I. Call to Order

II. Approval of the Minutes of January 13, 1970

III. Announcements and Information Items

A. Status of previous Senate actions

B. Committee appointment

1) Instruction Committee - S. Burroughs replacing Ena Marston
2) Publishers Board - Fred Rizzo replacing Bob Andreini
3) Ethnic Studies - Robert Boothe
4) Personnel Policy - Sarah Hardeman (Spring Quarter)

C. Progress Reports

1) Personnel Policy Committee - A. Rosen
2) Personnel Review Committee - R. Frost
3) Student Affairs Committee - R. Pautz
4) Ad Hoc Parking Committee Report - J. Lowry
   (Attachment A for Senators only)
5) Others

D. Statewide Academic Senate Report - C. Johnson

IV. Business Items

A. Election Committee - J. Stuart

First reading of Amendments to By-Laws

Proposed amendment to the Academic Senate By-Laws. V. Executive Committee, B. Paragraph 5. Add the following:

"Temporary administrative appointments of Senators elected by Schools shall not constitute vacancies unless such appointments are still in effect on the first day of the Academic Year following the date of each appointment."

Proposed amendment to the Academic Senate By-Laws. VI. Committees, A. 3. Paragraph f. The first sentence shall be changed to read as follows:

"Prepare and submit as a slate for election to the Grievance Committee a list of names of all teaching principal and principal vocational instructors in each school, except as provided in the following paragraph."
B. Personnel Policies Committee
Recommended Guideline for Faculty Personnel Files
(Revised version attached as "Attachment B")

C. Report from College Research Committee
(Attachments C1, C2, and C3.)

V. Discussion Items

A. Academic - Administrative Organization Structure Proposal -
President Kennedy's memo of January 15, 1970

VI. Adjournment
Memorandum

To: Dean Piper, Secretary
   Academic Senate
   Joyce Kalicicki, Secretary
   Staff Senate
   Ginny Reed, Secretary
   Student Affairs Council

From: Harold O. Wilson, Chairman
       Administrative Council

Subject: Fact Finding Committee on Campus Parking
         Final Report

Date: February 5, 1970

John Lowry, the Academic Senate representative to the Administrative Council, requested that copies of the final report prepared by the Fact Finding Committee on Campus Parking be made available for presentation to the Academic Senate. President Kennedy agreed to this request. During the February 2 meeting of the Administrative Council, it was suggested by the council that similar presentations would be appropriate to the Staff Senate and the Student Affairs Council. As a result of this recommendation, multiple copies of the report are being forwarded to each of you for that purpose. The recommendations in the final report were assigned to me by President Kennedy to review and have implemented, to the extent that State College policy, budgets and staffing permit.

I am requesting that each of you apprise your respective organization that an interim report prepared by the same committee was submitted to President Kennedy on May 9, 1969, containing three major recommendations, and as a part of one of those major recommendations, 19 minor recommendations were made having to do with the creation or re-identification of parking spaces on the campus.

Recommendation #1 of this interim report requested that the 400 car parking lot planned for construction directly north of the Food Processing Building be deferred. This recommendation was taken under advisement by the college and the professional consultants to the college, and after weighing the many alternatives, it was decided that the original position to construct the lot should be sustained, inasmuch as no other area for master planned parking would become available in order to provide additional parking space relief. This lot, although delayed nearly eight months, is now in the initial stages of construction.

Recommendation #2 concerned a different means of identifying and protecting the truck scale at the northeast corner of the Food Processing Building. This recommendation has been implemented.

Recommendation #3, as indicated above, requested consideration for the provision of additional parking spaces, primarily for faculty and staff. While not all of the specific recommendations could be followed for one reason or another, the intent of the recommendation was followed in that additional temporary staff parking areas were created on Pepper Lane between the Mathematics-Home Economics Building and
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the Library, on Cuesta between the Library and the Agricultural Education Building, on South Poly Vue (State Street) between Engineering West and the Air Conditioning Building, and on South Pepper Lane west of Graphic Arts. Approximately one-half of the recommended spaces to be added for faculty and staff are currently visitor spaces that are proposed to be repainted. Pending study of the effectiveness of visitor parking spaces and needs, this portion of the recommendation has been held in abeyance.
FINAL REPORT

of

THE FACT FINDING COMMITTEE
ON CAMPUS PARKING

2 Dec 69
Due to the growth and development of the College, the parking situation on campus is in a constant state of flux. However, certain aspects of parking do manifest themselves as being constant and relatively unchanging. Therefore, in this final report of the Committee, attention is directed to those aspects of parking which it feels should come under much closer scrutiny than this committee was able to do. It is to be hoped that further study will be made, and carried out, by a committee empowered to act on its findings in a manner consistent with College growth and with intelligent planning. Should such a permanent committee be appointed, it is hoped that it will be composed of faculty, staff and students, most of whom will have expertise in physical planning.

Circled letters in the report refer to recommendations of the Committee as listed in Appendix I.

Number of Parking Spaces:

Parking spaces cannot be discussed validly without including a reasonably accurate assessment on the size of the student body in future years. Utilizing the most up to date data available, the chart below clearly shows that parking space on campus will be in short supply for a number of years to come.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Allowed Spaces**</th>
<th>Actual Spaces</th>
<th>Shortage of Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring '69</td>
<td>9,053</td>
<td>4,526</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>1,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall '69</td>
<td>11,160</td>
<td>5,580</td>
<td>4,103</td>
<td>1,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall '70</td>
<td>11,817</td>
<td>5,909</td>
<td>4,505</td>
<td>1,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall '71</td>
<td>12,000*</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,505***</td>
<td>1,495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No projected figure on Full Time Equivalent students is available from Institutional Studies.
**Maximum allowed spaces under State law, which permits one parking space for each two Full Time Equivalent students.
***Facilities Planning office indicated an additional lot was in the planning stage but funding may not be available until additional revenue is raised.

One of the real problems in planning is that the College has consistently exceeded projected growth. Since planning for parking takes approximately a two year lead time
before new space is available, it is impossible to catch up unless accurate growth predictions are followed. The maximum allowable space by state law permits one parking space for every two full time equivalent students. For our present needs that would probably be adequate if that many spaces were actually available. However, as the campus population grows and as more students are forced to live farther from the campus, without the amenity of public transportation, it is conceivable that even reaching and maintaining the maximum allowable parking may not suffice.

Parking Permits:

There seems to be little correlation between the number of parking permits available for sale and the number of spaces available for parking. Since 1962, and for every year thereafter, there have been many more parking stickers sold than there are parking spaces available. To the driver with a valid permit to park, the search for a parking space frequently becomes an agonizing experience. Even worse, it becomes a maddening experience for which he condemns a faceless, anonymous administration. In a more jocular mood, he calls the parking permit a "hunting license", but this does not relieve him of his antagonism toward a poorly conceived and inadequately implemented parking system. If this driver happens to be a faculty member, his frustrations may be vented in the classroom. On the other hand, if the driver happens to be a student, he is prone to park illegally and take the attitude that flouting the law is not only acceptable but expected. This is an attitude that also permeates the faculty and staff. However, the least frustrated driver is the staff employee. His hours are more regular, since he probably works a normal 8 to 5 day, and his arrival on campus frequently gives him first choice in parking spaces. He is also the least mobile of the people on campus as he has little or no need to move his car during the day. He also makes up the element on campus that is generally more able to park closer to his area of work than either the faculty or students find it possible to do. Conversely, many of the teaching facilities are spread out over long distances, on and off campus, causing vehicular transportation to be a necessity during working hours.

Aside from the apparently unlimited quantity of parking permits, the sale of permits is handled in a most casual manner. No verification of a person's position in the college is requested when the purchaser applies for his permit. Moreover, no limitation is placed on the number of permits that a faculty or staff member may purchase. As
a result, there have been serious abuses in the use of parking permits. There have been instances in which more than one blue sticker has been purchased and then has been distributed to a non-purchaser in order to share, and thus reduce, the parking fee.

Student wives who work for the College obtain staff stickers without question. However, what usually happens is that the student himself now has a staff sticker available to him and is thus permitted to park anywhere. This type of abuse, in effect, negates the whole concept of the need for differentiated parking privileges. It is difficult, if not impossible, for faculty members to accept the rationale which permits this to occur. This type of abuse, insofar as parking is concerned, is the second major source of animosity and frustration among the staff and faculty. Incidentally, the Dean of Students permits the issuance of staff stickers to the four students who are ASI officers.

Parking Regulations and Enforcement:

The written parking regulations which were effective September 1, 1967, are partially obsolete and do not reflect changes which have taken place. It is doubtful that the parking regulations are adequately distributed among the students, staff and faculty.

Proper enforcement is not possible without proper regulations. During the past school year, laxity in enforcing the rules led to the anomalous situation in which it appeared that the College was condoning illegalities. An atmosphere of flouting the law on an acceptable basis was detectable. Many drivers became repeated violators. In a list of 254 names of students sent to the Dean of Students for disciplinary action, almost 1/3 of the student had received over 10 tickets, and some had received as many as 20 tickets for parking violations during one quarter. Many students have learned that it is not difficult to avoid the payment of fines in our traffic court. Such cynicism is inimical to the very nature of the College and on a philosophical level goes to the very heart of education.

Parking Planning:

To consider the physical aspects of campus master planning means immediate involvement with the movement of people and vehicles. The design of the campus as a whole cannot be separated from the planning of its traffic arteries.
and parking lots. In the report titled THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PHYSICAL MASTER PLAN, two concepts prevail. The first is "... the Campus at San Luis Obispo is dominated by the automobile..." and the second is that to overcome this the campus should..."...become a 'walking campus'...". Presumably, in order to accomplish this, an earlier master plan idea is to be followed. This plan is "No vehicle traffic within the Perimeter Road, except for service vehicles..." (is to be permitted)... and ..."the use of parking areas for students and staff (are to be) located outside the Perimeter Road...". These two ideas based on a small sized campus fail to take into account that walking distances on an enlarged campus become excessive. Even the carrying of a few books becomes burdensome over some of the distances. The "walking campus" plan also fails to take into account that the focal points of population on the campus are not evenly distributed. Some buildings house many more people than do other buildings.

Another item of concern is that the campus site is a hillside. Were the hillside to be effectively utilized, it could bring parking into a much more amenable juxtaposition with buildings (H). The whole idea of a "walking campus" ignores the fact that the winter season in San Luis Obispo is frequently rainy, cold and windy.

Attention is called to the Interim Report, dated 9 May 1969. Out of the 19 recommendations made at that time, only four have been implemented, and in the opinion of the Committee, these have been poorly handled.

Respectfully submitted by
THE FACT FINDING COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PARKING

M. L. Wilks, Chairman
William Buschman
Dan Sobala
Lila Carpenter
Charles Penwell
Lloyd Dietrich
Linda Farrell
Bruce Dunn
Rex Swan
Recommendations:

As a result of its findings, the Committee makes the following recommendations, which are keyed into the above report:

A. Purchasers of blue stickers should be required to identify themselves and should be checked off a roster prior to sale of permit.

B. Only one parking permit should be sold to each purchaser in any quarter.

C. Purchasing of annual stickers should be encouraged in order to reduce the clerical load. As an inducement, perhaps purchase of a nine month sticker would entitle the holder to summer parking privileges at no extra cost.

D. Blue stickers should be sold only to those who are full time employees. Define faculty, staff, student and part time employees. Issue appropriate permits in stringent accord with these definitions.

E. Rewrite regulations, making them more readily digestible. Improve the distribution of parking regulations by posting them at various locations on campus and by issuing a copy with each permit purchased. Add the following statement to the permit application card above the place for signature: "I have received a copy of the Parking Regulations and I agree to comply with them."

F. In lieu of a traffic court summons for student violators, institute a new procedure of administrative appointment as outlined in Dean Chandler's memo, dated 6 June 69, which is attached to this report as Appendix II.

G. Enforce parking regulations more stringently and include nights and weekends in such enforcement.

H. Proposed new buildings on campus should incorporate adjacent parking into their design. Hillsides offer the opportunity for concealed or semi-concealed parking and this should be taken into consideration.
Memorandum

To: Maurice Wilks

From: Everett M. Chandler

Subject: When I left the Parking Committee meeting, I said I would be willing to jot down some ideas on use of administrative appointment procedure for the parking problems. Attached is a tentative statement which outlines some of the kinds of things which would be involved. I don't pretend this is a complete proposal but I don't think we are ready for one at this point. This will fill in some of the necessary details to make such a statement work. I would be glad to work further with you and the Committee on this.
APPENDIX II

TENTATIVE PROPOSED NEW SYSTEM FOR ASSESSING PARKING VIOLATIONS - ALTERNATIVE TO CITATION SYSTEM

Recognizing that the current system of issuing traffic citations to students who violate parking regulations is only partially effective, a new system is proposed as follows:

1. The student receives an administrative appointment rather than a parking citation. The appointment requires him to report to a special meeting in a conference room on a given evening. Those in attendance will have met the requirement. Those who fail to show will be charged $2.00 for a missed administrative appointment.

2. The student who fails to show will be issued another administrative appointment which indicates that he is to report to the Security Office within two days. Failure to report here will be followed every other day by a subsequent administrative appointment notice, up to 10 notices. Two dollar charges will be assessed for each failure to show.

3. For the students who show, a "lecture" and explanation of parking rules and regulations and the reasons for them will be given. It is believed that the inconvenience of "losing" an evening to "traffic school" will have a substantial deterrent effect upon repeated parking violations.

4. Any student who can present a valid excuse, e.g., illness, away with an athletic team, etc., will have the $2.00 charge dropped and a re-appointment to the "lecture" will be made.

5. A record will be kept of the number of "lectures" attended. After five lectures the student will be referred to the Student Judiciary for disciplinary action. Continuous violations after action of the Student Judiciary will result in the student appearing before the Campus Hearing Board which will consider the violations as a major disciplinary matter.

6. One portion of the "lecture" will be an explanation of subsequent actions possible including disciplinary potential.

7. The student who fails to appear for the lecture and subsequent administrative appointments up to 10 will have his records held and will be assessed the $20.00 charges. In addition, he will be referred to the Student Judiciary and ultimately, if necessary, to the Campus Hearing Board. As a last resort, but one which will be used if required, the student will be "arrested" in class by a Security Officer and brought to the Security Office to explain why he has ignored the notices. Failure to provide the college with adequate address will not be sufficient excuse to relieve the student of missed appointment charges.
APPENDIX II

8. The proposed administrative appointment form will have the following attributes:

a. It will be card form, looking like the present citation, but color coded - red.

b. The card will be worded approximately as follows:

This is an administrative appointment as provided for in the schedule of fees and Title 5 of the California Administrative Code.

You are to report to [Building], at 8:00 p.m.

on [Date].

Failure to meet this administrative appointment will result in a charge of $2.00 as stated in the fee schedule. Repeated failure to meet administrative appointments may result in disciplinary action.

Signed: Donald S. Nelson
Director of Business Affairs
I. The official personnel file, being that file maintained in the office of the school dean or division head and containing all the materials which form the basis for decisions in personnel actions, including reappointment, tenure, promotion, and separation, shall be open to inspection by the individual faculty member who is the subject of the file and by any committee or administrator authorized to review the file in the course of official personnel business.

A. The following committees shall be authorized to have access to the files:
   Personnel Review Committee, Grievance Committee and Disciplinary Action Committee. Such access shall be only by the specific committee dealing with a case and only to the file concerned.

B. Administrative personnel who are authorized to have access to the files are:
   the Department Head of the faculty member who is subject of the file;
   the Academic Dean and Associate Dean of the school, the Director of Personnel,
   the Academic Vice President, the President, and any additional person or
   committee the President shall designate following consultation with the
   Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

II. Materials shall be placed in faculty personnel files by administrative personnel and/or department committees charged with personnel matters and by the individual who is the subject of the file.

A. The official personnel file shall contain all materials pertinent to the progress and welfare of the individual faculty member after initial appointment, but shall exclude documents such as payroll, insurance, and retirement records.

B. A method shall be established within each school or division which permits the faculty member to read the material included in his file upon implementation of this policy and at any future time that other material is added. Copies of material may be made by the faculty member except that if a letter or other document has been submitted by a single individual, a copy may be made only upon the written approval by the individual submitting the document. A written record must be kept in the file indicating who has had access with specific date.

C. Any written evaluations received about a faculty member from another institution shall be destroyed if the writer does not agree to their inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file in accord with this policy. No written evaluation in which the author is not identified shall be retained.

D. Letters of recommendation or confidential placement files used in the course of the original appointment of the subject faculty member shall constitute an exception to the access rule in I. Such material shall be kept in the file in a sealed envelope appropriately labeled to indicate the nature of the materials and that the subject faculty member shall not have access. After the faculty member attains tenure, such material shall be destroyed unless the originator has requested return.
E. Prior to implementation of access policy as stated in I, individuals from whom recommendations and statements have been obtained in confidence and which are present in current files shall be asked to acquiesce to review of their statements by the subject faculty member.

1. Refusal to grant permission for the subject faculty member to review such statements shall result in the removal and return to the author of the pertinent document(s) or note(s).

2. Any materials in the subject faculty member's file which were obtained from individuals since deceased, or otherwise not available, shall be removed from the file on the agreement of the subject faculty member and the dean, or the materials, if retained, shall be noted as not having been cleared by the writer.

III. Removal, amendment and/or response to personnel file materials.

A. Materials may be removed from the personnel file specified in Section II A:

1. By mutual consent of the faculty member and the dean, or

2. If the dean does not consent, by appeal of the faculty member to the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate, which shall determine whether the request shall be granted. If the parties involved do not concur in this determination, it may be appealed to the President.

B. The subject faculty member may seek amendment of materials which he regards as being erroneous or misleading by the same procedure as in III A.

C. In accordance with established procedures in grievance or disciplinary action cases, materials may be removed from the subject faculty member's file provided that the faculty member is so notified.

D. The subject faculty member may add to his file any materials which he regards as a pertinent response to any other materials contained in his files.

1. The addition of any materials derogatory of any other faculty or administrative staff members shall be an exception to the right to add materials.