

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California
ACADEMIC SENATE

ACADEMIC SENATE - MINUTES
Tuesday: October 27, 1987
UU 220 3:00 p.m.

Chair: Charles Crabb
Vice Chair: Charles Andrews
Secretary: Roxy Peck

I. Preparatory

- A. The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. upon obtaining a quorum.
- B. The minutes of the October 13, 1987 meeting of the Academic Senate were approved as mailed.
- C. The Chair noted the growing list of materials available for reading in the Academic Senate Office, especially those pertaining to educational assessment.
- D. The Chair directed the Senate's attention to pp. 5-6 of the agenda package concerning methods of adopting the Trustee procedures for Executive Review.
- E. The Chair announced that today's minutes would be taken by Ray Terry.

II. Reports: None

III. Consent Agenda: None

IV. Business Items

A. Resolution on Definition of "Close Relative"

1. M /S: To adopt the Resolution.
2. M /S (Botwin /Berrio): To delete "niece, or nephew" from the resolved clause. Nieces and nephews are not part of one's immediate family. "They are simply not close relatives," said Botwin.
3. Robert McNeil objected to the exclusion of nieces and nephews from the list of University interest admits. He asserted that he considers his nieces and nephews (some of whom may wish to attend Cal Poly) to be close relatives.

4. Charles Dana summarized the discussion to this point: Some faculty consider their nieces and nephews to be close relatives and some don't.
5. Sam Vigil conjectured that the policy on University interest admits was established to benefit those who live in SLO and can't send their children elsewhere. One's nieces and nephews generally do not live in SLO.
6. Reg Gooden asserted that the Resolution was designed to represent present practice and should not be changed without a compelling reason to reduce the list of close relatives.
7. Susan Currier opposed restricting the list of close relatives.
8. Ken Riener felt that the list should include one's spouse and children only.
9. Dave Ciano viewed the Resolution as the enunciation of a benefit we already have. "Why shoot ourselves in the foot?" asked the Senator from PCS.
10. The Botwin Amendment failed on a voice vote.
11. The Senate adopted the Resolution on Definition of "Close Relative" unanimously.

B. Resolution on Applied Research and Development Facility

1. The Chair recognized Lynn Jamieson who presented the background of the Resolution and numerous convincing reasons for its adoption by the Senate.
2. Robert Lucas also spoke strongly in behalf of the Resolution.
3. Reg Gooden, despite viewing the Resolution as a creative proposal, raised questions about a potential conflict of interest and warned that setting up a sequence of events in which funded research is "individual-specific" will make it more difficult to maintain the tradition of open research. Moreover, how would we fill the position in the future?
4. It was established that the contract with an outside consultant to facilitate the funding of applied research projects is for one year only and that a review will occur at the end of nine months to determine if the contract should be renewed.

5. Ken Riener asked if this method of soliciting funds were common practice at other institutions. Lynn Jamieson said that the Research Committee was not aware that this method of soliciting funding was used elsewhere.
6. Susan Carrier foresaw a problem in determining which projects are tagged with a finder's fee and which aren't.
7. Sam Vigil suggested that travel funds earmarked for the outside consultant might be better spent sending faculty to make industry visits in behalf of their own research.
8. Ken Riener suggested hiring more than one specialist.
9. Charles Dills asked his fellow Senators if the caveat not "to look a gift horse in the mouth" meant anything to them.
10. It was established that the outside consultant will receive 2% of any faculty-industry contract resulting from his efforts, but no percentage of gifts from industry to refurbish the Applied Research facilities.
11. Paul Murphy referred to the proposal as a project which, if successful, will be of great benefit to the University. We should accept the arrangement and trust that potential problems, if they occur, will be dealt with.
12. It was established that maintenance of the Applied Research facilities, once refurbished, will not require a continuation of the 2% surcharge.
13. Lee Burgunder referred to the proposal as a worthy one-year experiment. If necessary, let us rewrite the Resolution to emphasize that the action to be taken is temporary and non-precedential.
14. Jim Murphy viewed the almost unused facilities as shameful.
15. Jim Borland noted that positive action by the Senate is not required. The Administration may, and probably will, proceed with the implementation of the Resolution even if the Senate rejects it.
16. Paul Murphy suggested a rewrite of the Resolution on the Administration of Audiovisual Services, an Executive Committee Resolution (drafted by Ray

Terry in 1987) which expressed approval of certain administration-proposed changes, but subject to the disclaimer that there be no negative after-effects.

17. Vice Chair Charles Andrews expressed serious reservations concerning maintenance funding, the need for remodeling as the Applied Research facilities are used for different projects, and the duration of the commitment being proposed. He inquired as to the nature (if any) of input from James Strom and Art Gloster. Bob Lucas indicated that three discussions with Strom had occurred in an effort to coordinate fund-raising activities.
18. Robert McNeil felt that the Research Committee should review the consulting arrangement as well as the Facilities Board. Jim Borland asserted that it would be easier for him to accept the Resolution if there were more information specified in the Resolution, e.g. an annual review by the Research Committee and the Facilities Board.
19. Discussion tapered off. The Chair announced that the Resolution would return to the floor of the Senate as a second reading item on November 10, 1987.

V. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.