CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

Academic Senate Agenda

May 13, 1986

U.U. 220 - 3:00-5:00 p.m.

I. MINUTES:

Approval of the April 22, 1986 Academic Senate Minutes (attached pp. 2-9).

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

III. REPORTS:

A. President/Provost
B. Statewide Senators

IV. BUSINESS ITEMS:

A. Resolution (re funding) on Elimination of Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Exposure at Cal Poly- Hallman, First Reading, (to be distributed).
B. Joint Report and Recommendations to Eliminate Discordant Provisions of the UPLC Bylaws, the Leave with Pay Guidelines and the Academic Senate Bylaws - Rogalla, Chair, Constitution & Bylaws Committee/Terry, Chair, University Professional Leave Committee, Second Reading, (attached pp. 10-12).
D. GE&B Report - Lewis, Chair, General Education & Breadth Committee, Second Reading, (attached pp. 16-23):
   - AE 121 Agricultural Mechanics
   - CONS 120 Fisheries and Wildlife Management
   - FOR 201 Forest Resources
   - HE 203 Consumer Role of the Family
   - HE 331 Household Equipment
   - Bio Proposal Re ENT/CONS Prefixes
E. Resolution on Modification of CAM 619-Forgeng, Chair, Student Affairs Committee, Second Reading, (attached pp. 24-25).
G. Resolution on the Proposal for the Promotion of Ed Zuchelli-Cooper, Second Reading, (to be distributed).
H. Resolution on Senior Projects-Hewitt, Chair, Instruction Committee, Second Reading.
I. Resolution on Distinction Between Options and Concentrations-Williamson, Chair, Curriculum Committee, First Reading, (attached pp. 27-31).
J. GE&B Report - Lewis, Chair, General Education & Breadth Committee, First Reading, (attached pp. 32-37):
   - ART 208 Sculpture
   - HUM 302 Human Values in Agriculture
   - MATH 201 Appreciation of Mathematics
K. Resolution on Foundation Election Process-Greenwald, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on the Cal Poly Foundation, First Reading (attached p. 38).
L. Resolution on Free Electives-Williamson, Chair, Curriculum Committee, (attached p. 39); Substitute Resolution on Free Electives, First Reading, (attached p. 40).

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS:

VI. ADJOURNMENT:
Amendment No. 2: On Page 3 of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines" Section C shall be replaced by:

"C. Functions

1. Recommend to the Provost after approval by the Academic Senate changes in procedures and criteria for ranking leave with pay applications.

2. Recommend changes in leave with pay application response deadlines to the Provost after approval of the Academic Senate.

3. Review School/Library leave with pay procedures and criteria for compliance with MOU and University Guidelines. Recommended changes shall be directed to the appropriate administrator with a copy to the Provost.

4. Review all applications and the prioritization by School/Library Professional Leave Committees to ensure compliance with approved guidelines and quality of applications; inform the Provost of any apparent inequities in those rankings; and make recommendations based on its findings.

5. Make ad hoc recommendations concerning the filling of such unused sabbatical leave vacancies which occur after the initial awarding."

Amendment No. 3: In Article VII., Section H, the standing committees shall be renumbered as follows:

"Article VII

Section H. Standing Committees

12. Professional-Leave Research
13. Research Status of Women
14. Status-of-Women Student Affairs
15. Student-Affairs University Professional Leave"

Amendment No. 4: In Article VII, Section I, the standing committees shall be renumbered as in Amendment No. 3 above and wording parallel to that of Amendment No. 2 above shall be used in defining the responsibilities of the UPLC:

"Article VII

Section I. Committee Descriptions

12. Professional-Leave Research
13. Research Status of Women
14. Status-of-Women Student Affairs
15. Student-Affairs University Professional Leave
15. **Student-Affairs University Professional Leaves (Contd)**

b. The University Professional Leaves Committee shall be responsible for the direction of the professional leaves program of the University.

1. Recommend to the Provost after approval by the Academic Senate changes in the procedures and criteria for ranking leave with pay applications.

2. Recommend changes in leave with pay application response deadlines to the Provost after approval of the Academic Senate.

3. Review School/Library leave with pay procedures and criteria for compliance with MOU and University Guidelines. Recommended changes shall be directed to the appropriate administrator with a copy to the Provost.

4. Review all applications and the prioritization by School/Library Professional Leave Committees to ensure compliance with approved guidelines and quality of applications; inform the Provost of any apparent inequities in those rankings; and make recommendations based on its findings.

5. Evaluate all professional leave applications and recommend a priority ranking to the Provost. Make ad hoc recommendations concerning the filling of such unused sabbatical leave vacancies which occur after the initial awarding.

6. Shall act as the committee to review Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards referred to it by the President."
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate via
Academic Senate Executive Committee

From: Raymond D. Terry
Chair: UPLC

Subject: Recommendations for Changes in the "Leave With Pay Guidelines"

During the period February 17, 1986 through March 14, 1986 the UPLC carried out its annual review of school, Library and UPLC procedures and criteria. The UPLC is now prepared to recommend certain changes in UPLC procedures, criteria and the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications.

Background No. 1: The University temporarily departed from school/Library quotas for sabbaticals in 1984 and 1985. In the period before this, school quotas were computed so as to result in a proportional allocation to each school, based on the ratio of eligible faculty in each school to the total eligible in the University. The UPLC, in its effort to restore the status quo recommended Senate adoption of Sect. F.4.b of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines," which was excerpted from a 1980 version of CAM. We subsequently learned that the initial distribution to each school and the Library of one sabbatical leave, as specified in the LWPG's, had not been in effect for some time. The UPLC seeks now to remedy this error by recommending Senate adoption of

*Amendment No. 1: On Page 4 of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines" Item F.4.b. shall be changed to read:

"F.4.b. The sabbatical leave allocation shall be distributed according to the ratio of eligible faculty members in the respective schools and the Library to the total eligible in the University."

Background No. 2: The term of office for each elected UPLC member is two years. Each year half of the UPLC's elected members are subject to (re)election, resulting in a balance of continuity and change. However, due to a variety of reasons, the UPLC is faced with the election this May of six positions; four two-year terms and two one-year terms. To provide additional continuity, especially when more than half the UPLC is replaced, the UPLC proposes:

"A.4. The immediate Past Chair of the UPLC shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the UPLC."

Background No. 3: Often an unsuccessful applicant for a sabbatical later requests a change from a sabbatical leave to a difference-in-pay leave. Infrequently, a request is made to change from a difference-in-pay leave to a sabbatical leave. Such a request was made in Feb. 1985 and was denied on the grounds that the prioritized list of 44 sabbaticals had already been determined. In accord with the 1984-1985 procedures, determining the position of a new application would have necessitated redoing the entire ranking process. One suggested remedy is for each SPLC (LPLC) to submit a common priority list of both sabbatical and difference-in-pay leaves. The UPLC rejects this solution and recommends instead:

*Amendment No. 3: Requests by an applicant for a change from a difference-in-pay leave to a sabbatical leave may not be made after the professional leave applications have been forwarded to the UPLC (in early January).

Background No. 4: Each year one or more successful applicants for a sabbatical are led to decline the offer, sometimes to pursue activities which may benefit the University even more than completion of the intended sabbatical. In such cases, the President/Provost often postpones the sabbatical to a subsequent year, without requiring the applicant to reapply and/or be re-ranked. On the one hand, this seems acceptable and even desirable. However, the mandated postponement of a sabbatical has adverse consequences for new applicants of the school (Library) involved and is in conflict with Art. 27.8 of the MOU. The UPLC proposes the following:

*Amendment No. 4: Each SPLC (LPLC) should revise its "Procedures and Criteria for the Evaluation of Sabbatical and Difference-in-Pay Leaves" document so as to permit (or not to permit) the carry-over of postponed sabbaticals to the following year (without reapplication). Such a carry-over, if permitted, will effectively reduce the school's (Library's) quota with regard to new applications in the subsequent year. The application, if carried over, shall be forwarded to the UPLC for review and comparison in the light of new applications.

**Amendment No. 4**: If the President or his designee awards a sabbatical to one or more individuals, the number of such awarded sabbaticals shall be subtracted from the total sabbatical application prior to determining the quotas for each school and the Library, as specified in Section F.4.

Background No. 5: Each year the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications needs to be adjusted slightly to account for dates which fall on weekends or holidays. The UPLC proposes:

*Amendment No. 5: The Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications [LWPG, Page 6] shall contain the following statement:

"Note: Whenever one of the above dates falls on a weekend or holiday, that deadline is extended to the next regularly-scheduled workday."

---

"A.4. The immediate Past Chair of the UPLC shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the UPLC."

Background No. 3: Often an unsuccessful applicant for a sabbatical later requests a change from a sabbatical leave to a difference-in-pay leave. Infrequently, a request is made to change from a difference-in-pay leave to a sabbatical leave. Such a request was made in Feb. 1985 and was denied on the grounds that the prioritized list of 44 sabbaticals had already been determined. In accord with the 1984-1985 procedures, determining the position of a new application would have necessitated redoing the entire ranking process. One suggested remedy is for each SPLC (LPLC) to submit a common priority list of both sabbatical and difference-in-pay leaves. The UPLC rejects this solution and recommends instead:

*Amendment No. 3: Requests by an applicant for a change from a difference-in-pay leave to a sabbatical leave may not be made after the professional leave applications have been forwarded to the UPLC (in early January).

Background No. 4: Each year one or more successful applicants for a sabbatical are led to decline the offer, sometimes to pursue activities which may benefit the University even more than completion of the intended sabbatical. In such cases, the President/Provost often postpones the sabbatical to a subsequent year, without requiring the applicant to reapply and/or be re-ranked. On the one hand, this seems acceptable and even desirable. However, the mandated postponement of a sabbatical has adverse consequences for new applicants of the school (Library) involved and is in conflict with Art. 27.8 of the MOU. The UPLC proposes the following:

*Amendment No. 4: Each SPLC (LPLC) should revise its "Procedures and Criteria for the Evaluation of Sabbatical and Difference-in-Pay Leaves" document so as to permit (or not to permit) the carry-over of postponed sabbaticals to the following year (without reapplication). Such a carry-over, if permitted, will effectively reduce the school's (Library's) quota with regard to new applications in the subsequent year. The application, if carried over, shall be forwarded to the UPLC for review and comparison in the light of new applications.

**Amendment No. 4**: If the President or his designee awards a sabbatical to one or more individuals, the number of such awarded sabbaticals shall be subtracted from the total sabbatical application prior to determining the quotas for each school and the Library, as specified in Section F.4.

Background No. 5: Each year the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications needs to be adjusted slightly to account for dates which fall on weekends or holidays. The UPLC proposes:

*Amendment No. 5: The Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications [LWPG, Page 6] shall contain the following statement:

"Note: Whenever one of the above dates falls on a weekend or holiday, that deadline is extended to the next regularly-scheduled workday."
Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications

October 15 - Leave with pay eligibility lists are distributed and deadlines are announced by the Personnel Office. School deans / Library Director advise department heads and department heads notify eligible employees of eligibility and deadlines.

November 1 - Candidates are responsible for submitting applications for leaves with pay to department heads.

November 9 - Applications are forwarded to school deans / Library Director with department heads' recommendations following consultation with departmental faculty. The department shall provide a statement to the appropriate administrator regarding the possible effect on the curriculum and the operation of the department should the employee be granted a leave with pay. (MOU 27.6 & 28.8)

November 15 - Applications are forwarded to the SPLC's / LPLC by the school deans / Library Director.

Nov 15/Dec14- SPLC's and the LPLC review applications and interview all leave with pay applicants.

December 17 - Priority lists recommended by the SPLC's / LPLC are forwarded to the school deans / Library Director.

January 10 - School deans / Library Director forward a copy of their recommendations and priority lists, the SPLC / LPLC recommendations, all applications, and a report of the criteria and procedures followed in the recommendation process to the UPLC via the Provost.

Jan 11/Feb14- UPLC reviews school / library procedures and criteria for compliance, reviews applications, and develops a priority ranking of all applicants. Recommendations on priority are forwarded to the Provost by Feb. 14.

February 25 - The Provost notifies applicants of action on applications; such actions are subject to fiscal appropriations which are proposed for inclusion in the budget.

Feb 25/Mar25- UPLC recommends changes in school / library procedures and criteria to the Provost with a copy to the appropriate school deans / Library Director. The UPLC recommends to the Chair of the Academic Senate and to the Provost any changes in its procedures, criteria or the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications.
1. PROPOSER'S NAME  
George Brown

2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.  
Agricultural Engr.

3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)  
F.2.

4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)  
AE 121 - Agricultural Mechanics (2)  
Identification and use of tools and materials; tool sharpening and care; concrete mixes and materials; simple electric wiring; metal work; pipe fitting; basic woodworking; estimating quantities and costs. 1 lecture, 1 laboratory.

5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS  
Approves.

6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS  
Approves 6-0-0

7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION
## GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH PROPOSAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>Biological Sciences Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (Include section, and subsection if applicable)</td>
<td>F.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)</td>
<td>CONS 120 - Fisheries and Wildlife Management (3) Survey of fisheries and wildlife resources and management practices. Relationships to recreational values, land management, food production, and preservation. 3 lectures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</td>
<td>Approves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</td>
<td>Approves 6-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **PROPOSER'S NAME**  
NRM Department

2. **PROPOSER'S DEPT.**

3. **SUBMITTED FOR AREA** (include section, and subsection if applicable)  
F.2.

4. **COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)**  
FOR 201 - Forest Resources (3)  
Overview of forest resources including basic management, fire protection, and multiple use of forest, woodland, and chaparral lands for water production, forage, recreation, wildlife, timber, energy and urban forest values. Three lectures.

5. **SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**

   Approves.

6. **GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**

   Approves 8-0

7. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION**
1. **PROPOSER'S NAME**  
   Barbara P. Weber

2. **PROPOSER'S DEPT.**  
   Home Economics

3. **SUBMITTED FOR AREA (Include section, and subsection if applicable)**  
   D.4.b.

4. **COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)**  
   HE 203 - Consumer Role of the Family (3)  
   Study of the individual and family as consumers in the marketplace. Sources of consumer protection and recourse. Influence of selected management concepts on consumption patterns. 3 lectures.

5. **SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**  
   Against. See attached sheet.

6. **GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**  
   Against 0-6-0

7. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION**
To: George Lewis, Chair
   GE&B Committee

   -20- January 13, 1965

From: Area D. 4.b Subcommitte (Burton, Culver, Harris, Preston)

Subj: Evaluation of Home Economics 203

Our Subcommitte has reviewed the appropriateness of HE 203 (Consumer Role of the Family) for insertion into Area D.4.b in the General Education and Breadth curriculum. We recommend against this course in D.4.b based upon our evaluation of the support materials provided to you in Dr. Barbara Weber's memorandum of 21 October 1965.

Specifically, we note the following in our opposition to the course:

1. This course fails to meet the requirement of Area D as established in E.O. 338. It does not adequately address the interwoven nature of "human social, political and economic institutions and behavior" and it makes no effort to examine issues in a non-western context;
2. This course does not meet the Cal Poly GE&B Knowledge and Skills Statement requirements that concern (a) examination of the forces which shape institutions other than our own, (b) recognition of the interaction of communities and institutions, and (c) consideration of the geographical and cultural diversity of the world.

Comment: According to the clearly stated content and goals of Home Economics 203, the course is designed to increase the consumptive awareness of the American citizen. Essentially the course endeavors to help "...the consumer develop an individual consumer perspective, an awareness of sources of consumer protection and recourse, and a broad base of general information to apply management concepts to consumptive patterns." This effort directed at contemporary American consumers does not qualify as a candidate for inclusion in area D.4.b. Home Economics 203 does not examine problems in their contemporary as well as historical setting. It does not include both western and non-western contexts and fails to reflect the fact that human social, political and economic institutions and behavior are inextricably interwoven. Indeed if Home Economics 203 attempted to satisfy the criteria outline above it would (by its own definition) fail to achieve its stated goals and totally diminish the worthiness of the course to any contemporary American consumer. It is primarily a single issue course and must remain that way in order to fulfill its stated design. As such, Home Economics 203 simply does not qualify in Area D.4 b which is inherently broad based and represents an entirely different realm of study.
1. **PROPOSER'S NAME**  
Barbara P. Weber

2. **PROPOSER'S DEPT.**  
Home Economics

3. **SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)**  
F.2.

4. **COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)**  
HE 331 - Household Equipment (4)  
Principles involved in construction, operation, energy consumption, selection, safety, and space utilization of household equipment. 3 lectures, 1 two-hour laboratory. Prerequisite: Junior standing.

5. **SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**  
Approves, with the recommendation that Home Economics majors not be allowed to use this course to satisfy F.2.

6. **GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS**  
Approves 5-0-3  
Some members of the committee expressed reservations about the upper division status of this course.

7. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION**
### Proposal Form and Attachments

**General Education and Breadth Proposal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. <strong>Proposer's Name</strong></th>
<th>2. <strong>Proposer's Dept.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. <strong>Submitted for Area</strong> (Include section, and subsection if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1.b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. <strong>Course Prefix, Number, Title, Units, Description, etc. (Use catalog format)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To include ENT. and CONS. in the specific prefixes cited in Area B.1.b.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. <strong>Subcommittee Recommendation and Remarks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against (unanimous)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. <strong>GE &amp; B Committee Recommendation and Remarks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against. Committee divided the question:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT. 1-6-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS. 2-6-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. <strong>Academic Senate Recommendation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
be modified to include a parenthetical sentence listing the specific prefixes that define the term "life science." The proposed revision would read: Any 300-level life science course (i.e., with a BACT, BIO, BOT, CONS, ENT, or ZOO prefix) having one of the above as a prerequisite may also be selected with the exception of BIO 321, 342. (The added parenthetical statement has been underlined for clarity.)

In March of 1985 the GE&B Subcommittee for Area B, chaired by Dr. Mueller, directed its attention to the vague wording of GE&B, B.1.b. in the 1984-1986 catalog. This committee elected to define "life science" as those courses having "one of the prefixes: BACT, BIO, BOT or ZOO." The Bio Sci Department offers several 300-level life science courses having either an ENT or a CONS prefix. All of these courses are acceptable alternatives for Area B.1.b.

The effect of the present proposal would be to enlarge the 300-level life science courses offered by the Bio Sci Department that satisfy the GE&B Area B (B.1.b) requirements.

From: Jim Mueller, Chair
GE & B Subcommittee for Area B

Subject: Biological Science Department: Second Proposal

A meeting of the GE & B Area B subcommittee was held on November 6, 1985 to consider a request from the Biological Science Department to revise the definition of "life science" under GE & B guidelines in the catalog. Present at the meeting were Jim Mueller, Tina Bailey, Don Morgan, and John Pohling.

The proposed revision would expand the definition of "life science" for GE & B to include 300-level courses having the prefixes CONS or ENT. The subcommittee's vote was to deny the request. Our feeling was that courses with these prefixes do not carry the spirit of general education in Area B.

Documentation supporting this view can be found in GE & B notes #3, 10/19/81, from the Academic Affairs Office of the Chancellor:

Courses utilized to address understanding of science should be selected with an eye to exposing students to broad concepts and principles. Highly specialized and "how to" courses would not be expected to achieve the objectives of imparting "knowledge of the facts and principles which form the foundation of living and non-living systems" as well as exposing students to the methodologies of science and their limitations.

We reaffirm our decision of April 4, 1985 that the catalog read under GE&B B.1.b.: Any 300-level life science course (i.e., with a BACT, BIO, BOT, or ZOO prefix) having one of the above as a prerequisite may also be selected with the exception of BIO 321, 342.
Background statement on Modification of CAM 619:

CAM 619 was written at a time when diplomas were awarded and degrees conferred by the faculty at a single annual commencement ceremony, and the intent of this section of CAM was to provide the faculty with their one last chance to prevent a candidate from graduating "for any reason, academic or otherwise." Nowadays, degrees are not officially awarded and diplomas are not issued until the completion of all required academic work has been certified by the Registrar. No student has been denied a degree under the terms of CAM 619 in more than 20 years, and furthermore, the withholding of a degree for other than academic reasons would probably be challenged in the courts.

CAM 619 now reads:

Candidates for Graduation

The Registrar is responsible for checking the records of students who have applied for graduation. After being satisfied that those who have applied have met (or will meet pending satisfactory completion of their final quarter's work) all graduation requirements, the Registrar will submit a list, alphabetically by department, of "Applicants for Graduation" to the deans no later than three weeks before commencement. Notification of the faculty by the Registrar will coincide with the arrival of the list and space will be provided for interested faculty in the respective school to peruse it. This list will include the following covering statement: "The following students have applied for graduation. If they complete their current work in a satisfactory manner, they will have met the academic requirements. If for any reason, academic or otherwise, an instructor feels that any person on this list should not be graduated, the instructor must state reasons in writing to the Registrar at least two weeks before commencement." The Academic Deans Council will conduct hearings with the instructors who object to the applicants for graduation when they deem it appropriate. After all factors are considered, the Academic Deans Council will vote for or against the approval of graduating those who have applied. Their action will be final.
RESOLUTION ON MODIFICATION OF CAM 619

WHEREAS, CAM 619 was written at a time when diplomas were awarded and degrees conferred by the faculty at an annual commencement, and

WHEREAS, The intent of CAM 619 was to provide faculty the opportunity to prevent a candidate from graduating "for any reason, academic or otherwise," and

WHEREAS, The policy of withholding a degree from a candidate for nonacademic reasons would be subject to challenge in a court of law, and

WHEREAS, Degrees cannot be awarded until the completion of all course requirements has been confirmed by the Registrar, and

WHEREAS, Diplomas are not issued to successful candidates until such degrees have been confirmed, and

WHEREAS, No student has been denied a degree under the terms of this section in more than 20 years, and

WHEREAS, The addition of a second commencement ceremony has obscured the original intent of this section, and

WHEREAS, This section appears to be anachronistic and serves no legitimate purpose; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: To delete the language of Section 619 from the Campus Administrative Manual and substitute the following policy statement concerning Candidates for Graduation in Section 619 of the Campus Administrative Manual:

CAM 619 - Candidates for Graduation

The Registrar is responsible for checking the records of students who have applied for graduation. No degree will be awarded nor a diploma issued until all requirements for graduation have been met. The awarding of a degree and the date of graduation will be subject to the requirements stated on the student’s application for graduation, diploma regulations, and any other campus or CSU system directive in effect at the time of application. The Registrar will provide departmental faculty with a list of candidates who have applied to graduate each term within two weeks following the beginning of classes.

Proposed By: Student Affairs Committee April 15, 1986
Background: Women's Week has been celebrated at Cal Poly every year since 1982 in conjunction with National Women's History Week. The presentations focus on important aspects of women's role in society. Financial support has come, for the most part, through Student Affairs. Interest and attendance at Women's Week has continually grown, so that this past February, there were 31 presentations, including lectures, a poetry reading, luncheon, fun run, films and a theatrical performance. Well over 1100 attended the events; 90% of whom were students.

AS-86/____

RESOLUTION
RECOGNIZING WOMEN'S WEEK AT CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

WHEREAS, Women's Week has been celebrated at California Polytechnic State University every year since 1982 in conjunction with National Women's History Week; and

WHEREAS, Interest and attendance at Women's Week has significantly grown during that time; and

WHEREAS, The study of women's accomplishments in history, art, music, science, and other endeavors is an integral part of students' education; and

WHEREAS, Women's Week represents a collaborative effort of California Polytechnic State University students, staff and faculty, and other universities; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recognize Women's Week as an important aspect of California Polytechnic State University's educational offerings; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate urge all academic departments to support Women's Week in whatever manner deemed appropriate.

Proposed By:
Elie Axelroth and
Nancy Loe of Professional Consultative Services
April 8, 1986
RESOLUTION ON DISTINCTION BETWEEN OPTIONS AND CONCENTRATIONS AT CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

WHEREAS, The distinction made in CAM 411 between options and concentrations appears primarily to be based on the number of units contained in the curricular alternative; and

WHEREAS, There appears to be confusion at California Polytechnic State University, at the Chancellor's Office, and on other campuses both within and outside of the CSUC system as to California Polytechnic State University's distinction between options and concentrations; and

WHEREAS, A survey by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee of academic departments indicates no opposition to the concept of using only one such curricular alternative; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the following changes be made to CAM 411 and that these changes be implemented with the 1988-90 catalog:
411 Guidelines for Majors, Minors, and Concentrations

A. Recognized Categories of Curricular Concentrations Alternatives.

(Note: For the purpose of computing grade point average at graduation, "major" is defined as follows in 1. and 2. below.)

1. Major (B.S.)
   
   (a) For the B.S. degree, the major shall consist of no less than 54 or more than 70 quarter units of courses required for graduation in each curriculum.

   (1) Of the units in courses designated as major, at least 27 must be in 300 or 400 series courses.

   (2) Of the units in courses designated as major, at least six must be required in the freshman and at least nine in the sophomore year.

   (b) The courses in the major, designated as "M" courses, must be exclusive of those used to satisfy the general education requirement. The "M" courses generally are those with the major departmental prefix although others may be included.

2. Major (B.A.)

   (a) For the B.A. degree, the major shall consist of no less than 48 or more than 60 quarter units of courses required for graduation in each curriculum.

   (1) Of the units in courses designated as major, at least 24 must be in 300 or 400 series courses.

   (2) Of the total of 186 quarter units required for the degree, at least 60 must be in 300 or 400 series courses.
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(3) Of the units in courses designated as major, at least six must be required in the freshman year and at least six in the sophomore year.

(b) The courses in the major, designated as "M" courses, must be exclusive of those used to satisfy the general education requirement. The "M" courses generally are those with the major departmental prefix although others may be included.

3. Minor

No minor is required for the bachelor's degree.

Teaching minors consist of a minimum of 30 quarter units in a specific field. Teaching minors are designed to meet credential regulations and should not be confused with concentrations.

4. Option

An option is a curricular alternative in a department having 30 or more quarter units of specified courses not common to other curricular alternatives and designed to give the student substantially different capabilities than the other alternatives.

5. Concentration

A concentration is a block of courses to be chosen with the approval of the student's adviser comprising from 18 to 29-39 quarter units providing essentially different capabilities for the student. A minimum of 12 of these 18-29-39 units must be in specified courses.
B. Guidelines Relating to Options

1. The basic curriculum display in the catalog should show only those courses common to the two or more option alternatives.

2. Following the basic curriculum display, the courses required to complete the major in each option should be listed in the manner shown in the catalog.

3. In addition to courses offered by the major department, options may include required courses from other departments.

4. No maximum number of units are presently specified for options. However, it appears that 39 quarter units is a reasonable maximum. Although some existing options of over 39 quarter units have been allowed, strong justification will be required for approval of additional options of over 39 quarter units.

---

Guidelines Relating to Concentrations

1. The basic curriculum display in the catalog should show only those courses common to the concentration alternatives.

2. Following the basic curriculum display, the courses required to complete the major in each concentration should be listed in the catalog.

3. A footnote in the catalog should indicate the number of elective units which must be selected with the approval of the adviser to form the concentration.

Example: "At least 18 quarter units shall be chosen with the approval of the adviser in one of the concentration areas of Production, Management, or Science-Teaching."
Available concentrations should be named and may be described briefly in the departmental introductory material.

A list of those courses which are required and eligible for use in a specific concentration must be provided to the Evaluation Technician and departmental advisers by the appropriate school dean.

4. All units in an option must be specified. If the 30 or more quarter units cannot be specified, the concentration route should be used.

6. A student must select one of the available curricular alternatives concentrations recognized and/or displayed in the catalog.

7. "M" courses may appear in an option or a concentration as well as in the core or basic curriculum display.

8. A concentration within an option-a concentration is not appropriate.

9. There must be a discrete bachelor's degree program. That is, options-concentrations requiring a bachelor's degree program to run into the graduate year will not be approved.

Proposed By:
Curriculum Committee
April 8, 1986
# General Education and Breadth Proposal

**1. Proposer's Name**  
Art Department

**2. Proposer's Dept.**

**3. Submitted For Area (Include section, and subsection if applicable)**  
C.3.

**4. Course Prefix, Number, Title, Units, Description, etc. (Use catalog format)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art 208</td>
<td>Sculpture</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Exploration of three-dimensional form through problems in modeling, casting, carving and techniques of assembly. Miscellaneous course fee required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Laboratories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5. Subcommittee Recommendation and Remarks and**

This course was referred back to committee for possible inclusion in Area C.3., after having been considered and rejected for Area C.2. The Area C Subcommittee reaffirmed its support for including Art 208 in Area C.3. Nevertheless, the GE&B Committee rejected this proposal by a vote of 4-5-0. The members opposing such inclusion felt that Area C would not be strengthened by the inclusion of skills, studio, or performance courses.

**6. GE & B Committee Recommendation and Remarks:**

The members opposing such inclusion felt that Area C would not be strengthened by the inclusion of skills, studio, or performance courses.
1. PROPOSER'S NAME  
Stan Dundon  

2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.  
Philosophy  

3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)  
C.3. (and F.2. by Chair of GE&B)  

4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)  
HUM 302-Human Values in Agriculture (3). 3 lectures.  
Nature of values at issue in agriculture which impact on the wider community. Technical-factual foundation of needs of agriculture which contribute to value conflicts, ethical principles and devices yielding resolutions. Interdisciplinary team taught, with guest lecturers and possible field trips. Literary and historical materials dramatically expressing values.  

5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS  
Area C  Against  1-3-0 (Chair not voting)  
Area F  Against  

6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS  
Area C.3. Approves contingent upon course not being cross-listed with an AG prefix. 8-1-0  
Area F.2. Against  1-8-0  
See attached remarks by Chair.  

7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION
REMARKS

Rarely is there as much divergence between the recommendation of an area subcommittee and that of the GE&B Committee as has occurred in the proposal to include HUM 302 in Area C.3.

When originally proposed for C.3., the Chair of GE&B also referred the course to the Area F Subcommittee for possible inclusion in F.2. The Area F Subcommittee recommended against its inclusion in F.2. on the basis that its orientation was toward social and humanistic aspects of technology rather than to applications of technology to practical problems in, and practical skills required by (in this case) agriculture.

Likewise, the Area C Subcommittee recommended against its inclusion in C.3. primarily because the course content was not suitable for that area. In doing so, the Area C Subcommittee expressed concern that too often courses of an interdisciplinary nature that are proposed for GE&B, are routinely proposed for Area C.

The General Education and Breadth Committee in its deliberations expressed the view that an interdisciplinary course dealing with such a timely topic as HUM 302 does, should be included in the General Education program at Cal Poly, and that being a course in applied ethics, it was indeed appropriate for Area C.3.

While the Chair respects the views of both subcommittees and that of the GE&B Committee as well, he is troubled by the apparent disregard for HUM 302 in relation to the General Education & Breadth Knowledge and Skills Statement 7.A., 7.B., 9.A., and 9.B. These items would seem to apply directly to HUM 302, and have been attached for your perusal.
CAL POLY GRADUATES, BY VIRTUE OF THEIR EDUCATION AT A POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, SHOULD UNDERSTAND HOW TECHNOLOGY INFLUENCES AND IS INFLUENCED BY CULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS, THE APPLICATIONS OF TECHNOLOGY TO CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS, AND THE POTENTIAL OF TECHNOLOGY TO BOTH POSITIVELY AND NEGATIVELY AFFECT INDIVIDUALS AND SOCIETIES.

Outcome number 7 can be achieved by including the following:

A. Students should gain an awareness of their increasing dependence on technology, and how it is guided, managed, and controlled.

B. Students should be able to evaluate and assess questions of value and choice underlying technologies and how, in the course of their development, these questions have been addressed and answered.

C. Students should gain a basic level of computer skill and literacy.

CAL POLY GRADUATES, BECAUSE THEY WILL BE LIVING IN A TECHNOLOGICAL WORLD, SHOULD BE EXPOSED TO COURSES TAUGHT WITHIN THE TECHNOLOGICAL AREAS, SO THAT THEY WILL HAVE A BASIS FOR DEVELOPING A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF HOW TECHNOLOGY INFLUENCES AND IS INFLUENCED BY PRESENT DAY CULTURES AND OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS.

Outcome number 9 is addressed by courses which emphasize the following:

A. Students should develop an awareness of typical problems addressed by technology, such as methods of world food production, applications of the computer, or the production, distribution, and control of energy.

B. Students should have an opportunity to learn the difficulties inherent in solving technological problems. The emphasis should be on the application of theoretical knowledge to practical matters such as:

1. The consequences and implications of applied technology for environmental factors of climate, water quality, soil, and plant resources.

2. Problems stemming from the intersections of population growth, technology and resource consumption, such as climate change, the energy crisis, world hunger and soil erosion.

3. Contributions of technology in enhancing the availability of food and shelter, harnessing energy, and improving the quality of life.

C. Students should develop an awareness of issues raised by the intersection of culture and technology.
1. PROPOSER'S NAME
Mathematics Department

2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.

3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (Include section, and subsection if applicable)
   B.2.

4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)
   Math 201 - Appreciation of Mathematics (3)
   Contemporary mathematics and the relationship between mathematics and our cultural heritage. Intended to develop an appreciation for the role that mathematics plays in society, both past and present. 3 lectures.

5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS
   Approves (unanimous).

6. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS
   Approves 5-4-0. See attachment.
   Those members opposing felt that the integrity of the mathematics requirement would be better sustained by a traditional algebra course.
   Note that Math 113 is a prerequisite in the '86-'88 catalog.
Memorandum

To: George Lewis
Via: Lloyd Lamouria

From: Paul Murphy
Subject: Math 201

Date: October 1, 1985

The Mathematics Department would like to have the course Math 201, Appreciation of Mathematics, added to the list of allowable G.E.B. electives, in area B.

I am enclosing an expanded course outline of the course. I am also having letters sent to you from department heads in other departments, expressing the opinion that this course would be valuable to their majors.

Math 201 has been carefully designed to replace our former Math 100, Mathematics for General Education. For many years we offered Math 100 as an elective for students who did not need any particular mathematical skills for courses in their major or in their support courses. The course had no prerequisites, and the course outline gave the instructor a great deal of freedom. In 1982, the G.E.B. Committee decided not to include Math 100 in its list of allowable electives.

In the last several years, the entrance requirements for admission to Cal Poly have been substantially toughened, in mathematics as well as other subjects. This development has allowed our Curriculum Committee to design a new course which can meet the needs of students in the same majors as did Math 100, but which is considerably more rigorous and challenging.

In particular, Math 201 has a prerequisite of Math 113 or two years of high-school algebra. And since students are required to pass the ELM exam before they take any mathematics class at Cal Poly, instructors of Math 201 can be certain that their students will have basic algebra skills. With this in mind, we have chosen a text for Math 201 which is probably the most advanced of the texts which were used for Math 100. (Math 100 allowed the instructor to choose the text, and there were sometimes as many as four or five in use in a given academic year.) More important, this text, *Faces of Mathematics* by Roberts and Varberg, fits the goals expressed in Executive Order 338 and Cal Poly's "Knowledge and Skills Statement" extremely well. That is, the course and the text are designed to teach students "not ... merely basic computational skills, but ... as well the understanding of basic mathematical concepts" (E.O. 338, section IV B). Most instructors who used this text for Math 100 were very pleased with this aspect of the text; if they had any complaint, it was that the text was a bit too hard for many Math 100 students.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need additional information or supporting materials.
Background statement:

The committee has received extensive testimony from administrators, faculty, and students concerning the Cal Poly Foundation. The committee has also obtained input from the Executive Director and the Associate to the Executive Director of the Foundation.

The present election process for the Foundation Board of Directors has not been effective in communicating openings on this Board to either students or faculty. In addition, the present process provides for the election of new Board members by the current Board thus enabling the Directors to re-elect themselves. The result has been a Board that has effectively been closed to new individuals and new ideas.

RESOLUTION ON THE FOUNDATION ELECTION PROCESS

WHEREAS, The current process by which the Board of Directors of the California Polytechnic State University Foundation is elected has resulted in a Board that has effectively been closed to new individuals and new ideas; and

WHEREAS, The current process has not resulted in sufficient equity and balance among the various constituencies; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the process of selection/election to and membership of the Board of Directors of California Polytechnic State University Foundation be altered to be:

1. The University President or his/her designee;
2. Three administrative staff members of the University selected to serve three-year terms. The process is to be determined by the University President in consultation with the Board;
3. Three tenured faculty members of the University selected to serve three-year terms by the Academic Senate. The process is to be determined by the Elections Committee of the Academic Senate. No members shall serve more than two consecutive terms;
4. Three students of the University selected to serve one-year terms as determined by the University President. The process is to be consistent with Resolution #86-03 of the Student Senate;
5. At least one, but no more than three, off-campus members selected to serve one-year terms by the University President; and be it further

RESOLVED: That in the event that a vacancy occurs on the Board, a replacement shall be selected to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term of office of that individual by the same process by which that individual was selected.

Proposed By:
The Ad Hoc Committee on the Cal Poly Foundation
April 29, 1986
Background statement:

The Provost has asked the Academic Senate to review the present requirement that a minimum of nine units of free electives exist in each major curriculum at Cal Poly. After gathering opinions from both school deans and school curriculum committees, the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate finds the University faculty as a whole and itself to be evenly divided on this issue. We therefore submit two opposing resolutions for the full Senate to discuss and act upon.
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RESOLUTION ON FREE ELECTIVES

WHEREAS, Students are required to take a broad spectrum of courses by the General Education & Breadth requirements; and

WHEREAS, The units for General Education & Breadth requirements have been increased in recent years; and

WHEREAS, California Polytechnic State University’s hands-on, learn-by-doing philosophy may require many more design and project units than other schools; and

WHEREAS, This has made it difficult if not impossible for a number of disciplines to maintain their traditional quality of program within a four-year degree; and

WHEREAS, The spirit of collegiality vests curricular formulation responsibility within the faculty; and

WHEREAS, The faculty, department heads/chairs, and school deans thoroughly review the curricula for which they are responsible; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the curricula of majors at California Polytechnic State University need not include any free electives.

Proposed By:
Curriculum Committee
May 6, 1986
Background statement:

The Provost has asked the Academic Senate to review the present requirement that a minimum of nine units of free electives exist in each major curriculum at Cal Poly. After gathering opinions from both school deans and school curriculum committees, the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate finds the University faculty as a whole and itself to be evenly divided on this issue. We therefore submit two opposing resolutions for the full Senate to discuss and act upon.
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SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION ON FREE ELECTIVES

WHEREAS, 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; and

WHEREAS, The Campus Administrative Manual (CAM) Section 411.1 requires 12 units of electives, 9 of which may not be restricted in any way by the student's department; and

WHEREAS, In recent years exemptions have been granted to this Section 411.1 requirement to the extent that some majors have had no free electives; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That no exemptions from the requirements of CAM Section 411.1 be granted under any circumstances.

Proposed by:
Curriculum Committee
May 6, 1986
Background statement on RESOLUTION ON PCBs:

On March 5 and again on March 17, 1986, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) leaked from light fixtures in the Engineering West building, exposing students and faculty. The first incident was the more serious and disturbing, because faculty and students reentered the room on the day following the reporting of the hazard and had to be dismissed by the technicians who arrived to clean up the toxic material. PCBs are highly dangerous substances, even at the lowest levels, according to the Environmental Protection Agency. They enter the body through the skin, the lungs, and the gastrointestinal tract, and they do not dissipate, but rather accumulate. They are not only carcinogens; they have also been proven to cause birth defects, gastric disorders, liver damage, skin lesions, and other ills. The campus Office of Plant Maintenance and the Cal Poly Environmental Health and Occupational Safety Subcommittee (chaired by Richard C. Brug, Director of Public Safety) have been working to reduce the danger for the past several years. They have succeeded in replacing all the old lamps in the dormitories and food areas of the campus, as well as in the Science building (52), and about half of those in Engineering West. The Director of Plant Maintenance, Edward Naretto, estimates that about 22,000 old light ballasts remain in use on campus. They are currently being handled as quickly as budget restraints permit, but it will cost about $350,000 to eliminate the problem completely. While there is no government mandate for the immediate removal of PCB-bearing lamps, the two incidents of March suggest that Cal Poly must approach the problem with greater urgency than now obtains and that budget allocations must give this hazard the highest priority.
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RESOLUTION ON PCBs ON CAMPUS AT CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

WHEREAS, Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) leaked from fluorescent lamps on March 5 and again on March 17 in two different classrooms in the Engineering West building, exposing faculty and students (more than one class in the first incident); and
RESOLUTION ON PCBs ON CAMPUS AT
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

WHEREAS, PCBs are a known carcinogen and have also been proven to cause birth defects, gastric disorders, liver damage, skin lesions, and other severe health problems; and

WHEREAS, PCBs enter the body through the lungs, the gastrointestinal tract, or the skin and accumulate in fatty tissue, the liver, the kidneys, the lungs, the adrenal glands, the brain, the heart, and the skin, so that no exposure, however small, is safe; and

WHEREAS, California Polytechnic State University is pledged to the physical as well as the intellectual health of its students, faculty, and staff; and

WHEREAS, There can be no higher priority than the health and safety of campus personnel; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the replacement of all old fluorescent lamps on the campus be made a matter of the highest priority; and be it further

RESOLVED: That monies for this purpose be allocated immediately; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Director of Public Safety and the Office of Plant Maintenance adopt stronger communication measures to prevent the inadvertent entry by campus personnel into a room contaminated with hazardous material; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Director of Public Safety report on progress towards the complete elimination of PCBs to the Academic Senate at regular intervals.

Proposed By:
Marlin Vix/Barbara Hallman/Susan Currier
May 7, 1986
WHEREAS, There currently is no policy at California Polytechnic State University to provide for the recognition or honoring of those faculty members who have died while employed at California Polytechnic State University; and

WHEREAS, The university has no policies or procedures as to identifying such deceased faculty members who have made a major and significant contribution over many years to the academic mission and goals of the university; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That any faculty member who has at least 15 years of continuous employment at California Polytechnic State University immediately preceding death, and is employed at California Polytechnic State University at the time of death, or retired within the previous 12 months, and who can be identified as having made a significant contribution to an academic program through teaching, student relations, alumni relations, program development, or other documentable activities directed toward enhancement of the educational mission of California Polytechnic State University, shall be recognized and honored by being awarded the title of Honorary Professor, posthumously; and be it further

RESOLVED: That any person nominated for said recognition shall be evaluated for recommendation of action to the Academic Senate and the President by an ad hoc committee appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, with inclusion on the committee of a representative from the deceased's department; and be it further

RESOLVED: That public acknowledgment of this recognition shall be at the next following university commencement exercise; and be it further

RESOLVED: That it is recommended to the president that the names of all university employees and retirees who have died in the preceding year be read at the fall convocation and those persons honored with a moment of silence.

Proposed By:
Charles Andrews
May 13, 1986
RESOLUTION ON THE PROPOSAL FOR THE PROMOTION OF ED ZUCHELLI

WHEREAS: Due to the untimely death of Mr. Zuchelli;

WHEREAS: Mr. Zuchelli made many valuable and outstanding contributions to the polytechnic nature of the University.

WHEREAS: Mr. Zuchelli was very well-liked and respected by both his colleagues and students.

WHEREAS: Mr. Zuchelli was involved in the normal process of promotion; be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California Polytechnic State University supports and urges the Provost and the President to promote Mr. Ed Zuchelli to the rank of professor, posthumously.

Proposed by:

Alan F. Cooper
Biological Sciences Department
April 22, 1986