

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - MINUTES

June 4, 1985

FOB 24B

3:00 p.m.

Chair, Lloyd H. Lamouria  
Vice Chair, Lynne Gamble  
Secretary (Acting), Raymond D. Terry

I. Announcements and Discussion

- A. The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. He welcomed the returning members of the Executive Committee, the new members, guests and late arrivals as they entered.
- B. The Chair informed the Executive Committee that Ray Terry had volunteered to serve as Acting Secretary through the Summer Quarter and that his name would be placed in nomination for the position when the Senate convened in the fall. MSP to appoint Raymond D. Terry Acting Secretary (6-4-85 to 10-1-85).
- C. The Chair announced the date and time of the next Executive Committee meeting: Tuesday, June 11, 1985 at 1500.
- D. The Chair requested that the Statewide Senators advise him via Le Anne Barber as to travel needs for FY 1985/86. The Senators responded that their needs were met by the Statewide Office.
- E. The Provost announced the progress of the Search Committee for Dean of the School of Professional Studies and Education. Six candidates for the position have been interviewed. The Search Committee is expected to make its recommendations to the Provost within the next week. Quick action on the Committee's recommendation(s) is expected.

The Provost announced that the search for Vice Provost has begun. More than 120 applications have been received, and more than 20 are from persons within the CSU system.

The Provost announced that the Deans' Council has endorsed (6-3-85) the proposal for the Center for the Arts.

The Provost announced that a new (revised) model for allocated time on campus would be proposed.

- F. A prolonged discussion of assigned time ensued. The following points were made:
  - 1) Faculty assigned time is generated by the mode and level process.
  - 2) Time is withheld for emergency illness only.
  - 3) Positions may be released mid-year if faculty are unusually healthy.
  - 4) All positions were allocated this year.
- G. The Chair announced that the five goals promulgated by the President and Provost will be a business item for the June 11 Executive Committee meeting. Specifically, how should the Senate react to the concerns recently voiced, and cooperate in achieving mutual goals.

June 4, 1985

## II. Business Items

- A. Leon Maksoudian was nominated to be the faculty representative on the Board of Directors of the Cal Poly Alumni Association. The nomination was unanimously approved by the Committee. Maksoudian, whose name was initially suggested by Roxy Peck, will fill the seat left vacant by the death of Sandra Crabtree.
- B. Lynne Gamble requested that action on the Resolution on Augmented Funds for CARE Grants be deferred until her committee had received feedback from the President. The topic will become an agenda item for next week or next fall.
- C. Mike Hanson presented a draft of the Fairness Board Description and Procedures document. He outlined the major changes in the document: 1) There are presently 2 students on the Board. The revised document would increase student representation to 3 students; 2) Faculty membership on the Board is presently restricted to tenured faculty members. The revised document would not require faculty on the Board to be tenured; 3) A catch-all rule (Item C, page 2, of the draft document) to justify ad hoc procedures.

A discussion of the merits and procedures of the Fairness Board developed. The following points were made: 1) Neither the strictness of grading nor the method of grading is grounds for a grade change; 2) The Fairness Board does not have the authority to change a grade. It may recommend a grade change to the Provost. The President could overturn the Provost's decision.

The Provost related an example of a case which showed the usefulness of the Fairness Board in overturning unjust grading procedures. Al Cooper related an incident in which the Fairness Board's action was inappropriate (several years ago).

The following open questions were posed: 1) If a Master's thesis is rejected by a student's committee, can this action be grieved by the student via the Fairness Board? 2) In a course with a lab period, why does the lecture instructor sign the final grade sheet? Shouldn't the lab instructor give the lab grade and the lecturer give the lecture grade? 3) Should a faculty advisor advise students on matters other than academic problems?

The Chair directed that Mike Hanson: 1) consult with John Rogalla (Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee; and 2) submit the revised draft of the Fairness Board Description and Procedures document to the Student Affairs Committee (Bill Forgeng, Chair). If approved by this committee, it is expected that the request will be placed in formal format and reflect cooperative deliberation with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (John Rogalla, Chair) as well as clarify CAM considerations.

- D. The tentative meeting schedule for the Academic Senate and the Executive Committee for 1985-1986 was discussed. The early first meeting of the Senate in the fall (October 1) was noted. It was argued that this date was necessary in order for the Senate to act on the adoption of the Bylaws which would constitute the UPLC as a Senate committee and to approve the criteria and procedures of the UPLC for the 1985-86 professional leave requests.

The 1985-1986 tentative meeting outline includes one extra meeting.

- E. The Chair consulted with the School and PCS Caucus Chairs to receive their recommendations for appointment to Senate Standing Committees and nominations to universitywide committees. Caucus Chairs were encouraged to solicit volunteers for the remaining vacancies. With regard to the Energy Conservation Committee, the Provost suggested that volunteers be sought from among members of the Renewable Energy Institute.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

M E M O

To: Caucus Chairs of the Academic Senate

Date: June 10, 1985

NAME	SCHOOL	DEPARTMENT	ROOM	PHONES	
				OFFICE	DEPT
Ahern, James	SAGR	Ag Mgmt	Ag 247	2586	1457
Bonds, Robert	PCS	LAC	Chase 103	1256	1256
Botwin, Michael	SAED	Arch Engr	EW 109B	1333	1314
Cooper, Alan	SOSAM	Bio Sci	Sci N 220	2557	2789
Hallman, Barbara	CA&H	History	FOB 25L	2963	2543
Riener, Kenneth	SBUS	Business	BA&E 111	2010	2822
Tandon, Shyama	SOE	EL/EE	EE 132C	2907	2781
(OPEN )	SPSE				

Copies: Exec Com (other)

From: Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair  
Academic Senate

Subject: Caucus Chairs

When you and I sit in Executive Committee session, we count a total of 17 members. The question arises, who are the most important contributors on our Committee? To whom shall we most often turn for inputs, for guidance, for validation?

Without question, you, the Caucus Chair are the most effective contributor, the most important person on our Committee! You exemplify the best of the inputs coming to the Committee because of the pyramid effect. When you purposefully make yourself available to the body which elected you, and when you stimulate their responses, the quality of your decisions are exponentially enhanced.

How can you capitalize on your leadership role as Caucus Chair? Only you know the answer since each caucus chair may interact differently with his/her constituency, but with equal effectiveness. Here are some questions bearing on your effectiveness as Caucus Chair:

- is there need for a caucus, or is it an unnecessary carry over from times past.
- should you schedule caucus meetings on a regular basis, with notice in writing, and follow-up by a phone call.
- should your caucus search each agenda, both Executive Committee and Senate, for not only the obvious, but for the sleeper in the woodpile which can catch you unprepared.
- should you and your caucus colleagues argue both sides of a controversial question.
- should your caucus attempt to achieve consensus.

- assuming caucus consensus prior to floor debate, how can you change plans during debate if your members are widely separated (physically), and new information justifies a switch in signals.
- can some of the friendly and not so friendly amendments be anticipated during in-caucus debating of both sides of a question.
- should you continually be asking yourself and your caucus colleagues "what if" questions.
- should you and your co-senators interface with your constituency.
- should your interfacing include availability, openness, solicitation, and feedback from you to your constituents following subsequent action.
- is it necessary to develop mechanisms to ensure two way communications between your caucus and constituents.

By your willingness to serve on the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, you demonstrate an enviable uniqueness and capability necessary for collegial governance. I cannot tell you what makes for a proud and successful caucus. That is one which you will work out for yourself. May I leave you with one final thought? You as individuals (and I do mean individuals) represent the finest All-Star players on any campus. However, can you expect even All-Star players to win if they each go their own way and maintain that the huddle is unnecessary?

Congratulations on your election as Caucus Chair. Welcome aboard the 1985/86 Executive Committee. You are indeed a most important person!