

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO  
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING - MINUTES  
March 31, 1981

Chair, Tim Kersten  
Vice Chair, Rod Keif  
Secretary, John Harris

Members Present: Burroughs, Cooper, Dingus, Goldenberg, Hale, Harris, Hill, Kief,  
Jones, Riedlsperger, Rockman, Shaffer, Sharp, Tseng, Weatherby  
Guests: Brown, Kranzendorf, Wenzl

- I. Minutes The minutes were approved as distributed.
- II. Announcements C.A.R.E. Grants are being considered at this time.
- III. Business Items
  - A. General Education and Breadth Development Procedures (Wenzl)

Changes to document: Phase I (A): delete the word "entire" in the first sentence, and after the word "faculty" insert "including Professional and Consultative Services."

Phase III (A): after the word "volunteers" insert "and appoint."

Comments/Questions: On the time line, catalog deadlines might be inserted at the bottom. The funding commitment should be made by the University in advance of Phase IV. An assigned time for General Education and Breadth Committee next year should be highly considered. Could outcomes be sent out this spring to speed up process as most discussion would take place in later phases. Hearings might be a way to speed up input process rather than written responses from faculty.

M/S/P (Riedlsperger/Hill) to accept and place as a first reading business item at next Senate meeting (assuming resolution added that the Senate endorse such a procedure).

- B. +/- Grading (Brown)

Background: This system is in use at several other schools in the CSUC system as well as many other universities. It is a more refined manner of indicating the actual grade received for a class.

Comments/Questions: What is the rationale for the points allocated for particular grades? Why couldn't a percentage system based upon a hundred points be utilized? What does Records Office think of the proposal? Shouldn't the ramifications of the graduation of some students be a part of document?

- IV. Discussion Items

- A. Constitutional Revision (Kersten)

A revised Constitution is presented which was approved by Constitution and Bylaws Committee. Hearing will take place on April 15, 1981 for faculty input and a referendum will follow some time after.

- Comments/Questions: Wouldn't the use of strikeout/underlining make it easier to obtain substantive feedback? How will faculty be informed about hearing and referendum? Why is the A.S.I. representative ex-officio in document?

B. Reorganization of Computing Advisory Committee (Kersten)

Kersten's main concern is that the Academic Senate is excluded from both committees, especially the Instructional Advisory Committee.

C. President's Cabinet (Kersten)

Background: The following were felt to be issues: It is unclear as to the specific functions and possible effects of these functions, the actual representativeness of committee composition and the derivation of the Cabinet membership, and the procedures of the Cabinet are unclear with faculty input seemingly lacking.

Comments: Both the President's Cabinet and the Roundtable could impact policy decisions on this campus with a lack of faculty input for both of these organizations.

Suggestion: That Kersten pursue with President Baker the specifics of the Cabinet in the three areas mentioned above. Consider that this be a topic which President Baker might discuss with the Academic Senate on April 15, 1981.