I. Minutes: Approval of the September 23, 1986 Senate Minutes (attached pp. 2-5)

II. Communications:
   A. Brug's Response to Resolution AS-208-86, PCB's (attached pp. 6-7)
   B. President Baker's Response to Resolution AS-224-86/Weatherby, FERP (attached p. 8)
   C. President Baker's Response to Resolution AS-225-86/EX, Faculty Workload (attached p. 9)

III. Discussion:

IV. Reports:
   A. President/Academic Affairs Office
   B. Statewide Senators
   C. Chair's Report on Academic Senate Summer Activity

V. Business Items:
   B. Resolution on Lottery Funds Consultation - Conway, Chair of the Budget Committee, Second Reading (attached p. 11).
   C. Resolution on Guidelines for the Establishment of Research, Educational, or Public Service Units - Terry, Chair of Ad Hoc Committee to Review Guidelines for the Establishment of Research...Units, First Reading (attached pp. 12-16).
   D. Resolution on Opposition to Proposition 61 - Weatherby, First Reading (attached p. 17).

VI. Adjournment:
Memorandum

To: Dr. Warren J. Baker, President

Academic Senate

From: Richard C. Brug, Director of Public Safety

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION ON PCB'S - AS-208-86 (PROGRESS REPORT)

In your July, 1986, memorandum to Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair of the Academic Senate, you requested that I, as the Director of Public Safety, follow up with the Director of Plant Operations and the Executive Dean of Facilities Administration, on the progress being made in replacing fluorescent ballasts. You also requested that I periodically report said progress to you, to the Chair of the Academic Senate and to the University's Environmental Health and Safety Subcommittee as well as to the Public Safety Advisory Committee, which includes Senate representatives. Therefore, the following information constitutes the first progress report:

E.P.A. - Cal/OSHA Consultations

In consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency (E.P.A.) and the Division of Occupational Safety and Health Agency (DOSH Consultation Section), we have developed and implemented procedures which their staffs have recommended. Cal/OSHA has recommended that the University minimize any exposure to PCB from leaking and/or smoking ballasts even though a comprehensive standard for PCB has not been approved and current law does not require PCB containing equipment be retrofitted or replaced.

The E.P.A. recommends that we consolidate our disposed ballasts in the campus' PCB storage building for appropriate disposal with an authorized PCB waste facility. Although the language the E.P.A. uses is intended to encourage rather than require a collection and disposal program, the University will benefit from our pro-active disposal policy and safe response procedures.

Emergency Awareness

There was an article published in the August 7, 1986, issue of the Mustang Daily for the purpose of providing an awareness to the campus community of the programs in operation to solve the problems of PCB's, hazardous chemicals and asbestos. Hopefully, people will have a better understanding of the efforts being made to provide a safe environment.

During Fall quarter we plan to publicize emergency procedures for PCB ballasts in the Cal Poly Report and by memo to Department Heads. This will also be a priority for the Environmental Health and Safety Subcommittee.
Emergency Response

The Department of Public Safety's and Plant Operations' staffs have developed a response procedure which has been very successful in regard to leaking/smoking light fixtures. New signs have been completed and utilized when rooms/areas are closed due to problems/clean-up. We experienced one problem several months ago when a sign was removed and entry made. The new signs are official and should solve the problem in the future. Quicker response and removal/clean-up have been the results of the response procedures.

PCB Ballast Replacement

All PCB type ballasts in Engineering West are being replaced. The majority of this work was completed during the summer months. Completion of this project should be in the near future.

Campus-wide, all light fixtures found leaking or non-operative are immediately replaced. This procedure is ongoing.

The Plant Operations' staff is currently conducting an assessment of all campus buildings and documenting the locations of all light fixtures containing PCB's. Upon completion of this assessment, a priority list will be developed for removal of these fixtures. The assessment should be completed in approximately one month, however, removal will be contingent on funding. To date, thousands of light fixtures have been replaced campus-wide.

In conclusion, it is our intent to keep the community informed of all activities and progress. We are comfortable with our progress, in particular, with emphasis on safety, the emergency response procedures and the effective, quick clean-up/replacement steps followed. The majority of faculty and staff are aware of the problem and reporting procedures. Our goal is to strengthen this awareness on an ongoing basis.

Hopefully, any questions or concerns will be relayed to the members of the Environmental Health and Safety Subcommittee, staff of the Department of Public Safety or Plant Operations. Donald Van Acker, Assistant Director of Public Safety, Environmental Health and Occupational Safety Section, and Edward Naretto, Director of Plant Operations, are the recommended contact persons for clarification and immediate updates on progress.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
      President

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION REGARDING
         FACULTY EARLY RETIREMENT PROGRAM
         (AS-224-86/WEATHERBY)

Date: September 22, 1986

This will acknowledge your August 21 memo in which you transmitted to me the resolution adopted by the Academic Senate relative to the Faculty Early Retirement Program. As I am sure you are aware, the issue of the Faculty Early Retirement Program is an issue that is being considered as a part of the negotiation process between the CSU and the CFA. It is clear that the issue of the Faculty Early Retirement Program is an item that is within the scope of the collective bargaining process and the scope of the union contract. Accordingly, it is not appropriate for me to take action on the Academic Senate resolution.
To: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
     President

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE RESOLUTION ON
         FACULTY WORKLOAD (AS-225-86/EX)

This will acknowledge your memo of August 21 with which you
transmitted the resolution adopted by the Academic Senate on
August 5 on Faculty Workload. As I have commented to you in
a separate memo dealing with the resolution adopted by the
Academic Senate on Faculty Early Retirement Program, it is
not appropriate for me to respond to this resolution. While
it is appropriate for the Academic Senate to be concerned, as am
I, with provisions under which opportunities for professional
development are provided and to express those concerns, I think
that there is a very fine but critical line between expressions
of concerns regarding professional development opportunities
and the very specific language regarding workload which is
an issue within the scope of collective bargaining.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd H. Lamouria
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker
President

Subject: Proceedings of the Academic Senate, May 13, 1986
ELIMINATION OF DISCORDANT PROVISIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL LEAVE COMMITTEE (UPLC) BYLAWS, LEAVE WITH PAY GUIDELINES, AND THE ACADEMIC SENATE BYLAWS (AS-209-86/UPLC)

The Academic Senate Resolution, AS-209-86/UPLC, adopted May 13, 1986 and forwarded in your memorandum of May 19, 1986 has been reviewed. The above-named revisions are generally acceptable; however, before they are approved, the following modifications to Amendments No. 4 and No. 5 are suggested, as follows:

Amendment No. 4. "Postponements from one academic year to a subsequent academic year shall not be authorized." This would allow the postponement of a leave from one quarter to another quarter within the same academic year, which is not uncommon and allows faculty some flexibility between the time of their initial application and the commencement of that leave.

With regard to Amendment No. 5, it appears that the review of applications and the interview of the leave applicants must occur on the Wednesday of Fall Quarter finals week. It is recommended that this statement be modified to read:

"Wednesday of Fall Quarter finals week - SPLC's and the LPLC shall complete its review of applications and interview all leave with pay candidates on or before this date."

In addition, it is assumed that references to Provost will be changed to Vice President for Academic Affairs.

I believe these minor modifications would clarify the UPLC Bylaws. Please let me know if there is concurrence with these suggestions.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-____-86/____

RESOLUTION ON
LOTTERY FUNDS CONSULTATION

WHEREAS. CSU Lottery Education Funds for 1986-87 will be distributed to our campus and will include six broad categories including Continuing Commitments, New Program Authorizations, Discretionary Allocation, Administration, Reserve for Cash Flow, Endowment Allocation, and these funds will amount to $1,611,537.00; and

WHEREAS. Currently no body exists on campus to provide consultation to the President on how funds should be allocated/distributed in each of these categories, where discretion is allowed; and

WHEREAS. The President's newly proposed Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation does not have as one of its functions the overseeing of the distribution and allocation of campus funds. Another body that does address these concerns is needed; and

WHEREAS. The campus and the President are facing an October 31 deadline to propose on the Discretionary Allocation component of the Lottery Education Funds coming to the campus, and consultation is called for in the Chancellor's Office directive dated August 12, 1986, where it states:

Each campus President must request the funds via submission of a letter describing his/her planned uses of the Discretionary Funds. The uses identified in this submission must be in accordance with the guidelines which were approved by the Board of Trustees and which are provided as Attachment D. The request is to be directed to the attention of Mr. Louis V. Messner, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Budget Planning and Administration. Implementation of the request will be by Request for Allocation Order (RAO) which should be submitted with the expenditure plan. Both the plan and the RAO must be submitted no later than October 31, 1986. This date will provide time for the consultative process involving faculty, students, staff, and alumni. (Added emphasis not found in original document);

therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend to President Warren J. Baker that a representative university interim committee be formed, in conjunction with the Academic Senate, to make recommendations in respect to the distribution and allocation of CSU Lottery Education Funds on this campus, and that said committee report its recommendations to the President.

Proposed By:
Budget Committee
September 16, 1986
Memorandum

To: Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Raymond D. Terry, Chair
   Ad Hoc Committee to Review Guidelines for the Establishment of Research, Educational, or Public Service Units

Subject: Committee Report

Date: 8/20/86

Your memo of August 6, 1986 created and charged the Ad Hoc Committee with reviewing the proposed draft of Guidelines for the Establishment of Research, etc. and preparing recommendations for acceptance, rejection, or modification.

The Ad Hoc Committee met on Tuesday, August 12, 1986 to discuss its impressions of the document. The Ad Hoc Committee recommends a number of additions, deletions and substitutions in the proposed draft.

To highlight the changes recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee in the proposed document, items to be deleted are overstricken with a "-"; additions or substitutions are indicated by being underlined. Where the proposed document contained underlined words or phrases, these have been replaced by bold print to avoid confusion. Likewise, items preceded by a solid circle in the proposed draft are preceded by an asterisk in the amended proposed draft.

The major change recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee involves the definition of institutes and centers. The Ad Hoc Committee maintains that at universities having institutes and centers, an institute is usually the unit with the broader scope.

A second important change involves the appointment of ad hoc administrative review committees to aid in developing proposals.

Thirdly, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the director of an auxiliary academic unit be nominated by the faculty members of the proposed unit and approved by the school dean(s) involved and also by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Other changes recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee are primarily editorial. Verbal arguments in support of the proposed changes will be made at the September 16 Executive Committee meeting.
This bulletin gives guidance concerning the rationale and procedures for establishing institutes and centers. Such academic auxiliary units may be formed as organizational entities within the university if the teaching, research, or public services activities of the faculty members who participate will be improved.

This document governs those academic auxiliary units -- institutes and centers -- that are directed towards the enhancement of selected academic topics within the curriculum. It does not concern itself with the establishment or running of central administrative or service units such as the Computing Center, the Audio-Visual Center, or the Learning Assistance Center, which serve campus-wide functions and which also use the term "Center."

Rationale:

The main reason for establishing an institute or center is to bring into sharp focus the communication, planning, research, or other efforts of faculty and students interested in an area of study not normally focused by school or departmental organization. A center or an institute can enhance professional development opportunities for faculty, build links with industry and the community, provide identifiable campus entities for practitioners, foster interdisciplinary work, aid in obtaining external support, and complement the instructional program. An academic auxiliary unit will typically follow upon a trend of interest and professional activity already pursued by the proposed membership with some degree of success and will usually involve an important matter currently neglected or an area expected to grow in importance.

Institutes and centers are most often proposed when the normal committee structure does not adequately serve the ends desired. On occasion, a center or institute will be mandated by legislation, or Chancellor's office fiat. In such cases, a proposal for establishment must still be developed and forwarded for review and approval.

Definitions:

A-Center-is-a-unit-which-generally-encompasses-several
different-disciplines-or-areas-of-study-within-a-general-area-of
An institute is a unit which has more than one interest and/or function. A center is a unit with one interest and/or function.

An institute may encompass a number of units or centers.

Functions:
The functions of an institute or center may be any, all of, or more than the following:

* to provide opportunities for the professional development of faculty through basic and applied research and development activities, through challenging consultancies either sponsored or unsponsored, and through faculty exchanges

* to provide a clearinghouse for information of interest to practitioners and to conduct workshops and conferences for the continuing education of professionals

* to enhance the curriculum by facilitating and supplementing course-development academic learning

* to develop learning opportunities for students by identifying and developing internships, co-op placements, and summer-employment opportunities to practice their academic disciplines

* to provide supplementary educational support by acquiring gifts, general purpose grants, and equipment donations.

Procedures for Establishing a Unit:
The procedure to establish an auxiliary academic unit has two stages, a preliminary stage and a formal stage. To begin the process, a prospectus or preliminary draft of the proposal will be submitted via the appropriate school dean or deans to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for presentation to the Deans' Council. The proposal will (1) outline the scope of the proposed unit, (2) describe its relationship to the mission of the institution, and (3) present convincing arguments that the present-departmental-school- or-university-organization cannot serve the needs outlined provide justification that the proposed
unit better serves the needs outlined than the existing
departmental, school, or university organization.

If conceptual approval to proceed is given by the Deans’
Council and Vice President, the initiators will prepare a formal
proposal. This version will consider and answer, among other
questions, the following:

* what will the proposed unit do? (research, public
  service, etc.)

* why is it needed? Why is the present organizational
  pattern not adequate?

* what is its relationship to the instructional program?

* who are the unit’s founding members and how does their
  expertise relate to its purpose?

* what effect will the unit have on the department(s)? (e.g.
  will it generate released time for faculty or support for
  student research or internships?)

* what is the organizational structure of the unit?

* what are its bylaws?

* what support is required for the unit?

* what facilities will be needed? (space, equipment, etc.)

* how will the unit be financed in the short term and in the
  long run?

* what will happen if outside sources of funding are no
  longer available after the unit is formed?

* what constitutes membership in the unit?

* what is its advisory board? How selected?

* how will the unit ensure that participating faculty
  receive credit for their contributions in the review for
  retention, tenure, and promotion?

This formal proposal will be sent to the Vice President for
Academic Affairs who may appoint an ad hoc administrative
review committee chaired by the Associate Vice President for
Graduate Studies, Research and Faculty Development to aid in
developing the full proposal. The proposal will then
simultaneously be sent to the Academic Senate for review and
consultation.

The proposal will be submitted to the Associate Vice President.
President-to-the-Deans' Council: After review by the Academic Senate, the proposal (including the Academic Senate review) will be submitted by the committee to the Deans' Council. The deans will make a recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs concerning the establishment of the unit and will recommend a maximum for university resource support.

The Vice President will make a determination concerning the technical merits of the proposal and the proposed unit's financial viability, including the identification of any university resources essential to its establishment operation. If the proposed unit is judged viable, the proposal will be forwarded to the President for action.

General Considerations:

Each unit shall be administered by a director appointed by the person to whom he or she reports, with the concurrence of the line administration through the Vice President for Academic Affairs reporting to a member of the Academic Administration. The director shall be nominated by the faculty members of the proposed unit, and approved by the school dean(s) involved and also by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The director shall submit an annual report following each academic year to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, appropriate dean(s), financial supporters, and the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research and Faculty Development. The report shall include a summary of:

* what was done

* who did it

* how it was financed

* future plans

Every five years or less, the Vice President will appoint a committee to review the unit and to recommend continuation, change, or dissolution.

Organized units may not offer courses on their own for credit nor confer degrees, but will do so only through regular academic units. Members of a unit do not have academic titles unless they have them by virtue of an appointment in a department.

Administration of finances of the unit, except for that portion from the State budget, will be handled by the Cal Poly Foundation, not by the unit. The director shall be responsible for the unit's budget and for ensuring fiscal solvency.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

Background Statement:
Proposition 61 has been included on the November 4, 1986 General Election Ballot. If passed, this proposition would place a limit on the amount of money that public employees can earn. Furthermore, Proposition 61 would prohibit all public employees from accumulating sick leave and vacation time from one calendar year to another.

AS—___-86/____

RESOLUTION ON
OPPOSITION TO PROPOSITION 61
(THE GANN PAY INITIATIVE)

WHEREAS, The Compensation of Public Officials, Employees, Individual Public Contractors: Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute will be on the November 4, 1986 General Election Ballot; and

WHEREAS, The provisions of the initiative would have a profound negative effect upon The California State University; and

WHEREAS, The provisions of the initiative would arbitrarily impose conditions affecting salaries that will reduce the capacity of The California State University to recruit and retain qualified faculty and staff;

WHEREAS, The provisions of the initiative would prohibit the accrual of sick leave from year to year creating an unfair hardship on all public employees to the eventual detriment of The California State University; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University express its strong opposition to the Compensation of Public Officials, Employees, Individual Public Contractors: Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute (Gann Initiative); and be it further

RESOLVED: That this position be conveyed by the Chair of the Academic Senate to all interested parties.

Proposed By:
Joseph Weatherby
September 30, 1986
WHEREAS, The Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1986 (Proposition 56) would provide a funding mechanism for construction of buildings, renovation and reconstruction of facilities, for the acquisition of sites for facilities, and for equipping these facilities (to a maximum of $400 million); and

WHEREAS, Many buildings in the CSU require reconstruction in order to meet earthquake standards necessary in California; and

WHEREAS, The growth and changing demographics of the potential student pool for CSU will create the need for new buildings in various parts of the state; and

WHEREAS, The CSU is already well into planning and commitment for three satellite facilities (San Diego County, Ventura County, and Contra Costa County) which will increase CSU's capital budget needs in the next decade; and

WHEREAS, Declining revenues from the Tidewater Oil Fund and budget limits imposed by Article XIII.B of the California State Constitution may limit available resources for construction, reconstruction, and renovation of CSU facilities; and

WHEREAS, The current low interest rate environment makes the use of bonds relatively cost effective; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University strongly endorse The Higher Education Facilities Bond Act of 1986 (Proposition 56); and be it further

RESOLVED: That this position be conveyed by the Chair of the Academic Senate to all interested parties.

Proposed By:
The Academic Senate
Executive Committee
On September 30, 1986