I. The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by Chairman Robert Alberti.

II. Those in attendance were:

MEMBERS:
Alberti, Robert
Albar, Joseph
Batterman, Ronald
Beaman, Sara
Brown, Robert
Burroughs, Sarah
Burton, Robert
Coyes, Frank
Cutough, Norman
Emel, James
Fierstine, Harry
Frost, Robert
Gold, Marcus
Grannah, Priscilla
Greffenus, R. J.
Haggard, Kenneth
Holins, Walter
Hooke, Robert
Johnson, Corwin
Jorgensen, Nancy
Labhard, Leslie
Lowry, John
McCormac, Weston
Melson, Linden
O'Leary, Michael
Rhoads, Howard
Rogalla, John
Ross, Arthur
Saverker, David
Scales, Harry
Scheffler, Paul
Sennett, Robert
Sorensen, Robert
Sullivan, Gerald
Weatherby, Joseph
Wolf, Lawrence

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS:
Brown, Sara
Johnson, Corwin
Sorensen, Robert
Weatherby, Joseph

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS: (Non-Voting)
Chandler, Everett
Fisher, Clyde


III. The purpose of this special meeting was to discuss the Report of the ad hoc Senate Directions Committee (copy attached). Senate members debated at length some of the recommendations offered on Pages 2 and 3 of the Report.

It was moved and seconded (Burton, Andreini) to accept the report of the Directions Committee and discharge the Committee.

A substitute motion was made and seconded (Saverker, Andreini) that the Senate acknowledge receipt of the report and recognize that the report defines items of policy that will form business items for future Senate review and approval, and further that the ad hoc committee be discharged. The motion passed.

IV. Agreement was reached by straw vote that the following changes be made in the Directions Committee's recommendations:

A. Recommendation 1.a and 1.b should be included as a footnote.

B. Recommendation 1, Paragraph 2, Number 1 should read as follows: "...perpetuate the traditions of shared academic governance and assure the free expression of the Faculty..."

C. Recommendation 1.c, second sentence, should read as follows: "The Senate recommends policies and procedures to the President."

D. Recommendation 1.d should read as follows: "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.)"

E. Recommendation 1.e.1 should read: "academic policy and procedures, including, but not limited to, the assurance of academic freedom, curricula, course content and academic standards, long range academic planning;"

F. Recommendation 1.e.3 should read: "academic policy and procedures affecting academic personnel, including, but not limited to, professional responsibility..."

V. The following motions were made in conjunction with the recommendations indicated:

A. Bohman/Weatherby - to adopt Recommendation 1, including the changes noted in IV A-F above. (passed unanimously)

B. Anderson/Coyes - to adopt Recommendation 2.a and 2.c and refer 2.b to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. (passed unanimously)

C. Saverker/Gold - to adopt the substance of Recommendation 3.a and 3.b. (passed unanimously)

D. Anderson/Scales - to adopt Recommendation 11. (failed)

VI. The Senate members agreed to send the following specific items to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee for examination:

A. Recommendation 1.c should include this statement before the last sentence: "Actions taken by the President in response to Senate recommendations shall be reported to the Senate in writing."

B. Recommendation 1.e.4 should be studied for the meaning of "composition of the Faculty".

C. Recommendation 2.b, concerning representation from all constituencies of the Senate on all committees, should be reviewed as some senators felt that increased membership would not necessarily strengthen all committees.

D. Recommendation 3.c is to be reviewed to determine whether each member of the Personnel Review Committee should be entitled to one full vote.

E. Recommendation 3.a and 3.b, although approved in substance, should be reworded for clarity.

VII. Chairman Alberti requested that senators come prepared at the March 12 Senate meeting with specific recommendations for the remainder of the Directions Committee's Report.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.
Memorandum

To: Members of the Academic Senate

From: Ad Hoc Senate Directions Committee*
Barbara Weber, Chairman

Subject: Committee Recommendations and Report

The ad hoc Committee on Directions for the Academic Senate is pleased to present to the Senate this statement of recommendations and report of its deliberations on the future of the Senate at Cal Poly. This report is organized as follows:

A. Recommendations for Action by the Senate 2 - 4
B. Historical Development of the Academic Senate 4 - 5
C. Charge to the Directions Committee 5 - 6
D. Random Comments by Committee Members on the Role of the Senate 6 - 7
E. Input from Other Members of the Senate 7 - 8
F. Preliminary Subcommittee Reports 8
G. A Summary of the Survey of Faculty on Senate Membership and Goals 8 - 9

The Committee requests your careful review of this material, and invites your comments and questions, particularly at the Special Academic Senate meeting on March 5, 3:15 p.m., Staff Dining Room.

Although somewhat longer than we had hoped, the members of the Directions Committee believe this report will be valuable to you in evaluating the background for our recommendations. This report reflects over 50 hours of committee deliberations in meetings, and the work of several subcommittees.

* Robert E. Alberti (Professional Consultative Services)
  Sara Behman (Business and Social Sciences)
  Robert E. Burton (Communicative Arts and Humanities)
  Corwin Johnson (Agriculture)
  Thomas Johnston (Architecture)
  Stuart Larsen (Engineering)
  Leon Maksoudian (Science and Mathematics)
  Robert Valpey (Academic Dean)
  Barbara Weber (Human Development and Education)
A. Recommendations

The Committee submits for consideration of the Academic Senate the following recommendations:

1. Adoption of this statement of goals, and its incorporation into the Bylaws of the Academic Senate:

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

   a. 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;

   b. 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;

   c. 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 policy 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.

   d. 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 all university standing, special, and ad hoc committees and subcommittees. (See CAM 150.)

   e. Responsibilities of the Academic Senate, integral to the process of shared academic governance at California Polytechnic State University, include, but are not limited to, the following areas:

      1. academic policy, including, but not limited to, curricula, course content and academic standards; long range academic planning;

      2. consultation regarding administrative organization and selection of administrative officers of the University;

      3. personnel policies affecting academic personnel, including, but not limited to, professional responsibility, hiring, promotion, reappointment, tenure, leaves, working conditions;

      4. procedures and programs for faculty development, including, but not limited to, the composition of the Faculty, in-service training programs, and counsel regarding professional personnel problems.

2. The structure of all Senate committees should be strengthened:

   a. A committee on Long Range Planning should be established.

   b. All committees should include, but not be limited to, representation from all constituencies of the Senate (e.g. 7 schools and Professional Consultative Services).

   c. All committees should report at every regular Senate meeting.

3. Membership on the Personnel Review Committee should be as follows:

   a. Since there are members and alternates from each school or area presently serving, one member to be elected each year from now on.

   b. The newly-elected member becomes the junior member, and the previous junior member becomes the senior member from that school or area.

   c. Both members vote as a caucus.

4. Each school should elect three senators, plus one senator for each 30 faculty members or major fraction (no more than one per department until all departments represented).

5. Professional Consultative Services Faculty should continue to be represented under current procedure (one senator per 15 members or major fraction of Academic employees classified as Librarians, Audio-Visual Faculty, Counselor, or Medical Officer I).

6. Academic Deans are not to be represented on the Senate.

7. Department Heads are to be represented according to current procedure (one Department Head representative to be elected from each school).

8. Professional Personnel, including Associate Deans of Instructional Schools, are to be represented according to present procedure (one senator elected from this administrative group).

9. All senators are to be elected for two-year terms, provided 50% of the senators are elected each year for staggering and continuity purposes.

10. Senators may be elected for a maximum of two consecutive terms, provided that one may run for re-election after one year of break.

11. Tuesday, 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. is to be recognized by all departments and schools as Senate and/or committee meeting time, and all senators and committee members are scheduled accordingly.

12. Provisions shall be established for proxies for academic senators. Any senator missing more than two consecutive meetings without a proxy shall be automatically considered resigned from the Senate.

13. Senate should enhance its program of resources to faculty through development of:

   a. voluntary in-service training programs for improvement of instruction, student advisement

   b. an up-to-date "profile" of faculty backgrounds and interests to aid in planning, committee selection

   c. a faculty manual
B. Historical Development of the University Academic Senate

During the 1950's there was a body of faculty and staff on this campus that was consulted by the President from time to time. During this period, most of the faculty and staff felt that the group was more of a sounding board for the President when he desired the staff's opinion and not a true consultative organization. This group evolved into the Faculty-Staff Council. When Glenn Dumke became Chancellor of the State College System, he directed that a Faculty Senate or Council or other consultative group be formed on each campus. The organization. This system worked with some success during its first years. However, it soon became apparent that a vast majority of the business of the faculty and staff was conducted by these councils. The Deans of the instructional schools were members of the council. There were elected members from the various areas of the staff, including secretaries, Foundation, Custodial, Maintenance, Grounds, etc. This system worked with some success during its first years. However, it soon became apparent that a vast majority of the business to be conducted had to do primarily with the areas that were mainly of interest to the faculty. One of this was due to the fact that the faculty and staff worked under some different regulations, for example, the faculty grievance procedures, and partially due to the nature of the consultations during the period when we were working primarily with curriculum matters, it was sometimes a problem getting a quorum. Since these issues, grievance procedures, and curricula matters had deadlines to meet, they took precedence over other matters, and a number of members of the council from the staff felt they were getting little or nothing out of the council.

During the 1966-67 year, a number of staff members, as well as some faculty members, expressed a desire to form separate councils. A survey was taken that indicated that a large number of both the faculty and staff felt that they could be more productive if there were separate councils for each.

In the Fall of 1967, a committee began working on a constitution that would separate the faculty and staff into separate councils or senate, and yet give representation to all constituents. President Kennedy indicated that if both the faculty and staff wish to go in this direction, he would approve. However, he requested that the final constitution be sent to all members of the faculty and staff at Cal Poly for ratification.

The committee spent many hours and held a large number of open meetings to get input from all interested individuals. They reported regularly to the council, and in Spring of 1968, the council approved a draft of the constitution that was sent to all members of the faculty and staff for ratification. The vote on ratification of this constitution took place in May of 1968, and was overwhelmingly in favor.

President Kennedy accepted the constitution and indicated that he would consider the new organizations formed as soon as the bylaws were adopted for each. (Note: The directive from the Chancellor's Office directing each campus to form a consultative body indicated that the President and the Chancellor's Office must approve the constitution and bylaws of these organizations.)

A Bylaws Committee was appointed and spent most of the 1968-69 academic year forming the bylaws of the new Academic Senate. Again, there were a large number of open meetings to receive suggestions from all interested members of the faculty and regular reports were given to the Senate. A great deal of the Senate's time during that period was spent in discussing various phases of the bylaws. In writing both the constitution and the bylaws one of the concerns was that all groups be fairly represented on one of the senate. A great deal of time was spent trying to determine who was faculty and who was staff. Another concern was that if a group was left out, they would form a third consultative group.

Finally, after the normal amount of discussion and a great deal of compromise, the present bylaws were adopted by the Academic Senate, forwarded to the President who in turn forwarded them to the Chancellor's Office. A parallel committee was functioning in the Staff Senate and about the same time their bylaws were approved, and President Kennedy designated these as the consultative groups on this campus.

The bylaws have been amended several times since their adoption. The greatest change was the addition of a number of committees, such as, the Library Committee, the Research Committee, etc., which had been administratively appointed committees. During all of the discussions, one group, now designated as administrators of the university, was left "in limbo". A number of people felt that some of these individuals should be considered faculty; others believed them to be staff. However, no consensus could be reached. It was generally felt that they should be represented somewhere, so it was finally determined that this group would elect one representative to the Academic Senate and one representative to the Staff Senate. It seemed that no one felt this was an ideal solution at the time. However, it was better than leaving this group without any representation in either Senate. The question as to who should or should not be faculty and who should or should not serve on the Academic Senate has been an issue from time to time on this campus as it has been on others. However, in the past, we have never been able to reach complete agreement on this. In looking at other campuses in the CSUC System and elsewhere, it appears that we are not unique in this instance. The difficulty in applying labels was quite evident when President Kennedy proposed his 1973 organizational plan, when some segments were designated under the Executive Vice President and some under the Academic Vice President.

C. Charge to the Directions Committee

As "Academic Senate Directions Committee" was appointed in the Winter quarter, 1973,
The Senate has said "we want" in recommendations, rather than producing evidence in support of proposals.
The spirit of the Senate should be that of the faculty, although the name may appropriately be "academic".
An index of the maturity of the Senate may be increasing faculty involvement together with decreasing administration involvement.

The question of administrative membership on the Senate may be more of a problem of "overlap" than one of "overkill". If or without denial, for example, on the Senate, the Academic Council often supersedes the Senate. Regardless of the membership of the Senate, Senate policy criteria and parameters must be acknowledged by the President. (i.e. "what we do" is more important than "who we are").

The Senate, and its committees (where the work is done), must take responsibility and must prove itself responsible. Perhaps the size of the Senate itself is awkward: how about a more "workable" 20-30 members; or how about all faculty all in the upper 2 ranks all tenured OR ?? (A study last year suggests leaving size as is.)

The size, number, and structure of committees want review: important? benefit to faculty? influential in decision making? accessible to faculty? Time spent on adequate Senate and committee work can hurt classroom effectiveness; recognition and released time are vital.

Internal communication within the Senate must be improved: Feedback on President's Council, Academic Council, Administrative Council; Roll call votes make Senators more accountable; Committee reports available earlier and brought to Executive Committee by committee chairmen; Executive Committee itself may be a bottleneck.

The spirit of the Senate should be that of the faculty, although the name may appropriately be "academic".

An index of the maturity of the Senate may be increasing faculty involvement together with decreasing administration involvement.

The question of administrative membership on the Senate may be more of a problem of "overlap" than one of "overkill". If or without denial, for example, on the Senate, the Academic Council often supersedes the Senate. Regardless of the membership of the Senate, Senate policy criteria and parameters must be acknowledged by the President. (i.e. "what we do" is more important than "who we are").

The Senate, and its committees (where the work is done), must take responsibility and must prove itself responsible. Perhaps the size of the Senate itself is awkward: how about a more "workable" 20-30 members; or how about all faculty all in the upper 2 ranks all tenured OR ?? (A study last year suggests leaving size as is.)

The size, number, and structure of committees want review: important? benefit to faculty? influential in decision making? accessible to faculty? Time spent on adequate Senate and committee work can hurt classroom effectiveness; recognition and released time are vital.

Internal communication within the Senate must be improved: Feedback on President's Council, Academic Council, Administrative Council; Roll call votes make Senators more accountable; Committee reports available earlier and brought to Executive Committee by committee chairmen; Executive Committee itself may be a bottleneck.
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The question of administrative membership on the Senate may be more of a problem of "overlap" than one of "overkill". If or without denial, for example, on the Senate, the Academic Council often supersedes the Senate. Regardless of the membership of the Senate, Senate policy criteria and parameters must be acknowledged by the President. (i.e. "what we do" is more important than "who we are").

The Senate, and its committees (where the work is done), must take responsibility and must prove itself responsible. Perhaps the size of the Senate itself is awkward: how about a more "workable" 20-30 members; or how about all faculty all in the upper 2 ranks all tenured OR ?? (A study last year suggests leaving size as is.)

The size, number, and structure of committees want review: important? benefit to faculty? influential in decision making? accessible to faculty? Time spent on adequate Senate and committee work can hurt classroom effectiveness; recognition and released time are vital.

Internal communication within the Senate must be improved: Feedback on President's Council, Academic Council, Administrative Council; Roll call votes make Senators more accountable; Committee reports available earlier and brought to Executive Committee by committee chairmen; Executive Committee itself may be a bottleneck.
a sense of the Senate’s priorities.

6. Senate meetings should occur more often than once a month, and the "5:00 adjournment syndrome" should be avoided.

F. Preliminary Subcommittee Reports

1. External constraints upon the Senate;
2. Senate Membership
3. Senate Communications
4. Senate Committee Structure
5. Areas of concern to the Senate

Reports are available in the Academic Senate Office.

G. Survey Summary

In February, 1974, the faculty-at-large was surveyed by the Committee in order to guide its recommendations regarding membership and goals of the Senate. The summary of the survey is as follows:

1. Terms of Office of Senators
   - There were a total of 425 responses to this item, of which,
     - 221 (52.0%) favored a two-year term for the senators
     - 106 (24.8%) favored a three-year term for the senators
     - 20 (4.7%) favored other plans

2. Number of Consecutive Terms
   - There were a total of 422 responses to this item, of which,
     - 286 (67.8%) favored limited number per person
     - 136 (32.2%) favored unlimited number per person

3. Distribution of Elected Senators
   A. Instructional Faculty
      - There were a total of 439 responses to this item, of which,
        - 171 (39.0%) favored the existing process
        - 119 (26.9%) favored the plan of no more than one per department until all departments were represented
        - 43 (9.8%) favored the plan of 5 senators per school
        - 27 (6.2%) favored the plan of one senator per department
        - 24 (5.3%) favored the plan of all tenured faculty
        - 25 (5.6%) favored other plans

   B. Professional Consultative Services Faculty
      - There were a total of 394 responses to this item, of which,
        - 236 (59.9%) favored the current method
        - 28 (7.1%) favored the notion of increased representation
        - 101 (25.6%) favored the notion of decreased representation
        - 29 (7.4%) favored other plans

C. (1) Deans

   There were a total of 426 responses, of which,
   - 125 (29.3%) favored the current procedure
   - 136 (31.6%) favored the ex-officio non-voting status
   - 31 (7.2%) favored the notion of election at large
   - 20 (4.7%) favored the notion of one academic dean
   - 111 (26.1%) favored the notion of no dean representation
   - 5 (1.2%) favored other plans

C. (2) Associate Deans

   There were a total of 359 responses to this item, of which,
   - 52 (14.5%) favored the current procedure
   - 118 (32.8%) favored the ex-officio non-voting status
   - 49 (13.8%) favored the notion of election at large
   - 9 (2.5%) favored the notion of one academic associate dean
   - 131 (36.3%) favored the notion of no associate dean representation
   - 5 (1.4%) favored other plans

D. Department Heads

   There were 426 responses to this item, of which,
   - 180 (42.3%) favored the present procedure
   - 52 (12.2%) favored the notion of one selected from School Council
   - 98 (23.0%) favored the notion of eligible at large
   - 87 (20.4%) favored the notion that department heads not be represented
   - 9 (2.1%) favored other ideas

E. Administrative Personnel

   There were 406 responses to this item, of which,
   - 215 (53.0%) favored the current procedure
   - 53 (13.2%) favored the notion of increased representation
   - 138 (34.0%) favored the notion of not being represented

F. The last item was tabulated by taking the first and second ranked priorities. For this reason there were nearly twice as many responses (704), of which,
   - 133 (18.9%) ranked University governance as their 1st or 2nd priority
   - 151 (21.4%) ranked classroom teaching as their 1st or 2nd priority
   - 77 (10.9%) ranked research as their 1st and 2nd priority
   - 31 (4.4%) ranked student services as their 1st or 2nd priority
   - 157 (22.3%) ranked personnel policies as their 1st or 2nd priority
   - 94 (13.4%) ranked working conditions as their 1st or 2nd priority
   - 65 (9.2%) ranked intra-faculty communications as their 1st or 2nd priority

This concludes the survey summary.
Memorandum

From: Ad Hoc Senate Directions Committee*
   Barbara Weber, Chairman

Subject: Committee Recommendations and Report

The ad hoc Committee on Directions for the Academic Senate is pleased to present to the Senate this statement of recommendations and report of its deliberations on the future of the Senate at Cal Poly. This report is organized as follows:

A. Recommendations for Action by the Senate
B. Historical Development of the Academic Senate
C. Charge to the Directions Committee
D. Random Comments by Committee Members on the Role of the Senate
E. Input from Other Members of the Senate
F. Preliminary Subcommittee Reports
G. A Summary of the Survey of Faculty on Senate Membership and Goals

The Committee requests your careful review of this material, and invites your comments and questions, particularly at the Special Academic Senate meeting on March 5, 3:15 p.m., Staff Dining Room.

Although somewhat longer than we had hoped, the members of the Directions Committee believe this report will be valuable to you in evaluating the background for our recommendations. This report reflects over 50 hours of committee deliberations in meetings, and the work of several subcommittees.

*Robert E. Alberti (Professional Consultative Services)
Sara Behman (Business and Social Sciences)
Robert E. Burton (Communicative Arts and Humanities)
Corwin Johnson (Agriculture)
Thomas Johnston (Architecture)
Stuart Larsen (Engineering)
Leon Maksoudian (Science and Mathematics)
Robert Valpey (Academic Dean)
Barbara Weber (Human Development and Education)
A. Recommendations

The Committee submits for consideration of the Academic Senate the following recommendations:

1. Adoption of this statement of goals, and its incorporation into the Bylaws of the Academic Senate:

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

   a. 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;

   b. 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;

   c. 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 policy 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.

   d. 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 all university standing, special, and ad hoc committees and subcommittees. (See CAM 160.)

   e. Responsibilities of the Academic Senate, integral to the process of shared academic governance at California Polytechnic State University, include, but are not limited to, the following areas:

      1. academic policy, including, but not limited to, curricula, course content and academic standards; long range academic planning;

      2. consultation regarding administrative organization and selection of administrative officers of the University;

      3. personnel policies affecting academic personnel, including, but not limited to, professional responsibility, hiring, promotion, reappointment, tenure, leaves, working conditions;

      4. procedures and programs for faculty development, including, but not limited to, the composition of the Faculty, in-service training programs, and counsel regarding professional personnel problems.

2. The structure of all Senate committees should be strengthened:

   a. A committee on Long Range Planning should be established.
b. All committees should include, but not be limited to, representation from all constituencies of the Senate (e.g. 7 schools and Professional Consultative Services).

c. All committees should report at every regular Senate meeting.

3. Membership on the Personnel Review Committee should be as follows:

a. Since there are members and alternates from each school or area presently serving, one member to be elected each year from now on.

b. The newly-elected member becomes the junior member, and the previous junior member becomes the senior member from that school or area.

c. Both members vote as a caucus.

4. Each school should elect three senators, plus one senator for each 30 faculty members or major fraction (no more than one per department until all departments represented).

5. Professional Consultative Services Faculty should continue to be represented under current procedure (one senator per 15 members or major fraction of Academic employees classified as Librarian, Audio-Visual Faculty, Counselor, or Medical Officer I).

6. Academic Deans are not to be represented on the Senate.

7. Department Heads are to be represented according to current procedure (one Department Head representative to be elected from each school).

8. Administrative Personnel, including Associate Deans of Instructional Schools, are to be represented according to present procedure (one senator elected from this administrative group).

9. All senators are to be elected for two-year terms, provided 50% of the senators are elected each year for staggering and continuity purposes.

10. Senators may be elected for a maximum of two consecutive terms, provided that one may run for re-election after one year of break.

11. Tuesday, 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. is to be recognized by all departments and schools as Senate and/or committee meeting time, and all senators and committee members be scheduled accordingly.

12. Provisions shall be established for proxies for academic senators. Any senator missing more than two consecutive meetings without a proxy shall be automatically considered resigned from the Senate.

13. Senate should enhance its program of resources to faculty through development of:

a. voluntary in-service training programs for improvement of instruction, student advisement

b. an up-to-date "profile" of faculty backgrounds and interests to aid in planning, committee selection

c. a faculty manual
d. a system to aid in encouragement of research projects

e. improved communication with the student community

f. other informational programs on various topics of interest to faculty

14. These recommendations, after adoption by the Academic Senate, should be referred to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee for preparation of the necessary amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws to be presented to the faculty and/or Senate for approval.

B. Historical Development of the University Academic Senate

During the 1950's there was a body of faculty and staff on this campus that was consulted by the President from time to time. During this period, most of the faculty and staff felt that the group was more of a sounding board for the President when he desired the staff's opinion and not a true consultative organization. This group evolved into the Faculty-Staff Council. When Glenn Dumke became Chancellor of the State College System, he directed that a Faculty Senate or Council or other consultative group be formed on each campus. The Faculty-Staff Council became this consultative body at Cal Poly.

At first, the Chancellor's Office objected to a consultative group composed of both faculty and staff. However, they finally accepted our Faculty-Staff Council as meeting the requirement that each campus have such a body. The Council was composed of elected members from all areas of the campus, and each School was represented by an equal number of members. The Department Heads' Council in each School was represented by one member elected from that group. The Deans of the instructional schools were members of the council. There were elected members from the various areas of the staff, including secretaries, Foundation, Custodial, Maintenance, Grounds, etc. This system worked with some success during its first years. However, it soon became apparent that a vast majority of the business to be conducted had to do primarily with the areas that were mainly of interest to the faculty. Some of this was due to the fact that the faculty and staff worked under some different regulations, for example, the faculty grievance procedures, and partially due to the nature of the consultations during the period when we were working primarily with curriculum matters, it was sometimes a problem getting a quorum. Since these issues, grievance procedures, and curricula matters had deadlines to meet, they took precedence over other matters, and a number of members of the council from the staff felt they were getting little or nothing out of the council.

During the 1966-67 year, a number of staff members, as well as some faculty members, expressed a desire to form separate councils. A survey was taken that indicated that a large number of both the faculty and staff felt that they could be more productive if there were separate councils for each.

In the Fall of 1967, a committee began working on a constitution that would separate the faculty and staff into separate councils or senates, and yet give representation to all constituents. President Kennedy indicated that if both
the faculty and staff wish to go in this direction, he would approve. However, he requested that the final constitution be sent to all members of the faculty and staff at Cal Poly for ratification.

The committee spent many hours and held a large number of open meetings to get input from all interested individuals. They reported regularly to the council, and in Spring of 1968 the council approved a draft of the constitution that was sent to all members of the faculty and staff for ratification. The vote on adoption of this constitution took place in May of 1968, and was overwhelmingly in favor.

President Kennedy accepted the constitution and indicated that he would consider the new organizations formed as soon as the bylaws were adopted for each. (Note: The directive from the Chancellor's Office directing each campus to form a consultative body indicated that the President and the Chancellor's Office must approve the constitution and bylaws of these organizations.)

A Bylaws Committee was appointed and spent most of the 1968-69 academic year forming the bylaws of the new Academic Senate. Again, there were a large number of open meetings to receive suggestions from all interested members of the faculty and regular reports were given to the Senate. A great deal of the Senate's time during that period was spent in discussing various phases of the bylaws. In writing both the constitution and the bylaws one of the concerns was that all groups be fairly represented on one of the senates. A great deal of time was spent trying to determine who was faculty and who was staff. Another concern was that if a group was left out, they would form a third consultative group. Finally, after the normal amount of discussion and a great deal of compromise, the present bylaws were adopted by the Senate, forwarded to the President who in turn forwarded them to the Chancellor's Office. A parallel committee was functioning in the Staff Senate and about the same time their bylaws were approved, and President Kennedy designated these as the consultative groups on this campus.

The bylaws have been amended several times since their adoption. The greatest change was the addition of a number of committees, such as, the Library Committee, the Research Committee, etc., which had been administratively appointed committees. During all of the discussions, one group, now designated as administrators of the university, was left "in limbo". A number of people felt that some of these individuals should be considered faculty; others believed them to be staff. However, no consensus could be reached. It was generally felt that they should be represented somewhere, so it was finally determined that this group would elect one representative to the Academic Senate and one representative to the Staff Senate. It seemed that not one felt this was an ideal solution at the time. However, it was better than leaving this group without any representation on either Senate. The question as to who should or should not be faculty and who should or should not serve on the Academic Senate has been an issue from time to time on this campus as it has been on others. However, in the past, we have never been able to reach complete agreement on this. In looking at other campuses in the CSUC System and elsewhere, it appears that we are not unique in this indecision. The difficulty in applying labels was quite evident when President Kennedy proposed his 1973 organizational plan, when some segments were designated under the Executive Vice President and some under the Academic Vice President.

C. Charge to the Directions Committee

An "Academic Senate Directions Committee" was appointed in the Winter quarter, 1973,
"to study and make recommendations regarding the future role of the University Academic Senate". Barton C. Olsen (History), then Chairman of the Academic Senate, noted "It has been five years since the Academic Senate Constitution and Bylaws were adopted. It is time for a major review and perhaps 'overhaul' of the Senate structure. We want to insure the best possible organization to effectively represent the faculty in governance of the University."

Specific areas of concern noted in the charge to the committee include: the organization and effectiveness of the Senate; the relationship of the Senate to other campus bodies; the Senate committee structure; the possibility of a Senate newsletter to the faculty; the term of office of Senate officers; the membership of the Senate, including the appropriateness of administrative membership.

Dr. Olsen pointed out, however, that the committee has been encouraged to look at its task as open-ended, within the broad framework of Academic Senate functioning. "All aspects of the current and potential operation of the Senate are within the scope of this committee," he said.

D. Random Comments by Committee Members on the Role of the Senate

Early discussions in the Committee centered upon the role of the Academic Senate in University governance. The following thoughts were expressed (not necessarily agreed upon) in the first Committee discussions:

The Senate should be a sounding board for how academicians feel; reflect needs of faculty; make needs understood in the right channels; tell administration what faculty want and need.

The President is recognized as the policy making entity.

The faculty should respect Senate opinion -- such that they try to influence it.

One major frustration is that administration has all the power.

Is faculty indifference inherent or conditioned by administrative autocracy?

Can we break into the circle of insignificance?

The President treats Senate as representative of faculty.

Many view administration and faculty as two opposing forces.

Can we recommend changes which would better accomplish the goals and demonstrate teamwork with administration?

The Senate needs credibility both with constituency and with administration.

The Senate is now a passive group--should be assertive.

One concern relates to administration via C.A.M. vs Academic Senate Policy:

President "cannot" give up ultimate authority.

Institutional relevance: the initiative should come from professional faculty.

Does faculty want to deal only with important issues or will it handle trivia?

What are the dimensions of the professional responsibility of faculty in these areas? It is often true that the Senators are not doing homework. Faculty peer evaluation would be more respected if properly done.

We should review the structure of major Senate committees, and their effectiveness in operations and relationship to the Senate.

There is too much administrative power now on our Senate.

Cal Poly should "act like a University," with the premium on the knowledge and expertise of the faculty in guidance of institutional policy.

The Senate could use the administrative resources: e.g. to get complete "staff work" from the Academic Affairs staff.

The Senate should express its view, whether invited or not.

Maybe we should not wait for CAM to authorize us; we take our own authority from faculty.

Senate should actively seek student support in its recommendations.
The Senate has said "we want" in recommendations, rather than producing evidence in support of proposals.

The spirit of the Senate should be that of the faculty, although the name may appropriately be "academic".

An index of the maturity of the Senate may be increasing faculty involvement together with decreasing administration involvement.

The question of administrative membership on the Senate may be more of a problem of "superlap" than one of "overlap". With or without deans, for example, on the Senate, the Academic Council often supersedes the Senate.

Regardless of the membership of the Senate, Senate policy criteria and parameters must be acknowledged by the President. (i.e. "what we do" is more important than "who we are").

The Senate, and its committees (where the work is done), must take responsibility and must prove itself responsible.

Perhaps the size of the Senate itself is awkward: how about a more "workable" 20-30 members; or how about all faculty OR all in the upper 2 ranks OR all tenured OR ??? (A study last year suggests leaving size as is.)

The size, number, and structure of committees wants review: important? benefit to faculty? influential in decision making? accessible to faculty?

Time spent on adequate Senate and committee work can hurt classroom effectiveness; recognition and released time are vital.

Internal communication within the Senate must be improved: Feedback on President's Council, Academic Council, Administrative Council; Roll call votes make Senators more accountable; Committee reports available earlier and brought to Executive Committee by committee chairman; Executive Committee itself may be a bottleneck.

E. Input from Other Senate Members

After several weeks of meetings in which the discussions followed the "random" wandering indicated by those notes, the Committee began to focus upon a number of specific issues and to move toward recommendations. At the Academic Senate meeting of May 8, a committee report generated some interest on the part of Senators, who stayed after the meeting to make specific suggestions to the Committee, a number of which have been implemented in 1973-74:

1. Curriculum proposals should be handled in detail by the Curriculum Committee only. The Senate should establish policy guidelines and criteria, then leave "nit picking" to the Committee.

2. Senate functions should be concentrated in these major areas:
   a. long range planning and policy reviews affecting faculty (equitable work loads, equitable mix of faculty);
   b. continuing review of quality of curriculum and degree standards;
   c. continuing review of administrative process and selection, to assure academic freedom and tenure;
   d. continuing review of allocation of University resources and publication to the faculty of relevant fiscal information.

3. Senate agenda should be developed and distributed earlier - at least several days before Senate meetings, preferably a full week.

4. Executive Committee of the Senate should involve committee chairmen, particularly when reports are due from committee.

5. Standing Committees should be required to make regular reports to the Senate on their work. The Senate, in turn, should provide committees with direction and
a sense of the Senate's priorities.
6. Senate meetings should occur more often than once a month, and the "5:00 adjournment syndrome" should be avoided.

F. Preliminary Subcommittee Reports

1. External constraints upon the Senate;
2. Senate Membership
3. Senate Communications
4. Senate Committee Structure
5. Areas of concern to the Senate

Reports are available in the Academic Senate Office.

G. Survey Summary

In February, 1974, the faculty-at-large was surveyed by the Committee in order to guide its recommendations regarding membership and goals of the Senate. The summary of the survey is as follows:

1. Terms of Office of Senators
   There were a total of 425 responses to this item, of which,
   221 (52.0%) favored a two-year term for the senators
   184 (43.3%) favored a three-year term for the senators
   20 (4.7%) favored other plans

2. Number of Consecutive Terms
   There were a total of 422 responses to this item, of which,
   286 (67.8%) favored limited number per person
   136 (32.2%) favored unlimited number per person

3. Distribution of Elected Senators
   A. Instructional Faculty
      There were a total of 439 responses to this item, of which,
      171 (39.0%) favored the existing process
      119 (27.1%) favored the plan of no more than one per department until all departments were represented
      43 (9.8%) favored the plan of 3 senators per school
      57 (13.0%) favored the plan of one senator per department
      24 (5.5%) favored the plan of all tenured faculty
      25 (5.7%) favored other plans

   B. Professional Consultative Services Faculty
      There were a total of 394 responses to this item, of which,
      236 (59.9%) favored the current method
      28 (7.1%) favored the notion of increased representation
      101 (25.6%) favored the notion of decreased representation
      29 (7.4%) favored other plans
C. (1) Deans
There were a total of 426 responses, of which,

- 125 (29.3%) favored the current procedure
- 134 (31.6%) favored the ex-officio non-voting status
- 31 (7.3%) favored the notion of election at large
- 20 (4.7%) favored the notion of one academic dean
- 111 (26.1%) favored the notion of no dean representation
- 5 (1.2%) favored other plans

C. (2) Associate Deans
There were a total of 359 responses to this item, of which,

- 52 (14.5%) favored the current procedure
- 118 (32.9%) favored the ex-officio non-voting status
- 49 (13.6%) favored the notion of elections at large
- 9 (2.5%) favored the notion of one academic associate dean
- 131 (36.5%) favored the notion of no associate dean representation
- 5 (1.4%) favored other plans

D. Department Heads
There were 426 responses to this item, of which,

- 180 (42.3%) favored the present procedure
- 52 (12.2%) favored the notion of one selected from School Council
- 98 (23.0%) favored the notion of eligible at large
- 87 (20.4%) favored the notion that department heads not be represented
- 9 (2.1%) favored other ideas

E. Administrative Personnel
There were 406 responses to this item, of which,

- 215 (53.0%) favored the current procedure
- 53 (13.1%) favored the notion of increased representation
- 138 (34.0%) favored the notion of not being represented

4. The last item was tabulated by taking the first and second ranked priorities. For this reason there were nearly twice as many responses (704), of which,

- 133 (18.9%) ranked University governance as their 1st or 2nd priority
- 151 (21.4%) ranked classroom teaching as their 1st or 2nd priority
- 73 (10.4%) ranked research as their 1st and 2nd priority
- 31 (4.4%) ranked student services as their 1st or 2nd priority
- 157 (22.3%) ranked personnel policies as their 1st or 2nd priority
- 94 (13.4%) ranked working conditions as their 1st or 2nd priority
- 65 (9.2%) ranked intra-faculty communications as their 1st or 2nd priority
Dear Faculty Member:

Academic Senate, in early 1973, appointed an ad hoc committee to examine the role and future direction of the Senate. That committee has deliberated many hours and is now ready to present alternatives to the faculty at large. Would you take a few moments to give us your opinions on the items below? This is not a vote, but an opinion poll to guide the committee in its preparation of a formal proposal to present to the Senate for its consideration.

I. Terms of Office of Senators
1) Two years
2) Three years (current procedure)
3) Other

II. Number of Consecutive Terms
1) Limited number per person
2) Unlimited number per person (current procedure)

III. Distribution of Elected Senators (Size of the Senate)
A. Instructional Faculty
1) No change; i.e., three senators per school plus one senator for each 30 faculty members or fraction (no more than two per department until all departments represented) (65)
2) Three senators per school plus one senator for each 30 faculty members or fraction (no more than one per department until all departments represented) (65)
3) Three senators per school (24)
4) One senator per department (50)
5) All tenured faculty (432)
6) Other

B. Professional Consultative Services Faculty
1) One senator per 15 members or major fraction (Academic employees classified as Librarian, Audio-Visual Faculty, Counselor, or Medical Officer I) - current procedure
2) Increased representation
3) Decreased representation
4) Other

C. Deans and Associate Deans of Schools
1) Ex-officio voting (current procedure for Deans)
2) Ex-officio non-voting
3) Eligible for election at-large from each school
4) One Academic Dean representative, voting
5) Not to be represented
6) Other
D. Department Heads

1) One selected from school Department Heads' Council, voting (current procedure)

2) One selected from School Council, non-voting

3) Eligible for election at-large from each school

4) Not to be represented

5) Other ____________________________________

E. Administrative Personnel (i.e. Assistant to the President; Executive Vice President; Associate Dean, Facility Planner; Director, Information Services; Director, Alumni Affairs; Director, Personnel Relations; Public Information Specialist; Agricultural Information Specialist; Associate Dean, Resources and Planning; Associate Dean, Curriculum and Instruction; Associate Dean, Educational Services; Coordinator, Special Programs; Director, Institutional Studies; Director, International Education; Coordinator, Graduate Studies and Research; Associate Deans of Schools of Instruction; Director, Library; Director, Admissions, Records, and Evaluations; Registrar; Associate Dean, Women; Director, Counseling and Testing; Director, Activities; Director, Health Services; Director, Placement and Financial Aids; Financial Aids Officer; Director, Housing; Director of Business Affairs; Director, Computer Center; Associate Dean, Continuing Education; Co-Directors, Educational Opportunity Programs; Budget Officer; Executive Director, Foundation; Director, Audio-Visual Services and Production.)

1) One senator elected from this administrative group (current procedure)

2) Increased representation

3) Not to be represented

4) Comments____________________________________

IV. The Senate should place additional emphasis upon improvement of (rank in priority order):

___ university governance
___ classroom teaching
___ research opportunities
___ student services
___ faculty personnel policies/procedures
___ working conditions (offices, space, parking...)
___ intra-faculty communication
___ __________________ (other)
___ __________________ (other)
___ __________________ (other)

RETURN THIS FORM TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE OFFICE, TENAYA 103, BY FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8.