I. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Barton Olsen in the Faculty/Staff Dining Room at 3:17 p.m.

II. Those in attendance were:

MEMBERS:

Alberti, Robert
Bailey, Roger
Boone, Joseph
Brady, Mary
Burroughs, Sarah
Burton, Robert
Cirovic, Michael
Clerkin, Edward
Coyes, Frank
Fierstine, Harry
Frost, Robert
Greffenius, R. J.
Harden, Sheldon
Hooks, Robert
Johnson, Corwin
Labhard, Iezlie
Lowry, John
Mott, John
Murphy, Paul
Neel, Paul
Nelson, Linden
Olsen, Barton
Peterson, James
Quinlan, Charles
Rickard, Herman
Rhoads, Howard
Roberts, Alice
Rogalla, John
Rosen, Art
Scheffer, Paul
Sorensen, Robert
Smith, Howard
Smith, Murray
Thoms, Guy
Voss, Larry
Wills, Max
Ex-Officio (Voting)
Anderson, Roy
Andreini, Robert
Fisher, Clyde
Gibson, J. Cordner
Valpey, Robert
Grant, Dave

III. Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting of March 13, 1973 were approved as submitted.

IV. Chairman Olsen introduced Dr. Charles Adams, Chairman of the Statewide Academic Senate, CSUC. Dr. Adams spoke and answered questions relative to faculty issues in the CSUC system. A summary of his remarks is attached to these minutes ("Attachment A").

V. Vice Chairman Arthur Rosen conducted the Academic Senate business meeting.

1. The Senate Elections Committee report was distributed by committee chairman Murray Smith. Dr. Rosen called for additional nominations from the floor. There were none. The list of nominees is attached to these minutes ("Attachment B").

2. Information Items
   a)  
   b)  
   c)  (SEE AGENDA 4/10/73 - Information Items)
   d) Item IV-3 from agenda: Curriculum Committee report attached to agenda.
   e) Item IV-6 from agenda: Howard Rhoads moved, seconded by Corwin Johnson, to make this a business item. The motion was carried. (See Item IV-3-a).
3. **Business Items**

a) Howard Rhoads moved, seconded by Corwin Johnson: that the Academic Senate CPSU adopt the alternative proposal ("Attachment C-2") and submit it to the CPSU faculty as representing this Senate's position on the Statewide Academic Senate "Salary Schedule Referendum." Following considerable discussion, it was moved, seconded, and carried to amend the main motion to read: that the Academic Senate CPSU adopt the alternative "Salary Schedule Referendum" and submit it to the CPSU faculty simultaneously with the Statewide Academic Senate "Salary Schedule Referendum." The results of both surveys are to be forwarded to the Statewide Academic Senate together with our opinion that the Referendum statement proposed by the Statewide Senate is inadequate in both form and substance ("Attachment C-1").

The amendment carried.

The amended main motion carried.

b) Frank Coyes moved, seconded by John Lowry, that: the Academic Senate CPSU adopt the "Guidelines for Evaluation of Department Heads" ("Attachment D"). After discussion, the proposed document was modified slightly to clarify the definition of "Department Heads." The previous question was moved, seconded, and carried, ending debate.

The main motion carried 25-10.

c) Harry Fierstine moved, seconded by Ed Clerkin, that: the Academic Senate CPSU adopt the "Statement of Educational Quality" (Attachment "E"), and forward it to the President, the CSUC Trustees, and the CSUC Academic Senate. Following discussion, Roy Anderson moved, seconded by David Saveker, that: the proposal of the Instruction Committee be referred back to the Committee as incomplete.

The motion to refer carried.

Acting Chairman Rosen requested that the Instruction Committee present a revised proposal at the May meeting of the Academic Senate.

4. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

The next Executive Meeting is Tuesday, May 1, and the next regular meeting is Tuesday, May 8.
Summary of comments before the Academic Senate CPSU, April 10, 1973, by Dr. Charles Adams, Chairman, Academic Senate of the California State University and Colleges.

Structure and Operations of the Statewide Academic Senate

There are 50 members (plus the Chancellor) in the Academic Senate, CSUC.

Campuses elect 2, 3, or 4 senators, depending upon FTE enrollment.

The State of California budgeted $167,000 in 1972-73 for the Senate. It is hoped that $237,000 will be available in 1973-74. Funds are expended for: released time for the Chairman; 1/2 released time for Chairmen of standing committees and members of the executive committee; travel expenses; office staff at CSUC headquarters.

The Senate holds regular meetings for 2 days several times a year, and key members of the Senate meet regularly with the CSUC Board of Trustees, and committees of the Board.

A particularly important expansion of Senate influence over the last four years has been in "behind-the-scenes" influence of Trustees in committees and individually.

The Senate appoints faculty members to a number of systemwide committees, some 60 CSUC faculty members hold such appointments this year.

The Senate now presents "briefs" to the Trustees with data and recommendations supplementary to the staff reports which appear in the Trustees' agenda.

The Senate maintains active communication with the University of California Academic Senate.

Issues of Concern to the Academic Senate and the Faculties

The CSUC System suffers from a lack of clear definition of roles (Presidents, Chancellor's Staff, Academic Senates, Student Governments).

Administrators are given disproportionate representation in policy making (e.g. the Chancellor's Office plus the Council of Presidents both represented, on a committee, with only one faculty representative).

The Statewide Senate (and local senates) often "meddle and peddle": we meddle in others' business (e.g. student issues); we peddle our influence.

The Chancellor's staff attempts to influence the Board of Trustees inappropriately in preparing the Trustees' meeting agenda.

Salary issues:

The concept of "comparison institutions" is a charade manipulated to fit a predetermined figure.

Collective negotiation is "inevitable and necessary," however faculty organizations must work cooperatively for the mutual benefit of the
faculties, not competitively.

Salary schedules, when developed cooperatively (e.g. with Senate involvement must be met or renegotiated in the same manner as initially derived.

The "Salary Schedule Referendum" will be conducted by the Senate in late April or early May.

The Chancellor's "moonlighting" proposal is in limbo.

The Statewide Senate will review the classification of Librarians.

Questions regarding the definition of "full funding," the faculty allocation formula, and the elimination of Class I and Class II are all pending. Further study of the Salary Schedule.
NOMINATIONS FOR:

**Academic Senate Officers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman:</td>
<td>Sheldon Harden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Alberti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman:</td>
<td>Robert Burton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alice Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary:</td>
<td>Harry Scales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Committee of the Academic Senate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Lavid Saveker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>John Rogalla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Arts</td>
<td>Roger Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>Lezlie Labhard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Walter Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Paul Scheffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Mathematics</td>
<td>Arthur Rosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Consultative Services</td>
<td>Marcus Gold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Salary Schedule Referendum

WHEREAS, The events that have transpired since the adoption of the "new (1970) salary structure" in the Spring of 1970 suggests that the legislature is unwilling to fully fund it, and

WHEREAS, Many faculty who originally favored the salary structure proposal now have serious reservations in view of the events that have transpired, especially the events since July 1972, and

WHEREAS, Some change in the salary structure from the existing structure appears both necessary and desirable; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges by means of a referendum submit the following questions to the entire faculty of the system between April 23, 1973 and May 5, 1973:

RESOLVE

1. The CSUC faculty supports the 1970 salary structure contingent upon full funding for its implementation:
   Yes  No

2. The CSUC faculty supports the 1970 salary structure and desires that it be implemented as soon as possible even if funding for full implementation is not available or assured.
   Yes  No

3. The CSUC faculty prefers to continue with the present salary structure.
   Yes  No

4. The CSUC faculty requests that an appropriate committee be established to formulate a new salary structure (i.e., different from the existing structure and the 1970 salary structure) for the system and that until such time as a new salary structure is developed and adopted, the present salary structure remain in effect.
   Yes  No

* Full funding and full implementation are interpreted to mean that sufficient funds will be provided for a rate of progression that is consistent with the average waiting period specified in the 1970 salary structure.

APPROVED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSUC  MARCH 9, 1973
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

Salary Schedule Referendum

WHEREAS, The events that have transpired since the adoption of the "new (1970) salary structure" in the Spring of 1970 suggests that the legislature is unwilling to fully fund it, and

WHEREAS, Many faculty who originally favored the salary structure proposal now have serious reservations in view of the events that have transpired, especially the events since July 1972, and

WHEREAS, Some change in the salary structure from the existing structure appears both necessary and desirable; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University and Colleges by means of a referendum submit the following questions to the entire faculty of the system between April 23, 1973 and May 5, 1973:

(1) The CSUC faculty supports the 1970 salary structure contingent upon full funding* for its implementation.

(2) The CSUC faculty supports the 1970 salary structure contingent upon full funding* and the elimination of the additional "intensive review" procedure proposed by the Chancellor.

(3) The CSUC faculty supports the 1970 salary structure and desires that it be implemented as soon as possible even if funding for full implementation* is not available or assured.

(4) The CSUC faculty supports the continuance of the present salary structure contingent upon elimination of the 60/40 limitation on promotion.

(5) The CSUC faculty prefers to continue with the present salary structure.
The CSUC faculty requests that an appropriate committee be established to formulate a new salary structure (i.e., different from the existing structure and the 1970 salary structure) for the system and that until such time as a new salary structure is developed and adopted, the present salary structure remain in effect.

Note: In balloting, faculty are requested to rank order their preference for each of the above choices.

1. ________________________
2. ________________________
3. ________________________
4. ________________________
5. ________________________
6. ________________________

* Full funding and full implementation are interpreted to mean that sufficient funds will be provided for a rate of progression that is consistent with the average waiting periods specified in the 1970 salary structure.
GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION
OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

I. Faculty evaluation of department or division heads at California Polytechnic State University is designed, as part of the established departmental personnel procedures, to be one means of assisting those individuals in achieving a high level of administrative effectiveness and productive working relationships with faculty, staff, and students.

II. Evaluation instruments developed for this purpose should provide means for assessing working relationships, leadership qualities, academic excellence, willingness and ability to communicate, and the maintenance of rapport with others on campus and in the community.

III. Department or division heads at California Polytechnic State University shall be evaluated by their respective academic, academic-related, and other professional employees once each year by May 1.

IV. All academic, academic-related, and other professional employees who have been employed in their respective departments for at least one year shall be eligible to participate in the evaluation if they so choose.

V. For purposes of these procedures:
   1. "Department or Division Heads" shall include all heads of Instructional Departments and Divisions and any other Directors who supervise employees eligible to vote in the election of Academic Senators.
   2. "Academic, academic-related, and other professional employees" shall include all University employees who teach and all academic-related and professional employees who are eligible to vote in the election of Academic Senators.

VI. To initiate this procedure, each department or division shall develop guidelines and criteria for such evaluation. All those who are eligible to evaluate the department or division head are eligible to serve on a committee which shall be established for this purpose. The committee shall forward a copy of its recommended procedures to the School Dean and the department head for their suggestions and recommendations prior to adoption.

VII. During the implementation phase of the evaluation process in 1973-74, the evaluations, which may be anonymous, shall be presented to the department or division heads or directors for their information. In subsequent academic years, the evaluations shall be presented to the department or division heads or directors in a manner consistent with the established departmental or division procedures, and they shall also be submitted to the Dean of the respective school or division.
We, the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, are concerned that the cost of education has been the primary consideration within the State University and Colleges System to the detriment of the quality of education. Specifically, considerable improvement in quality could be developed in the area of Faculty-Student, Faculty-Faculty, and Faculty-Profession inter-relationships. Present staffing provisions provide only minimum levels of time for contact with each student. The faculty needs to devote more time to:

Interaction with and attention to individual students.
Free exchange of ideas with students and other faculty members.
Preparation of current course material.
Innovation and improvement of teaching techniques.
Evaluation of student performance.
Professional development in order to remain current with rapidly advancing knowledge.

We believe the present assumption that a faculty member only needs two hours of outside class time for each hour in class to achieve the above goals is inadequate; the above listed improvements cannot be fully implemented within such a time scale. In our experience, if any of the above listed needs are to be pursued with vigor, at least three hours of outside class time for every hour in class are a much more realistic standard. We propose that four hours of time for each hour of class contact be accepted as \( \frac{1}{4} \) work load unit\(^5\) (1 hour in class plus 3 hours outside of class), and that the standard work load be constituted of 3 such work load units, plus work load unit\(^5\) for related activities.

We believe such a change in work load standards would result in improved educational quality in the California State University and Colleges System.

\( ^* \) It is assumed that comparable equivalencies will be developed for lab schedules, activity courses, supervision of student projects, etc.
ACADEMIC SENATE
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo

APRIL 10, 1973

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE LIBERAL STUDIES PROGRAM

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate CPSU has a continuing concern in the implementation and development of the B. A. degree in Liberal Studies to meet the requirements of the Ryan Bill; and

WHEREAS, There will be occasion to review the policies and curriculum as the program is implemented and projected for the years 1975-77; and

WHEREAS, The nature of the curriculum (essentially interdisciplinary or multi-subject and including basic courses beyond General Education in many departments and a number of schools) creates special university-wide concerns; therefore be it

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate CPSU recommends to the President that an advisory committee be formed, including at least one representative of the Academic Senate, to work with the Chairman of the Department of Liberal Studies and the Dean of the School of Human Development and Education; and be it further

RESOLVED That the Senate representative on the Advisory Committee shall make periodic reports to the Senate on the status of the Liberal Studies degree program; and be it further

RESOLVED That the members of the Advisory Committee shall have terms of at least two or three years and that the terms shall be overlapping.
THE ACADEMIC SENATE
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA

WHEREAS The Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University
has become an increasingly effective voice for the faculty in
University governance; and

WHEREAS Members of the faculty spend a great deal of time and effort
in carrying out the business of the Academic Senate; and

WHEREAS The granting of one-half released time to the Chairman of the
Academic Senate provided a measurable increase in the
effectiveness of Senate operations; and

WHEREAS The business of the Academic Senate is conducted in a large
part through extensive paperwork, including agendas and minutes
of the Senate and its major committees, committee reports, recom-
mendations to the President of the University, the Statewide
Academic Senate, the Chancellor and Trustees of the CSUC system,
routine internal memoranda and letters to off-campus individuals
and agencies, all of which require clerical assistance in
preparation; and

WHEREAS It is inappropriate and unfair to place the burden of the
Academic Senate clerical workload on clerical staff in the
various departments with which Senate officers are affiliated; and

WHEREAS The Academic Senate Office, Tenaya Hall 103, can be an effective
communications center for the Senate only if it is staffed
regularly; and

WHEREAS Senate officers change periodically (annually at the present
time), while continuity of Senate operations is important; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University is, as far as is known,
the only member institution in the CSUC system which does not
assign a regular clerical position to the Academic Senate;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That the Academic Senate, California Polytechnic
State University petition the President of the
University to assign a 0.5 clerical position at
the level Clerical Assistant III-A to the Academic
Senate, effective July 1, 1973; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Executive Committee of the Academic
Senate, CPSU be authorized to recruit and select
a person to fill the position thus assigned, pro-
vided only that such person not be simultaneously
employed by any other department or unit of the
University.