

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California  
ACADEMIC SENATE

ACADEMIC SENATE - MINUTES  
Tuesday: April 14, 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 3:10 p.m. upon obtaining a quorum.
- B. The minutes of the March 10, 1987 Academic Senate meeting were approved as mailed.
- C. The Chair called the Senate's attention to Items II.A and II.B.

II. Communications: Cf. pp. B-18.

III. Reports

- A. President's Office: None
- B. Academic Affairs Office

Malcolm Wilson announced that the School of Business has just received full accreditation.

- C. Statewide Senators: None
- D. Elections Committee

Lane Page (Chair: Elections Committee) announced the receipt of nominations for the Senate, C.S.U. Senate and UPLC vacancies. Voting will take place during the week of April 20. The ballots will be counted in LIB 301 on April 24, 1987 at 1:00 p.m..

An insufficient number of nominees were received for the Senate and UPLC from a number of schools. Additional nominees are being sought for one-year appointments by the Executive Committee based upon recommendations from individual caucuses.

Nominations for the Academic Senate offices of Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary are now being solicited. Nominations are due to the Academic Senate Office by May 5.

IV. Consent Agenda: Resolution on Attendance at Conventions, Conferences, or Similar Meetings (First Reading)

There was no discussion of this item. It will automatically advance to Second Reading status at the April 28, 1987 Academic Senate meeting.

V. Business Items

A. GE&B Report

1. The Chair recognized George Lewis (Chair: GE&B) who presented his committee's report.
2. Proposed revision of Area B (pp. 32-34 of the agenda package)

George Lewis portrayed the recommendations of the GE&B Subcommittee for Area B as clean-up work, needed to make B1(a) and B1(b) consistent with each other. The suggested changes were submitted to all affected departments last fall. No objections were voiced at that time.

3. GE&B Proposals for ART 101, 108, 112; FR 233, GER 233, SPAN 233, DANC 321 and STAT 321X
  - a. The proposals were presented at length and in reverse order from that given in the agenda package.
  - b. Upon questioning by Diane Michelfelder (Philosophy), George Lewis corrected some typographical errors on the GE&B Proposal forms for FR 233, GER 233 and SPAN 233. All references should be to area C1 on pp. 26, 27 and 28.
  - c. George Lewis corrected an error in the reporting of the GE&B Committee vote on ART 101 (page 20 of the agenda package). The vote should have been reported as: 6-3, not 9-0.
  - d. Reg Spoden wanted to know if ART 101 has recently come into compliance with the guidelines for Area C? Or have the guidelines themselves been changed?
  - e. George Lewis contended that the GE&B Committee vote is subject to the changing membership of the committee. The issue could have been resolved either way each year it was considered.
  - f. The GE&B Report will advance to a Second

Reading status at the April 27 Senate meeting.

- B. Resolution on the Fairness Board Description and Procedures.
1. The Chair recognized Dave Ciano (a member of the Fairness Board) to present the Resolution in the absence of George Beardsley.
  2. The major changes that the proposed resolution would effect are:
    - a. Faculty members would no longer have to be tenured.
    - b. Before a student's case could be taken up by the Fairness Board, the student would have had to try to resolve the matter at the Instructor level and the Department Head level, but not at the Dean level.
    - c. The number of (voting) student representatives on the Fairness Board would be increased from one to three.
  3. Upon questioning by Charles Andrews, it was established that there is still no deadline by which a student must complain to the Fairness Board or lose the opportunity to do so.
    - a. Dave Ciano provided a number of reasons why the committee wanted to leave the complaint period open-ended, but said that he would ask the members again.
    - b. Mike Stebbins indicated that the matter had been brought before the Fairness Board during the debate over the Resolution on Retention of Exams and Student Access to the Same. The committee was firm in its decision not to impose a time limit on student complaints.
    - c. Charles Andrews urged the committee to make his suggested change. If not, he would propose a resolution at the next Senate meeting to impose a limit.
  4. Hypothetical examples were posed where the number of student representatives could conceivably equal or exceed the number of faculty members on the Fairness Board.
  5. Pamela Miller expressed the view that based on a study of Fairness Boards across the country,



to the winter quarter of each year when certain faculty members show the last vestiges of their creativity by their justifications for nominating themselves for an MPPP award.

4. Tim Kersten assured the Senate that the CSU Senate was working hard to fund a PCP for Faculty Development.
5. Mike Stebbins expressed some dissatisfaction with the second whereas clause of the Resolution.
6. The Chair announced that the Executive Committee will continue the discussion of the Resolution on April 21, 1987. The Resolution will return to the full Senate on April 28, 1987 for a Second Reading.

VI. Discussion Items: None

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m..