CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA

May 6, 1975; 3:15 p.m.; Staff Dining Hall

I. Remarks by the Chair

II. Minutes - Academic Senate Meeting, April 15, 1975

III. Senate Membership - Reinstatement of Stuart Larsen

IV. Committee Reports
   A. Budget (Nielsen)
   B. Constitution & Bylaws (Johnson)
   C. Curriculum (Sullivan)
   D. Distinguished Teaching Award (Larsen)
   E. Election (Hooks)
   F. Faculty Library (Barnes)
   G. Fairness Board (Langman)
   H. General Education & Breadth Requirements (Daly)
   I. Instruction (Jennings)
   J. Long-Range Planning (Saveker)
   K. Personnel Policies (Beecher)
   L. Personnel Review (Andreoli)
   M. Research (Thomas)
   N. Student Affairs (Drandell)
   O. Academic Council (Laphard)
   P. Administrative Council (Sullivan)
   Q. Foundation Board (Weatherby)
   R. President's Council (Weatherby)

V. Reports
   A. ASI President - Collective Bargaining (Plotkin)

VI. Business
   A. Elections (Hooks)
   B. Constitutional Amendment - Academic Senate Membership (Johnson)
      (Attachment IV-C, A.S. Agenda, April 15, 1975) - Second Reading
   C. Constitutional Amendment - Preamble (Johnson) (Attachment VI-C)
      Second Reading
   D. Budget Resolution (Nielsen) (Attachment VI-D)
   E. Salary Schedule for Summer Session (Beecher, Olson) (Attachments VI-E)
   F. Staffing Formula (Saveker) (Attachment VI-F)
   G. Library Space (Barnes) (Attachment VI-G)
   H. University Advancement Program (Sullivan) (Attachment VI-H)

VII. Announcements
   A. Scoresheet (VII-A)
   B. Committee Assignments (VII-B)
   C. Faculty Promotions in Budget (Weatherby)
   D. Year-End Reports (Laphard)
   E. Ad Hoc Committee on Equal Term Enrollment (Weatherby)
   F. Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluation (Weatherby)
   G. Budget Support Review Meeting - Chancellor's Office (Weatherby)

* Additional background material on the above items is available in the Senate Office.
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

1. Add new Section 1 to Article III. Renumber present Section 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 to 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Section 1) Preamble

We, the Faculty of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, in order to (1) perpetuate the traditions of shared responsibility for academic affairs and insure the free expression of the Faculty voice in University affairs, and (2) provide a recognized framework for faculty leadership in continuing development of a quality Faculty, endorse these principles:

a. Faculty members have a major role in the governance of the University through the Academic Senate, which is the recognized representative body of the Faculty. The Senate recommends policies and procedures to the President. On those occasions when the President rejects a Senate proposal, he informs the Senate in writing of the compelling reasons for such action.

b. Faculty members, support staff members, and students participate in the governance of the University through the Academic Senate, Staff Senate, and Student Affairs Council and as members of university standing, special, and ad hoc committees and subcommittees. (See CAM 160.)

c. Responsibilities of the Academic Senate, integral to the process of shared responsibility for academic affairs at California Polytechnic State University, include the following areas:

1. academic policy and procedures, including the assurance of academic freedom, curricula and academic standards; long range academic planning;

2. consultation regarding major organizational changes with university-wide impact and selection of administrative officers of the University;

3. personnel policies and procedures affecting academic personnel, including professional responsibility, hiring, promotion, reappointment, tenure, leaves, working conditions;

4. procedures and programs for faculty development, including the composition of the Faculty, in-service training programs and counsel regarding professional personnel problems.

*The laws, regulations, and procedures duly enacted by the People of the State of California and the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges are the foundation of the governance of this University;

The President of the University, as designated in Title 5, California Administrative Code, is the chief governing officer of the University and is responsible for its operation to the Board of Trustees of the CSUC.

As.S.Agenda, 5/6/75
Attachment VI-C
RESOLUTION RE INVESTIGATION AND MAKING OF RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE BUDGETARY PROCESS TO INCREASE
DIRECT FACULTY INPUT

WHEREAS: Budgetary restrictions imposed by the Governor have
a direct impact on instructional funding for CPSU, SLO; and

WHEREAS: Presently the faculty at CPSU, SLO, has no direct
input in the budgetary process; and

WHEREAS: The need for direct faculty input into the budgetary
process is vital in order to assure a more representative
process in budgetary formulation; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, CPSU, SLO, support the Academic
Senate Budget Committee's request to investigate the
restructuring of the budgetary process and make recom-
mendations to increase direct faculty input.
Background and Rationale

The Personnel Policies Committee has reviewed a report on Summer Session salaries written by Ralph D. Mills, State University Dean of Continuing Education (See attached report). Mills' primary concern is the system-wide decline in Summer Session FTE. He notes that the program has been discontinued at Pomona and is threatened with elimination at Bakersfield, Humboldt, and San Luis Obispo. To improve the situation, Mills proposes the following salary schedule changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>SALARY CHANGE</th>
<th>PROJECTED % OF SUMMER SESSION FACULTY(1975)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>+ 4.85%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>+ 4.85%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>+15.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistants</td>
<td>+40.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effect of these changes would be to create two salary classifications: An upper level ($310/quarter unit) for both Full and Associate Professors and a lower level ($243/quarter unit) for Assistant Professors, Instructors and Assistants. If implemented, this salary schedule will enable the Summer Session to continue offering classes at $20 per unit, making the program more attractive to students than it would be with a higher unit cost.

Recommendations

The Personnel Policies Committee voted unanimously to recommend opposition to the proposed change in the Summer Session salary schedule. The principle arguments advanced in support of this position are:

1. The report does demonstrate that the percentage of Full Professors in the Summer Session has steadily increased. But the report does not demonstrate a causative link between that rise and declining enrollment and therefore cannot show that the functional elimination of Full Professors will reverse or even slow the decline in Summer Session FTE.

2. The report does not demonstrate that cost/unit is a critical factor in predicting the number of Summer Session FTE. Thus in the period 1963-1969, FTE rose by 11.7% while unit cost rose by 95.6%. However, in the period of 1969-1974, when unit cost rose by only 33%, FTE declined by 35.8%. Finally, in the period 1970-1972, unit cost was held constant (as the report proposed to do in the future) and FTE enrollment declined by 17%.

3. Given tight budgets, rising costs and the uncertainty of enrollment levels for CSUC system as a whole, the Committee thought that a recommendation to meet the similar problems in Summer Session with a salary cut might be misunderstood, or at least hard to explain in some sectors of California society.
Listed below are some basic thoughts and assumptions that were assumed (in varying degrees) by the Statewide Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee in recommending the modification of Summer Session faculty pay schedules:

1) Summer Sessions fulfill a valid educational need and are academically defensible.

2) The proper way to finance educationally viable programs is the way regular programs are handled -- State funding. Our judgment was simply that that was not going to happen.

3) It was the judgment of the Committee that the Summer Session program would, in all probability, soon collapse on several campuses (including San Luis Obispo), unless some financial changes were made.

4) We believe there is a basic flaw in trying to equate a faculty salary formula based on a State support formula with the self-support financial arrangements of Summer Sessions.

5) Teaching in a Summer Session is of a voluntary nature for instructors. This fact may have nothing to do with any fundamental salary concept but the salary proposal does not interfere with the mainstream of our present State supported salary structure.

6) We had concerns that any move to "cut any salary willingly" would be misinterpreted by persons either in the Chancellor's Office or in Sacramento -- and that that misinterpretation could find a way of expressing itself in the salary structure of the State. There is no way of knowing whether that concern is a product of our paranoia or whether it represents a real danger.

7) We thought we could live with a stipulation that the proposal would be for a period of three years and could not be continued unless something like the present process was set up again. There was some views expressed that such a stipulation by the Senate might be well intended now but that once functioning, the program would be kept by the Chancellor's Office no matter what the CSUC Senate said.

8) There is some disagreement over the percentages of salary increase or decrease in the proposal but the Faculty Affairs Committee was informed that the figures are (approx.) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Instructors</td>
<td>40% raise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>15% raise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>4.8% raise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>4.8% raise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>20% salary cut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) The Committee's hope was that if the salary proposal were adopted, more instructors would choose to teach in Summer Sessions (not Full Professors) and thus more courses would be offered. Hopefully over a three year period this situation would (gradually) see fewer classes cancelled and the present trend toward demise would be reversed.

10) Our primary concern was that Summer Sessions not die. If the program were in fact to collapse, the issue of who was paid what or how much would be pointless -- thus, the vote to endorse the proposal on a trial three-year basis.

Barton C. Olsen
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Attachment VI-E-2
WHEREAS, There has been a consistent increase in the proportion of senior faculty (associate and full professors) who teach in summer session programs; and

WHEREAS, This increase in the proportion of senior faculty places severe financial limitations on summer session programs which, in turn, restrict the available offerings and threaten the academic integrity and the continued existence of these programs; and

WHEREAS, Summer session programs provide significant educational opportunities for many students who otherwise would be denied such opportunities; and

WHEREAS, The salary schedule modifications which have been proposed by The California State University and Colleges Deans of Continuing Education would create more financial flexibility and facilitate better educational planning for these programs; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That pending full state funding of The California State University and Colleges summer sessions, the Academic Senate CSUC endorse on an interim basis modifications in the salary schedules for summer session faculty proposed by The CSUC Deans of Continuing Education; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these modifications be discontinued after a trial period of three years, unless specifically renewed following review and consultation with the Academic Senate CSUC.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSUC recommend deletion of references to academic rank in the proposed salary schedules and limit pay classification designations to Lecturer 1 or Lecturer 2 or equivalent classifications; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Academic Senate CSUC interim approval of this proposal be contingent upon the acceptance of this recommendation.

POSTPONED MARCH 6-7, 1975

A.S. Agenda, 5/6/75
Attachment VI-E-3
RESOLUTION RE STAFFING FORMULA

Background and Rationale

The ad hoc subcommittee appointed by Executive Committee action on April 8, 1975, to review and make recommendations on the Technical Advisory Committee report entitled "A Method for Projecting Faculty Need" met and recommended a course of action that was reviewed and accepted by the Academic Senate Long Range Planning Committee. The views and recommendations of the subcommittee are as follows:

Four courses of action were discussed in response to the Statewide Academic Senate request for feedback.

1) To accept and endorse the whole package of the Technical Advisory Committee "as is;"

2) To strongly endorse the package in principle and recommend further study in part;

3) To reject parts of the proposal for cause;

4) To reject the whole proposal for cause.

The subcommittee consensus was that alternative 2 met the needs of the Cal Poly, SLO, faculty, and with the concurrence of the Long Range Planning Committee it recommends that the Technical Advisory Committee proposal be presented as a business item for the endorsement of the Cal Poly Academic Senate at its May 6th meeting.

The proposal would be beneficial to the present Cal Poly staffing practice by decreasing the present SCU/FTEF ratio by about 5%. This should encourage a supplementation of faculty by about 5% during the steady state enrollment interval indicated during the budget period addressed by the study.

The committee believes that the Senate should act on this item in two parts. One is to strongly endorse the study as written and the other is to enjoin the Statewide Senate to expand this study by surveying the faculty work load formulas covered by Appendix C of the report so that faculty/student contact hours ratios currently followed throughout the system can be studied in order to ascertain the variances in the student contact teaching loads imposed on faculty in this regard. In the 45 hour week quoted by the legislative analyst as normal faculty work load, no upper limit on faculty/student contact hours is stipulated. This factor should be explored by hegis taxonomy on the basis of student weekly contact hours/FTEF/HEGIS category. The attached two resolutions are recommended for Senate action accordingly.

Resolutions

Resolution A

Whereas the Academic Senate of the CSUC system has requested the response
of the Cal Poly Senate to the report "A Method for Projecting Faculty Need" prepared by the Technical Advisory Committee on Faculty to the Chancellor, and

Whereas the Technical Advisory Committee on Faculty Staffing report recommends definite improvements in the faculty/student ratios that would improve the level of instruction possible at Cal Poly SLO if adopted by the Trustees and implemented by the State; be it

Resolved that the Academic Senate of Cal Poly SLO strongly endorses the principles expressed in the report "A Method for Projecting Faculty Need"; and be it further

Resolved that this endorsement and concurrence in principle be conveyed to the President and expressed to the Chairman of the Statewide Academic Senate in support of their actions to enhance the quality of higher education in the CSUC system.

Resolution B

Whereas the Technical Advisory Committee on Faculty Staffing to the Chancellor has made limited recommendations in the report "A Method for Projecting Faculty Need" to enhance the quality of higher education in the CSUC system through recommending improvements of faculty/student budget staffing formulae; and

Whereas further improvements could be achieved by refinements in the portion of the study contained in its Appendix C; be it

Resolved that the Cal Poly SLO Senate urges the Statewide Academic Senate to expand its study in the areas covered in Appendix C of the study "A Method for Projecting Faculty Need"; and be it further

Resolved that these studies be continued in sufficient detail to develop student weekly contact hours/Full-time Faculty Equivalent/Discipline (HEGIS) Category within the CSUC system; and be it further

Resolved that this expression of Senate interest be conveyed to the President and expressed to the Chairman of the Statewide Academic Senate in support of their actions to enhance the quality of higher education in the CSUC system.
RESOLUTION RE LIBRARY SPACE

WHEREAS The lack of student reader stations and book shelving facilities in the library have reached critical levels; and

WHEREAS Floor space external to assigned library space needs to be provided for 150,000 volumes by July 1, 1976; and

WHEREAS This additional external space is absolutely essential to the continued availability of presently installed reader stations and other vital library service; be it therefore

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate urges the University Administration to provide book storage space, on or off campus, for an anticipated 150,000 volumes by July 1, 1976; and be it further

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate urges, as a partial solution to the space problem, the relocation of non-library activities from the old library, specifically ROTC, the "Cellar," the language laboratory and administrative offices.
RESOLUTION RE FACULTY REPRESENTATION IN UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM

Background and Rationale

Earlier this year, President Kennedy initiated an University Advancement Program, with Mr. David Cornell serving as Director. One of his duties was "to provide assistance to a program of communications which would enable the University to do a more effective job of communicating its programs and plans to students, alumni, parents and friends. Based upon this communications consideration, an additional part of an advancement program is that of development of fund raising to assist the University in achieving its goals through funding beyond that which the state can provide." In order to properly allocate these funds, President Kennedy has established a "priority committee" composed of the President, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Students, and the Director of University Advancement. The Resolution below indicates the need for a faculty member on the committee.

Resolution

WHEREAS CAM 790 University Advancement Program defines the objectives, case statement, and procedural implementation of this program; and

WHEREAS CAM 91.C.3 creates a priority committee consisting of the President, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Students, and Director of University Advancement (secretary of the committee); and

WHEREAS this priority committee does not include a faculty member, although CAM 9 .C.2 states "Implementation of the advancement program must be the concern of every member of the faculty and staff;" and

WHEREAS imperative "faculty concern" obviously calls for an equally imperative faculty participation; therefore, be it

RESOLVED That a faculty member appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate be added to the priority committee to insure appropriate and proper faculty participation in matters of relevant academic governance.

A.S.Agenda, 3/6/75
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Policy

A. Objective

The overall objective of the advancement program is to use the total resources of the university most effectively in presenting the case of the university to its multiple audiences. The advancement program's case statement reflects the university's philosophy and mission with emphasis on those items which make these two factors different from the case statements of other universities and colleges. The ultimate goal of an effective advancement program is to secure better understanding of the university's philosophy and mission which in turn will result in maximum funding for the university's programs whether these monies come from public or private sources.

B. Case Statement

Since its founding in 1901, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo has been dedicated to occupationally centered curricula. This pragmatic approach to postsecondary education has earned for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo a distinctive role in higher education in California and throughout the country. The university is particularly noted for its special emphasis and excellence in such applied fields as agriculture, architecture, business, engineering, home economics, science and mathematics, which are integrated with closely related career-oriented or supporting fields of communication arts, education, humanities, and social sciences.

Additionally, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo is dedicated to helping each student achieve maximum personal development. An honored element within this tradition is the concept of "learning by doing." Students are encouraged to obtain actual experience through individual and group projects, work-study programs, internships, and cooperative education programs. The university has an outstanding cocurricular program designed to provide students with experience in many project or group settings. There is a strong emphasis on leadership training throughout these programs.

Faculty and staff members who are selected on the basis of academic qualifications, professional experience and teaching ability are likewise encouraged to maintain a constant interplay between general principles and practical applications in all instruction whether in the laboratory, classroom, or field study. If any two qualities are the hallmark of the typical California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo instructor, they are teaching ability and practical applications in all instruction.

C. Procedural Implementation

1. Primary responsibility for the advancement program is vested in the President, who is the chief advancement officer of the university. The president may delegate elements of this responsibility to other university officers and especially to the Executive Vice President and the Director of University Advancement.
2. Implementation of the advancement program must be the concern of every member of the faculty and staff. Support is given to the advancement program by the Public Affairs section of the university through needed publications, public information services, alumni programs, community services, and the communications media.

3. Priorities for advancement funding within the university must be determined on a timely and systematic basis. Departmental needs will be determined by department (or activity) heads in consultation with appropriate faculty or staff personnel within their areas and forwarded via the line organization. A priority committee consisting of the President, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Students, and Director of University Advancement (secretary of the committee) will determine a major priority list for all proposed needs within the university. This committee will meet at least annually to review and update this list. Insofar as possible the priority listing will be used when establishing funding needs and when discussing private funding with individuals, corporations, corporate foundations, and charitable foundations.

4. The President of the university will periodically call informal meetings of groups of administration and faculty (either active or emeriti) for the purpose of discussing potential donors for funding of projects with private monies. These individuals, corporations, corporate foundations and charitable foundations should be identified by their fields of interest within the university and, if possible, by their estimated giving potential. The President may ask appropriate faculty and staff members to help in the continuing communication that must take place with these potential donors.

5. Periodic calls on corporate, corporate foundation, and charitable foundation executives are essential to insure continuing liaison with these key people.

6. Deferred Giving Programs (sometimes called Planned Giving or Estate Planning) will be established by California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

7. An Annual Fund Giving Program will be established by California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

8. Whenever practicable, all gifts and grants will be channeled through the California Polytechnic State University Foundation. (See CAM 5/7/5)

9. Minimum standards will be established to insure that named funds are funded at a sufficient level to justify the naming of the fund.

Added March 1975
RESOLUTION RE INVESTIGATION AND MAKING OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE BUDGETARY PROCESS TO INCREASE DIRECT FACULTY INPUT

WHEREAS: Budgetary restrictions imposed by the Governor have a direct impact on instructional funding for CPSU, SLO; and

WHEREAS: Presently the faculty at CPSU, SLO, has no direct input in the budgetary process; and

WHEREAS: The need for direct faculty input into the budgetary process is vital in order to assure a more representative process in budgetary formulation; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, CPSU, SLO, support the Academic Senate Budget Committee’s request to investigate the structuring of the budgetary process and make recommendations to increase direct faculty input.
ACADEMIC SENATE HIGHLIGHTS - May 6, 1975

I. Reports

A. The following newly elected Senators were introduced:
   
   Arthur C. Duarte, Agricultural Management
   R. J. Greffenius, Natural Resources Management
   Larry Rathbun, Agricultural Education
   Joe Amanzio, Architecture
   Paul Wolff, Architecture
   Tim Kersten, Economics
   Stanislaus Dundon, Philosophy
   Dale Federer, Psychology
   Mary Stallard, Women's P.E.
   Rex Hutton, Mathematics
   Grant Miller, Medical Officer

   The new Statewide Academic Senator is Paul Murphy, Mathematics

   The newly elected officers of the Academic Senate are:

   Lezlie Labhard, Home Economics Chairperson
   David Saveker, Architecture Vice Chairperson
   Charles Jennings, Art Secretary

B. Curriculum Committee - the Vice President for Academic Affairs has agreed to meet with the Curriculum Committee following the Academic Senate approval of the curriculum package for clarification and discussion of the package.

C. Faculty Library Committee - the committee has concurred with the Director of the Library that the faculty reading room be converted for general library use. This decision was made in response to a severe space shortage in the library and because of the very low usage rate of the reading room.

D. Academic Council - The Council is trying to write up guidelines and procedures for Community College Articulation. An ad hoc committee, including a faculty representative, will be appointed to develop a philosophy and to write a definition of articulation prior to formulation of procedures and guidelines by the Council.

E. Administrative Council - A new computerized follow-up program to create greater compliance with the vehicle code on campus will be initiated on May 19.

F. ASI President - Scott Plotkin reviewed the actions of the CSUC Student Presidents Association in recent legislative hearings and with the Governor. The group was successful in adding two amendments to the Dills bill on Collective Bargaining (SB 275) prior to its being passed by the Governmental Organizations Committee which provide for student input in the bargaining process. The students were also very supportive of the restoration of faculty promotions and were thanked for their role in getting promotions restored in the budget.
II. Action

A. The following nominations for the 1975-76 Executive Committee were approved:

Luther Hughes  Agriculture and Natural Resources
Milton Drandell  Business and Social Sciences
Robert Burton  Communicative Arts and Humanities
William Krupp  Engineering and Technology
Louis Pippin  Human Development and Education
Anthony Buffa  Science and Mathematics
Nancy Jorgensen  Professional Consultative Services

B. The Constitutional Amendments on Senate Membership (Attachment IV-C, A.S. Agenda, April 15, 1975) and on the Preamble (Attachment VI-C, A.S. Agenda, May 6, 1975) were both passed. These amendments must now be voted on by the entire faculty.

C. A resolution tasking the Academic Senate Budget Committee with an investigation of the structuring of the budgetary process in order to achieve more faculty input in the process was passed.

D. A resolution opposing the modification of the Summer Session Salary Schedule that was proposed by the Statewide Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee was passed.

E. A resolution was passed endorsing in principle the Technical Advisory Committee on Faculty Staffing's report entitled "A Method for Projecting Faculty Need". The resolution asked that further study be done in the area of student weekly contact hours/full-time faculty equivalent/discipline (HEGIS) category development. (Attachment VII-F, A.S. Minutes, 5/6/75)

F. The resolution requesting additional library storage space was postponed for action by the Summer Executive Committee.

G. The resolution to add a faculty representative on the priority committee on the University Advancement Program was withdrawn due to the President's revision of the respective CAM section to include faculty representation.

H. Resolutions of commendation for service to the faculty and Academic Senate were passed for Bob Andreini and Joe Weatherby.

III. Announcements

A. The Director of Finance of the State of California has recommended to the State legislature that faculty promotions (the number requested by the CSUC less the 55 which were proposed to be held by the Chancellor's Office) and the International Program be reinstated in the budget.

B. An ad hoc committee on equal term enrollment is going to be appointed by President Kennedy.

C. An ad hoc committee to study student evaluation of faculty has been appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

D. The Statewide Academic Senate is seeking a faculty member within the system to serve during the 1975-76 academic year as an Executive Secretary of the Commission on New Directions. For more information, contact the Senate Office.