

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of the ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Tuesday, July 20, 1993

UU 216 3:00-5:00pm

Preparatory: The meeting opened at 3:22pm.

I. Minutes:

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none

III. Reports:

- A. Academic Senate Chair:
- B. President's Office: none
- C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: none
- D. Statewide Senators: none
- E. CFA Campus President: none
- F. ASI representatives: none

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:

- A. **Diversity:** Chair Wilson reviewed the process agreed to for addressing Diversity issues which had been discussed during the previous three meetings. The three areas of concentration will be (1) curriculum/GE&B, (2) hiring/RPT, and (3) sensitivity/raising appreciation for diversity.

Three Executive Committee members were selected to the Diversity Summer Task Force: Mary Beth Armstrong, David Dubbink, and Phil Fetzer. The three students will be Lawson Bush, Monet Parhar, and Refugio Rodriguez.

The students named above expressed their desire to focus on the following ethnic/gender groups, although any proposals made would not exclude other minority groups: African-Americans, Asian-Americans, Mexican-Americans, native-Americans, and women. Certain terms will be defined by the group such as "bicultural." Resolutions drafted by the task force are to be ready to go before the first Executive Committee of fall quarter. Dubbink asked whether funding was to be addressed by the task force. It was generally agreed that resources should follow the recommendations approved. Parhar felt the task force should set forth actions to be taken, not prepare a resolution that asks the Senate to do it. Bush agreed that problems and solution should be set forth for the Senate's adoption. The resolution needs to contain action items, not reiterations of the problem. Crabb suggested that certain recommendations might need to be directed to other committees who would operationalize them. Waller stated that the task force should request specific actions for the committees to take not vague, general instructions--"we would like to see these things implemented and would like this committee to figure out how to do so."

Brown added that there are layers and layers of perception problems for many faculty in the classroom. Conway felt there needed to be a combination of action items and discussion items. The committees should be given a time certain to return their committee's recommendations to the Senate office. Fetzer added that the Executive Committee is in a position to take a leadership role in this area and he proposed the following motion: That the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate go on record as placing Diversity issues (which include but are not limited to the recommendations developed by the Diversity Summer Task Force) as its top priority for the 1993-1994 academic year. The M/S/P unanimously. It is the intent of this motion that the discussion of Diversity keep coming to the forefront of the Senate's agenda and not be pushed back by other items. Brown stated the more specific the actions articulated by the task force, the better the committee's results will be. He added it might also be helpful if

the committees be asked to identify short-term and long-term things that could be done.

Gooden suggested perusing the GE&B and Cultural Pluralism requirements on other campuses in preparation for the Senate's full discussion of the recommendations that come forth. Crabb recommended looking at campuses outside of California that look more like Cal Poly. Pomona no longer looks like Cal Poly. Liberal arts colleges don't look like Cal Poly. The co-chairs of the GE&B Committee might be good resource individuals to contact.

- B. **Charter campus:** The Chair asked whether there was consensus from the Executive Committee members to approve the formation of an oversight committee to review the development of a charter campus proposal. This oversight committee would consist of individuals from the Senate, Labor Council, staff, administration, and ASI. This was perceived as being helpful to the process as it would bring trust that this was a shared effort. It will help eliminate the suspicion that the top administrators are pulling all the strings to create a charter campus. Conway hoped the oversight group would bring clarity to the process and disseminate information regarding its progress. The role of oversight should be coupled with that of communication. Clear faculty involvement is needed in the effort. The motion (Dana/Fetzer) to approve an oversight committee to the charter campus proposal process was M/S/P unanimously. At the next meeting of August 3, the Executive Committee will continue its discussion of the charter campus, approve the process identified earlier (as diagrammed on the flow chart distributed) and decide how faculty would be selected to the various task forces the process will generate.

Since the committees' charges will be focused (vision committees, issues committees, and measurements committees), faculty interest will need to be matched to specific committees. The following information needs to be communicated to the faculty: (1) the process (2) the issues identified and the number of task forces needed to address these, and (3) the time frame for completed action at the campus level, Chancellor's Office, Board of Trustees, legislature, etc.

VI. Discussion: none

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:50pm

Recorded by:



---

Margaret Camuso  
Academic Senate