

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93401
ACADEMIC SENATE

Executive Committee Agenda
November 26, 1985
Faculty Office Bldg. 24B, 1500-1700

<u>MEMBER:</u>	<u>DEPT:</u>	<u>MEMBER:</u>	<u>DEPT:</u>
Ahern, James	Ag Mgmt	Gay, Larry W.	IT
Bonds, Robert	LAC	Gooden, Reg. H. Jr.	Political Sci
Botwin, Michael	Arch Engr	Kersten, Timothy	Economics
Cooper, Alan F.	Biology	Lamouria, Lloyd H.	Ag Engr.
Currier, Susan	English	Olsen, Barton	History
Fort, Tomlinson Jr.	Admin	Riener, Kenneth	Bus Admin
Gamble, Lynne E.	Library	Tandon, Shyama	EL/EE
		Terry, Raymond	Mathematics

Copies :

Baker, Warren
Pohl, Jens
Vix, Marlin
Lewis, George
Labhard, Lezlie

I. Minutes: Approval of the November 12, 1985, Executive Committee Minutes

*(Pg 2-4)
removed*

II. Announcements:

- A. Interim Vice Provost is Wally Mark
- B. Resolution for Senate Assigned Time Update-Lamouria
- C. Lottery Funds Update-Lamouria
- D. Recommendation on Contents of Official Personnel Folder-Lamouria
- E. Review of Membership of Cabinet Sub Committees - Lamouria
- F. Administration's Response to Statement on Collegiality-Lamouria

(Pg 5-6)

(Pg 7-8)

III. Reports

- A. President/Provost
- B. Statewide Senators - Asilomar Conference
- C. State of Women-Conference

IV. Business Items:

- A. Resolution for Removal of Ceiling on Instructional Computer Equipment-Pohl (Pg 9)
(Chair, Budget Committee)
- B. Parking Change Recommendations-Vix (Chair, Ad Hoc Com. on Parking) (Pg 10-12)
- C. GE & B-Lewis (Chair, GE & B) (Pg 13-14)

V. Discussion Items:

- A. Parliamentary Procedures - Ahern (Chair, Ag. Caucus)

VI. Adjournment

State of California

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California 93407**M e m o r a n d u m****To :** Tomlinson Fort
Provost**Date:** November 4, 1985**Copies:** Warren Baker
Charles Andrews
Lynne Gamble**From :** Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate**Subject:** Grievance Settlement Recommendations
Charles Andrews to Lloyd H. Lamouria**Date:** 25 October 1985

This memo is in confirmation of my telephone conversation with Bonnie on 1 November 1985.

Normal processing of the recommendations would be from my office to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and finally to the floor of the Senate. In view of the fact that the RPT process has begun, it is best that for 1985/1986 that the process be shortened.

Please be advised that Vice Chairperson Lynne E. Gamble and I support the recommendations contained in Andrews memo of 25 October 1985. (I was unable to contact Secretary Ray Terry at the time of writing this memo.) Hopefully the Dean's Council will favorably receive these and thereby further improve the RPT process.

Thank you for your inquiry.

State of California

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Memorandum

RECEIVED

: Lloyd Lamouria
Chair, Academic Senate

1985

Date : October 25, 1985

File No.: DDH1016

Academic Senate

Copies : Warren Baker
Tomlinson Fort, Jr.
Mike Suess
PPC Committee
MembersFrom : Personnel Policies Committee
Academic Senate
Charles Andrews, Chairman

Subject : Grievance Settlement

At the request of the Deans' Council, the Personnel Policies Committee reviewed the wording of the Grievance Settlement and agreed on this interpretation:

1. All evaluative statements shall be signed.
2. If ballots are used, such ballots shall include only a statement of the question, and "yes," "no," or "abstain."
3. Ballots may be signed, dependent upon departmental policy.
4. The statement of evaluation and/or recommendation is not a ballot -- even though it may be signed by all evaluating faculty. When ballots are used, a tally of the vote shall be reported.
5. It is strongly recommended that departmental peer review committees use Form 109.
6. Statements generated by the committee as a whole shall be signed by the chair of the committee and all committee members.
7. All items used in a report are to be supported by a statement signed by an individual committee member.

The committee voted on October 24 to approve this interpretation and forward it to the Chair of the Academic Senate for further disposition.

State of California

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407**Memorandum**

To : Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate

Date : November 19, 1985

File No.:

Copies : Warren Baker

RECEIVED

NOV 21 1985

From : Tomlinson Fort, Jr.
Provost

Subject: Trustees Statement on Collegiality

Academic Senate

Thank you for your memorandum of October 31, 1985. Upon receiving it, I reviewed again the Trustees Statement on Collegiality and have also discussed its appropriate implementation on our campus with the President. I certainly concur with the statement as written and with the general principle that governance of the University should be shared among the faculty and the administration.

With this statement made, I believe that, depending on the subject of concern, the roles of administration and faculty are different. As an example, curriculum development and planning should (generally) be done by the faculty. Faculty have expertise which comes from years of study and continuing involvement in a given subject. The administration does not have this background. You will recall that I recently sent to you a great deal of material relating to electives in the curriculum and asked for the advice and counsel of the Academic Senate. I did not request that a joint Senate/Administration committee be set up to make this review. The role of the Administration will be to take recommendations of the faculty committee and Academic Senate and determine whether they can be implemented.

Fiscal and budget issues are different from curricular concerns in that the expertise in these areas resides in administrative staff people who work with University resources on a day-to-day basis. For this reason, and because of the judgement and efficiency which derives therefrom, President Baker and I agree that production of models for resource allocation should begin with the administration. Advice and counsel of faculty representatives will of course be sought. There is not any secret about the resource allocation process, and early participation of a faculty representative from the Academic Senate Budget Committee on any committees established to review resource allocation methodology is desirable.

We expect as a routine process to consult with the Academic Senate before making major decisions about resource allocation prior to formula distribution. I am sure you appreciate that the magnitude of the resource allocated should be a factor in determining the extent of the consultation. In general, we would expect consultation on these matters to occur routinely through the administrative representatives on the Academic Senate Budget Committee.

State of California

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California 93407**M e m o r a n d u m****To :** Tomlinson Fort
Provost**Date :** October 31, 1985**Copies :** Warren Baker
Jens Pohl**From :** Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate**Subject:** Trustees Statement on Collegiality
Example: Operating Expense and Allocation Model Review

We have just completed an agreement that relative to O/E Review, we would use two Academic Senate nominees working with three administrators. This working agreement is limited to the O/E Review and thereby does not include Technical/Clerical/Student Assistant. As you know, it is my recommendation that we use the duly constituted Academic Senate Budget Committee for input to the budgetary process. I respect your reservations that the full Budget Committee would be unwieldy and that expertise may be lacking. You mention that it would take time for the Budget Committee to come up to speed. This is true. However, when we look at Senate participation over the long haul, the concept of the learning curve diminishes in importance. With respect to an unwieldy group size, I expect that the Budget Committee chair would use a sub-committee. Administrative continuity (Landreth, Lebens, Ramirez) on the Senate Budget Committee has been excellent. These three men are primary resource persons in Administration and they are voting members of the Academic Senate Budget Committee. Truly the Senate Budget Committee is representative.

For matters directly bearing on resource allocations intra faculty and Consultative Services, it is my recommendation that we use the Budget Committee of the Academic Senate as the working body.

For matters indirectly bearing on resource allocations, e.g. "management decisions" which precede the division of resources, it is my recommendation that the Academic Senate be represented as part of the shared decision making process.

Both of the above recommendations are in full conformity with reason, courtesy, and the Trustees Statement on Collegiality.

In the event that you find it difficult to provide the degree of consultation outlined above, please let me know so that we retain effective, up-front communication.

State of California

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Memorandum

To : Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate

Date : November 14, 1985

File No.:

Copies :

From : Jens Pohl, Chair
Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject : Proposed Academic Senate Resolution

Please find attached recommendations from the Budget Committee for a possible Academic Senate resolution.

The proposed resolution addresses an apparently arbitrarily imposed \$200,000 limit per CSU campus per year on computer equipment expenditures, from the Instructional Equipment Replacement (IER) allocation. This limit has a particularly negative impact on the Cal Poly campus where obsolete equipment is more likely to be replaced by new computer-based equipment in our many technical degree programs.

Thank you.

Attachment

PROPOSED ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION

BACKGROUND

Historically, budgeting practices by the Chancellor's Office have restricted total computer equipment expenditures to \$200,000 per CSU campus per year, from the Instructional Equipment Replacement (IER) allocation, regardless of the amount of the IER allocation to the campus (see Attachment B, p.2, August 27, 1985, Instructional Replacement Allocation Memo).

WHEREAS, Existing faculty and students must have adequate opportunities to develop, refine and exercise computer information processing skills; and

WHEREAS, A significant amount of existing instructional and classroom/laboratory computer hardware is inadequate to meet the challenges of computer technology; and

WHEREAS, An increasing proportion of replacement equipment is computer-based; and

WHEREAS, An artificial ceiling has been imposed upon CAL POLY and other campuses within the CSU system as to the replacement of obsolete and inappropriate instructional computer equipment; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate requests that the Chancellor's Office remove the ceiling on replacement of instructional computer equipment within the IER allocation.

Nov. 12, 1988

To: Academic Senate
 Lloyd Lamouria, Chair

From: Ad Hoc Parking Committee

Regarding: Parking Change Recommendations

The committee recommends the following:

1. Increase the number of spaces allocated in lot H-2 for faculty and staff from 49 to 150-200.

Justification: Lot H-3 (the lot to the south of the Food Processing building) will become the site of the Agriculture classroom, laboratory and office complex. It is anticipated that this lot will be lost due to construction by as early as the beginning of the winter quarter. The faculty and staff will lose 62 critical parking spaces. (Although we have focused on this particular lot, every time construction begins on a new building, it seems a parking lot is lost.)

2. Increase the number of city buses servicing the campus at critical hours.

(It appears that this problem is being remedied.)

3. Increase patrolling of the parking lots.

Justification: The number of people patrolling the parking lots has not been adequate to insure that students are not parking in faculty and staff spaces. (Last year there were three people on scooters. I was informed by Richard Brug, Director of Public Safety, that six students have been added to the staff this year. Mr. Brug informs me that the student patrolmen have been very effective in reducing the number of illegally parked cars.)

4. Increase the fines and revise the method of collecting fines.

Justification: The present fine does not appear to be a deterrent to parking illegally. If the fine were substantially increased, parking violations should be reduced. Likewise, it is suggested that the method of contesting parking violations be revised. Currently, fines are either paid on campus or challenged in Municipal Court. It is the committee's feeling that the court recognizes the parking problem on campus and throws out many of the cases it reviews. The failure to pay a parking fine should be considered as serious a problem as the failure to pay a library fine. If the University could develop its own review procedure

(possibly a student/faculty review panel that met weekly for an hour or two to handle "walk-in" challenges to the tickets students or faculty/staff receive) then there would be better control of the parking problem.

5. Evaluate the basis for and use of the parking permit over-sell ratio.

Justification: Currently the over-sell ratio (the number of permits sold divided by the number of spaces allocated) is essentially the same for students as it is for faculty and staff. Is there a reasonable basis for this parity when faculty/staff are more likely to be on campus for 8 hour periods and students are here for far fewer hours per day? If this assertion is true,

more spaces should be allocated to the faculty and staff. It is suggested that the use of this ratio be examined more carefully by the Parking and Traffic Subcommittee of the Public Health and Safety Committee.

6. Develop a reasonable method by which visitors to the campus can acquire a visitor parking permit.

Justification: Currently the method of obtaining a visitor permit requires that the visitor run the risk of getting a parking citation while they are trying to get a permit. This is inefficient and breeds ill-will.

What do you want us to do next?

I have enclosed a copy of a memo I wrote to Doug Gerard requesting that many of the points mentioned above be included on the agenda of the Traffic and Parking Subcommittee meeting to be held on Nov. 20. Hopefully, these topics will be included.

Also, an interesting bit of information for your consideration. Peter Phillips, the Architecture Coordinator (I think this is his title) periodically conducts what is called a Vacancy Parking Rate Count and his most recent study disclosed the following:

1. On a Wednesday at 10:00 a.m. there were 339 parking spaces vacant. This represents 7.6% of the total spaces available on campus.
2. On a Thursday of the same week at 2:00 p.m. there were 794 parking spaces vacant. This represents 17.7% of the total spaces available on campus.

(I think the inference is that there is no parking problem at Cal Poly.)

Nov. 8, 1985

To: Doug Gerard, Executive Dean

From: Marlin Vix

Regarding: Traffic and Parking Subcommittee Meeting

I have a few topics that may be appropriate for discussion at the Nov. 20 meeting.

1. Are there ways we could improve the method by which visitors to the campus acquire visitor parking passes?
2. Once lot H-3 is closed due to construction of the new Agriculture building, what immediate plans are there to offset the loss of 62 parking spaces for the faculty and staff?
3. Has the parking problem for part-time voluntary staff (M.D.'s) in lot C-7 been resolved?
4. Could we discuss the basis for and use of the parking permit over-sell ratio? Can this ratio be used as a planning tool or is it merely an after-the-fact calculation? Is there a basis to have the over-sell ratios virtually the same for faculty/staff as for students?
5. Could we have a general discussion of the current guidelines given to the police relative to the issuance of parking tickets, i.e., their priority of lots patrolled, number of tickets issued daily, etc. Also, what is the percentage of tickets that are contested in Municipal Court and what is the policy of the University if students do not pay parking fines?
6. Are we going to discuss the Student Senate resolution regarding the reevaluation of the bus schedule? It seems to be fairly sensible.

Thank you for considering these possible agenda items.

State of California

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California 93407**Memorandum****To :** Executive Committee**Date:** November 20, 1985**Copies:****From :** George Lewis, Chair
GE & B Committee**Subject :** Catalog Recommendations

The GE & B Committee has completed business on the items carried over from 1984-1985. Our recommendations are attached.

I will be happy to discuss the details of our recommendations with any interested Senator or Executive Committee Member.

- I. The Committee recommends retention of the following courses in the General Education and Breadth requirements. The changes in the courses for the 1986-1988 catalog are perceived as routine.

1. TH 220	[number]	C.2.
2. FR 101, 102, 103	[description]	C.3.
3. FR 201, 202, 203	[description & mode]	C.3.
4. FR 305	[units]	C.3.
5. GER 201, 202, 203	[description & mode]	C.3.
6. GER 405	[description]	C.3.
7. MU 404, 405, 406	[may be repeated]	C.3.
8. SPAN 101, 102, 103	[description]	C.3.
9. SPAN 201, 202, 203	[description & mode]	C.3.
10. SPAN 405	[title & description]	C.3.
11. TH 327, 328	[description]	C.3.
12. DFA/HE 210	[description]	E.2.
13. PSY 304	[title & description]	E.2.
14. DPT 230	[description]	F.2.
15. SS 121	[description]	F.2.

II. The committee recommends as indicated on the following courses proposed for inclusion in the General Education and Breadth requirements:

			<u>Subcommittee Recommendation</u>	<u>GE & B Comm. Recommendation</u>
1.	HUM 301X.	The Renaissance in Italy.	C.3. against	against
2.	HUM. 305X.	Latin American Culture.	C.3. for	for
3.	ART 208.	Sculpture.	C.2. against	against
4.	NRM 101.	Natural Resources of America.	F.2. for	for
5.	AE 340.	Irrigation Water Management.	F.2. for	against ¹⁾
6.	FOR 201.	Forest Resources.	F.2. for	against ²⁾
7.	NRM 201.	Environmental Management.	F.2. for	for
8.	GEOL 202X.	Earth History.	B.1.a. for	for
9.	AE 121, 124, 131, 134, 141, 142, 231, 315, 321, 335, 337		F.2. against	against
10.	ENGL 362.	Myth and Symbol in Literature for Youth.	C.3. against	against
11.	HUM 302.	Human Values in Agriculture.	C.3. not ready to recommend	likewise ³⁾
12.	EL 339.	Electrical Engineering: Its Development and Impact on Our Society and Culture	F.2. against	against

* * * * *

¹⁾ SS 121 is a prerequisite, and is already in F.2.

²⁾ GE & B failed to approve by a 5-5 tie vote.

³⁾ Area C subcommittee has not had sufficient time to consider. GE & B Committee concurs.