I. Minutes

There were no minutes to be approved since this meeting is a continuation of the meeting of May 27, 1986.

II. Announcements: There were none.

III. Reports: There were none.

IV. Business Items

D. Bylaw Change to Delete Ex Officio Members from the UPLC

1. The Chair recognized John Rogalla (Chair: C & B) who reviewed the background of the amendment.

2. On May 13, 1986 the Senate overwhelmingly rejected an amendment to the UPLC document "Leave With Pay Guidelines" which would have brought the LWPG in line with the Senate Bylaws which permit the Associate Director of Personnel and the Provost or his designee to be ex-officio, non-voting members of the UPLC. By deleting this portion of the Bylaws, both documents would become consistent.

3. M/S/P (Botwin/Andrews): That the amendment be advanced to Second Reading status.

   The motion was approved by consensus.

4. M/S/P: To adopt the Bylaw Change To Delete Ex Officio Members from the UPLC

E. Resolution on the Foundation Election Process

1. The Chair recognized Art Dickerson, a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Cal Poly Foundation who presented the background and content of the Resolu-
tion in the absence of the Committee's Chair Harvey Greenwald whose Spring Quarter teaching assignment prevented him from being in attendance.

2. Mike Stebbins asked Art Dickerson to elaborate on the content of Resolution # 86-03 of the Student Senate.

3. Robert Bonds provided some helpful insights as to the present method of election used by the Foundation Board.

4. Ken Riener spoke in favor of the Resolution as a way of legitimizing the Board's composition. According to Riener, the Board members have no definite constituency. "People who represent only themselves should not be making important decisions affecting the University."

5. Richard Kranzdorf noted that each of Items 2, 3, 4 of the first resolved clause consist of two sentences, the first of which addresses membership, the second addresses the process of selection /election to the Foundation Board.

6. M/S/P (Weatherby /numerous others): That the Resolution be advanced to Second Reading status.

7. Reg Gooden sought to determine whether faculty representatives should act as delegates or as Trustees. Joe Weatherby felt that it didn't make any difference. Such Senate-recommended Foundation Board members would necessarily have a different perspective from those who are currently "elected."

8. There was a brief discussion of the implementation of the Resolution if it passes the Senate and is approved by the President.

   The Chair noted that the Foundation Board had recently chosen new members. The next election would be in May 1987. The new procedures, if approved, would take place then.

9. The Resolution was adopted by the Senate unanimously.

10. The Chair named and thanked each of the four members of the Ad Hoc Committee.

F. Resolution for the Recognition of Deceased Faculty

1. The Chair recognized Charles Andrews (Chair: PPC). This resolution, though presented for the first
time today, had been accepted by Al Cooper in place of the ad hoc resolution which he introduced on May 13. The Resolution, thus, had Second Reading status.

2. M/S (Gooden /Bonds): To adopt the Resolution.

3. Reg Gooden proposed, and Charles Andrews, accepted a friendly amendment to change the word "Honorary" to "Honored" in the first resolved clause.

4. Marshall Wright, in his maiden speech before the Senate, gave a humorous and logically-convincing argument for not acknowledging the passing of certain honored professors at commencement exercises.

5. Charles Andrews accepted as a friendly amendment the addition of a phrase to the third resolved clause so that it now reads:

"That public acknowledgment of this recognition shall be optional to the family at the next following university commencement exercise; and be it further."

6. Elie Axelroth noted the apparent lack of gains in women faculty since 1976 and asserted that the Senate should be doing more concerning the important issues on campus rather than discussing this Resolution. Thus, although she was not opposed to anything in the Resolution, she announced that she would vote against it.

7. The Resolution was adopted with 2 negative votes and no abstentions.

8. Al Cooper inquired how the Resolution would be applied in the case of the recent and unexpected death of Ed Zucchelli.

9. The Chair indicated that the Ad Hoc Senate Committee called for in the second resolved clause would be formed. The Executive Committee, on June 10, would act on its recommendations. Barring family objections (Cf. the Wright Amendment), Ed Zucchelli could be honored at the June 14 Commencement Exercise.

6. Resolution Recognizing Women's Week at Cal Poly

1. Speaking in favor of the Resolution were: Elie Axelroth, Barbara Hallman, Robert Bonds, Larry Gay and others.
2. Scott Rice wanted assurance that Women's Week would not conflict with some other observed week. This point was also made by Charles Andrews.

3. The phrase "in whatever manner deemed appropriate" in the second resolved clause was interpreted to be a veiled request for financial support.

4. The Resolution was adopted with one negative vote and no abstentions.

H. Conflict-of-Interest Policy for Principal Investigators

1. The Chair recognized Charles Andrews (Chair: PPC) who discussed the background and objectives of the proposed guidelines.

2. At Reg Gooden's request, Charles Andrews provided some examples of possible conflict-of-interest. The Resolution seeks to require extensive disclosure so that a principal investigator cannot benefit financially from university-funded research and a contributor to university research cannot benefit from having a crony on the faculty assert predetermined views as objective conclusions of independent research.


4. M/S/P: That the Document "Conflict of Interest Policy for Principal Investigators of Nongovernmental Sponsored Research" be adopted by the Senate.

5. The motion was adopted with 2 negative votes and 4 abstentions.

I. Revised Enrollment Recommendations

1. The Chair recognized Steve French (Chair: LRP) who summarized the report's contents. The LRP Committee recommends increasing enrollment beyond 14200 FTE only when campus resources permit it. The earliest this could occur is in 1990-1991 when planned physical plant expansions will be completed.

2. The Report also addresses the problem of changing demography, changing eligibility standards for CSU and the impact on Cal Poly. Recommendations in these areas were noticeably absent. But the Report did emphasize the need for a detailed expansion plan which would address the distribution of new
students among new and existing programs and the securing of new staff and facilities to handle the new students. The Report commented on the admissions ratios for first time freshmen and transfer students and recommended further study.

3. M/S/P (Charles Andrews / Robert Bonds): To advance the Report to Second Reading status. There were three negative votes and one abstention.

   a. Some discussion occurred concerning the need and pressures for expansion within CSU and especially at Cal Poly.
   b. Bill Forngeng and Steve Hanes wanted to know if voting "yes" meant that we endorse the Report or just accept it.

The Chair indicated that the Report was accepted when it was received by the Senate Office. The present vote would endorse the contents of the Report.
   c. Robert Bonds emphasized the need for the Senate to let the Administration know it wants to be involved in long-range-planning and will send guidelines to the Administration on matters that concern it.
   d. The Report was adopted on a voice vote.

J. Proposed Dean Evaluation Resolution and Form

1. The Chair recognized Charles Andrews (Chair: PPC) who made a brief statement and referred specific questions about the form to George Stanton, a member of the PPC who had served on the subcommittee that prepared the form.

2. Some questions that were raised were:
   a. Should the scale be 0-5 or 1-6?
   b. Should a "Not applicable" category be included in addition to, or in place of, the "can't say" category?
   c. Should deans be required to satisfy professional development requirements?
   d. Will there be greater response to this new form than to the present dean evaluation form?
3. Bill Howard asserted that Deans should not be singled-out for evaluation. Associate Deans, Department Heads and Full Professors all need to be reviewed carefully.

4. Charles Andrews noted that this was not an urgent issue so there was no need to advance the item to Second Reading status. The Chair indicated that the Resolution and form will move to Second Reading status next fall.

K. Resolution on AIMS Quarterly Budget Reporting
   1. No one from the Budget Committee was present to initiate the discussion of the Resolution.
   2. The Chair indicated that the Resolution would not be discussed in the absence of Jens Pohl (Chair: Budget Committee) or some other member of the Budget Committee. Elie Axelroth objected to this ruling. The Chair, however, noted that the Resolution concerned only mandatory quarterly reporting of AIMS Project funds. The Resolution does not address the issue of funding itself.
   3. John Poling announced his intention to amend the Resolution by inserting the following clause:
      "RESOLVED: That instruction funds shall not be used to fund the AIMS Project."

L. Resolution on CSU Trustee Professorship
   1. The Chair recognized Charles Andrews (Chair: PPC) who made a brief statement concerning the Resolution.
   2. There was no discussion of the item at this time.
   3. The Chair indicated that the Resolution would move to Second Reading status next fall.

M. Resolution on Amendments to the Bylaws for the Elections Committee (re vacancies remaining after an election)
   1. The Chair recognized John Rogalla (Chair: C & B) who presented the background of the Resolution, viz., the fact that only two persons in SDSAM ran for election to four vacant Senate seats in the recent election.
   2. The Resolution seeks to prevent a similar situation from occurring in the future. It does not address
what to do about the current situation in SOSAM.

3. There was no discussion of the item at this time.

4. The Chair indicated that the Resolution would move to Second Reading Status next fall.

V. Adjournment

A. Robert Bonds requested that the Senate Office send a note of thanks to all standing committee chairs and caucus chairs for their hard work during the year.

B. Reg Gooden further requested that the "thank-you notes" not be form letters, but shall be addressed separately. The Chair concurred.

C. The Chair read the names of each person who had served on the Senate during 1985-1986 but who would not be returning to the Senate next fall. He thanked each of them for their passed service and noted that they would be missed.

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