

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of the ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, May 11, 1993
UU 220, 3:00-5:00pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:14pm.

- I. Minutes: The minutes of the February 2, April 20, and April 27, 1993 Executive Committee meetings were approved without change.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
 - A. An at-large Senate member is needed to the Program Review and Improvement Committee. The nominees to date are James Bermann, Dan Bertozzi, Dennis Nulman, and Richard Shaffer.
 - B. A videocassette is available of the Assembly hearing on the Master Plan for Higher Education held May 11, 1993.
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair: The Chair apologized for the confusion that occurred regarding the Resolution on Budget Recommendations which came before the Senate on May 4, 1993. He will be preparing a summary document which explains how the Executive Committee arrived at its recommendations.
 - B. President's Office: none
 - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: Vice President Koob announced that his earlier request to have an unofficial faculty group he could discuss budget reduction ideas with was no longer necessary this academic year. However, next year university-wide adjustments will have to be decided (versus college-wide adjustments) and he would like a mechanism in place whereby he could discuss ideas without having them become rumors-of-action circulating amongst faculty. Brown stated he would like to see a mechanism for this type of informal discussion to evolve ideas, but there should then be an additional mechanism in place to get full faculty consultation as a result of those discussions.

Koob also commented on his request to have the Senate appoint a group to review the Teaching Enhancement Proposals. He is looking for good multimedia projects with "instructional merit" which would also attract support from vendors. 33 proposals were received. The proposals will also be reviewed by IBM and Apple. This effort is part of the general interest to keep Cal Poly in the forefront of teaching innovation.
 - D. Statewide Senators: none
- IV. Consent Agenda: none
- V. Business Items:
 - A. **GE&B course proposal for PHYS 211:** agendized for the May 18, 1993 Senate meeting.
 - B. **GE&B course proposal for WS 411:** agendized for the May 18, 1993 Senate meeting.
 - C. **Curriculum proposals:** The following proposals were received from the Curriculum Committee: B.S. Computer Science, English Department, College of Liberal Arts, Music Department, Political Science Department, Psychology and Human Development Department, Speech Department. Some minor corrections were made to the proposal sheets for B.S. Computer Science, College of Liberal Arts, and Psychology and HD. Andrews made a motion to postpone the review of Psychology & HD until the next Executive Committee meeting of the quarter in order to review all the attachments to the proposal. Bailey responded that in the past, when the Curriculum Committee had finished its review, then this was sufficient to forward it to the Senate agenda. Over the past six years, everything brought forth by the Curriculum Committee has been agendized. Brown added that if it was the process of review the Executive Committee felt was incomplete then the proposal should not be agendized. However, if it was the content of the proposal that was in question, then the proper forum for such debate was the Senate floor. The motion failed.

- D. **Resolution on the Calendaring System:** Euel Kennedy was present to give some background information regarding the survey results presented in the report (attached to the resolution). Dana asked what endorsing the recommendations of the report would imply since they don't clearly set forth a request for specific action. Gooden suggested the resolution be reworded to read "discuss its recommendations" instead of "endorse its recommendations." Andrews responded that a resolution was not needed to discuss something. Kersten stated the Executive Committee's function in agendizing items is to make sure that they have been drawn properly, not to debate whether it agrees with them or not. If they have been properly prepared, then they should be agendized. Mueller countered with the comment that it was, however, the function of the Executive Committee to put things in a form that would expedite them when they came before the Senate. Mori reiterated the concern that the recommendations of the report were not specific and a proper resolution would articulate the specific recommendations that are being endorsed. A motion was M/S/P (Andrews/Murphy) to change the wording of the resolution to read "...and endorse its recommendations forward the Academic Senate recommendations to the President."
- E. **Resolution on Priority Registration:** Laura Freberg was present to give background information on the resolution. The resolution is an effort to improve the situation which currently exists regarding senior priority for registration of classes. The resolution has received good student feedback and support and no negative feedback was received. Murphy stated there may be a potential drawback if students use their priority privilege before they are seniors and then they can't get the classes they need to graduate. Freberg agreed this would be unfortunate, but this responsibility more appropriately rests with the students. The following modifications were suggested for clarity: (1) identify the groups that will be affected by this change, and (2) provide a time frame when the change will be implemented. The resolution was agendized for the May 18, 1993 Senate meeting as modified.
- F. **Resolution on Faculty and Student Awareness of Ethnic Diversity Concerns:** agendized for the May 18, 1993 Senate meeting.
- G. **Resolution on Paper Use:** agendized for the May 18, 1993 Senate meeting.
- H. **ASI resolution on teaching evaluations:** Nicole Brown was not present to introduce this resolution. It will come before the Executive Committee again on May 20, 1993.

VI. Discussion:

- A. **"Electronic newspaper":** Brent Keetch was present to discuss an idea for providing faculty with information regarding matters that are being discussed/decided on campus. There is a sense among faculty that important things are happening that affect their lives, but they don't know what those are. Keetch proposed obtaining information from the major committees on campus and summarizing the committees' discussions in the form of a newspaper or bulletin board. The best way to get the information out would probably be electronically. We need a place where it would be easy for faculty to find out what is being discussed in the major committees. CPNN was suggested as a very accessible network for this type of thing. Johnston added he would like to see the Academic Senate meetings televised for viewing as a means of informing faculty of matters being deliberated by the Senate.
- B. **Faculty involvement in the planning of a Charter Campus:** The Chair spoke with President Baker earlier this month about this matter. He relayed to President Baker that the lack of faculty support for the Charter Campus was because they did not see enough faculty involvement in the process. Baker stated he would like to see as much faculty involvement as possible and he would like the faculty to vote on the adoption of a Charter Campus. The Chair was not sure what the process would be for involving more faculty in Charter Campus planning but this charge will be coming from Vice President Koob. We have been asked to first identify the rules and regulations we might request exemption from: Executive Orders, Title 5 provisions, mandates from the Chancellor's Office, etc. Gooden felt these should all be looked at one time because they would impinge upon one another. Johnston suggested a faculty statement be provided that stated what we want to **retain**. The faculty are uncomfortable because there is a block of concerns that are not being addressed; i.e., HEERA. HEERA mandates the existence of an academic senate as well as collective bargaining.

Mori wanted to see some resolutions passed by the Senate stating ways in which faculty would feel comfortable dealing with the Charter Campus matter and issues they feel need to be retained and discussed. These resolutions should say those things that would set people's minds at ease. If everything is up for grabs, we're uncomfortable with that. There are some things we don't want to be up for grabs. If we have a mechanism for forming committees and giving information to faculty that includes faculty, that's acceptable. Murphy summarized what was being requested: (1) A conceptual statement that describes what a Charter Campus is and outlines the advantages and disadvantages of becoming a Charter Campus, (2) what elements would be affected? (components could be analyzed within each element), (3) a statement of which areas we would want to have campus control over, and (4) which areas we want to keep in place (collective bargaining, HEERA, other faculty protections, etc.).

Brown agreed that the goals we feel would benefit us should be identified. In addition, what the role of the Academic Senate should be under a Charter Campus should be articulated. If these are identified up front, a lot of other issues will go away. Johnston added that certain things keep getting in the way of a broader discussion of the issues. Irvin noted that there was a difference between making a statement 'that the university will continue collective bargaining' and at the same time saying there are things within collective bargaining we'd like to look at (i.e., workload). If we take the posture that we're not going to touch certain things, then that means we can't examine them. Mori agreed but emphasized that right now there are many alarm bells going off and if everything is put on the table, the concept will lose out. She felt there would be an opportunity to talk about bargaining issues once a sense of safety was achieved.

An Executive Committee meeting will be scheduled for Thursday, May 20, 1993 to address Charter Campus further. Items for further discussion include collective bargaining, tenure, preliminary statements, grassroots process, approval by faculty, vote on components.

Gooden recommended forming an ad hoc committee to draft the preliminary statements and presenting these to the Executive Committee. Brown felt it would be helpful to have more discussion to see what issues have been raised before having the entire Senate make a decision.

The documents requested by the Executive Committee included: Humboldt's Charter Campus proposal, the Executive Orders and other controlling documents the university may want to be released from.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:55pm.

Recorded by:



Margaret Camuso, Academic Senate