I. Session called to order in Staff Dining Room by Chairman Howard Rhoads at 3:15 p.m.

II. Those in attendance were:

MEMBERS:
- Lukes, Thomas
- Neel, Paul
- O'Leary, Michael
- Olsen, Barton
- Price, J. D.
- Rhoads, Howard
- Rice, W.
- Rickard, Herman
- Ritschard, Ronald
- Rogalla, John
- Rosen, Arthur
- Saveker, David
- Scales, Harry
- Simmons, Orien
- Smith, Murray
- Stuart, John
- Stubbis, Daniel
- Voss, Larry
- Webb, James
- Wheeler, Robert
- Whitson, Milo
- Wilks, Maurice
- Wills, Max

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS (VOTING)
- Anderson, Roy
- Cummins, Carl C.
- Evans, Pete
- Fisher, Clyde P.
- Johnson, Corwin
- Russell, C. R.

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS (NON-VOTING)
- None

III. Business Item:

1. Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Responsibility.

This particular item was tabled at the previous regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate.

MSC to remove from table.

MOTION: RECOMMENDED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Academic Senate directs the Election Committee to hold a special election within two weeks to form an Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Responsibility to function on an interim basis until procedures for selection of a permanent committee are developed and accepted by the Senate. The Committee shall have one representative from each of the seven schools and one representative from the Professional Consultative Services and shall be elected from tenured members of Associate Professor (Senior Instructor) or higher rank. When activated, a functional committee (quorum) shall consist of five members.

Moved (Johnson) Seconded (Stubbs) to adopt the recommendation of the Executive Committee regarding the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Responsibility.
One member of the Senate asked about the necessity of convening a special meeting of the Academic Senate. Mr. Rhoads indicated that a case involving the subject matter of professional responsibility might be involved and a committee was needed to address itself to that case if such were to develop. Mr. Johnson reminded the Senate that it was an Ad Hoc Committee and would take any case that might come along. Mr. Wilks reiterated this position by indicating that the committee would act as a committee and take care of any pertinent matters.

Mr. Anderson asked why the P. Review Committee couldn't handle the case under question. There was further discussion on this subject, the general feeling among some being that it would be better to handle the case before it reached that degree of difficulty.

Some senators expressed the view that the Senate was acting in undue haste and the normal procedures should be followed in allowing the Senate time to organize a regular committee to deal with such matters.

When asked what would happen if the committee in question were not formed at the present time, Mr. Rhoads indicated that he felt he would have no choice but to indicate to President Kennedy that the Senate could not agree as to the urgency of the matter and was thus deadlocked on the matter of forming an Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. Anderson objected to any implication that the Senate wasn't interested in the matter.

At this point in time it was moved and seconded to amend the second to last line (Senior Instructor) to read (Senior Instructor or equivalent)...

The motion to amend carried.

There was further discussion for and against the original motion.

Mr. Evans moved that the ASI President be a member of the committee with full voting rights. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. W. Alexander called for the question.

Vote: For the original motion 31
Against the original motion 5

Motion CARRIED

IV. Information Item:

Mr. Rhoads brought to the attention of the Senate the letter from Mr. W. Boyce, Chairman, Student Affairs Committee, wherein he indicated the present situation regarding Student Evaluation of Faculty Teaching Ability. (See Attachment "D" of Agenda).

MSC to adjourn: 3:50 p.m.
ACADEMIC SENATE - AGENDA
SPECIAL MEETING
April 18, 1972

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

II. Business Item

1. Establishment of an Ad hoc Committee on Professional Responsibility

MOTION: RECOMMENDED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Academic Senate directs the Election Committee to hold a special election within two weeks to form an Ad hoc Committee on Professional Responsibility to function on an interim basis until procedures for selection of a permanent committee are developed and accepted by the Senate. The Committee shall have one representative from each of the seven schools and one representative from the Professional Consultative Services and shall be elected from tenured members of Associate Professor (Senior Instructor) or higher rank. When activated, a functional committee (quorum) shall consist of five members.

BACKGROUND:

At the April 11th Senate Meeting, a very important business item was tabled pending receipt of further information. This information, referred to by John Stuart in support of his motion to table, is attached.

The tabled motion proposed to establish an Ad hoc Committee on Professional Responsibility. It is intended that this ad hoc committee would operate only until formal Senate action is taken to establish a permanent committee.

There is a present need for an Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Responsibility. A member of the Cal Poly faculty has been charged with unprofessional conduct. The Executive Committee feels that it is in the best interests of the faculty to investigate this allegation as soon as possible.

This is our chance to prove that the faculty is capable of objective investigation into the alleged unprofessional conduct of a colleague. It is also an unprecedented opportunity on this campus to establish the fact that the faculty can manage its own professional conduct problems with due process.

ATTACHMENTS - A, B, & C.

III. Informational Item

1. Summary of Student Evaluation Situation from Chairman of Student Affairs Committee. (Attachment D)

This Summary inadvertently not distributed at the April 11 Senate Meeting.
TO: Members of the Executive Committee  
of the Academic Senate  
FROM: Howard Rhoada, Chairman  
       Academic Senate  
DATE: April 7, 1972  
COPIES TO: President Kennedy  
           Larry Voss  
           Chet Young  
SUBJECT: Special Meeting to Select A  
         Committee on Professional Responsibility

Califomia State Polytechnic College  
San Luis Obispo

Last November, the Executive Committee referred the Statement on  
Professional Responsibility (which was approved by referendum on  
February 24, 1971 by the faculty members at Cal Poly) to our Personnel  
Policies Committee for recommendations of possible implementation  
methods. Since the Personnel Policies Committee has not yet completed  
the assignment, it is necessary that the Executive Committee now  
select a Committee on Professional Responsibility without the benefit  
of their recommendations.

Consequently, I am calling a special meeting for this purpose.

DATE: April 11, 1972  
TIME: 7:00 a.m.  
PLACE: Ag 138

Since the "Implementation" section of the approved document specifically  
states that "the members of such a committee should be chosen with  
special attention to the high regard in which they are held by the  
Academic Community," I propose that the Committee be constituted as  
follows:

(1) Only faculty members of Principal rank be considered for  
service on the committee.

(2) A 3-member committee be established by lot from among those  
eligible.

(3) If a person selected has a personal interest in a case he  
may disqualify himself and be replaced, again by lot.

(4) The selected members be notified that they have been  
selected and are professionally obligated to serve.

(5) The Committee thus selected shall hear, review, and recommend  
on whatever cases come before it until a permanent implementation  
procedure is adopted by the Senate.

If this proposal does not meet with your approval, please be prepared to  
offer an alternate solution to implementation.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Executive Committee
FROM: Dan Stubbs
SUBJECT: Proposed Academic Senate Special Meeting April 18, 1972

Statement to accompany agenda:

This meeting is to consider the business item which was tabled, pending receipt of further information at the April 11 session.

The information referred to by John Stuart, in support of his motion to table, is attached.

Note that the proposal is to establish an ad hoc committee which would operate only until formal senate action regarding such a committee is taken.

A member of the Cal Poly faculty has been charged with unprofessional conduct. The executive committee feels that it is in the best interests of the faculty to investigate this allegation as soon as is reasonably possible.
Memorandum

William Alexander, President
Academic Senate

Date: February 24, 1971

File No.: 
Copies: 

From: Murray Smith, Chairman
Election Committee of the Academic Senate

Subject: Referendum re Professional Responsibilities Statement

The results of the referendum re the adoption of the Professional Responsibilities Statement and the Implementation of the Professional Responsibilities Statement as determined by the Election Committee of the Academic Senate in a ballot count on February 24, 1971 are as follows:

I APPROVE THE STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ENDSERED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC ..... 193

I DO NOT APPROVE THE STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ENDSERED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC ..... 28

I HAVE NO OPINION ..... 2

I APPROVE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES STATEMENT ENDSERED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC ..... 175

I DO NOT APPROVE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES STATEMENT ENDSERED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC ..... 37

I HAVE NO OPINION ..... 2
The Academic Senate California State Colleges requests that each faculty member in the State Colleges be given an opportunity to indicate approval or disapproval of the Academic Senate's Statement of Professional Responsibilities and Implementation of the Professional Responsibilities Statement.

Dr. Corwin Johnson was a member of the committee of the Academic Senate CSC that prepared the Statement of Professional Responsibilities; he has written a short history of the document and it is attached.

Copies of the Statement (4 pages) and the Implementation (2 pages) thereof are attached.

1. Please indicate your vote by placing marks in the appropriate boxes.

2. Fold the ballot so the name of the chairman of the Election Committee is on the outside, staple and place your ballot in the campus mail.

(Ballots must be received by the Election Committee by February 22 to be valid.)

I APPROVE THE STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC. ................................................................. [ ]

I DO NOT APPROVE THE STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC. ................................................................. [ ]

I HAVE NO OPINION, ................................................................. [ ]

I APPROVE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES STATEMENT ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC. ................................................................. [ ]

I DO NOT APPROVE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES STATEMENT ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC. ................................................................. [ ]

I HAVE NO OPINION. ................................................................. [ ]
Memorandum

To: Murray Smith, Chairman
    Election Committee

Date: February 11, 1971

File No.

Copies:

From: Corwin M. Johnson, Member, Faculty Affairs Committee
    Academic Senate, California State Colleges


During the summer of 1970, a number of groups and individuals came to the conclusion that a code of responsibilities or a code of ethics would be desirable for the faculty of the California State Colleges. One of the groups that discussed this was the Ad-Hoc Committee for the Procurement and Retention of Quality Faculty, whose membership is composed of Vern Graves, Chairman, Academic Senate, CSC; Charles Adams, Chairman, Faculty Affairs Committee, CSC; two trustees; and two college presidents. Vern Graves felt that there was a very definite need and he brought this subject to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, CSC. At their September 21, 1970, meeting they passed a resolution requesting that the Faculty Affairs Committee, of the Academic Senate, CSC, investigate and prepare a code of professional responsibilities or ethics and meet as often as necessary to have this ready for the December meeting of the Academic Senate, CSC.

The Faculty Affairs Committee considered this at their first meeting on October 14, 1970, and the entire Academic Senate endorsed the Executive Committee's resolution at their meeting of October 15-16, 1970. During this period, one of the trustee members of the Ad-Hoc Committee on the Procurement and Retention of Quality Faculty introduced a resolution to the trustees, which was passed, requesting the State-Wide Academic Senate to prepare a code of professional conduct.

So, with the requests coming in from all quarters, the Faculty Affairs Committee met in November and twice in December and, at the December 17-18, 1970, meeting of the Academic Senate, presented a document which has now become known as the "Statement of Professional Responsibility and Procedures for Implementation" to the Academic Senate, CSC. This was accepted at the first reading with several suggestions for improvement. The Committee then made some changes in the document and decided that it should be divided into two sections. The first section was the statement of professional responsibilities which will require no action from the trustees, but is a code for the faculty of the California State Colleges. The second section was the procedures for implementation which would require the approval of the trustees. These two papers were presented to the Academic Senate, CSC, at their meeting of January 14-15, 1971, with the recommendation of the Committee that they be endorsed by the Senate and sent to the local campuses for ratification.

This recommendation was passed overwhelmingly by the Academic Senate, CSC, and the documents are now before you for ratification. The document on professional responsibilities is self-explanatory; however, a word is needed on the procedures
for implementation. At the present time, when a breach of professional responsibilities occurs, the only action that can be taken is through the present "Disciplinary Action Procedures." It was felt by the Committee that there should be another step whereby a faculty member accused of a breach of professional responsibilities could be tried by his peers and a solution arrived at that is not as drastic as that under the "Disciplinary Action Procedures." It will be noted that if a solution cannot be reached with these procedures, one might still go to the "Disciplinary Action Procedures." However, it is felt by the Committee that most of the problems that have arisen could be solved by the less drastic means.

As a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, Academic Senate, CSC, I have worked on this since last October and have a rather bias outlook. However, I do think these documents are in the best interests of the faculties of the California State Colleges and hope that everyone will vote in favor of them.
A STATEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Academic freedom is a special freedom, necessary to the mission of professors in a college or university. Professional responsibility is its natural counterpart. As individuals, professors have the responsibility to conduct themselves in ways that will promote the achievement of the purposes for which academic freedom exists. To the extent that, as members of a profession, they have rights of self-government, professors as a group have an obligation to keep their houses in order and to take such steps as may be necessary to the fulfillment of their professional mission. A statement of professional responsibility may serve as a useful reminder of the variety of obligations assumed by members of the profession.

Teaching as a profession, and, specifically, teaching in institutions of higher learning, involves members throughout the nation and the world. As a consequence, a statement of professional ethics or responsibilities for teachers should enunciate principles which apply within the profession at large. Accordingly, the following statement is taken almost entirely from documents developed and published by the American Association of University Professors, some of them in conjunction with other well-known professional organizations. The core of this statement is the AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics. Additional items are taken from other statements alluded to in the Statement or promised in it—statements widely known and endorsed throughout the profession.

Though this statement brings together assertions of professional responsibility gleaned from several diverse documents variously developed during the past three decades, it is not exhaustive; it is at most only representative of major areas of responsibility. By means of footnotes this statement makes reference to materials which more fully develop the necessarily abbreviated representation of individual principles herein. Moreover, the Academic Senate of the California State Colleges pledges, as does the AAUP Council in its 1970 Statement on Freedom and Responsibility, to "encourage and assist local faculty groups seeking to articulate the substantive principles here outlined...".

STATEMENT

The responsibilities of a faculty member may be considered from five major perspectives: (1) as a member of the teaching profession; (2) as a teacher; (3) as a colleague; (4) as a part of an institution; (5) as a member of a community.

1. As a member of the teaching profession, the professor:
   a. seeks and states the truth as he sees it. (SPE)
   b. devotes his energies to developing and improving his scholarly competence. (SPE)
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Professional Responsibility Statement

c. accepts the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. (SPE)

d. practices, fosters, and defends intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and free expression on and off the campus. (SPE AND SFR)

e. avoids allowing his subsidiary interests to hamper or compromise his freedom of inquiry. (SPE)

2. As a teacher, the professor:

a. encourages the free pursuit of learning in his students. (SPE)

b. holds before his students the best scholarly standards of his discipline. (SPE)

c. demonstrates respect for the student as an individual. (SPE)

d. adheres to his proper role as an intellectual guide and counselor. (SPE)

e. makes every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct. (SPE)

f. makes every reasonable effort to assure that his evaluation of students reflects their true merit and is based on their academic performance professionally judged and not on matters irrelevant to that performance, whether personality, race, religion, degree of political activism, or personal beliefs. (SPE and SFR)

g. respects the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. (SPE)

h. does not refuse to enroll or teach students on the grounds of their beliefs or the possible uses to which they may put the knowledge to be gained in a course. (SFR)

i. refrains from forcing students by the authority inherent in the instructional role to make particular personal choices as to political action or their own part in society. (SFR)

j. does not persistently intrude into the presentation of his subject material which has no relation to that subject. (SFR)

k. presents the subject matter of his course as announced to his students and as approved by the faculty in their collective responsibility for the curriculum. (SFR)

l. allows students the freedom to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in a course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion. (SFR)
m. avoids any exploitation of students for his private advantage. (SPE)

3. As a colleague, the professor:
   a. respects and defends the free inquiry of his associates. (SPE)
   b. shows due respect for the opinions of others in exchanges of criticism and ideas. (SPE)
   c. acknowledges his academic debts. (SPE)
   d. strives to be objective in his professional judgment of colleagues. (SPE)

4. As a member of an institution, the professor:
   a. seeks above all to be an effective teacher and scholar. (SPE)
   b. observes the stated regulations of the institution provided they do not contravene academic freedom. (SPE)
   c. maintains his right to criticize regulations and seek their revision. (SPE)
   d. determines the amount and character of the work he does outside the institution with due regard for his paramount responsibilities within it. (SPE)
   e. recognizes, when considering the interruption or termination of his services, the effect of his decision upon the program of the institution and gives due notice of his intentions. (SPE)
   f. requests a leave of absence or resigns his academic position when acute conflicts between the claims of politics, social action, and conscience, on the one hand, and the claims and expectations of his students, colleagues, and institution, on the other, preclude the fulfillment of substantial academic obligations. (SPE)
   g. refrains from calling attention to grievances in ways that significantly impede the functions of the institution. (SPE)
   h. accepts his share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of his institution. (SPE)

5. As a member of a community, the professor:
   a. measures the urgency of his obligations as a citizen in light of his responsibilities to his subject, his students, his profession and his institution. (SPE)
   b. makes every effort, when he speaks and acts as a citizen, to be accurate, to exercise appropriate restraint, to show respect for the opinions of others, and to indicate that he does not speak for his college or university. (SPE AND SEU)
Professional Responsibility Statement

c. promotes conditions of free inquiry. (SPE)
d. furthers public understanding of academic freedom. (SPE)

FOOTNOTES

1 Statement on Professional Ethics, the primary source of items in this statement. AAUP Bulletin, Vol. 55, No. 1, Spring, 1969, pp. 86-87. Parenthetical references and footnotes identify documents from which items have been taken, most of them almost word-for-word.


IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STATEMENT ON
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND PROFESSIONAL SELF-DISCIPLINE

The fundamental purpose of a statement of professional responsibility is to establish a guide to responsible performance that is consistent with the highest ideals of the academic profession. It thus establishes an ideal to which faculty members can and should aspire, rather than a minimum standard to which faculty members must adhere. Hence, such a statement is not intended to serve primarily as a reference for disciplinary action. Nevertheless, when cases of gross disregard for principles of professional responsibility occur, the faculty has both a right and duty to call the lapse to the attention of the individual concerned and to expect that the irresponsible behavior will be discontinued.

Most departures from responsible professional behavior are likely to be minor lapses which can be corrected simply by calling the matter to the attention of the person involved. Ordinarily such matters are handled within the faculty member's academic unit.

If a breach of professional responsibility is alleged which cannot be or is not, adequately handled thus informally within the basic academic unit, the matter should be taken up at the institutional level. Each college should have a Committee on Professional Responsibility. The members of such a committee should be chosen with special attention to the high regard in which they are held by the academic community. To this committee any member of the academic community may refer allegations of unprofessional conduct.

As quickly as may be feasible, the Committee on Professional Responsibility should begin an inquiry into the facts of any case it is asked to investigate. The Committee may at any time discontinue the inquiry because the facts do not provide sufficient evidence to support the allegation. The Committee may also decide at any time that the case involves only minor matters which properly should have been referred to the basic academic unit for informal resolution and so refer it, with or without recommendations.

If the Committee on Professional Responsibility does carry its inquiry to completion, it should prepare a report which presents its conclusions and the basis for those conclusions. A copy of the report should go to the faculty member whose behavior was questioned and a copy to the person(s) requesting Committee consideration of the case, and a copy should be retained by the Committee. When in the judgment of the Committee the nature of the case suggests such a conclusion, the Committee may recommend the initiation of formal disciplinary action.

The intent underlying this procedure is to provide a mechanism whereby the faculty can call serious disregard for professional responsibility to the attention of an offending faculty member without the necessity of subjecting him to formal disciplinary action. It is expected that in most instances the weight of an adverse conclusion by the Committee on Professional Responsibility will bring about a correction of irresponsible behavior.
If grossly irresponsible behavior should continue, however, it may be necessary for the possibility of formal disciplinary action to be considered. Nevertheless, formal charges of unprofessional conduct should not be filed unless and until the corrective procedures outlined above have been tried. The college administrative officer who has general charge of disciplinary procedures should consult with the Committee on Professional Responsibility before proceeding with any disciplinary action based on charges of unprofessional conduct.

When formal disciplinary action is based on charges of unprofessional conduct, the faculty disciplinary action committee should be given the final determination as to whether sanctions should be imposed and the form they should take. Consideration should be given to a wide range of sanctions other than dismissal, such as warnings and reprimands, to provide a more versatile disciplinary response to various degrees and kinds of unprofessional behavior. But primary emphasis should be placed on preventive action. Apparent failures to meet professional responsibilities should be approached with a sustained attempt to inform, persuade, and improve; disciplinary action, regardless of the degree of sanction it may eventually suggest, should be a last resort.
In 1969, the Academic Senate agreed to a student evaluation program of faculty teaching ability which would be published by the students, be entered into on a voluntary basis by the faculty, and would have no official bearing on any faculty personnel actions. The result was the "Assist" faculty evaluation survey which was published in the Spring of 1970.

In 1971, the Student Affairs Committee, after almost a year of intensive study, presented a program to the Academic Senate for developing a more meaningful student evaluation of faculty teaching ability. This proposal was defeated by the Academic Senate. The rejection of the program was due principally to objections voiced in three key areas: the results of the evaluation would be consolidated and placed in the faculty members' official personnel file without being individually signed and submitted by student evaluators; the results would be published; and a faculty committee from each department would be significantly involved which fact might cause subsequent faculty dominance in the process and negate the emphasis on student input.

In May 1971, after the rejection of the above proposal, Senator Dave Grant offered a resolution which was amended in part by Senator Art Rosen, and which passed the Senate by a 50 to 1 vote. The resolution, as amended, read as follows:

"that the Academic Senate SLO reaffirm its support of student evaluation of academic instruction, and further that the Academic Senate SLO recommend full cooperation of all faculty, departments, and schools with student evaluation which is used in accordance with existing faculty personnel policies, but carried out by students with no interposition of faculty control or supervision of such evaluations."

In the Fall and Winter of 1972, several divergent actions occurred in the subject area. The Associated Students formed an "Assist" Committee which subsequently developed a program of faculty evaluation which included virtually all of the features (and more) contained in my Committee's proposal which was rejected by the Academic Senate. Concurrently, my Committee, at the request of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, studied and recently reported back to the Executive Committee means by which students could provide meaningful input to faculty evaluations under existing administrative channels and procedures.
While the above actions were taking place, in view of the Grant resolution heretofore referred, I refused repeatedly to permit my Committee to become involved officially in student proposals for faculty evaluations while simultaneously offering the students, informally, the benefit of our experience in this area.

As a further complexity, during this current academic year, many Deans of the various schools have individually initiated school-wide programs to provide for meaningful student evaluation of faculty teaching ability. The School of Engineering has continued their evaluation program which was in effect prior to my Committee's involvement. The School of Agriculture has a decentralized departmental evaluation program. The School of Communicative Arts and Humanities and all other schools are either operating experimental programs or considering such implementation in the immediate future.

It would appear, therefore, that effective programs designed to provide meaningful student evaluations of faculty teaching ability are being undertaken by the Schools of the College. Further, students may, if they so desire, continue to develop and conduct their own "Assist" program within the resources available to them.

The foregoing chronology was presented by myself to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate at their meeting of April 4, 1972. After a careful analysis and discussion of all facets of the situation, the consensus of opinion was that it would be both futile and redundant for my Committee to pursue the matter any further. The Executive Committee then voted to relieve the Student Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate of all responsibilities connected with student evaluations of faculty teaching ability. This memorandum is submitted as a matter of record.