

-2-

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California
ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - MINUTES
Tuesday: February 3, 1987
UU 220 3:00 p.m.

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

I. Call To Order

- A. The meeting was called to order at 3:12 upon obtaining a quorum and upon the arrival of the Secretary.
- B. The minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of January 20, 1987 were approved as mailed.
- C. Reg Gooden informed the Executive Committee that the Cal Poly Foundation was co-sponsoring a series of lectures on South Africa.

II. Communications: None

III. Reports

- A. President: No report
- B. Academic Affairs Office
 - 1. The Chair recognized Malcolm Wilson who made a brief report on the budget situation.
 - 2. Malcolm Wilson explained the content of pp. 11-12 of the agenda package. He noted, in addition, that the number of faculty positions held in reserve had been reduced from 2.25 to 0.99!
- C. Statewide Senators: No reports

IV. Consent Agenda: None

V. Business Items

- A. The Chair called the Executive Committee's attention to a memo from President Baker tentatively approving AS-

238-B7/CBC. In his memo President Baker called attention to the fact that the Women's Council of the State University is not an officially recognized organization of the CSU. Cf. p. 6 of the agenda package.

- B. The issue was thus raised: Does the Academic Senate wish to include within its specified membership of Academic Senate committees representatives of organizations that are not an official part of CSU?
- C. By consensus, the Chair was authorized to respond to President Baker and to indicate that the Senate wishes to proceed as indicated.

VI. Discussion Items

- A. What is the role of the Academic Senate with respect to graduate studies?
 - 1. The Chair recognized Bob Lucas who answered some questions concerning graduate studies.
 - 2. Reg Gooden felt that it is inappropriate for those departments that don't have graduate programs to be involved in making policy for those that do.
 - 3. Susan Currier wanted to know why, in some instances, a standing committee of the Academic Senate speaks for the faculty and in other instances, a university-wide committee is the official spokesman.
 - 4. It was established that there is no consistent use of consultative bodies.
 - 5. The Chair asserted that the Academic Senate representative to a University-wide committee has the right to contribute to discussions of the committee and the responsibility to alert the Senate as to what is on the committee's agenda.
 - 6. The Chair favored a hierarchy of review with two committees in agreement on an issue before it goes to the Deans' Council.
 - 7. Charles Dana asked for some clarification concerning the role of the Graduate Studies Committee.
 - 8. By consensus it was agreed that the Chair will contact Academic Senate representatives to University-wide committees concerning their reporting requirements.

- B. What is the distinction between the titles: part-time lecturer vs graduate assistant?
1. The Chair directed the Executive Committee's attention to pp. 7-10 of the agenda package in which it was established that the title "lecturer" confers upon the bearer "full responsibility for a class," whereas the title "graduate assistant" implies that the bearer is in some way under supervision.
 2. Saunny Dills provided some anecdotal information concerning her duties as a graduate assistant elsewhere.
 3. Al Cooper demanded to know why we were discussing this issue.
- C. Should the appointed senator position (representing the part-time faculty) be changed to a voting position?
1. Saunny Dills spoke in favor of the change.
 2. Reg Gooden linked the issue with that of Department Head representation in the Senate. He argued that having a vote will not result in more serious participation. Nor is it likely that the part-time faculty representative will be a tie-breaker for some important issue. Changing the position from non-voting to voting is simply a gesture.
 3. The Chair recognized John Rogalla who informed the Executive Committee that a constitutional plebiscite would be required to effect the change.
 4. Susan Currier argued that Department Heads and students have other bodies on campus in which they are represented, whereas the part-time faculty are not represented elsewhere.
 5. M /S (Kersten /others) to refer the issue to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (without instructions).
 6. Ray Terry argued in favor of requiring the C&B Committee to prepare a set of parallel resolutions, one for each way mentioned of enfranchising the part-time faculty: (1) one part-time representative elected by the part-time faculty across the campus; (2) one part-time representative per school elected by the part-time faculty of that school; (3) one part-time representative appointed by the Senate.
 7. Susan Currier opposed this idea. "We should not burden the part-timers with committee work."

B. The motion to refer was passed on a voice vote.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m..