I. Call to order in Faculty/Staff Dining Room at 3:15 p.m.

II. Approval of minutes of December 7, 1971, meeting.

III. Business Items

A. Senate Rules of Order

A request has been made that votes by the Senate be taken by hand vote rather than the normal procedure under Robert's Rules of Order.

B. Personnel Policies Committee - Resolution relative to Admin. Bulletin 70-8 on Faculty Personnel Files. (Refer to agenda material for December 7 meeting please. This item tabled until this meeting.)

C. Constitution & Bylaws Committee - Second reading, action items: (see attachment 1)

1. Section I - Definitions
2. Section VI-B-2 - Research Committee
3. Section VI-B-5 - Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee

D.

E.

IV. Informational & Discussion Items

A. Committee Appointments

- Instruction Committee: David Brodie replaces Ben Polk.

- Ad hoc Committee on Salaries: Dale Federer, Chm.
  Roy Anderson
  Roger Sherman

B. Report from Statewide Academic Senate

C. Report on Chancellor's Conference on External Degree Programs: Harry Scales
D. CBL Committee Referral on Student Participation on Dean Selection Committees: Develop language which would permit students to participate on Dean Selection Committees and report back at February Executive Committee.

E. Reports by Senate Committee Chairmen.

F. The Executive Committee will meet February 1, 1972, at 3:00 p.m. in Ag. 138.

G. The Senate will meet February 8, 1972, at 3:00 p.m. in the Faculty/Staff Dining Hall.
I. DEFINITIONS

Add: D. ASI Members of Academic Senate Committees

Unless otherwise specifically stated in these bylaws, the ASI representative shall be a student who is carrying at least seven quarter units and has completed two consecutive quarters and at least 24 quarter units at Cal Poly and have a grade point average of at least 2.0.

VI.- B.- 2. Research Committee

a. Membership
   Add: ASI Representative at the end of the first sentence of this paragraph.

VI.- B.- 5. The Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee

The Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee shall be composed of 5 faculty members to be appointed by the Chairman of the Academic Senate with the approval of the Executive Committee and 2 students to be appointed by the ASI. These faculty members will be former recipients of the Distinguished Teaching Award, and will serve a two-year term, except for the first year (1972-73) when 3 of the members will serve a one-year term. No member of this Committee should serve more than one term without an intervening period of at least one year.

The students will be of at least junior standing (have completed at least 90 quarter units of college work) and have had at least three consecutive quarters and completed 36 quarter units at Cal Poly with a grade point average of at least 2.0.

The Committee shall determine the criteria to be used for judging distinguished teachers. Nominees for the award will be received by the Committee during the Fall Quarter, and final selection will be made not later than the sixth week of the Spring Quarter.
Memorandum

To: All Cal Poly Faculty Members

From: Howard Rhoads, Chairman
Cal Poly Academic Senate

Subject: Communication from the Chairman of the Academic Senate of the California State Colleges

Recently David Provost, Chairman, ASCSC, released the attached statement to news media and requested that wide distribution among the campus faculties be provided by local senates. The Executive Committee of our local senate today requested that I communicate the full text of the statement to each of you via this memo.

I believe that you will find the release interesting and pertinent to the present fiscal and operational situation in the State College System. It should clarify several areas of misunderstanding which seem to exist in the minds of college faculties about the relationship between the ASCSC and the Board of Trustees.
Headlines and disaster go together. All of us recognize that bad news excites—and sells newspapers. Unfortunately, when it comes to higher education, the picture is distorted by an emphasis on the incredible, the flambouyant phrase, the outrageous proposition. One of the many misconceptions that plague the State Colleges is that the Board of Trustees somehow have copped out on higher education. There is a view, widely held among faculty, that the Board members are more concerned with reflecting the attitudes of the public through policies imposed on the State Colleges than they are in explaining and defending what goes on as an essential part of educating the young men and women of this state. There is a chasm of distrust which has led to a belief that the Board is the antagonist of the faculties rather than their supporter. There is no doubt but what many actions taken by the Board of Trustees in recent years have been met with dismay to the point of outrage. The fact remains, however, that those who work most closely with the Board have seen it act courageously on many occasions in defense of our State Colleges. These actions often are not reported and in some instances actions reported are misinterpreted. An example of the latter is to be found in one campus newsletter which recently reported the Trustees had once again demonstrated their insensitivity to the financial plight of the faculty by failing to include in their
budget requests provision for a general salary increase. The budget referred to in the newsletter was the support budget which never includes adjustments in the faculty salary schedule. These adjustments are always requested in a totally separate document, one which in fact was approved later by the Board of Trustees. Thus, through a massive misunderstanding of the budgetary process, the Board was mistakenly maligned.

The November meeting of the Board provides ample evidence that faculty advice and, for that matter, the advice of students and college presidents, is not always ignored. A few examples should serve to demonstrate the point:

- The Trustees approved, by an overwhelming margin, authorization for the expenditure of mandatory student fees for augmentation of campus health services. Particularly notable is the fact that three Trustees expressed doubt to the point of opposition to the proposal but indicated in their public remarks that they were willing to set aside those doubts temporarily and accede to the unanimous wishes of the faculty, students and college presidents. It is this kind of action which altogether too seldom is reported on our campuses.

- With but one negative vote, the Board adopted a resolution requesting Chancellor Dumke to continue his efforts to obtain a favorable ruling which would permit payment of previously frozen merit salary adjustments on a retroactive basis. This request, coming as it did from representatives of the Academic Senate of the California State Colleges, CSEA, CCUFA, UPC and AAUP, indicated once again that unanimity often will lead to a positive response by the Trustees.
The issue of payroll certification was discussed extensively and intensively. Faculty representatives who vigorously opposed the practice of individual certification as demeaning and unprofessional were joined by the college presidents who declared it unnecessary and destructive of faculty morale. In response to these presentations, the Board made it clear that in passing their resolution on the subject last July they had in no way intended to mandate individual certification.

And it was at this meeting that the Board did indeed adopt a new salary proposal, one calling for an increase in faculty salaries of 13% and in fringe benefits of 6%. In addition to this action, which continues a long standing position of the Trustees in support of faculty salary increases, several Trustees indicated their willingness to carry the fight for adequate compensation to the State Legislature, the Department of Finance and to the Governor himself.

All of this is not to say that everything the Board does meets with faculty approval. There are a number of issues upon which I have expressed vehement opposition to Board action. I fully expect to do so again. Unfortunately, however, these occasions of division within higher education are most often in the headlines; those where agreement is reached and confrontation avoided tend to be buried in the back pages if they are reported at all. It is in an attempt to redress this imbalance that these remarks are made.