I. Call to Order
   A. The meeting was called to order at 3:12 p.m. upon obtaining a quorum.
   B. The minutes of the April 22, 1986 meeting of the Academic Senate were approved as mailed.

II. Announcements: None

III. Reports
   A. President / Provost: None
   B. Statewide Academic Senators
      1. Reg Gooden reported that the CSU Senate had passed a Resolution Commending Barton Olsen at its latest meeting. Reg read the sometimes humorous but ever-praise-worthy Resolution to the Senate. The Chair echoed the sentiments expressed in the Resolution.
      2. Tim Kersten gave a short report on action taken at the recent CSU Senate meeting. Position papers were drawn up defending the present role of student evaluations (as one instrument) in the RTP process; recommending that the probationary period for faculty be reduced from six to four years; and opposing the immediate award of tenure to new administrators.

IV. Business Items
   A. Resolution on the Elimination of PCB Exposure at Cal Poly
      1. The Chair recognized Barbara Hallman who presented the background leading to the Resolution.
2. This item was first brought before the Executive Committee on May 6, 1986. Due to its urgency, the Executive Committee made the Resolution the first item of business of today's meeting.

3. It was established that $350,000 would be necessary to replace all fluorescent lights that may have PCB in them. New fluorescent lights do not contain PCB.

4. Lynne Gamble conjectured that, without clear action by the Senate, the replacement of potentially harmful fluorescent lights would be a slow process.

5. MSP to move the Resolution to a Second Reading.

6. There was no further discussion.

7. MSP to adopt the Resolution on Elimination of PCB Exposure at Cal Poly.


1. The Chair recognized John Rogalla who assured the Senate that the recommendations of the joint report would indeed eliminate the inconsistencies noted by the President in a memo dated 12-2-85.

2. The Chair recognized Ray Terry (Chair: UPLC) who moved the adoption of Amendment #1 and called the Senate's attention to the controversy surrounding the amendment at the April 22 meeting. Cf. Item IV.E (page 6 of the minutes of 4-22-86).

3. It was established that the defeat of the Amendment would have no immediate effect since the Senate By-Laws provide for the Associate Director of Personnel and the Provost or his designee to be ex-officio, non-voting members of the UPLC.

4. Joe Weatherby suggested that the Amendment, upon its defeat by the Senate, be referred back to the UPLC. Ray Terry suggested that sending it to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee or to the Personnel Policies Committee would be more productive. The UPLC in its most recent meeting on May 2, 1986 reaffirmed its support of Amendment #1 (7-0-0).

5. Amendment #1 was rejected by a voice vote in which no supporters of it could be heard.

6. Ray Terry moved to adopt Amendment #2. The motion
was seconded and, after a short discussion, was adopted by a voice vote.

7. Ray Terry moved to adopt Amendment #3. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The amendment was adopted by a voice vote.

8. Ray Terry moved to adopt Amendment #4. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The amendment was adopted by a voice vote.

C. Recommendations for Changes in the LWPG's

1. The Chair recognized Ray Terry (Chair: UPLC) who moved the adoption of Amendment #1.

2. Reg Gooden moved to refer Amendment #1 back to committee to work out a more equitable distribution of sabbatical leaves. There was no discussion. The motion to refer to committee passed with one negative vote and one abstention.

3. Ray Terry asked that Amendment #2 be withdrawn from consideration since it would have no effect for the next two years.

4. Ray Terry moved to adopt Amendment #3. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The amendment was adopted by a voice vote.

5. Ray Terry moved to adopt the following version of Amendment #4:

"Postponement of sabbatical leaves shall not be authorized."

Joe Weatherby seconded the motion. A short discussion ensued.

Mike Botwin asked for clarification of the procedures involved when a vacancy occurs among a school’s sabbatical leave applicants.

Reg Gooden urged support of the revised Amendment #4.

Amendment #4 was adopted by a voice vote, with one abstention and no negative votes.

6. Ray Terry moved to adopt Amendment #5. He further noted that Amendment #5 dealt only with the addition of a note to the Calendar for Professional Leave Applications. The UPLC was making no recommendations concerning the Calendar itself, which
the Senate approved last November.

7. Bill Forgeng proposed a friendly amendment to insert the word "academic" before "holiday" and before "workday." This would provide adjustment of the timetable for holiday recess, as well as for weekends and federal/state holidays.

Ray Terry indicated that it was not the UPLC's intention to shift the Dec. 17 deadline to early January.

Amendment #5, as modified, was approved with one negative vote.

8. To prevent delay in the completion of reviewing applications, interviewing of candidates and forwarding of priority lists by the SPLC's /LPLC to the school deans /Library Director, the following amendment to the Calendar for Processing Professional Leave Applications was

MSF: That the date "Dec. 14" be replaced by "Wednesday of Fall Quarter Finals' Week" and that the date "Dec. 17" be replaced by "Friday of Fall Quarter Finals' Week."

D. GE&B Report

1. The Chair recognized George Lewis (Chair: GE&B and Replacement Senator (Mathematics) for Richard Saenz (Physics) for Spring Quarter 1986) who moved the adoption of the GE&B recommendations.

2. There was no discussion of the positive recommendation by the GE&B Committee of AE 121 for inclusion in Area F.2.

3. Ken Scotto expressed the concern of some faculty that CONS 120 may not be appropriate for inclusion in Area F.2 and that it may be better suited for inclusion in Area B.
   a. Bill Forgeng (Chair: Area F Subcommittee) indicated that any course that constitutes basic science or technology may be considered for Area F and that it was the opinion of his subcommittee that CONS 120 met the requirements of Area F.
   b. MS (Ken Scotto /James Vilkitis) to refer the positive recommendation of CONS 120 for inclusion in Area F.2. back to the GE&B Committee.
c. George Lewis indicated that the course was included in Area F.2. when it had an NRM prefix and that it would be inconsistent to reject it for inclusion in Area F.2. now since the only difference is in the course prefix.

d. The motion failed by a voice vote.

4. There was no discussion of the positive recommendation by the GE&B Committee of FDR 201 for inclusion in Area F.2.

5. A short discussion of HE 203 took place.
   a. The GE&B Committee, in concurrence with the Area D subcommittee, recommended against the inclusion of this course in Area D.4.b.
   
b. Lynn Jamieson asked if the course may be appropriate for inclusion in some other area. Could the GE&B Committee consider a course, rejected for one area, for another area, without having to have the course resubmitted?
   
c. George Lewis asserted that Barbara Weber, the course proposer, indicated that she wanted approval for Area D, that she was informed of the course’s rejection for Area D, and that she did not ask that the course be reconsidered for another area.

6. The GE&B Committee recommendation for inclusion of HE 331 in Area F.2. was discussed.
   a. Barbara Hallman questioned whether HE 331 should be a 300-level course.
   
b. Dan Williamson (Chair: Curriculum Committee) declined to comment on this question when asked by the Chair.
   
c. George Lewis indicated that it was each Department’s responsibility to maintain the integrity of the courses in its Department.
   
d. It was established that the GE&B Area F Subcommittee did recommend that HE majors not be allowed to use this course to satisfy Area F.2.
   
e. Ken Riener drew a parallel between the issues involved in the recommendations of AE 121 and HE 331. He felt that the GE&B Committee was consistent in approving both courses.
   
f. Harry Busselen (Dean: School of Professional Studies and Education) declined comment on HE 331 when asked by the Chair.
7. Two proposals from the Biological Sciences Dept. aroused heated debate.
   a. The GE&B Committee recommended against the inclusion of ENT in the specific prefixes cited in Area B.1.b.; it also recommended against the inclusion of CONS in the specific prefixes cited in Area B.1.b.
   b. The Chair recognized Jim Mueller (Chair: Area B Subcommittee) who explained why his subcommittee had unanimously recommended against both proposals. He indicated that CONS is not a designated life science, that the Subcommittee had some doubts about the basic science requirement of the proposed courses.
   c. Al Cooper vigorously defended the proposals made by his Department. It became evident, however, that there was little sentiment in the Senate chambers to overturn the GE&B Committee recommendation regarding ENT courses.
   d. Al Cooper moved to amend the GE&B Report to reverse the negative GE&B recommendation concerning CONS courses. Voting for the Cooper Amendment would be voting to include CONS courses in the specific prefixes cited in Area B.1.b.
   e. The Cooper Amendment failed on a voice vote.
8. The GE&B recommendations were approved by a voice vote.

E. Resolution on Modification of CAM 619
   1. The Chair recognized Bill Forgeng (Chair: Student Affairs Committee) who reviewed the content of the whereas clauses. In short, we do not have the legal right to enforce CAM 619; nor has anyone attempted to invoke its power for twenty years.
   2. The Resolution on Modification of CAM 619 was approved unanimously.

V. Adjournment
   The meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.