

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

**Minutes of the ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Tuesday, June 1, 1995  
Ag/English 241 3:10-5:00 pm

Preparatory: The meeting was opened at 3:15 pm.

Members present: R. Brown, Gooden, Greenwald, Hale, Hampsey, Hannings, Kersten, Koob, Lutrin, Wilson

I. Minutes: none

II. Announcements: none

III. Reports: none

IV. Discussion: Gooden reported that originally, the members of the Charter Governance Committee had intended to use the Cal Poly Plan as a case study to test the proposed structure. However it subsequently decided that the Governance Committee should go forward with finishing other aspects of their work. The final draft will be coming back to the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee previously had agreed to establish some sort of committee to steer the Senate's discussion and decision-making process as related to the Cal Poly Plan.

Koob noted that the timeline for reaching a decision about the Cal Poly Plan is a major issue. Work will have to be completed between Fall Conference and January 1. He will provide what is needed for the Plan to get done. On June 19, Baker wants the team to go to a meeting at the Chancellor's Office. During summer the boundary conditions will be set to form the working context for next Fall.

Kersten: The boundaries aren't clear. How will this Plan become approved? Additionally there is no reason given about why the group has selected a 3-3-3-3 balance.

Gooden noted that ratification will be by the faculty.

Wilson: The question is are we going to buy into appointing three people to Baker's steering committee or establish our own?

**MSPU That the Academic Senate representatives to the President's Cal Poly Plan steering Committee be the Chair, Vice Chair and Past Chair (Greenwald, Hampsey, Wilson).** This is strictly a steering committee for the Cal Poly Plan and this representation can be renegotiated. President Baker is to be informed that agreeing participate in this process is not to be construed as accepting this governance structure on a permanent basis.

It was noted that a "steering committee" is still needed at the Senate level and that it should have a different name so as to avoid confusion. Greenwald noted that he was thinking it would include a maximum of five members. It might be called the Cal Poly Plan Oversight Committee. In the summer, the Executive Committee will fill this role. We may decide to form another committee in fall.

In further discussion regarding the Governance Council Dr. Koob noted that the collective bargaining unions preferred not to have representatives on the Governance Council. The Governance Council decision probably will not be made for a year. Information on the five models explored by the Charter Governance Committee can be found under "publications" on the Gopher List or in Juan Gonzalez' office.

V. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Sam Lutrin".

Sam Lutrin, Secretary  
Academic Senate

YET TO BE LAUNDERED  
FOR EDITORIAL CONSISTENCY

Skinner - Exec 6/1/95

DRAFT 3

May 24, 1995

5/25/95

To: Charter Governance Committee

Fr: Juan Gonzalez

cc: Charter Oversight Committee

Following draft will be discussed at our May 31, 1995 meeting.

## CHARTER GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

### PROPOSAL FOR

## THE CAL POLY GOVERNANCE COUNCIL

Union person will  
need to be  
included as one  
of the  
mbrs  
12

### I. Charter Governance Committee Charge

The Charter Governance Committee was appointed by Vice President Robert D. Koob (November, 1994) to examine the internal governance structure of the campus and its relationship to other constituencies, i.e., the CSU system, state Legislature, statewide student organizations, bargaining units, and the Academic Senate.

The Charter Governance Committee in its early deliberations decided that its initial charge would be the development of an internal governance structure of the campus during the academic year, 1994-95. The other governance relationships would be focused upon in the following academic year, 1995-96.

This proposal for a Cal Poly Governance Council is developed in conjunction with the Charter Oversight Committee, the Charter Fiscal Flexibility Committee, and the Charter Employee Relations Committee. The underlying desire on the part of the Charter Governance Committee is to develop a model that will utilize a consensus decision making model that will yield the highest cooperation of all constituency

groups within the University. The procedure for decision making the Charter Governance Committee adopted was the National Association of Women's Centers consensus model for group decision making. This procedure is described in Attachment A.

In preparing the governance model, the Charter Governance Committee itself adopted a standard of participation that asked each member of the committee for a commitment to preparedness, a commitment that respected openness, a commitment of participatory consultativeness, and a commitment to excellence. These standards of participation led to the development of the governance model.

## II. Charter Governance Committee Membership

Those individuals appointed to the Charter Governance Committee were as follows:

Juan C. Gonzalez, Vice President for Student Affairs--administration representative,  
Chair  
Eric Doepel, Director, Annual Giving--representing Staff Council  
Pat Harris, Coordinator, Women's Programs and Services--representing Staff Council  
James Conway, Speech Communications Department--representing CFA/Labor Council  
Marsha Epstein, ~~Academic Computing Services~~ <sup>INFO TECH SERVICES</sup> representing CSEA/Labor Council  
Reginald Gooden, Political Science Department--representing Academic Senate  
Tom Hale, Mathematics Department--representing Academic Senate  
Diane Michelfelder, Philosophy Department--representing Academic Senate  
Yvonne Archibeque--student representative  
Erica Brown, ASI President--student representative  
Clint Rehmann--student representative  
Robert Koob, Vice President for Academic Affairs--administration representative  
Wesley Witten, Community advisory member  
Lorraine Ridgeway, recording secretary

### III. Guiding Principles Utilized by the Charter Governance Committee

In an effort to guide the Charter Governance Committee in developing models for governance, the following guiding principles were adopted for use in its efforts and deliberations. These were adopted as a basis for the development and standards of performance with a new governance structure. These principles are:

- Involvement. All constituents should be involved; however, the degree may vary depending on the interest, need and time constraints imposed by the nature of the issues.
- Efficiency. Current and prospective needs and demands require increased efficiency, that is more output with fewer resources. Accordingly, the actions and processes must strive for efficiency.
- Timely Involvement Actions. Conclusions and results should be timely to satisfy the needs and to capture opportunities. Involvement includes both immediate/pressing and strategic long-term issues with an approach toward being innovative, responsible and anticipatory.
- Mutual Responsibility and Accountability. All constituents must participate with a high level of trust to initiate and facilitate change. To achieve this high level trust, all participants must act responsibly and be accountable for their actions.
- Communication. Communication must be open and thorough.

- Consultation. All constituents need to be consulted for input and involved in the conceptualization and implementation of change. Priority levels can be assigned based on relative needs and responsibility.
- Openness. The entire process must be open and accountable to all constituents.
- Environment. All elements of the institutional environment, that is constituent groups, need to be identified and included. Some endeavors will impact constituent groups outside the institutional environment such as community members and alumni.
- Leadership. Leadership must be active, vigorous and decisive to shape an institutional vision and implement changes to realize Cal Poly's goals.

## COMPONENTS OF THE PROPOSED CAL POLY GOVERNANCE MODEL

### IV. Authority

It is proposed that the authority of the Cal Poly Governance Council should entail all issues not governed by areas of exclusivity. Exclusivity is defined as those areas that are delegated or mandated by either Board of Trustee policy, Title V, and/or California State Code (HEERA). The four areas of exclusivity defined by the committee are as follows:

- Presidential Authority (the President)
- Mandated Student Control of Fees (A.S.I.)
- Employee Relations, Terms and Conditions of Employment (exclusive bargaining units)
- Faculty Retention/Promotion/Tenure and Evaluation; Curricular Content (Academic Senate)

All issues outside the exclusivity areas will be the responsibility of the Cal Poly Governance Council.

The Cal Poly Governance Council will focus its energies primarily on the development and review of policy issues. As the policy governing body, the Governance Council will also evaluate how policy is appropriately implemented.

The Cal Poly Governance Council will require sub groups to exist in order to deal with areas of exclusivity or other pressing issues on campus. These standing committees will include, but not be limited to, the Employee Relations Committee. The chair of this and other standing committees shall be present in meetings of the Governance Council to provide consultation as needed and to ensure effective communication. ~~These constituencies and their representative bodies are defined as faculty (Academic Senate), students (A.S.I.), staff (Staff Council) and administration.~~

## **V. Cal Poly Governance Council Membership**

The University President will chair the Cal Poly Governance Council as a representative of Administration..

Membership in the Cal Poly Governance Council will be drawn from four constituency groups. These constituency groups were defined as Academic Senate for faculty, Associated Students, Inc., for students, Staff Council for staff, and Administration. Each constituency group would be represented by three (3) members for a total of twelve (12) voting members. Every attempt will be made to ensure labor council representation through Academic Senate (faculty) or Staff Council (staff).

Additionally, it is acknowledged that Foundation will be represented either from Administration or Staff Council (staff).

Each constituency group will determine its own selection or appointment method for their representatives. It is recommended that representative terms be staggered in order to ensure continuity.

## **VI. Communications**

Communication is seen as the pivotal component of an effective governing council. Communication is perceived to be paramount and vital in increasing campus staff morale, facilitating effective decision making, and creating opportunities to involve members of the community. Communication is seen as an important governance



function in line with responsibility of constituency groups and accountability for joint decision making.

Each constituency group will be held responsible for conveying information to and from the governance council. Recommended means of communication includes meeting minutes, newsletters, electronic mail, and the student newspaper. University publications should be seen as potential vehicles for increased communication.

The Governance Council and each constituency group is expected to prepare its own communication plan and to implement it effectively.

Meetings will be generally open to the public with an option to call closed meetings when deemed necessary. Weekly meetings will be scheduled year-round. Confidentiality is not seen as a premium; rather openness and inclusivity are priorities.

## **VII. Agenda Setting**

Cal Poly Governance Council agenda items may be presented by any member of the campus community. All agenda items will be submitted to the Governance Council Chair. Agenda items will be prioritized by the Governance Council.

## **VIII. Responsibility and Accountability**

Members representing different constituencies will be responsible to those constituencies for all decisions, communication, consultation, and involvement. It is

acknowledged that all constituents must participate with a high level of trust to satisfy the demands of the governance structure. The commitment to shared decision making obligates each member bear the equal responsibility of collective, consensus-based stewardship.

### **IX. Timeliness**

External forces, complexity of issues, need for consultation, will impact the ability to have timely involvement. Timeliness will depend on the nature of the topic. All efforts should be directed toward comprehensive communication and consultation.

### **X. Logistics**

Simply creating a governance council does not provide the necessary ingredients to make it successful. Indeed, institutional investment is a prerequisite. The Cal Poly Governance Council should receive appropriate resources for it to be successful in its charge.

### **XI. Relationship to Existing Structure**

The Governance Council will define official links to on-going structures and processes. These links will be explicit, formal, and consistent.

CHTRMDL.ALR

May 17, 1995

*Miss - Exec 6/1/95*

**RECEIVED**

**CAL POLY**

State of California

**Memorandum**

**MAY 30 1995**

**SAN LUIS OBISPO  
CA 93407**

**Academic Senate**

**To:** Jack Wilson, Academic Senate Chair  
Erica Brown, ASI Inc., President  
Bonnie Krupp, Staff Council Chair

**Date:** May 23, 1995

**From:** Warren J. Baker  
President



**Copies:** W. Boldt, J. Gonzalez,  
D. Howard-Greene,  
R. Koob, F. Lebens,  
R. Ramirez

**Subject:** Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee

---

The development of a campus structure and process for consultation is an important next step in development of the Cal Poly Plan. With this memorandum I would like to propose the establishment of a steering committee to coordinate our summer and fall planning efforts, request nominees to serve on this committee and also request your formal recommendations regarding an overall process for developing the Cal Poly Plan.

This year the Charter Governance Committee has discussed the creation of a Cal Poly Governance Council, a body that would represent the administration and the key university constituency groups—the faculty (through the Academic Senate), the students (through ASI), the staff (through Staff Council)—in deliberations concerning the setting of overall university policies. The Charter Governance Committee has developed a draft proposal for a Cal Poly Governance Council which they will continue to discuss and refine through the summer. In the meantime, the Committee has proposed that the administration consider pilot testing key elements of this governance model through establishment of a steering committee for the Cal Poly Plan that would be styled after the proposed Governance Council.

The proposed Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee would work to achieve a working consensus about the elements of a Cal Poly Plan and would produce a plan for submission to the Chancellor's Office. In its structure and procedures the Steering Committee would be constituted as follows:

1. The Steering Committee would be chaired by the President and include twelve additional members, with three members each appointed by the Academic Senate, ASI, Staff Council and the Administration.
2. The Steering Committee would be governed by guiding principles articulated in the draft Governance Council proposal, including: involvement, efficiency, timeliness, mutual responsibility and accountability, communication, consultation, openness, inclusion and leadership.
3. The Steering Committee would give high priority to effective communication between the Committee, each of the constituent groups and the campus community as a whole.

Jack Wilson, Erica Brown, Bonnie Krupp

Page 2

May 23, 1995

4. The Steering Committee would be allocated sufficient resources to carry out its charge.

I believe that the kind of steering committee proposed by the Charter Governance Committee is a key element in the successful development of the Cal Poly Plan.

- So that we may move forward as expeditiously as possible, I would like to ask the Academic Senate, ASI and Staff Council each to nominate three members to serve on a Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee during the summer of 1995 and the 1995-96 academic year.
- In addition, I would like at this time to formally invite procedural comments and suggestions regarding other practical steps that should be taken to ensure the development of a strong Cal Poly Plan—a plan capable of guiding the University into the next century.

Please relay your nominations and your process recommendations to me by June 9, 1995.