I. Session called to order in the Faculty/Staff Dining Room by Chairman Barton Olsen at 3:15 p.m.

II. Those in attendance were:

Members:

Alberti, Robert
Boone, Joseph
Brady, Mary
Bruckart, William
Burton, Robert
Cirovic, Michael
Clerkin, Edward
Coyes, Frank
Evans, J. Handel
Fierstine, Harry
Frost, Robert
Gold, Marcus
Greffemius, Ruben
Harden, Sheldon
Hendricks, Francis
Holtz, Walter
Hooks, Robert
Isachsen, Olaf
Johnson, Corwin
Johnston, Thomas
Labhard, Leslie
Larson, Stuart
Murphy, Paul
Neel, Paul
Nelson, Linden
O'Leary, Michael
Olsen, Barton
Quinlan, Charles
Rice, Walter
Ritschard, Ronald
Rhoads, Howard
Roberts, Alice
Rogalla, John

Rosen, Arthur
Savaker, David
Scales, Harry
Scheffer, Paul
Servatius, Owen
Simmons, Orien
Sorenson, Robert
Smith, Howard
Stubbs, Dan
Thomas, Guy
Voss, Larry
Weatherby, Joseph
Wills, Max

EX-OFFICIO
(Voting)

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS
(Non-Voting)

III. The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of June 2, 1972 were approved.

IV. Announcements

1. New members of the Academic Senate were introduced. A corrected roster of the Academic Senate membership and the Academic Senate committee assignments will soon be distributed.
2. Joe Romney is the new Senate Parliamentarian.

3. The Ratified Constitution of the Academic Senate, Staff Senate, and Joint Assembly as well as the Bylaws of the Academic Senate were distributed.

V. Discussion Item

Personnel Policies Committee: Bylaws changes relative to Professional Responsibility Committee. First Reading.

Art Rosen suggested that members that have not had a chance to do so review these proposed changes before the next meeting. (See Agenda Academic Senate, October 10, 1972, Attachment 1.) Jon Ericson raised the question of why have departmental committees rather than a school wide committee. Dr. Rosen responded that there already was a University wide committee. Howard Rhoads expressed the opinion that the departmental committee concept is duplicating the Academic Senate Committee. He felt that except in very large departments it would be impossible to select an impartial committee. He also indicated that the judgment made could cause dissention within a small department. He suggested that those who can serve on the committee be enumerated rather than limiting committee membership to those teaching more than six units. He also raised the question of the difficulty and propriety of judging a colleague's conduct. Alice Roberts pointed out the difficulty of obtaining consistency among departments in the decisions made by such groups. The Chairman asked the Senate members to relate their comments in writing on the proposed changes to Dan Stubbs, Chairman of the Personnel Policies Committee.

VI. Information Items

1. Barton Olsen summarized President Robert Kennedy's responses to previous actions of the Academic Senate (See Agenda, Academic Senate, October 10, 1972, Attachment 2 and 3.)

   (a) A committee will be formed to get pilot programs started for faculty evaluation of academic deans and department heads.
   (b) All faculty members who have a need for change of office hours to those recommended by the Academic Senate should make their requests known to their department heads and deans. The precedent has already been set for some faculty members.
   (c) The Personnel Policies Committee was directed to examine the entire subject of faculty titles to see if now might not be an appropriate time to adopt the standard titles.
   (d) The Personnel Policies Committee was directed to study and make recommendations on the President's suggestions on AB 70-8 Paragraph II C.
   (e) The Personnel Evaluation Form to be used this year on a trial basis was distributed. (Form 109-September 1972.) This form, with minor changes, is similar to Attachment 3 - Academic Senate Agenda Oct. 10, 1972, which was received by the Chairman in August.

2. The Chairman gave a report on a faculty survey on collective bargaining made last Spring term and compiled by David George. The majority of faculty respondents were in favor of some sort of collective bargaining. (See Attachment 1.)
3. State Senator Roy Anderson gave a report on the State Academic Senate's position on collective negotiation. This proposal was adopted by the State Academic Senate by a large vote. This document is to be forwarded to the State Board of Trustees in the near future. (See Attachment 2.) Mr. Howard Smith raised the question as to whether Cal Poly's State Senators had adequately used the consultative process prior to casting their ballots. The two State Senators present at the meeting indicated that they had.

VII. Business Item

Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty.

A committee including Robert Burton, Ron Ritschard, Sarah Burroughs, Larry Voss, and Clyde Fisher was previously appointed to prepare guidelines for student evaluation of faculty. Clyde Fisher indicated that it was not the intention of the Committee for the guidelines to be used during the Fall Quarter for retention, promotion or tenure but rather for the instructor's own use. The Winter Quarter Evaluation may be used for retention, promotion and tenure purposes. Robert Burton pointed out that these guidelines are not implementing guidelines, but rather frame or reference guidelines. No action was taken by the Committee on the ongoing faculty evaluations that are being made by departments and schools.

The motion was made by Howard Rhoads and seconded by Robert Burton that the Academic Senate forward to the President,

"The Academic Senate accepts the Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty and recommends their implementation on a trial basis during the current academic year with the stipulation that the Personnel Policies Committee shall review the effects of the implementation and make recommendations back to the Senate at an appropriate time."

Motion passed. (See Attachment 4 - Academic Senate Agenda, Oct. 10, 1972.)

VIII. The Academic Senate meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.
SUMMARY OF FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

This past spring quarter a questionnaire was sent out to faculty members in order to survey their opinion on collective bargaining. The purpose of such a survey was to gather faculty opinion in hopes that it might provide some direction for future action regarding collective bargaining.

The questionnaire was sent out to all faculty members (numbering, as of spring, 728, according to Personnel Office figures). Of these, 307, or 42%, were returned. In addition, 7 questionnaires were received from people in Academic Affairs and the Library. The information was not available to determine how accurately this represented the faculty. Return rates, however, were calculated for each academic school (shown in the following table).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>% of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agric.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. &amp; S.S.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A. &amp; H.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. &amp; E.D.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. &amp; M.</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>728</td>
<td>287</td>
<td><strong>42% (overall)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The overall return percentage includes 20 respondents which gave no indication of school. It does not include the 7 respondents from Academic Affairs/Library.
Summary of Frequency Distribution

The following is a summary of the responses to particular questions. Each will include comments as necessary. Question #4, which asks the respondent to make a statement on what he (she) thinks "collective bargaining is all about", produced such a wide assortment of responses that it would be difficult to list them all in this brief summary. After a bit of categorizing, there were 26 categories for the various types of answers. Not all of the respondents to the questionnaire made a statement. In fact, only 177 did so.

Some categories included many respondents, while others included only one. Responses ranged from enthusiastic support to unequivocal condemnation. These included claims that collective bargaining is needed to save and protect professionalism, that it is "about time", and collective bargaining is "long overdue", to the feeling that it is a necessity which has been forced on the faculty by an unresponsive system, to warnings of unionism and fears of "leftist politics". The large amount of responses, however, were definitions of collective bargaining, leaning either pro or con.

The remainder of the questions will be presented in table form.
How would you feel about the adoption of collective bargaining for faculty members at Cal Poly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>71%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=308

Comments: The faculty at Cal Poly is overwhelmingly in favor of collective bargaining.

In what areas do you feel collective bargaining might prove effective - indicate under E - or ineffective - indicate under I?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention/Promotion</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Work Cond.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Work Cond.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Acad. Frdm.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: With the exception of the Budget, the faculty at Cal Poly feel that collective bargaining would be effective.
If a majority of faculty voted for collective bargaining, what form of representation would you prefer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Academic Senate</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee organization</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent, elected committee for all</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of representatives from the faculty organizations for all</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 9% gave multiple responses with no indication of preference. Loss of 1% is due to rounding the figures.

A cross-tabulation program was also run on the computer to determine responses according to age, academic rank, and academic school. This revealed that in all age groups there was overwhelming support for the adoption of collective bargaining, with the exception of those over 65. Support lessened in the older groups, but was still 57% in favor in the 55 to 64 age bracket. When support for adoption is examined according to academic rank, there again is strong support at all levels. At no academic level was there a majority feeling of opposition (lecturer, 70%; instructor, 88%; assistant professor, 88%; associate professor, 68%; and full professor, 56%; these are percentages in favor of the adoption of collective bargaining).
The results according to academic school showed that only in the school of Business and Social Sciences was a majority support lacking. The following table illustrates the break down:

### Results by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agric.</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. &amp; S.S.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A. &amp; H.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. &amp; E.D.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. &amp; M.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tendencies seen here are generally held throughout the rest of the questionnaire. Those who were for the adoption of collective bargaining were also seen as predicting it's effectiveness.

In summary, the faculty of Cal Poly have expressed their favor for the adoption of collective bargaining. They have also expressed their belief that collective bargaining would be effective in most areas, the budget being the exception.
NOTE:

The resolutions which follow should be considered seriatim. Be it resolved by the Academic Senate CSUC:

1. The outcome of collective negotiation by the faculty should be a legally binding contract, subject, if need be, to legislative approval of certain provisions.

2. The State of California, as the employers, should be represented in negotiations by agents with appropriate authority, depending on the nature of items to be negotiated. The Governor or his designees should be involved where budgetary support will be required. The Trustees of The California State University and Colleges should be involved on issues related to their authority.

   (NOTE: The Subcommittee's recommendation here agrees with the views of those who chose alternative 2b on the questionnaire. A plurality of those responding favored this alternative. If both the Governor and the Trustees are involved in negotiations, their representatives could participate in negotiations from the beginning; or, alternatively, negotiations could be conducted first with the Trustees, and then with the Governor. The Subcommittee does not wish to recommend a choice between these two alternatives at this time.)

3. Legislation should provide for the selection of an exclusive negotiating agent.

   (NOTE: Responses to the questionnaire reflected a fairly even division between those who favored alternative 3(a), an exclusive negotiating agent, and those who favored 3(c), a negotiating council, with faculty organizations represented in proportion to their membership size. The Subcommittee's preference for alternative (a) is based upon: (1) the awareness that there is a great deal of unhappiness with the provisions of the Winton Act, which embodies the formula of alternative (c); and (2) the belief that alternative (a) is more flexible, in that a council of allied organizations could be selected as an exclusive negotiating agent if the faculty so desired, while the formula of alternative (c) would rule out the possibility of selecting a single organization as an exclusive negotiating agent, regardless of the faculty's wishes.)
4. Legislation providing collective negotiating rights for employees of the State of California should specify the faculty of The California State University and Colleges as an appropriate negotiating unit.

(NOTE: This question was not included in the questionnaire. The statute adopted by Hawaii in 1970 established a precedent for such a step, and the Subcommittee's consideration of this issue leads us to the belief that it is a wise step. What constitutes "the faculty" would not be decided by such a provision of the law, of course; the details as to which positions would be included would remain to be worked out. In this connection, see the next resolution.)

5. For purposes of collective negotiation, the faculty should be interpreted as including department chairmen, professional librarians, and professional counsellors with academic rank.

(NOTE: The three categories indicated here are those which were favored most heavily in the responses to the questionnaire. It should be noted that the Subcommittee's recommendation is meant to be a positive affirmation of the desirability of including the three groups mentioned; it should not be taken as necessarily indicating the Senate's position with respect to other groups which may be proposed for inclusion later.)

6. There should be a single, systemwide negotiating unit for the faculty of The California State University and Colleges.

(NOTE: This was the overwhelming preference of those who responded to the questionnaire, as well as the preference of the Subcommittee. However, it may be noted that this position does not necessarily rule out local negotiations, provided they are supplementary to and not inconsistent with a systemwide agreement.)

7. The scope of negotiations should not be limited by law. Any subject of interest to the parties concerned should be open to negotiation.

(NOTE: Those who responded to the questionnaire were evenly divided on whether any limitations of the scope of negotiations should be by law or by voluntary action of the negotiating agent, in the event that limitations are required. In responding to another question, however, it seemed clear that most persons prefer that there be no limitation on the subjects that may be discussed. The Subcommittee concurs with that view.)
8. Impasse procedures provided by law should include:
   a) mediation;
   b) fact-finding; and
   c) (compulsory) arbitration.

9. There should be no generalized prohibition against strikes
   by public employees.

10. No strike should be undertaken by an agent representing
    the faculty unless a majority approves such action in a
    systemwide referendum.

11. Once a negotiating agent is chosen, other faculty organizations
    should continue to have the rights:
    a) to represent a faculty member in grievance or
       disciplinary matters, if requested to do so by
       the faculty member; and
    b) to payroll deduction privileges.

12. Once a negotiating agent is chosen, all faculty should be
    required to pay the standard rate of organizational dues to
    the agent. However, faculty members should have the option
    of indicating that they wish their payments to go to some
    (non-competing) purpose, fund, or organization, and the
    agent organization should then be obligated to transfer or
    assign the funds in accordance with such wishes.

   (NOTE: Almost half of those responding to item 14 on the
   questionnaire favored alternative (c), which is essentially
   the first sentence of the Subcommittee's recommendation.
   Most of the remaining number favored alternative (b), which
   specified a moral obligation to support the agent organization
   financially. The Subcommittee believes that the second
   sentence in its recommended position would allow those
   few faculty members who might have strong objections to an
   absolute requirement for payment of dues to specify an
   alternative (non-competing) use for the funds they contribute.
   We believe that such a provision, which is not without
   precedent, would be in the best interest of the faculty.
   What we are talking about here is an "agency shop" requirement,
   and it is to be voted that such a requirement, if absolute,
   may have a serious conflict with the principle of tenure:
   a person who refuses to pay required dues must be dismissed,
   even if the person has tenure. We believe there should be
   an alternative that provides a way to avoid such a serious
   problem.)
13. All faculty should be eligible to participate fully in the affairs of the agent representing the faculty.

   (NOTE: This recommendation is closely connected to the preceding one. When the responses to the questionnaire's items 13 and 14 are considered carefully, it becomes evident that a large majority believes that: (a) all faculty who pay dues should have the right to participate; and (b) all faculty should pay dues. It follows that all faculty should have the right to participate, if all are required to pay dues as indicated in recommendation 12.)

14. Once a negotiating agent has been chosen, the Academic Senate CSUC should continue to exist as long as it has an effective role to play.

   (NOTE: A number of those responding to the questionnaire indicated their belief that the Senate would have an effective role, indicated by alternatives (a) and (c) of item 15. The Subcommittee is less sanguine about such possibilities, but proposes the recommendation above as a reasonable position in any event.)

A final NOTE: One of the items on the questionnaire asked whether a negotiating agent should or should not be restricted in seeking representation on governance committees. Most of those responding felt that no restrictions should be placed on the negotiating agent in this respect, and the Subcommittee concurs with this view. Since no action is required, the Subcommittee has not prepared any statement of position on this question, but simply reports to the Senate the consensus of views expressed.