

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California
ACADEMIC SENATE

Executive Committee - Minutes
Tuesday, May 20, 1986
FOB 24B, 3:00 - 5:00 P.M.

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

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

Invited Guests: Andrews, Irvin, Pohl, Rogalla

I. Call to Order

- A. The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. by the Vice Chair who acted as Chair in the absence of Lloyd Lamouria.
- B. The minutes of the May 6, 1986 Executive Committee meeting were approved as mailed.

II. Announcements

- A. The Chair announced that the recent special election for UPLC membership in the School of Engineering had just been invalidated. A second special election will be held. Nomination forms are now available in the Senate Office and must be returned by Wed., May 28; the election will take place during the week of June 2.
- B. The Chair reminded the school caucus chairs that this is the last week for them to meet to elect a caucus chair for the 1986-1987 academic year. The identity of the new caucus chairs will be announced at the May 27 Senate meeting.

III. Reports

- A. President /Provost: There were no reports.
- B. C.S.U. Senators: There were no reports.
- C. Special Report by Bill Forgeng (Chair: Student Affairs Committee)
 - 1. Bill Forgeng reported that apparently someone in the Dean of Students' Office decided that there are

already enough honorary societies on campus; hence, the refusal to recognize Alpha Chi. The details are not yet known.

2. Glenn Irvin announced his support for Alpha Chi and expressed doubt that such an organization can be denied from coming on campus.

IV. Business Items

A. Resolution on AIMS Quarterly Budget Reporting

1. The Chair recognized Jens Pohl who spoke briefly in support of the Resolution (Cf. p. 25 of the agenda package.). He emphasized that the Vice President for Business Affairs has no objection to the content of the Resolution.
2. The Executive Committee agreed by consensus to put the Resolution on the agenda of the May 27 Senate meeting.

B. Second Consideration of PCP Recommendations

1. The Chair recognized Jens Pohl who presented an updated version of its April 8, 1986 recommendations which the Executive Committee approved in a meeting on April 10, 1986. That meeting, however, lacked a quorum. Hence, the Executive Committee must now confirm its previous action.
2. Jens Pohl noted the existence of two PCP proposals developed by the Budget Committee. He also called attention to the current remuneration differential between sabbatical leaves based on the quarter and semester systems.
3. The following points were made:
 - a. Funding of any PCP's below the first and second on the priority list is doubtful.
 - b. The Governor may be trying to force us to use lottery funds to fund PCP's.
 - c. There is no coordination between the prioritized list of PCP's and the Senate's list of lottery fund uses (passed in April).
 - d. Last year the Chancellor's Office requested specific proposals; this year it favors conceptual proposals. No one yet knows the reason for this change in policy and procedure; nor the significance of it.

4. MSP (Gooden /Terry): That the Executive Committee confirm its previous support of the Budget Committee's recommendations for PCP's.

C. Conflict of Interest Policy for Principal Investigators

1. The Chair recognized Charles Andrews (Chair: PPC) who summarized the content of the document "Proposed Conflict of Interest Policy for Principal Investigators of Nongovernmental Sponsored Research."
2. The document, which was prepared in concurrence with the Research Committee (Chaired by Robert Mc Neil), deals with disclosure of the source of funding of principal investigators of funded research. Such funded research may not be funded by anyone with whom the principal investigator may have an outside financial interest or outside commitment.
3. Charles Andrews gave several examples of situations in which a conflict of interest may exist.
4. It was established that the document will be retyped and sent directly to Jan Pieper. Charles Andrews, however, insisted that Senate action would be required to establish it as policy.

D. Resolution on School Dean Evaluations

1. The Chair recognized Charles Andrews (Chair: PPC) who documented the need for an evaluation instrument to be used by the Academic Vice President in obtaining faculty input concerning its dean's performance and effectiveness.
2. The proposed Resolution and the uniform evaluation form (pp. 17-20 of the agenda package) were discussed.
3. The importance of the "can't say" column was examined. In some instances, a response of "can't say" is practically the same as a response of "unsatisfactory." In other cases, the response simply indicates that the faculty member lacks adequate information on which to base an opinion.
4. Glen Irvin emphasized the importance of Department Head evaluation of Deans, since a school's Department Heads deal with its Dean more closely than the general faculty of the school. He asked if separation of Department Head responses from general faculty responses would be advisable.
5. Charles Andrews noted that Department Heads now

serve at the Dean's pleasure, not the President's. Separating the responses may be dangerous, especially in a school with few departments. Glenn Irvin repeated his desire to know if a certain dean lacks the confidence of his department heads. Charles Andrews suggested that the Academic Vice President conduct a separate survey of Department Heads.

6. The statistical validity of the survey was discussed. It was established that in general the response to the "Annual Evaluation of Academic Deans" usually is inadequate, that the results of the survey usually are not valid, and generally have no adverse effects on the deans evaluated.
7. The Executive Committee agreed by consensus to place this item on the agenda of the May 27 Senate meeting.

E. Resolution on CSU Trustee Professorship

1. The Chair recognized Charles Andrews (Chair: PPC) who summarized the background and arguments in support of the Resolution.
2. It was established that the Resolution has no budgetary impact. The differential between the individual's previous salary and that of Full Professor Step 5 is paid by the Chancellor's Office.
3. The Resolution does not prevent a person from being appointed to the position of Trustee Professor on his own campus; it does, however, make it less likely for a person from another campus to be appointed to such a position at Cal Poly. Such appointments would not be prohibited, but must have the support of the receiving Department at Cal Poly "after an evaluation and an affirmative vote by the tenured faculty of the Department."
4. Tim Kersten indicated that the Statewide Senate had passed a resolution almost identical to this one.
5. The Executive Committee agreed by consensus to place this item on the agenda of the May 27 Senate meeting.

F. Revised Enrollment Recommendations

1. Steve French was not present to lead the discussion of the recommendations from the Long Range Planning Committee.

2. The report was initially prepared in the Winter 86 quarter, but was returned to committee for further study of the need and desirability of increasing Cal Poly's enrollment beyond the currently optimal 14,200 level.
3. The Executive Committee perused the four-page memo (pp. 21-25 of the agenda package) and complimented the Committee on the superb graphics.
4. The Executive Committee agreed by consensus to place this item on the agenda of the May 27 Senate meeting.

G. Distinguished Teaching Awards

1. The Distinguished Teaching Award Committee, in a memo from its Chair, Don Hensel, to the Academic Senate Chair indicated opposition to the action of the Executive Committee in approving on 9-24-85:

M/S/P (unanimously): The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate approves in principle the President's request that the present Distinguished Teacher Awards be partially sponsored by the Alumni Association and that the name of the award be modified to reflect the sponsorship."

2. Don Hensel, in his memo of 5-6-86, asserted that "if acceptance of the stipend requires renaming the award, we recommend rejecting the increased stipend."
3. The Chair announced that the controversy had been resolved. The Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee has agreed to a compromise certificate which would include the statement: "This award made possible through unrestricted contributions from alumni."

H. Resolution on Amendments to Bylaws for the Elections Committee (concerning vacancies remaining after an election)

1. The Chair recognized John Rogalla (Chair: C & B) who presented the background and content of the Resolution which was recommended unanimously by his committee.
2. Al Cooper spoke on behalf of the School of Science and Mathematics in which there were only two nominees for Senator and four vacancies. He insisted that the School not be punished by a loss of representation and recommended that two persons be ap-

pointed to fill the vacancies.

3. Barbara Hallman indicated that the Resolution was not punitive, but positive; it offered a method of avoiding similar situations in the future.
4. Ray Terry noted that the C & B Committee had initially been presented with a draft resolution that would have permitted appointment to such vacancies; the C & B Committee, on April 17, seemed receptive to this idea when both the Chair and the Secretary of the Academic Senate were present to argue for it. They evidently reversed themselves when they met again on May 1. The Committee was asked to provide a solution to the immediate problem; by suggesting a preventive solution for future use, they, in effect, punish SOSAM and any other school where there were more vacancies than nominees.

Ray Terry gave some reasons for the lack of nominees: the change in the normal timelines for nominations and elections; the inclusion of information about Senate elections with material about committee membership requests; placing announcements in the Cal Poly Report which many faculty do not read.

5. Glenn Irvin voiced his respect for and support of the Senate, but noted that when no one runs for a vacant position, the Senate's credibility is diminished.
 6. Tim Kersten agreed, but supported the idea of appointing persons to the vacant positions. If the seats remain vacant, the Senate will alienate a large segment of the university; the lines of communication will be broken.
 7. Reg Gooden felt that appointments to the vacancies could be made. The Bylaws are "constructively vague" in that respect.
 8. Robert Bonds tried to diffuse what was becoming an explosive issue. He suggested ending discussion on this issue, passing the Resolution on to the Senate to help avoid future problems, and attempting to explore other ways of ameliorating the present problem, perhaps by appointment, perhaps by a special election, etc. The Executive Committee agreed to do this.
- I. Resolution on Amendment to the Constitution (concerning the election of two Senators from and by the instructional department heads)

1. The Chair recognized John Rogalla who presented the background and content of the Resolution.
2. It was pointed out that Department Heads may serve on the Senate now, if they wish to stand for election as do others. Dan Bertozzi, a Department Head, presently is a Senator. Other Department Heads have served on the Senate in the past.
3. It was remarked that Department Heads are no better able to make decisions about many topics brought before the Senate than are the general faculty.
4. Al Cooper informed the Executive Committee that Sandra Dills, who represents a large number of lecturers, will no longer serve as the Lecturer Representative since it is a non-voting position. To give two persons voting Senate seats because they are Department Heads would exacerbate the situation.
5. Reg Gooden argued in favor of a new Senate Standing Committee of Department Heads with the appointments to be made by each School Caucus Chairs from among the Department Heads of his /her school.
6. It was conjectured that special treatment for Department Heads would drive a wedge between faculty and Department Heads.
7. M/S/P: (Bonds /Terry) That the Resolution be referred back to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

The motion was unanimously carried.

J. Bylaw Change to Delete Ex Officio Members from the UPLC

1. This matter was mentioned, but not discussed, at the end of today's meeting.
2. Failure to act on this matter before the end of the year would be inconsistent with the Senate's action on May 13 in rejecting an amendment to the Leave With Pay Guidelines that would have included a representative of the Personnel Office and one from the Provost's Office as ex-officio, non-voting members.
3. The required bylaw change was placed on the agenda of the May 27 Senate meeting by the Chair in consultation with the other officers.

VI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m..