

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

MINUTES

Tuesday, April 5, 1988  
UU 220 3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

I. Preparatory:

- A. The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.
- B. The minutes of the March 1, 1988 and March 8, 1988 meetings were approved as submitted.

II. Communications: none.

III. Reports:

- A. President: none.
- B. Academic Affairs:  
Malcolm Wilson reported that Peter Lee had accepted the position of Dean of the School of Engineering.
- C. Statewide Senators: none.

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

V. Business Items:

- A. Resolution on Improving Instructional Techniques  
Ray Terry indicated that this resolution had been rejected by the Instruction Committee. He stated that the committee was not really opposed to the resolution, but felt that it overlaps with the resolution currently before the full Senate.

M/S/P (Andrews, Borland) to withdraw the resolution at this time. It may be considered at a later date depending on the action taken by the Senate on the similar resolution.

- B. Resolution on Peer Evaluation of Instructors  
Ray Terry indicated that this resolution is based on recommendations in the Ad Hoc Committee's report. The committee had received no input from other committees on this issue at the time of its review. The Instruction Committee was opposed to the resolution. The committee doesn't see how peer evaluation can be done in a quantifiable manner, and felt that the resolution could be potentially harmful. The resolution was later reviewed by the Personnel Policies Committee and this committee also expressed opposition to the resolution.

M/S/P (Andrews, Borland) to remove this item from the agenda.

- C. Resolution on Comprehensive Exams in General Education  
Ray Terry indicated that this is another resolution that arose out of the Ad Hoc Committee report. The Instruction Committee opposed this resolution based on input from the GE&B Committee. The comments of the GE&B Committee were included in the agenda package.

M/S/P (Andrews, Borland) to remove this item from the agenda.

The chair and several members of the Executive Committee encouraged the GE&B Committee to draft a resolution that would bring its position on the issue of assessment to the attention of the full Senate.

- D. Resolution on Timetable for Retention, Tenure, Promotion  
Paul Murphy indicated that the changes in dates were proposed in order to give the Department leaders and the School Peer Review Committees more time to complete their work. This was done because the old dates in some instances allowed the Department leaders only two days to complete their evaluations, and because the role of the School Peer Review Committee has recently been expanded and the workload increased.

The old dates and the proposed new dates were given and are as follows:

Recommendations Forwarded	Retention (1st-2nd Yr)		Retention (3rd-6th)/ Tenure		Promotion	
	new	old	new	old	new	old
PRC to Candidate	11/17	11/24	1/11	1/18	1/11	1/18
PRC to Dept. Ldr.	11/24	12/1	1/18	1/25	1/18	1/25
Dept. Ldr. to Cand.			2/8	2/15	2/8	2/15
Dept. Ldr. to Dean			2/15	2/22	2/15	2/22

All other dates given in the document are unchanged from previous policy.

Lee Burgunder suggested that the whereas clauses could be reworded to make them more specific.

Harry Sharp indicated that the early dates for 1st year retention are not reasonable.

Paul Murphy indicated that the final dates are dictated by the contract.

M/S/P to place this item on the agenda of the full Senate at the April 26 meeting.

- E. Proposed Revisions to the Sexual Harassment Policy  
Donna Duerk indicated that the proposed revisions were to clarify some of the definitions in the old policy and were based on the experience gained in trying to implement the policy on campus. She indicated that the Committee on the Status of Women was in general satisfied with the current policy.

Members of the Executive Committee made the following suggestions regarding the document (Page numbers refer to agenda page numbers):

(Wilson, Burgunder, Peck) Wording of the added sentence regarding remedies for bringing forward false claims needs to be reworded and clarified.

(Andrews) The definitions on page 16 appear to be redundant with the new additions on page 15. The added paragraph may be unnecessary. If it is to appear in both places, the committee should be certain that they say the same thing.

(Andrews) Suggested adding the words in writing to Section H on page 18.

(Andrews) The use of the term conflict of interest on page 18 may be confusing with respect to the earlier resolutions before the Senate on conflict of interest.

(Andrews) The last sentence on page 15 should have committee member replaced by an employee.

(Andrews) There is nothing in the document that addresses the problem of a faculty member being propositioned by a student. Something to this effect could be added.

(Andrews) The statement on confidentiality on page 19 is inadequate. It doesn't provide any protection to the accused. This may be a deficiency in the document.

(Andrews) The document used calendar days, working days, and days in establishing time lines. This may be confusing and the document should select one and use it throughout.

(Andrews) On page 21 section B.1.d, who provides possible remedies and who decides what is a prima facie case?

(Andrews) Section 3 d on page 22 might be reworded to read After the Sexual Harassment Compliance Coordinator has considered the response of the Complainant and Respondent to the preliminary report, he/she shall submit a written report to the President, with copies to the Complainant and Respondent, which shall include a recommended remedy.

In the subsequent discussion, Elie Axelroth indicated that this document represents a statement of policy and that some of the concerns of the Executive Committee might be implementation problems. Paul Murphy stated that he questioned the effectiveness of some of the informal procedures outlined in section D2 on page 20.

Lee Burgunder indicated that he also had some suggestions for revision of the document. Because of the late hour, he was asked to forward his suggestions directly to the Committee on the Status of Women.

M/S/P (Andrews, Hellyer) to refer this resolution back to committee for revision.

F. Resolution on the Curriculum Review Process

Harry Sharp indicated that this resolution represents the Curriculum Committee's proposed plan for revising the curriculum process. It attempts to make curriculum an ongoing process that has proposals forwarded as they are ready. Proposals would not be tied to a particular catalog cycle. It is the committee's feeling that the proposed process would lead to better curriculum decisions.

Charlie Crabb stated that he felt that the current process allows for the opportunity to coordinate curriculum changes. He doesn't see how this would be accomplished under the proposed system.

Joe Weatherby indicated that he is opposed to the resolution. He feels that it would lead to annual approval of courses. He also noted that it would be difficult to deal with the issues of course proliferation and course conflicts if the curriculum is dealt with on a piecemeal basis.

Malcom Wilson concurred with Weatherby. He also indicated that the first whereas is inaccurate when it states that Cal Poly has been growing in size. He suggested that perhaps a better solution would be to look at major degree proposals in the off cycle years.

M/S (Kersten, Gooden) to place this resolution on the agenda of the next full Senate meeting.

The motion failed. This resolution will be referred back to committee.

G. Resolution on General Education Transfer Curriculum

George Lewis stated that this resolution is his attempt to deal with one of the many issues raised by the proposed GE&B transfer curriculum. It is not a resolution from the GE&B Committee, although he thinks that the GE&B Committee will endorse the resolution.

George revised the resolved clause to read

Resolved: That the California Polytechnic State University Academic Senate recommend that the application of the general education transfer curriculum be confined to transfer from community colleges to CSU or UC campuses.

The second whereas was also modified by changing the word proposals to proposal.

George Lewis explained that the enabling legislation in the Senate and Assembly refers to transfer from the community colleges to CSU and UC. However, somewhere along the way the scope has been expanded to include transfers between any two state institutions. He feels that this would ultimately result in two GE&B programs on campus.

Malcolm Wilson questioned whether we wanted to take a stand which

might be interpreted as being against transfers within the CSU system. George Lewis pointed out that there was already a mechanism for facilitating transfer with the system.

M/S/P (Hellyer, Andrews) to place this resolution on the agenda of the full Senate.

- H. (Revised) Resolution on Cheating and Plagiarism  
George Beardsley stated that this resolution incorporates changes to the previous resolution on this topic, as suggested by President Baker.

M/S/P (Andrews, Sharp) to place this resolution on the full Senate agenda.

- I. Replacement for Sam Lutrin to the University Union Advisory Board for Spring Quarter 1988.  
There were two nominees for this position--Gail Wilson and Stan Ullerich.

M/S/P (Andrews, Borland) to appoint Stan Ullerich.

VI. Discussion Items:

- A. Lottery Education Fund Instructional Budget Proposal.  
A faculty request for Senate support of a lottery proposal has been received. It was the consensus of the Executive Committee that this was not an appropriate request.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:08 p.m.