

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California  
ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - MINUTES  
Tuesday: November 18, 1986  
UU 220 3:00 p.m.

Chair: Lloyd H. Lamouria  
Vice Chair: Lynne E. Gamble  
Secretary: Raymond D. Terry

I. Preparatory

- A. The meeting was called to order at 3:11 p.m. upon obtaining a quorum.
- B. The minutes of the Oct. 28, 1986 Executive Committee meeting were approved as mailed.
- C. After some informal discussion, it was agreed that the Senate meeting, originally scheduled for Nov. 25, 1986, should be cancelled due to the lack of urgent business and the nearness of the Thanksgiving Recess.

II. Communications: None

III. Reports

A. President / Academic Affairs Office.

Glenn Irvin declined to make a report.

B. Statewide Senators

Reg Gooden reported on two issues soon to be considered by the CSU Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee: (1) Policies and Procedures concerning Executive Review and (2) The Implications of the Separation of Rank and Salary. He indicated his desire to initiate a campus-wide debate on the latter issue.

The Chair agreed to place the issue of Separation of Rank and Salary on the agenda of the next Executive Committee meeting.

C. Communications Advisory Committee (Information Systems)

- 1. The Chair recognized Jens Pohl, a member of the committee who updated the Executive Committee on the recent activities of the Communications Committee.

2. According to Pohl, every university in the 1980's needs a communications network. Existing technology permits communication in all three areas: voice, video, and data. Such a network can be accomplished using a LAN (Local Area Network) and /or a digital (phone) switch. The two methods of achieving the same goal are not incompatible.
3. In 1976 a Master Plan for Communications for the Campus was developed. Only now are we beginning to implement parts of the Master Plan. Some parts have been lost. Opinions have changed concerning some parts of the plan. A decision has been made to go ahead with a LAN, not a phone switch.
4. The rationale for a LAN are not as detailed as we would like. What should be our next procurement? Is it desirable to have a feasibility study? Four bids were received for the initial development of the LAN. The bid accepted was not the lowest. The vendor with the lowest bid is pursuing legal action against Cal Poly. The first part of our communications system should be installed as soon as this issue has been resolved.
5. Jens Pohl distributed an insufficient number of copies of an information package on AIMS originally prepared for the 11-3-86 meeting of the President's Council. Present plans call for only three campuses (SLO, Long Beach and Los Angeles) to go ahead with the AIMS Project. The projected cost increased. Indeed, the Chancellor's Office itself has proposed a new direction for the System as a whole. At present, the AIMS Project is either dead or seriously wounded.

IV. Consent Agenda: None

V. Business Items

A. Resolution on the Recognition of Deceased Faculty

1. Discussion of this item began prior to the arrival of Charles Andrews (Chair: PPC).
2. Ray Terry noted that the amended resolution permits the designation "Honored Professor" to be bestowed on any deceased faculty member, including one who already was, in fact, a Professor. The intent of the original resolution was to confer the title only on those faculty who had made outstanding contributions to the University, but who had not achieved the rank of Full Professor by the promotion process.

3. Upon his arrival, Charles Andrews addressed this matter. He indicated that his committee had considered the question and preferred the present wording of the Resolution. Referring the Resolution back to the Committee would accomplish nothing. An amendment to place restrictions on eligibility for the designation should be proposed on the floor of the Senate.
4. By consensus, the Executive Committee agreed to move the Resolution forward to a first reading at the next Senate meeting.

B. Trustees' Outstanding Professor Award

1. The Chair recognized Lou Pippin (Chair: Distinguished Teacher Award Committee) who expressed his committee's view that recipients of the Trustees' Outstanding Professor Award were persons of a different ilk than those encountered at Cal Poly. The chances of a person from Cal Poly receiving the Award were slim. We should not participate in the process. Indeed, San Francisco State University does not participate. The Award pays lip service to excellence in teaching, but really honors book writing, committee service, etc.
2. Crissa Hewitt expressed the view that we should submit one or more nominees, but also express our concern about the criteria for receiving the award.
3. Reg Gooden and Ray Terry separately expressed the view that another committee should be in charge of the selection of nominees from this campus. Ray Terry proposed the idea of an Ad Hoc Committee to do the initial selection of nominees for the Award; the DTA Committee would then have to certify the proposed nominees teaching excellence before their names could be submitted to the Trustees.
4. At the Chair's request, Lou Pippin withdrew the item from consideration.

C. Report on Constitution and Bylaws Action

1. The Chair recognized John Rogalla (Chair: C&B) who presented the content of four resolutions prepared by his committee.
2. There was no discussion of Resolution 1.
3. Mike Botwin questioned the wording of item (2) of Resolution 2. It was subsequently changed to read:

"Within 10 school days of the election in which a vacancy exists, forward to the chair of the appropriate caucus all completed nomination forms."

4. Lynne Gamble felt that Resolutions 2 and 3 were of an editorial nature and did not need to go to the floor of the Senate. John Rogalla disagreed. "The Administration is very picky," said Rogalla.
  5. The Executive Committee's attention was directed to an alternate version of Resolution 4 prepared by Nancy Loe.
  6. The Chair called upon John Rogalla and Nancy Loe to resolve the inconsistencies between the two resolutions before the next Senate meeting so that we may have only one Resolution before the Senate concerning the Status of Women Committee.
- D. Request from the Distinguished Teacher Award Committee to Extend the Deadline for Nominations from Dec. 15, 1986 to Jan. 15, 1987.
1. The Chair recognized Lou Fippin who accepted the responsibility for the failure to meet the usual deadline. The alternative would be a decreased number of nominations.
  2. Joe Weatherby proposed extending the deadline further to Feb. 1, 1987.
  3. Reg Gooden was assured that this would be a one-time extension of the deadline.

## VI. Discussion Items

- A. CSU, Sacramento, Report on the August Retreat.

There was no discussion of this item.

- B. Should the topic of admissions policies and quotas be referred to the Student Affairs Committee or to the Long Range Planning Committee?

Mike Stebbins (Chair: Student Affairs) indicated that a couple members of his committee are interested in this matter, but that it is not a high priority item for the committee as a whole.

- C. Should a blue-ribbon committee be formed to look into the need to reorganize the Senate Committee structure?

1. Susan Currier objected to the method of appointing ad hoc committees. She suggested that such

committees be staffed via caucus appointments.

2. The Chair maintained his right to appoint the members of an Ad Hoc Committee without consultation with anyone, but indicated that he would seek advice from the Executive Committee and /or other Officers.

Four different procedures were used in the appointment of the four existing ad hoc committees. Timing and objectives affect the choice of process.

3. Ray Terry indicated that each time the Senate / Executive Committee authorizes the Chair /Officers to create an Ad Hoc Committee, it may specify the method of selection. No one method of choosing members of all ad hoc committees should be attempted.
4. It was agreed that when an ad hoc committee is formed that overlaps the area of responsibility of one or more standing committees, the ad hoc committee should contain a representative from each standing committee affected.

An example of this procedure is found in the formation of the current Ad Hoc Committee on the Effect of Class Size. Five committees are represented with the chair of each committee being the nominating authority.

5. Steve French proposed monitoring the various ad hoc committees that now exist to see how different methods of selection work.
6. Joe Weatherby expressed the view that our Senate has too many committees. The CSU Senate deals with statewide issues effectively with only four committees.
7. The question of whether or not a blue ribbon committee be formed to look into the need to reorganize the Senate committee structure was left unresolved. By default, no action was taken. No one other than the Chair, supported the concept of internal review.

D. Proposed Resolution Requiring Placement of all Standing Committee Resolutions before the Senate

1. Charles Crabb asked why we need an Executive Committee if all standing committee resolutions will be automatically agendaized?

2. Joe Weatherby claimed that the Executive Committee exists to facilitate action on the Senate floor. It should anticipate problems, but not discuss the substance of issues.
3. This item is on the Constitution and Bylaws Committee's agenda for its November 19 meeting.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.