

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

Minutes of the ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, January 4, 1994
UU 220 3:00-5:00pm

The January 4, 1994 meeting of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate was devoted entirely to the discussion of the charter campus planning process. The old question of process occupied much of the discussion.

There was much discussion about : 1) what the product of committees will be and 2) where and how will those products flow. It was clear that the answers to these questions are not now clear but must be clarified in order for the process to proceed. It was pointed out that somewhere in the process policy will have to be developed. Which set of committees will do this?

It was suggested that this next set of 3 committees (Governance, Fiscal Flexibility and Financial Mgt. and Employee Relations), which constitute Task Force 3, should be charged with identifying the sub issues within each of the major issues, determine obstacles and opportunities associated with the sub issues and propose solutions to overcoming the obstacles and taking advantage of the opportunities. They should not develop policy.

There was much discussion about how the senate, and the other constituent groups, might then study the results of Task Force 3 with an opportunity to amend them before they are sent on to the next set of charter campus planning committees, Task Force 4. It was pointed out that even though this would slow the process down, it would increase the probability of success of the final product of the process, a charter draft. Or putting it another way, once a charter is drafted it may be impossible, and it would be at best very difficult, to make changes that could be necessary to enhance its chances of acceptance. The analogy of the 'fast track' approach used to draft and pass NAFTA was mentioned. Congress could not amend the NAFTA draft. It could only vote it up or down. A similar approach with a charter campus draft is not likely to be supported by the faculty or other constituent groups.

There was much discussion about where in the process policy would be developed. It was felt that policy should be developed by the set of committees comprising Task Force 4. The policies would of course flow from the work of Task Force 3. The committees comprising this Task Force would be formed to develop policy on Governance, etc.. This is another reason that it is important for the Academic Senate (AS), ASI, Staff Council, Labor Council and CFA and the administration to have an opportunity to study the output of the committees of Task Force 3 with an opportunity

to amend those outputs before policy recommendations are made by the second set of committees.

The discussion then focused on the constitution of the Governance and Fiscal Flex. and Financial Mgt. committees. It was acknowledged that it is important to have representation from all constituent groups on the most important of committees, the Governance Committee. However, the Executive Committee was unanimous in reiterating that a majority of the members of that committee be faculty appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee. This view is consistent with the policy established by the State wide Academic Senate and developed over a period of 20 years in which the faculty of the CSU have struggled long and hard to develop and maintain a modicum of collegiality between the faculty and administration. It is also consistent with the policy of the American Association of University Professors. Finally it is consistent with law as spelled out in HEERA, the Higher Education Employer-Employee Rights Act. There was strong consensus that retreat by the faculty from this position would set a precedent that faculty could not support.

The constitution of the committee on Fiscal Flex. and Fin. Mgt. suggested by the Oversight Committee met with approval by the Executive Committee.

There was unanimous agreement that there is no need for committees on Research and Communication. It was suggested that each committee of Task Force 3 be responsible for its own research and that the Oversight Committee have the responsibility for communication. In fact communication was one of the original responsibilities described for the Oversight Committee when it was proposed to the Executive Committee.

Finally the following motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously. It was moved that: 1) the executive committee reaffirm its strong feeling that a majority of the Governance Committee be faculty selected by the academic senate; 2) that the Fiscal Flexibility and Financial Management Committee be constituted as recommended by the Oversight Committee; 3) the Governance Committee and the Fiscal Flexibility and Financial Management Committee, and all committees in Task Force 3, should identify the sub issues associated with their committee's main issue, determine the obstacles and opportunities associated with those issues and propose solutions; 4) that the constituent groups have the opportunity to examine the results of Task Force 3 and be able to amend those parts as they see necessary before they are passed along to Task Force 4 and 5) that the committees of Task Force 4 develop policy recommendations based on the output of Task Force 3 (amended if necessary).

I would like the Executive Committee to meet from 3 to 5pm on Tuesday, January 4, 1994, in UU 220 to discuss the proposed constitution of the governance (and other) committee(s) for charter campus planning. Please calendar this date. I hope you are enjoying your break.