

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California  
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Tuesday, February 14, 1989  
UU 220 3:00 p.m.

I. Preparatory:

A. The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

II. Communications: none.

III. Reports: none.

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

V. Business Items: none.

VI. Discussion Items:

A. Ad Hoc Review Committee's Report on Academic Senate Structure

The chair reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Senate Structure had been established by the former Senate chair, Charles Crabb. The report sets some goals and makes some proposed changes. A number of the Ad Hoc Committee members were present at the Executive Committee meeting.

A summary of the discussion follows:

1. Malcolm Wilson inquired about the references to staff support to be provided by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Office. He indicated that he did not have a staff person available to support Senate committees. Mike Stebbins replied that the type of support intended was not clerical support, but rather someone who could provide data and interpretation of data, as needed by the committee. Murphy asked who did provide clerical support to Senate Committees. Andrews responded that it was sometimes the committee chair or the chair's department and sometimes the Senate office.
2. Burgunder requested information on the subcommittee structure proposed. Specifically, he asked why subcommittees rather than separate committees were used. Sharp responded that the subcommittees would report to the committees, not directly to the Senate. Subcommittees were not formed solely from members of the main committee primarily because of the workload problem.
3. Moustafa requested information on the function of the Senate Affairs Committee. Sharp responded that this committee would do appointments, elections, regulation-- the business aspects of the

Senate.

4. Andrews noted that the Steering Committee determines when the Executive Committee meets. It looks like the Executive Committee has no authority to meet without the approval of the Steering Committee. Sharp responded that the intention was to empower the Steering Committee to convene a meeting of the Executive Committee, but that the Executive Committee would also have regular meetings. The Steering Committee is designed to be a small management group, not a deliberating body.
5. Andrews inquired about to whom committees report. Stebbins replied that committees would report to the Senate via the Steering Committee.
6. Wilson noted that the current Executive Committee often sends things back to committee for further information and that this saves a lot of Senate time. It is not clear whether the proposed Steering Committee would serve this function.
7. Andrews noted that appointment of committee chairs is a problem. If committee chairs do not serve at the pleasure of the Senate, there is no way to guarantee that committees are responsive. Sharp responded that this is a problem, and that the Ad Hoc Committee was not unified as to how committee chairs should be selected.
8. Lutrin noted that a dean's selection of a faculty member on a university committee did not necessarily constitute faculty representation. Wilson proposed that they be selected in consultation with the school caucuses. This should be clarified.
9. Stanton commented that the committee chair appointments are not the only thing that affect functioning of a committee. If the Steering Committee feels that committee work isn't ready to go to the Senate, they could convene a meeting of the Executive Committee.
10. Peck inquired as to why the subcommittee structure for the proposed Research and Professional Leave Committee wasn't formally addressed and expressed concerns over workload for a committee with such large charges.
11. Murphy proposed that the Steering Committee's charge should be modified to give it the authority to determine that an item is not properly prepared for Senate action.

12. Kersten stated that he sees a potential conflict between the Executive and Steering Committees because the charges appear quite similar. Stebbins replied that these two committees are not two competing committees. One is a subset of the other and the two committees have the same leadership. Snow stated that the intent was a clear division of duties between the two groups, and that the wording might need to be changed to make this clear. Lutrin indicated that she did not see a conflict. She sees it as a division of policy and housekeeping. Gooden stated that it is often hard to distinguish between administrative and substantive problems. The proposed set up could allow for a collision between the two groups. Borland commented that the two-tiered approach was proposed in response to earlier criticisms of the proposed streamlined Executive Committee.
13. Lutrin stated that she would like to see this move forward, and asked what the next step might be. Burgunder suggested that the next step would be to translate the report into a series of bylaw changes. Sharp felt that the amount of work involved in writing bylaw changes shouldn't be undertaken unless there is some sort of consensus that the proposed changes are in the direction that people would like to move. Andrews indicated that other options would be to call a general faculty meeting to discuss the report or to take it to the full Senate. Wilson suggested that the report be discussed in the school caucuses. Moustafa indicated that he liked Wilson's idea of taking the report to the caucuses. The Executive Committee could then reconvene to determine an appropriate action.

M/S (Lutrin, Dobbs) to place the following resolution on the agenda of the next Senate meeting:

Resolved that the Academic Senate adopt the Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Senate Structure.

The intent of the resolution, if adopted, is that the proposed changes would move toward implementation.

Murphy said he would prefer to address only the first part of the report (pages 1-3) initially. He feels that the Senate should first decide if there is a serious problem that requires drastic action. If there is agreement on this issue, then possible corrections could be introduced. Moustafa concurred with Murphy.

The motion failed.

Executive Committee members were asked to discuss the issue with their caucuses and bring back a response.

V. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.