

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California  
ACADEMIC SENATE

ACADEMIC SENATE - MINUTES  
Tuesday: April 28, 1987  
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 3:13 p.m. upon obtaining a quorum.
- B. The minutes of the April 14, 1987 meeting of the Academic Senate were approved as mailed.

II. Communications: Cf the agenda package for April 14, 1987.

III. Reports: None

IV. Consent Agenda: Resolution on Attendance at Conventions, Conferences, or Similar Meetings

The Resolution was adopted by consensus.

V. Business Items

A. GE&B Proposals for ART 101, 108, 112; FR 233, GER 233, SPAN 233; DANC 321; STAT 130X, and Proposed Revision of Area B.

- 1. The Chair recognized George Lewis (Chair: GE&B) who moved the GE&B Report to the floor and initiated a brief discussion of them.
- 2. M /S (Lewis /Murphy) to adopt the proposals en masse.
- 3. The GE&B proposals were adopted unanimously.

B. Resolution on Fairness Board Description and Procedures (Second Reading)

- 1. M /S (Stebbins /Ciano) to adopt the Resolution.
- 2. Charles Andrews expressed grave reservation about granting to the VPAA power to change a student's grade. He contended that the University does not have the authority to change a grade assigned by an instructor. Accordingly, he moved to amend the Resolution by changing the word "decision" in A.13 to "recommendation."

3. Speaking against the amendment were: George Beardsley, Mike Stebbins, Paul Murphy, and others.
4. Speaking in favor of the amendment were: Al Cooper, Lynne Gamble.
5. The Andrews Amendment carried on a voice vote.
6. Dave Ciano called for a division of the house. A show of hands confirmed the Chair's ruling:

Yes: 19, No: 18

7. The amended resolution was adopted on a voice vote. Again, Dave Ciano called for a division of the house. Again, a show of hands confirmed the Chair's ruling:

Yes: 17, No: 15

- C. Resolution on Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards (amended between first and second readings)
  1. The Chair recognized Ray Terry who attributed the amended status of the Resolution to Reg Gooden. He argued that MPPP funding should be discontinued even if the money is not reallocated to professional development.
  2. Bill Horton spoke in opposition to the Resolution. He contended that the MPPP Awards do reward people appropriately; if MPPP funding were discontinued, the money would be lost; hence, the Resolution would be a counter-productive measure.
  3. Charles Andrews, while supporting the Resolution, felt that the MPPP awards will continue to exist after the new Unit 3 contract settlement is reached.
  4. Bob Lucas surmised that passage of the Resolution would emphasize the faculty's support of funding professional development and would have significant impact on the Legislature.
  5. The motion passed on a voice vote.
- D. Catalog Changes for 1988-1990 (First Reading)
  1. The Chair recognized Charles Dana who outlined the actions taken by the Curriculum Committee.
  2. Bill Forgeng drew attention to a minority report

objecting to the Curriculum Committee's disapproval of the reinstatement of ENVE 435 in the Civil Engineering curriculum (despite the approval of the Department faculty and the SENG Curriculum Committee) and to its recommendation that CE 487 be dropped from the curriculum.

3. Sam Vigil spoke in support of the minority report.
4. Bill Horton yielded the floor to Jim Harris (Head: EL/EE) who spoke concerning two issues: the change in graduate courses from 3 credits to four credits and the necessity for block scheduling of certain EE/EL courses in the junior year.
5. Despite the excellent quality of the presentation, a number of senators expressed complete confusion. Included in this group were George Lewis, Mike Botwin and Jim Vilkitis.
6. Bill Forgeng urged Jim Harris to prepare a written report defending his proposal for block scheduling and Charles Dana to prepare a written report why the Curriculum Committee opposes the proposal. Tom Rice echoed this sentiment.
7. Mike Botwin asked if the students had been polled concerning the issue of block scheduling. Jim Harris indicated that the students would have divided opinions. Mike Botwin equated block scheduling to forcing the students to take a single 12 unit course.
8. The SOSAM proposals were considered next. Only one proposal (Math 099) was disapproved by the Curriculum Committee.
9. Paul Murphy informed the Senate that a memo in support of Math 099 would be forthcoming. He emphasized that this course was not the ELM Remedial Course taught by Cuesta College, but would be at the level of the present Math 114 (soon to be deleted from the Mathematics curriculum).
10. The 1988-1990 curriculum proposals from SENG and SOSAM will advance to Second Reading status at the next Senate meeting.

E. Resolution on Cooperative Education (First Reading)

1. The Chair recognized Charles Dana who indicated that the Curriculum Committee was satisfied that the procedures to be used would be adequate to consider the courses regular University courses.

Grades will be assigned by full-time faculty.

2. Pat Howard spoke concerning the present administration of Co-op Ed. Fred Abitia spoke in favor of the Resolution as a means of generating more credit and hence funding for Co-op programs.
  3. Questions were raised concerning the qualifications of Co-op faculty, the titles they would have, etc.
  4. Bill Horton reminded the Senate that action on this Resolution had been tabled until the Ad Hoc Committee on Experiential Education should make its report.
  5. The Chair indicated that a preliminary report had been received from the Ad Hoc Committee and that this item will be held until we have the Ad Hoc Committee's final report.
- F. Resolution on Goals and Objectives (First Reading)
1. The Chair recognized Steve French who spoke about the need for for a goals statement that would be more specific than the Mission Statement.
  2. The role of the University Academic Planning Committee was discussed. Susan Currier, a member of that committee for four years, shared some insightful comments.
  3. George Lewis reminded the Senate that tremendous hours of work were expended by faculty who served on the University Reorganization Committee several years ago. However, the Committee's recommendations were largely disregarded.
  4. Pamela Miller argued against embarking on another divisive study unless the recommendations of the new committee will be effected.
  5. Tal Scriven argued against initiating a study of goals and objectives. Paul Murphy asserted that our one unifying goal as faculty is the establishment and maintenance of an excellent curriculum.
  6. The Resolution will advance to Second Reading status at the next Senate meeting.
- G. Resolution to Ensure Confidentiality in the Consideration of Candidates for an Honorary Doctorate (First Reading).
1. The Chair spoke about the need for this resolution.

RECEIVED

APR 1 1968

There was no discussion.

APR 1 1968

2. M /S (Andrews /Cooper): That the Resolution be advanced to Second Reading status. There was no opposition.
3. M /S (Andrews /Terry): That the Resolution be adopted.
4. Discussion commenced. The need for faculty input was emphasized by several senators.
5. Charles Andrews proposed tabling the Resolution until such time as procedures for faculty input are available. This suggestion was accepted by consensus.

VI. Discussion Items: None

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.