I. Call to Order
   A. The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. upon obtaining a quorum.

   B. The minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of 3/31/87 were approved as mailed.

   C. The Chair called the group's attention to the agenda modification: Communications item II.E has been moved to Business item V.E.

II. Communications

   The Chair called the group's attention to items A - D.

III. Reports

   A. President's Office: None

   B. Academic Affairs Office: None

   C. Statewide Senators

   Reg Gooden made a short report on the efforts being made to secure funding for repeatedly-defeated PCP's. Funds have been provided to study this matter. A survey is in process of being completed. Soon, selected faculty will receive a survey form.

   1. Tim Kersten informed us that he had previewed the questionnaire which, in his opinion, could be filled out by a typical faculty member in about 15 minutes.
2. Bob Lucas noted that about 177 names have been selected for distribution of the form at Cal Poly. Some of the persons are not on campus. When removed from the list, there will still be about 160 persons to be surveyed. Eight sessions will be organized to help people go through the form. Malcolm Wilson will notify those to be surveyed in a personalized form letter.

D. Budget Committee Report

Jim Conway addressed the Executive Committee concerning lottery funding. The deadline for all proposals for the use of lottery funds in 1987-1988 will probably be June 1, 1987 (approximately three weeks after the expected distribution of the new guidelines for such proposals). Jim recommended that whatever decisions have to be made be made by the President's Advisory Committee on Instructional Program Resources. Two relevant documents were distributed (including a draft copy of the FY 1987/1988 Interim Plan for Allocation of Budget Increases).

IV. No Item IV.

V. Business Items

A. Resolution on the Definition of "Close Relative"

1. Al Cooper pointed out some omissions of truly close relatives and the inclusion of some nebulously-close relatives.

2. Some other substantive faults with the Resolution were uncovered:
   
   a. The two whereas clauses justify the first resolved clause; however, the second resolved clause is not justified by a whereas clause.

   b. The statement of CAM 311.5 A.4 should appear in the background statement. The second resolved clause should be separated from the present Resolution, be accompanied by its own background statement and contain a relevant whereas clause.

3. By consensus, it was agreed to return the
Resolution to the FFC with suggestions for improvement.

B. Resolution on Attendance at Conventions, Conferences or Similar Meetings

1. By consensus, it was agreed to place the Resolution on the agenda of the April 14, 1987 Academic Senate meeting.

2. M/S/F (Crabb/Gooden): To place the Resolution on the Academic Senate’s Consent Agenda.

C. Resolution on MPPP Awards

1. Reg Gooden initially spoke against the Resolution as the wrong way to eliminate the MPPP Awards. He believed that salary funding and MPPP funding were tied together.

2. Citing recent phone conversations with Adelaide Harmon-Elliott and Charles Andrews, Susan Currier asserted that she believed the two items were separate line items in the budget. It was agreed to get more information on whether this was correct.

3. Charles Crabb questioned the propriety of sending a Resolution to CFA. The Chair asserted his belief that it was entirely proper.

4. At Bill Forgeng’s suggestion, the name of Adelaide Harmon-Elliott was added to the list of local recipients of the Resolution, if passed by the Senate.

5. Charles Andrews arrived, accompanied by Barbara Richter, an off-campus candidate for the VPAA position. At the Chair’s request, Andrews elaborated on the relation between salary funding and MPPP funding.

6. By consensus, it was agreed to place the Resolution on the agenda of the April 14, 1987 Academic Senate meeting, subject to a determination that MPPP funds are a separate line item in the budget.

D. Solicitation of legislative support for improving faculty offices

1. An estimate was given for the number of single-faculty offices vs non single faculty offices on campus.
2. Mike Botwin criticized the President's veto of single-faculty offices in the rebuilding of Engineering West (ravaged by fire in April 1986).

3. Bill Forgeng supported the principle that single-faculty offices be constructed whenever remodelling occurs.

4. Malcolm Wilson also supported this principle, as does the Chancellor, but indicated that there may have been additional factors involved in the Engineering West decision.

5. MaryLinda Wheeler identified the need for faculty conference rooms in each area of new construction.

6. The Chair asked for the Executive Committee's approval to speak for the Senate when he attends a hearing in Sacramento on the issue of single-faculty office space.

7. By consensus, the Executive Committee endorsed the Chair's request.

E. Resolution on Large Capacity Lecture Rooms

1. The Chair informed the group that Ken Palmer (Chair: Ad Hoc Committee on Effective Class Size, Instructional Quality, and Faculty Workload) could not be present today.

2. Malcolm Wilson noted an error in the sixth whereas clause (the first whereas clause on p. 17) and assailed the next-to-the-last resolved clause as unworkable.

3. Charles Crabb moved to refer the Resolution back to committee with instructions for the committee to work with the VPAA Office to overcome the technical difficulties in the Resolution.

4. By consensus, the Executive Committee concurred with the Crabb motion.

F. GE & B Proposals for ART 101, ART 105, ART 112, FF 233, GER 233, SPAN 233, DANQ 321, STAT 130X, and proposed revision of Area B

1. Tim Kersten criticized the report as disorderly.

2. Ray Terry suggested that the GE&B Proposal Forms form the principal part of the report and that the subcommittee reports either be deleted or appear as an appendix to the report.
3. George Lewis consented to this proposal. The Executive Committee concurred.

4. Discussion of the content of pp. 56-59 occurred.

5. Mike Botwin asked if the Senate Office could provide each Senator with a "GE&B primer." Susan Currier suggested that Senators bring their course catalog to the Senate meeting (or xerox the appropriate pages from the catalog). George Lewis suggested that a reminder to do this be included in the next agenda package.

6. Transfer of Audiovisual Services to Information Systems

1. Cf. pp. 11-12 of the agenda package.

2. Discussion centered around
   
a. Is the transfer a fait accompli? Or is it only proposed? Is Senate consultation being sought before or after the fact?

   b. Will the transfer have any deleterious effects on the instructional use of audiovisual services?

3. Ray Terry proposed that the Senate neither support nor oppose the proposed transfer, but simply say:

   "RESOLVED. That the quality of the instructional use of audiovisual services shall neither be impaired nor reduced by any organizational change in the administration of Audiovisual Services."

4. Following the Executive Committee meeting, a new and improved version of this Resolution was developed and subsequently included in the agenda package of the April 14, 1987 Senate meeting.

VI. Discussion Items: None

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.