

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

Minutes of the  
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
Tuesday,  
September 18, 1990  
UU 220, 3:00 - 5:00 pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:10pm.

I. Minutes:

The minutes from the May 8, May 15, and June 5, 1990 Executive Committee meetings were approved with a minor correction in the May 8 minutes. Baker's responses to the Chair's memo concerning the inactivity of the Athletic Advisory Committee and the Facilities Use Committee (as per the June 5 minutes) are available in the Academic Senate Office.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

The Chair directed attention to the Memo on Academic Senate assigned time allocations. Three WTU'S were allocated to the chair of the Fairness Board because of the increased amount of time now required in fulfilling the obligations of that position.

III. Reports:

A. Chair's Report  
Introductions.

Tom Jackson, Jr., Academic Development Specialist (Housing) described his new position which includes work with Living Learning Centers, START, and possibly academic advising for dormitory students, and received comments and suggestions from the Executive Committee members.

B. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office

The Vice President for Academic Affairs, Robert Koob, posed four requests to the Executive Committee:

1. He would like to propose (a) that the Academic Senate reevaluate its program evaluation process, and (b) that a program evaluation committee be designated by the Academic Senate. He emphasized the faculty have the specific knowledge to evaluate programs and he feels that program evaluation can and should be done by faculty. However, if the faculty abdicate their responsibility in this area, Koob noted that the administration was prepared to make the appropriate decisions.

J. Ahern commented that each program area already prepares a five-year plan. M. Botwin stated that decisions made about curriculum affect departmental resources, therefore, the two are difficult to separate. Also, faculty already scrutinize their own programs and are often more critical of themselves than others would be. T. Bailey said that the Curriculum Committee has been able to approach only a few general problems. She inquired as to whether the Oversight Committee could address some of these general problems. R. Koob saw the Curriculum Committee as being so heavily involved that it would not be able to handle evaluation. He

further added that an Oversight Committee would take care of items for the University as a whole. R. Gooden asked Koob to identify the timeline for change. Gooden said that the GE & B Committee could be used for evaluation but could possibly get into some "turf defense". GE&B would need to come up with goals and discipline standards. Gooden pondered a general question of the degree to which we will let externals dictate what we do. S. Moustafa noted the many accreditation and planning committees we already have in existence.

2. Koob questioned whether the Academic Planning Committee was the appropriate consultative body for him to deal with for academic planning? He wants to make certain the process is correct; the content, he noted would be dealt with by the full Senate.

The Executive Committee agreed that the Academic Planning Committee could be considered the appropriate body for Koob to meet with in seeking faculty consultation.

3. Koob wants the GE&B Committee to give the input to the Oversight Committee on all GE&B matters. The Executive Committee agreed with this strategy.

4. The Graduate Studies Committee is not presently linked to the Academic Senate. Koob feels that the Senate should be involved in defining what role graduate studies has at Cal Poly.

- C. Statewide Senators:  
No report.

IV. Consent Agenda:  
No items.

V. Business Item(s):

- A. Approval of the Academic Senate Calendar for 1990-1991: The calendar was approved.
- B. Resolution on Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty-Personnel Policies Committee.

P. Murphy introduced and provided background information on the "Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty." He stated that there has never been concurrence on this issue between the faculty and the administration and it is a continuing source of strain. Originally, each faculty was to be evaluated in each course. In 1988, the Academic Senate attempted to alter this policy so that each faculty member was to be evaluated in at least two courses per year, but the resolution was not approved by President Baker. The present proposal would require keeping this policy for tenured full professors but would add more evaluations for all other groups of faculty, including lecturers. J. Ahern alerted the Executive Committee to the fact that the present student evaluation calculations are incorrect because they use averages instead of central tendencies. P. Murphy suggested this be an amendment. The resolution was approved as an agenda item for the next Academic Senate meeting.

- C. Resolution on Proficiency Exam for Computer Literacy. Withdrawn at this time by the Chair of the G.E.&B Committee for further work.
- D. Senate/Committee Vacancies and Approved Appointments :

J. Murphy advised the Executive Committee of a number of vacancies on Senate Committees. Caucus chairs were reminded to attend to filling empty positions as soon as possible. The following committee appointments were approved:

Elections Committee	Omar Zia	SENG
Fairness Board	K.N. Balasubramanian	SENG
Instruction Committee	David Riley	SENG
Library cCommittee	Mark Johnson	SENG
Status of Women Comm.	Lois Brady	SENG
Student Affairs Comm.	H. Mallareddy	SENG

Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee	Ken Ozawa	SSM
	Stu Larsen	SENG
	Pat Pendse	SSM

- E. J. Murphy noted that the Senate will have to decide on the proper representation for the Center for Teacher Education. T. Kersten suggested that the matter of representation be directed to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. W. Reynoso announced that Laura Dimmit will serve as a temporary replacement for Sam Lutrin as Academic Senator during the Fall Quarter. Concerning the Dean of the School of Business Selection Committee, the President accepted only one of the Senate's duly elected candidates. Baker asked that the second candidate be from a different school and; further, that he (Baker) would prefer to add diversity to the search committee. Although there was definite opposition to accommodating this request, the Chair felt it was in the best interests of the faculty for the Senate to choose a second faculty member rather than having the vacancy filled by administrative appointment as authorized by CAM.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:03pm.