CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA 93407

ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES

December 3, 1985
UU-220 3:15 p.m.

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

Members Absent: (not recorded)

I. Minutes

A. A number of typographical errors were corrected by the Secretary in a memo distributed on the Senate floor.

B. In addition to the distributed corrections, the following were noted:

1. Les Bowker and Marshall Wright had been mistakenly listed as absent from the November 5 Senate meeting.

2. John Phillips noted that the adjournment of the November 5 Senate meeting had actually occurred prior to 5:00 p.m.

C. Subject to the corrections noted in A and B above, the minutes were approved.

II. Reports

A. President’s Report

The President announced that he had officially received the statement of Senate action changing its Bylaws (October 1) to establish the UPLC and adopting (November 5) the UPLC criteria
and procedures contained in the document "Leave with Pay Guidelines."

The President noted a number of inconsistencies between the C&B (Rogalla) Report and the UPLC (Terry) Report. He suggested that the two Senate committees study this matter and resolve the inconsistencies.

B. Statewide Senators’ Report

Reg Gooden and Tim Kersten reported on the activities of the Statewide Senate.

1. Cal Poly was well-represented at the Asilomar Retreat (November 15-17) at which the strengths and weaknesses of the baccalaureate degree were discussed.

2. The next regularly-scheduled meeting of the CSU Academic Senate is January 9, 1986.

3. The following issues are presently under consideration by the Statewide Academic Senate:
   a. A resolution relating to Article 12 of the CFA contract (lecturers’ rights);
   b. A resolution on professional activities (modeled after Cal Poly’s broad definition of professional development);
   c. A resolution on professional responsibility and sexual harassment. Such a resolution already exists. This resolution would be a reaffirmation and refinement of existing policy.

4. Input concerning the issues mentioned above would be appreciated.

III. Business Items

A. Resolution on Disabled Students
Bill Forgeng (Chair: Student Affairs Committee) and Harriet Clendenen (Director: Disabled Student Services) spoke in favor of the resolution. The following points were noted:

1. The word "reasonable" was added to the second and third "Whereas" clauses by the Student Affairs Committee after the last Senate meeting. Likewise, the second "Resolved" clause was changed to meet objections voiced by Susan Currier and others at the November 5 Senate meeting.

2. The Resolution was the result of action taken by the SAC in response to questions and concerns certain students had with respect to test adaptations. Disabled students have specific needs and concerns that can be met; e.g., extended time, test proctors (supplied by DSS).

3. Al Cooper, speaking on behalf of five Biological Sciences faculty, sought to distinguish between physical handicaps and learning disabilities. He pointed out that the granting of extended time to disabled students may be viewed as unfair to those without handicaps.

4. Lynn Jamieson explained that students with learning disabilities (e.g., dyslexia) need someone to read questions to them, not to explain the questions. A less distracting setting is often required for such students to take examinations.

5. Harriet Clendenen indicated that while learning disabilities represented a relatively-new category of disabilities, they are as significant a handicap as a physical impairment. There exist numerous verifiable learning disabilities. When DSS verifies that a student has such a recognizable learning disability, the student is encouraged to sign a release for DSS to answer questions by faculty.

6. Harriet Clendenen explained that proctors supplied by DSS read questions to disabled students without giving explanations.
7. At Charles Andrews' request, the word "recognized" was changed to "identified."

Bill Forgeng moved the adoption of the Resolution on Disabled Students. Reg Gooden seconded the motion. The Resolution was adopted unanimously.

B. Resolution on Apartheid

Robert Bonds (Chair: Professional Consultative Services Caucus) spoke on behalf of the Resolution which he had introduced.

1. Robert Bonds indicated that the eighth "Whereas" clause and the second "Resolved" clause are being deleted from the Resolution.

2. Charles Andrews asked if the Resolution sought total divestment or only divestment of holdings in corporations that do not adhere to the Sullivan Principles.

3. David Kaminskas (ASI) felt that the Student Senate was in favor of divestment based on non-adherence to the Sullivan Principles.

4. Mark Reichel (a student senator last year) said that last year's Student Senate preferred total divestment.

5. Reg Gooden spoke in favor of total divestment. He branded the Sullivan Principles as passe and denounced adherence to them as a "red herring."

6. Al Cooper asked how it was possible not to do business with South Africa.

Quintard Taylor (History) explained that most banks had decided not to do business with South Africa before now and that a Reagan Executive Order last August prohibits U.S. banks from doing business with South Africa in any event.
C. Resolution on the Removal of the Ceiling on Instructional Replacement Equipment (First Reading)

Jens Pohl (Chair: Budget Committee) was unavailable. Art Duarte was present to introduce the Resolution (p. 7) and respond to questions. The following points were established:

1. The limit on computer replacement equipment is $200,000; the total replacement budget is about $1,500,000 which consists of $913,000 which has been budgeted. The remainder is expected to come from the lottery.

2. Local interpretation of what is (not) computer replacement equipment is important since even an everyday appliance like a coffeepot contains a computer. Each year more and more equipment has some form of computer attached to it.

3. The instructional computer replacement equipment budget is separate from the computer center budget. In addition, computer equipment is asked for in other portions of the budget.

4. The limit on computer replacement equipment has been in existence for a long time. Formerly, the limit was $50,000.

5. In some schools a high-priority item which falls into the computer-replacement equipment category has been rejected because of the $200,000 ceiling, whereas a lower priority item not in the computer-replacement equipment category has been provided. No specific examples were given.

6. Computer equipment may need to be replaced more often. Technology moves rapidly. Systems continually need to be upgraded to maintain current, state-of-the-art equipment.

7. The $200,000 limit probably does not include software.
Provost Fort voiced his support for the Resolution. He asserted that the Schools know best what their needs are. An artificial constraint serves no purpose.

D. GE & B Catalog Recommendations (Cf. pp. 8-9)

Reg Gooden introduced the item as George Lewis (Chair: GE&B Committee) had not yet arrived. While awaiting George Lewis' arrival, the Chair recognized Crissa Hewitt who presented reasons why ART 208 should be included in the GE&B requirement (Area C. 2). She referred to a Resolution (distributed on the Senate floor) which, if adopted by the Senate, would overturn the GE&B's recommendation against the inclusion of ART 208 in Area C. 2.

Reg Gooden moved that the rules be suspended and the item move to a second reading.

The Chair announced that this motion was non-debatable and required a two-thirds vote. Parliamentarian Robert Bonds upheld the Chair's ruling. George Lewis arrived at an opportune moment. The Chair announced that the Senate would return to the planned sequence of business.

1. Jim Vilkitis questioned the GE&B's recommendation against the inclusion of FOR 201 in the Area F. 2 GE&B requirements. The course failed to be recommended for inclusion by a tie-vote.

2. Tim O'Keefe presented information concerning the content and purpose of the course.

3. Tim Kersten asked for an explanation of why the course should be in the technology area of GE&B.

4. George Lewis stated that many courses proposed for inclusion in the GE&B requirements are good courses but are inappropriate for the GE&B area that they seek to occupy. Also, when there is substantial opposition to including a course in the GE&B requirements there should be a compelling reason for recommending it.
5. Marylinda Wheeler suggested that the GE&B Committee provide a rationale for each of its recommendations.

George Lewis indicated that the GE&B Committee felt that the issues addressed by FOR 201 would be better presented in NRM 101.

6. It became evident that the course outline FOR 201 had been changed since it was first presented to the Committee. By consensus, it was agreed that the new course would go through channels again.

7. Crissa Hewitt moved the adoption of her "Resolution for the Inclusion of ART 208 Sculpture in GE&B C. 2." To permit a vote, Reg Gooden moved the Resolution to a second reading. The motion failed after a voice vote and a show of hands.

8. George Lewis informed the Senate that failure to approve the routine changes (page 8, Item I) would deny these courses entry in the 1986-1988 catalog.

9. Reg Gooden moved to separate the recommendations of Item I (page 8) from those of Item II (page 9).

10. A motion to suspend the rules (to permit the separation of the GE&B Report) was adopted with one dissenting vote.

11. A motion to separate the GE&B Report passed with four abstentions.


13. Additional discussion of ART 208 took place.

IV. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.