to establish guidelines for discussion. Two issues should be discussed here: (1) what kind of strategies should be used for systemwide PSSI procedures (eliminate, modify, etc.), and (2) the local issue of how to create a livable policy. Devore pointed out that his resolution was larger in scope than just the PSSI issue. Harris gave an introduction to the charges given to the Faculty Affairs Committee: (1) how to get rid of the PSSI process, and (2) how to fix the procedures. Harris felt that if we are interested in performance, this is critical. RPT is a problem. Now PSSI is in the middle of this discussion. Harris reported that there are 17 different PSSI policies at the various campuses. Faculty Affairs Committee, as well as the college PSSI committees, are reviewing all policies. Faculty Affairs Committee found a lack of communication between past and current college committees. Faculty Affairs Committee hopes to have a document for review by the second week of Spring quarter. Amspacher explained what Task Force is doing. The group is drafting a letter to the Chancellor, which available for viewing and comment. The Task Force has agreed that PSSI's will not go away and that there are basic problems with the PSSI's for the entire CSU. The Task Force will query other campuses, rank priorities, draft a final document, and then present in an unemotional manner what the problems are and suggested solutions. The Task Force hopes for a better impact if the document is presented campus-by-campus. Devore described his resolution, indicating that this resolution is not just about PSSI's. He was offended by the disregard of the administration to the college and university recommendations. Devore was distressed that most faculty did not receive any PSSI's and felt that disparities existed. He felt that there should be more egalitarian treatment of faculty. Devore felt that since faculty are being asked to teach heavier loads, adequate compensation should be given. He cannot remember the President or Chancellor commenting on inappropriate compensation of faculty. Devore doesn't feel the union can represent this to the Chancellor because less than 50% of faculty belong to the union, and other non-union faculty would be viewed as

happy with the status quo. Lewis urged the Executive Committee to agendize this resolution. Lewis feels that the PSSI's are designed to hurt and discredit the work that the faculty are doing. Gooden said that the Chancellor will say that this is nothing new to faculty, that faculty are always evaluated, and that faculty should be able to handle internal reviews. Gooden felt that the word "collusion", in the second whereas, is difficult to convince or prove without data. Amspacher felt caught in the middle. He is not comfortable with the PSSI process, because he does not know exactly what the President did or did not do. Gowgani advised getting the "system-wide act" together. Zetzsche clarified how collective bargaining came about. He felt that the Chancellor has more direct input to the Legislature than the Collective Bargaining Unit. Zetzsche urged signing of proxies to give more input to Sacramento. Gooden reported that the Chancellor feels that this is a faculty issue, and felt that the Chancellor will support a faculty-run PSSI system. Harris was concerned with contributing to a lack of collegiality, rather than the President making his own recommendations. Greenwald indicated that during the plenary session, in front of Molly Broad, a person voiced opinions against PSSI's and got a standing ovation. Greenwald felt that we can get support from other campuses, doesn't feel that censure of the administration is appropriate, and urged rewording of the document. Lewis spoke to resolution and questioned what the CSU administration has done to reward the faculty and staff for getting through the budget crisis. Hampsey spoke for the "spirit of the resolution", but voiced concern that the wording seems to accuse the administration of doing this on purpose. Hampsey reported that during the meeting last month (in Monterey), a question was posed to the Trustees to see who of them was in favor of the PSSI process. Haupt responded that "faculty have to be accountable to corporate culture". Martinez spoke against PSSI process because this does not help support junior faculty. Martinez spoke in favor of the resolution. Harris voiced concern about the word "collusion". Locasio voiced frustration that the reported dollars available for PSSI's changed amount several times during the year, and did not feel that there was accountability for the budget from the Chancellor's office. Hood tried to determine criteria which was used to award PSSI's, and provided analogies. Gowgani reminded the group that the proportion of lecturers/assistant professors/associate professors/professors who received awards correctly reflects the population of faculty at Cal Poly. Hampsey urged separation of censure of statewide administrators and campus administrators. Bowker reminded the group that the process is only two years old, and advised that we do a thorough autopsy of the results. Morrobel-Sosa questioned what are adequate measures of performance. She also reported that Chancellor Munitz stated in Monterey that the PSSI process will be here as long as he is. Gooden felt that this was not initiated entirely by the top administration. The Chancellor has an Executive Council, which includes campus presidents. Lewis felt that any resolution should be phrased in outrage, and doesn't want to exclude President Baker from the resolved clause. Devore wanted document to be somewhat passionate - to catch the attention of the powers that be. He felt that there was culpability at the President's level, and doesn't feel that the President is being honest with the faculty. Harris felt that this resolution is not just addressing PSSI's and has trouble supporting the document as it stands. He felt that we should not combine issues. Zetzsche indicated that he hesitates to criticize President Baker, since we have to continue to work with him. Hampsey brought back the two issues - that there is unhappiness with the local tinkering of the PSSI's and the frustration that the Chancellor gave us the PSSI process in the first place. Hampsey stated that the issue about how President Baker is doing in his tenure is not the issue here. O'Keefe spoke in support of the resolution by Devore,


and voiced that he felt that these issues were linked. M/S/P (Gooden/Bowker) to agendize the resolution. Harris also cautioned that this resolution sets the group up for a libel suit.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

**Guided Hunting at Swanton Pacific Ranch:** Zingg indicated that guided hunting is not occurring at the ranch at the moment. One approach to wildlife control being discussed includes revenue, with the expectation that Swanton be self-sufficient. Other means being discussed with Wally Mark, include "gather and kill" (round-up for slaughter elsewhere). There is a serious problem with wildlife control, which has resulted in approximately \$10K fencing and crop damage. Hunting is not the only solution being explored. Greenwald and others fear that the decision on guided hunting will be made without input from the Senate. Zingg assured the group that there will be. Lewis questioned the stretch between education and guided hunting. Gooden asked which college would be in charge. CAGR. O'Keefe cautioned that the Senate should look at the whole proposal, not just parts of it. Amspacher does not see this as a safety issue that the Senate should be concerned with. Morrobel-Sosa was concerned with safety, as well as the noise factor. She recommended that the Senate look at this issue from a preventative view, rather than after the fact. Gowgani cautioned people to not speak out unless they are familiar with the total scheme at Swanton, and felt that Wally Mark should be invited to come and explain what is going on. Gowgani also felt that this is an emotional issue.

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

Submitted by:

  
Leslie Cooper  
Academic Senate