

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO
ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - MINUTES

Tuesday: May 6, 1986
FOB 24B 3:00 p.m.

RECEIVED

MAY 11 1986

Academic Senate

Chair: Lloyd H. Lamouria
Vice Chair: Lynne E. Gamble
Secretary: Raymond D. Terry

Members Present: Ahern, Botwin, Bonds, Cooper, Gamble, Gay,
Gooden, Hallman, Kersten, Lamouria, Riener,
Terry

Invited Guests: Irvin, Lewis, Williamson

I. Minutes

- A. The minutes of the April 29, 1986 Executive Committee meeting were distributed.
- B. MSP (Kersten /Gamble) to approve the minutes as distributed.
- C. At the end of the meeting, Larry Gay noted an error in reporting the vote on the AIMS Project Resolution. In Item IV.A.5, the vote should have been reported as

"6 Yes, 2 No, 1 Abstain."

II. Announcements

- A. Nominations for Faculty Trustee deadline at Long Beach is September 29, 1986. Forms are available in our Senate office.
- B. Chairman Roy Brophy has authorized distribution (to the Board of Trustees) of our Resolution on Adequate Lead Time for Consultation.
- C. Deadline on Call for Topics for Academic Program Improvement for 1987-1988 is June 30, 1986. Forms are available in the Academic Senate office.

III. Reports

A. President /Provost

- 1. The President was absent from this meeting.
- 2. Glenn Irvin, representing the Provost's Office, had no report.

B. Statewide Academic Senators

Tim Kersten made a brief report reminding the Executive Committee of three items to be considered by the C.S.U. Senate at its next meeting and asking for last-minute input. The three agenda items for the C.S.U. Senate are: the length of the probationary period for tenure-track faculty; early tenure for administrators; and the role of student evaluations in the RTP process.

1. Reg Gooden asserted that six years was an appropriate probationary period for tenure-track faculty at research institutions, but that four years was adequate for teaching institutions.

Tim agreed; however, the Chair noted that six years may be appropriate due to our professional development requirement.

2. Lynne Gamble and others felt that the length of time before which an administrator could receive tenure (one year) should be lengthened, not shortened.
3. Concerning the role of student evaluations in the RTP process, everyone felt that student evaluations should be only one factor in determining instructor effectiveness. Even if all the members of a Department were Full Professors, the results of student evaluations could be used to improve teacher effectiveness.
4. Ken Riener expressed the view that student evaluations can be made valid using computer technology and correct statistical reasoning.

IV. Business Items

A. Two Resolutions on Free Electives

1. The Chair recognized Dan Williamson (Chair: Curriculum Committee) who presented two alternative resolutions concerning the need to allow (prohibit) exemptions from the requirements (established by CAM 411.1) of 12 units of electives, 9 of which may not be restricted in any way by a student's department.
2. Resolution No. 1 would permit exemptions to CAM 411.1; Resolution No. 2 would prohibit such exemptions. Dan Williamson indicated that the Curriculum Committee was evenly split (4-4) on this issue and was recommending that both Resolutions go to the Senate floor to be decided there.

3. Mike Botwin initiated a discussion as to the origin of CAM 411.1: Did it have faculty support? Or was it the product of an agreement between former President Kennedy and his deans?
 4. Glenn Irvin offered to provide copies of a summary article: "History of the Free Electives Issue." He indicated that he would send a copy to the Chair for distribution among those Executive Committee members who wished one.
 5. George Lewis felt that GE&B may be threatened by free electives. Indeed, the "ever-vigilant Industrial Engineering Department" has already indicated willingness to comply with CAM 411.1 if there is a corresponding reduction in GE&B requirements.
 6. Mike Botwin initiated a discussion of the need for free electives.
 - a. Dan Williamson felt that the essence of the issue was found in the first whereas clause of Resolution No. 2, viz., "it is desirable for all students to have the freedom to take courses of their own choice in the attainment of a bachelor's degree."
 - b. Free electives derive from an individual's own curiosity and are entwined with his /her personal growth and development.
 7. It was decided by consensus to send both Resolutions forward to the Senate floor in the present order.
 - a. Tim Kersten conjectured that both resolutions may be adopted.
 - b. The Chair assured Tim that our Senate was much too sophisticated to adopt diametrically opposing positions.
- B. Proposed Inclusion of IE 314 (Engineering Economics) in GE&B Area D
1. The Chair recognized George Lewis (Chair: GE&B) who referred to a package of material sent to the Academic Senate Office last week. It became evident that no one had copies of it. The relevant documents were quickly retrieved from the Senate Office and distributed.
 2. According to George Lewis, Don Morgan (who proposed the course) claims that the course has been revised

to meet Area D requirements, after being rejected for inclusion in that area last year.

- a. The appropriate GE&B subcommittee felt that the changes were cosmetic, not substantial, and were unanimous in recommending against its inclusion in Area D.
 - b. The full GE&B Committee recommended against inclusion by a vote of 2-6-1.
 - c. According to George Lewis, "...this course represents mischief; it is only an attempt to subvert the GE&B requirement. I am so opposed to this course that I cannot speak objectively about it."
 - d. The course is used in ABET requirements as a design course. The course is also considered preparation for one section of the Engineering License Exam.
3. Tim Kersten inquired as to why the proposal was not tabled in the GE&B Committee.
 4. Mike Botwin suggested not forwarding the proposal to the Senate.
 5. Reg Gooden warned that the Bylaws may prohibit us from refusing to send the proposal forward. The Chair suggested getting an opinion from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.
 6. MSP (Hallman /Botwin) that the IE 314 proposal be tabled. The motion carried without a dissenting vote.
- C. Report on Recommendations Relating to Reporting Format of Discretionary Funds
1. Jens Pohl (Chair: Budget Committee) was not present at the meeting.
 2. Materials for this agenda item were included in the April 29 agenda package.
 3. The Report (including the suggested reporting format) was approved by consensus.
- D. Resolution on Elimination of PCB Exposure at Cal Poly
1. Barbara Hallman reviewed the effects of PCB exposure. She indicated that she had drawn up a first draft resolution, but had been urged by Marlin Vix

not to present it until his committee had seen it.

2. Barbara Hallman indicated that she had attended a meeting of the Public Health and Safety Subcommittee. The PCB problem was on the top of its agenda. Engineering East and West are the big problems at present. Replacement work will be done this summer. Funds have been lacking. The Committee would welcome a Senate Resolution for action.
3. It was agreed that an Executive Committee Resolution would be easy to obtain this year. Whether full Senate action could be accomplished was a different matter.
4. Jim Ahern and Larry Gay voiced support for putting it on the May 13 agenda.
5. MSP: That the "Resolution on Elimination of PCB Exposure at Cal Poly" be the first business item on the May 13 agenda.

V. Discussion Items

A. Improving effectiveness of Executive Committee meetings

1. Initial suggestions included:
 - a. Consent calendar to be prepared by officers;
 - b. Committee replacements to be made by the Chair honoring School /PCS caucus recommendation when received in writing from the caucus chair.
2. By consensus, the Executive Committee agreed that the Academic Senate Chair shall ask each Standing Committee Chair if his /her item of business is controversial enough to require his /her presence at the Executive Committee meeting at which it is to be decided whether to send the item to the Senate floor.
3. Agreement could not be reached as to whether discussion should center around the merits of a resolution or report or simply whether the item should be put on the Senate agenda.

Reg Gooden noted some positive effects of debating an issue within the Executive Committee. It helps estimate the amount of time that the Senate will require and foreshadows the item's success or failure.

4. Larry Gay emphasized the need for a uniform meeting time for caucuses. Due to the additionally-scheduled Executive Committee meetings the one Tuesday (3:00 -5:00 p.m.) that was free each month is now encumbered.
 5. Agreement could not be reached as to whether all Curriculum Committee proposals had to come before the Senate.
- B. Program Review: How can the Senate be an effective participant in upgrading or deleting programs where justified?
1. Ken Riener emphasized the need for an accurate cost-benefit analysis when considering the addition or deletion of programs.
 2. Al Cooper maintained that "there's more to a University than cost-benefit analysis." Overstaffing in his and other Departments could easily be solved by lay-offs. We must not neglect the human side of issues.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m. with the Chair's distribution of the tentative agenda for the May 13 Senate meeting. There were ten business items to be dealt with, excluding those added to the agenda today.

The Chair announced the need next year for an Executive Committee meeting each week and a Senate meeting once every other week.