I. Call to Order /Minutes

A. The meeting was called to order at 3:20 p.m., as soon as a quorum existed.

B. The Chair announced that the President had made some minor corrections to the originally-submitted minutes for the April 1, 1986 Senate meeting which had been devoted to an address by the President followed by an hour-long question period. The revised minutes were distributed to the Senate on dittos.

C. Neither the Secretary nor any other Senator noted any substantial difference between the two sets of minutes for the April 1 meeting.

D. The revised minutes for April 1, 1986 were approved as revised.

II. Announcements

A. The results of the recent elections to the Senate and the UPLC have been posted on the back wall of the Senate chambers.

B. The Foundation Board is now placing a copy of its agenda in the Kennedy Library for review by the Senate and individual faculty members.

C. Building numbers will be added to all buildings on campus along with the name of the building, as funds become available.

D. Joe Weatherby, the Senate’s Governmental Specialist, informed the Senate of trouble developing in the State Senate concerning the funding of FERP and concurrent enrollment.

III. Reports

There were no reports from the Office of the President, nor from the Office of the Provost, nor from the CSU Senators.
IV. Business Items

A. Procedural Changes for the MPPP Awards

1. The Chair recognized Charles Andrews (Chair: Personnel Policies Committee) who noted some minor editorial changes made in the document since the April 8 Senate meeting when it first became an agenda item.

2. Charles Andrews moved the adoption of the document "Procedural Changes for MPPP Awards".

3. The revised procedures were adopted by the Senate with one abstention.

B. Resolution on the Proposal for the Promotion of Ed Zuchelli

1. Al Cooper moved to suspend the rules so as to permit consideration of this Resolution, which was not an announced agenda item. The necessary two-thirds vote was received.

2. The Chair opened the discussion.
   a. Clarissa Hewitt asked if adoption of the Resolution would have any financial impact.
   b. Al Cooper believed that there would be no economic impact.
   c. Jan Pieper tentatively agreed with Al Cooper.
   d. Charles Andrews suggested that the whereas clauses should be redrafted to provide information about Ed Zuchelli's numerous contributions to the University and its academic programs.
   e. Reg Gooden moved to table the Resolution until the next Senate meeting (May 13) at which time it would go to a second reading. Reg felt that Senate action now may be inappropriate since it would preempt action by Ed Zuchelli's peers. Posthumous recognition by the Senate usually occurs after and/or at the request of a faculty members Department.
   f. Tim Kersten suggested that Reg's motion lacked substance since failure to table the motion today would also cause the item to move to a second reading on May 13.
   g. Reg Gooden defended his motion to table the
Resolution to May 13 to prevent its being moved to a second reading today.

h. Discussion tapered off. The motion to table was voted upon. The necessary two-thirds vote was received.

C. Resolution on Giving of Finals During Finals’ Week

1. The Chair recognized Clarissa Hewitt who indicated that the Resolution in the agenda package differed from that considered on April 8 in one way: the resolved clause recommending docking the pay of faculty members who disobey CAM 484 had been deleted.

2. Clarissa Hewitt moved the adoption of the Resolution.

3. Reg Gooden noted that the Resolution now contained no sanctions at all.

4. Jim Ahern asked for clarification of the meaning of designated time and asked if exams could be administered by other faculty members or if CAM required a faculty member to administer his own finals.

5. Lezlie Labhard questioned exactly what the Resolution recommended that the Administration do. Charles Andrews gave a partial answer to her question.

6. Sandra Dills inquired about the Amendment to the Resolution (found on p. 18 of the agenda package). Clarissa Hewitt would not accept the amendment as friendly.

7. Ray Terry moved the adoption of the amendment on page 18 and provided reasons for its adoption; viz. the publicizing of all dean-approved exceptions to CAM 484 would help to reduce the number of unapproved changes in the times of finals and may also contribute to reducing the number of dean-approved exceptions, which, likewise, inconvenience other faculty members.

8. Tim Kersten questioned the arbitrary time line of the fifth week to distribute the list of dean-approved exceptions. Ray Terry agreed that the time line was arbitrary and could be as late as the ninth week.

9. Robert Bonds noted that just a few exceptions can
upset things greatly. The burden of hardship is on the students. Robert, in his years of counseling, has listened to hundreds of students complain about the time of finals being changed.

10. Charles Andrews was adamant in retaining the five-week deadline. He argued that instructors should be able to identify such needs by the fifth week, that exceptions are for the benefit of the faculty member who must take the responsibility. Andrews also noted that numerous faculty are willing to substitute for other faculty to conduct the latter’s finals during the designated times.

11. Clarissa Hewitt read portions of CAM 484.

12. The amendment was adopted by the Senate unanimously.

13. Steve French asked if CAM would preclude giving a take-home final due at the same (different) time than a scheduled in-class final. It was agreed that take-home finals are unaffected by CAM.

14. Ken Riener expressed the need for some clear set of penalties for those who violated CAM 484. He asked that another resolved clause be added to the Resolution asking the Administration to draw up a set of penalties.

a. The Chair indicated that the Administration would not wish to develop a set of penalties without recommendations from the Academic Senate.

b. Clarissa Hewitt had difficulty deciding whether to accept Ken Riener’s suggestion as a friendly amendment.

c. Tim Kersten explained the meaning of a friendly amendment. Even if the proposer of a resolution is willing to accept an amendment as friendly, any other Senator can object, in which case the amendment must be voted upon separately.

d. The amendment was not accepted as friendly due to the opposition of Reg Gooden.

e. The matter was resolved when Dan Bertozzi suggested inserting the word "vigorously" in the resolved clause so that it would read:
"That the Academic Senate request again that the Administration vigorously enforce CAM 484."

15. Charles Andrews moved the question. The required two-thirds vote was obtained. The Resolution was adopted with two negative votes.

D. Resolution on Amendments to the Bylaws

1. John Rogalla (Chair: C&B) was absent. Bill Forgeng agreed to answer questions in his stead.

2. Reg Gooden proposed changing "memo of understanding" to "memorandum of understanding", the former being a sign of sloppiness.

3. The Resolution was adopted by a voice vote.

E. Joint Report and Recommendations to Eliminate Discordant Provisions of the UPLC Bylaws, the Leave with Pay Guidelines and the Academic Senate Bylaws

1. The Chair recognized Ray Terry to present the report in the absence of John Rogalla.

2. Ray Terry pointed out that the Senate bylaws provide for an ex-officio non-voting representative from the Personnel Office and the Provost's Office. The UPLC Bylaws inadvertently left out this provision. Amendment No. 1 seeks to amend the UPLC Leave With Pay Guidelines to make the membership section agree with the Senate Bylaws.

Charles Andrews and others asserted that the membership of these two individuals on the UPLC is contrary to the MOU.

Ray Terry argued that the two Administration representatives are ex-officio, non-voting; that they provide some worthwhile services by their presence; and that the UPLC, in fact, has to justify greater contract deviations in its de facto recognition of non-elected faculty members on the committee (due to the resignation of an elected member and the non-election by one school of a member to the UPLC).

In response to a question by Ken Riener, Ray Terry listed some advantages of ex-officio membership on the UPLC by the Associate Personnel Director and a designee of the Provost's Office.

Charles Andrews once again voiced his opposition to any Administration members on the UPLC and
suggested that Amendment No. 1 be withdrawn and replaced by an amendment to the Bylaws excluding the above-named ex-officio members from the UPLC.

Bill Forgeng suggested that the local CFA Chapter President, or his designee, be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the UPLC.

3. Presentation of Amendments 2, 3 and 4 aroused little discussion.

4. The joint UPLC / C&B Report will move forward to a second reading on May 13.

F. Recommendations for Changes in the Leave With Pay Guidelines

1. The Chair recognized Ray Terry who presented the content of the five amendments proposed by the UPLC.

2. Reg Gooden noted that a purely proportional system could result in a school or the Library receiving a zero quota. He suggested modifying Amendment #1 to prevent this from occurring.

3. Ray Terry defended Amendment #2 as a good solution to some future problem. It would have little effect on the UPLC in 1986-1987 since he had decided to remain a member of the UPLC and had just been re-elected as SDSAM's representative to the UPLC.

4. Tim Kersten could find no fault with Amendment #3, but felt that it was unnecessary. The UPLC should simply deny requests for a change from a difference-in-pay leave to a sabbatical leave. It was established that the UPLC routinely grants requests for changes from a sabbatical to a difference-in-pay leave.

5. Concerning Amendment #4, the general view was to adopt the version (distributed at the April 8 meeting) which simply prohibited postponements of sabbaticals to a later year without reapplication and review by the UPLC.

6. Amendment #5 was well-received, but some dissatisfaction was expressed with the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications. Several persons felt that the one-week period between submission of professional leave applications to the Department Heads and their being forwarded to the school deans/Library Director was too short a peri-
iod for significant Department action.

Ray Terry noted that the Mathematics Department does not comment on the content or quality of professional leave applications submitted by its faculty, only on whether the individuals' absence will affect Department programs. Such action can easily be accomplished within a week.

7. The UFLC Report will move forward to a second reading on May 13.

G. GE & B Report

1. The Chair recognized George Lewis who made a few brief remarks about his committee's report. He noted that none of the six proposals were controversial; i.e., the GE&B Committee and the appropriate GE&B Subcommittee were in agreement in their recommendations.

2. The Chair indicated that the content of the report would move forward to a second reading on May 13.

H. Resolution Recognizing Women's Week at Cal Poly

1. The Chair recognized Elie Axelroth to speak in favor of the Resolution.

2. This item was put on today's agenda as a result of action by the Executive Committee in its meeting of April 15, 1986. Despite the shortness of the presentation and the omission of the text of the resolution from the agenda package, the Resolution will move forward to a second reading on May 13.

I. Resolution on the Modification of CAM 619

1. The Chair recognized Bill Forgeng who noted that much of CAM 619 is outdated and of dubious legality.

2. The Resolution, which was prepared in concurrence with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, will establish the failure to satisfy academic requirements as the only barrier to graduation for a student.

3. Despite the shortness of the presentation and the omission of the text of the Resolution from the agenda package, the Resolution will move forward to a second reading on May 13.

J. Additional GE&B Proposals
1. The Chair recognized George Lewis who briefly presented three additional GE&B proposals of a more controversial nature than those presented above (Item G).

2. Due to the lateness of the hour and the reluctance of Joe Weatherby to this item being placed on the meeting's agenda, George Lewis withdrew the item from consideration.

3. The three additional GE&B proposals will become a first reading business item on the agenda of the May 13 meeting.

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate

From: John Rogalla, Chair: C&B
      Raymond D. Terry, Chair: UPLC

Subject: Joint Report and Recommendations to Eliminate Discordant Provisions of the UPLC Bylaws, the Leave with Pay Guidelines and the Academic Senate Bylaws

President Baker, in a memo dated 12-2-85, indicated that the C&B Report (approved by the Senate on 10-1-85) and the UPLC Report (approved by the Senate on 11-05-85) were unofficially approved. Official approval would be contingent on the resolution of minor inconsistencies within and between the two reports. The inconsistencies fell into three categories.

It is our opinion that the inconsistencies referred to in Items 1a, 1b and 2a of the President's memo resulted from the President's reading of an outdated copy of the Academic Senate Bylaws. No changes are recommended.

The proposed correction noted in Item 3a is valid. The inconsistency resulted from a secretarial error in which Sections A.2. and A.3. of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines" were accidentally deleted. To remedy this inconsistency, the UPLC recommends Senate approval of Amendment No. 1 (below).

The inconsistencies noted in Items 2b and 3b of the President's memo may be partially remedied by changing portions of the Leave with Pay Guidelines and also portions of the Senate Bylaws. The necessary changes in the Leave with Pay Guidelines are incorporated in Amendment No. 2 (below). The same changes in the Senate Bylaws are effected by Amendment No. 3 (below) and Amendment No. 4 (below).

Amendment No. 1: On Page 3 of the UPLC document "Leave with Pay Guidelines" the following two items will be added:

"A.2. The Associate Personnel Director or his /her designee shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the UPLC."

"A.3. The Provost and his /her designee shall be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the UPLC."