MINUTES

Academic Senate
California State
Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo

December 12, 1968

I. A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by Interim Chairman Rodney Keif in Science E-27 at 10:30 a.m. Those in attendance:

W. Alexander  D. Grant  R. Pautz
R. Anderson  S. Harden  C. Piper
W. Anderson  G. Hasslein  D. Price
R. Andreini  A. Higdon  R. Ratcliffe
A. Andreoli  C. Johnson  A. Roest
D. Andrews  R. Kef  A. Rosen
R. Asbury  R. Kennedy  E. Smith
C. Beymer  D. Koberg  J. Stuart
G. Chizek  L. Lewellyn  H. Walker
C. Cummins  B. Loughran  A. Wirshup
C. Fisher  J. Lowry  V. Wolcott
R. Frost  T. Meyer
G. Furinsky

II. M/S/P  A. Higdon/C. Johnson - unanimous to accept minutes as distributed.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS:

A. (D. Grant) - Ad hoc Personnel Committee has completed review of cases involving appointment, re-appointment, and tenure as required by Title V. The resolution of the State-wide Academic Senate (AS-221-68/F & SA) on APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, PROMOTION, and REASSIGNMENT (Attachment I, December 12 Agenda), will be discussed at the January 14 meeting to give our State-wide Academic Senators a consensus of our feelings on the resolution.

A proposed Revised Grievance Procedure will be presented at the January 14 meeting by the Faculty Grievance Committee.

B. (R. Keif) - There are approximately 20 college-wide committees on which Academic Senate Representation is necessary. Names of volunteers or candidates should be sent to Dr. Mounts.

IV. STATE-WIDE ACADEMIC-SENATE (SWAS) report: (Warren Anderson) Personal notes to be distributed.

(Roy Anderson) Items of timely interest to SWAS: Referendum; research; salary; personnel files; policy statement to Chancellor office; statement regarding appointment, reappointment, tenure, etc. was previously passed by SWAS but not relayed to Chancellor till "open files" statement became firm; the future of SWAS has been questioned and an ad hoc committee for evaluation has been formed (of which Roy is a member).
DISCUSSION (Nonverbatim report):

(R. Keif) Does the referendum relate to SWAS spring '68 criticism of the Chancellor?

(R. Anderson) Yes. (Faculty referendum AS-214A-68/EX) The Academic Senates on each campus are asked to submit the following question to their faculties during the week of 6-10 January '69:

"Do you support the action of the Academic Senate of the California State Colleges on 24 May '68, in which the Senate expressed its lack of confidence in Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke, and further requested him to resign?"

The burden for presenting the relevant issues to the faculty rests with the local Senate.

(J. Stuart) Did our local Senate react to this?

(B. Mounts) Our Faculty-Staff Council responded to these specifications against the Chancellor in a resolution of dissatisfaction against the SWAS on 10 June '68.

(R. Anderson) The SWAS referendum is directed to individual faculty members and not local senates.

(B. Mounts) The net effect of this referendum is the relative merit of SWAS prerogative vs. local senate autonomy.

(R. Kennedy) Is the SWAS exceeding the bounds of its original intent, if not constitutionality, in resorting to this referendum? One of the charges against the Chancellor was his lack of consultation; in reaching that conclusion the SWAS was guilty of the same charge. Does the referendum represent a face-saving maneuver for them?

(R. Anderson) There is constitutional authority for such action.

(V. Wolcott) Our ballots should be accompanied with a letter of transmittal that we are following instructions but do not agree with the "constitutional" rights of SWAS to do the study and, therefore, its meaning is in question.

(R. Keif) Can we refuse this mandate? Are we legally bound to it?

(R. Anderson) CSC Humboldt has taken steps to cast ballots. Our action should not jeopardize future relationship between this campus and SWAS.

(C. Johnson) The Academic calendar does not allow time for a meaningful reaction by 6 January. The referendum refers only to the Chancellor's attitude prior to June '68. Will there be opportunity to react to his stance since that date?

(W. Anderson) A resolution to the effect that we do not care to reply might be in order.

(B. Loughran) No reaction is a weak stand; we should endeavor to react within the time limit imposed upon us.
(R. Frost) The time limitation is not too stringent in that the document has been available in the faculty reading room since June. It was also featured in "Voice of the Faculty", the ACSCP publication.

(C. Fisher) The Referendum is an excellent opportunity for the faculty to corroborate the stand made by the Faculty-Staff Council in the June resolution of disagreement with SWAS.

(R. Keif) The Executive will take the necessary steps to respond to the referendum request. There will be a special meeting of the Academic Senate at 3:15 p.m., January 7.

V. BUSINESS ITEMS

A. Report from By-laws Committee - (C. Johnson)

M/S (C. Johnson/M. Gold) - to accept the proposed by-laws as distributed by the Committee.

DISCUSSION (Nonverbatim)

(R. Andreini) - acceptance is so important it should be done paragraph by paragraph.

(C. Johnson) - By-laws document will exist only after the last paragraph is accepted.

(Discussion was suspended at 12:00 Noon, and the meeting was recessed until 3:15 p.m.)

The meeting was reconvened at 3:20 p.m. in the Staff Dining Room. H. Walker served as acting secretary.

The chairman reported on a phone call he made during the recess to the State-wide Academic Senate office regarding the Referendum. The deadline for holding the Referendum is extended to February 21. The chairman announced the special meeting of January 7 would be unnecessary and would not be held.

Following the procedure started in the morning session, the By-laws as distributed by the Committee were analyzed by paragraph and accepted on voice vote as follows:

A. Elected Senators - as submitted
B. Officers - as submitted
C. Committees
   Paragraph 1 - as submitted
   Paragraph 2 - delete "and Facilities" from line 2. Add a comma after "ASI members" in line 9.

C-1 Budget Committee - delete "and Facilities" from line 1; delete "and facilities planning" from line 2.

C-2 Curriculum Committee - add "academic master planning," at the end of line 1.

C-3 Sections a through g - as submitted
   Section h - reverse the order of "tally the votes" and "open mail ballots publicly"
Section 1 (5) - change "case" to "cast" in line 6.
Section 1 (6) - insert this sentence between lines 1 and 2: "Nominations shall be re-opened." Delete the last sentence.

C-4 Paragraph 1 - as submitted
C-4 a and b - as submitted
C-4 c change "committees" to "committee members."
C-4 d - as submitted
C-4 e Delete the last three words.
C-4 f Delete the last three words.
C-4 g - as submitted
C-4 h Change "of the chairman" to "by the chairman"; delete "upon request"
C-4 i Delete entirely.
C-5 Instruction Committee - delete "new instructional devices, teacher/student ratios, and other"

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Mounts/ H. Walker