I. Meeting called to order at 3:15 by Chairman Howard Rhoads in the Staff Dining Room.

II. Those present were:

MEMBERS:

Alexander, William  
Boone, Joe  
Brady, Mary  
Burroughs, Sarah  
Burton, Robert  
Carpenter, Thomas  
Cleath, Robert  
Clarkin, Edward  
Coyes, Frank  
Pierstine, Harry  
Gold, Marcus  
Harden, Sheldon  
Johnson, Richard  
Labhard, Lezlie  
Landyshev, Alexander  
Lowry, John  
Morgan, Donald  
Mott, John  
O'Leary, Michael  
Olsen, Barton  
Price, J. D.  
Rhoads, Howard  
Ricksard, Ronald  
Rogalla, John  
Rosen, Arthur  
Saveker, David  
Scales, Harry  
Scheffer, Paul  
Servatius, Owen  
Smith, Murray  
Sorensen, L. Robert  
Stuart, John  
Stubbs, Daniel  
Voss, Larry  
Weatherby, Joseph  
Wills, Maurice  
Wills, Max  

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS (VOTING)

Coyes, Frank  
Rogalla, John  

III. 1. MSC to put the matter of College wide student evaluations on the agenda.

2. Paul Scheffer and Sarah Burroughs reported on the statewide meeting which they attended relating to general education and breadth requirements.

Their report suggested that two of the main items of discussion were:
(1) State universities and colleges have agreed to accept certified general education and breadth requirements of students transferring from Junior Colleges, and (2) the use of CLEP exams.

3. Bob Andreini spoke for a few moments relative to his having attended his first meeting as the new senator for the CSUC senate. He indicated that collective negotiations and the significance of arts and humanities were the two topics which seemed to be of major concern.

IV. AGENDA ITEMS:

1. Personnel Policies Committee - First Reading Item: Copies of the committee's proposals relative to by laws changes regarding the Personnel Review Committee were distributed. Mr. Rosen explained why the recommended changes were made. The matter will be brought up as an action item at the next senate meeting.
2. Personnel Policies Committee: This committee proposed several changes in CAM which relate to personnel matters. Barbara Weber gave some background as to why some of the proposed changes were recommended. Due to the length of the document and the fact that many senators felt it would be better to have time to study the matter more thoroughly it was MOVED and SECONDED to have the matter postponed until the next meeting. The motion CARRIED.

3. Questionnaire on Collective Bargaining: Larry Voss explained the background on this item. Moved and seconded to accept the questionnaire. There was considerable discussion about the relative merits of some items. Dave George explained the reasons for some of the questions. He felt that the committee was making a serious attempt to make the questionnaire a valid one. Moved and seconded to strike out question no. 4. FOR the motion... 21. AGAINST the motion... 21. Mr. Rhoads voted against the motion. Motion FAILED.

Vote on the original motion of Mr. Voss CARRIED.

4. Student Evaluation:

WEREAS

It has been reported that, at the request of the Academic Council, a college-wide student evaluation procedure is to be implemented during the Spring Quarter, 1972,

WEREAS

Many departments and schools have already developed such procedures designed to evaluate their specific teaching objectives,

WEREAS

No substantive consultation with faculty has occurred with regard to the evaluation instrument, the procedures or the dispensation of the results,

WEREAS

The proposed evaluation procedures are in opposition to the Academic Senate position on this issue,

WEREAS

Some tabulation of the results of the proposed college-wide procedure are to be placed in each faculty member's personnel folder, in opposition to Academic Senate recommendations,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Academic Senate objects to the Administration's proposed imposition of a college-wide student evaluation procedure.

This item provoked considerable discussion. Mr. Scales was called upon to report on the Academic Council meeting where the issue of student evaluations for the spring quarter was discussed. He said that as he understood the matter a system of mandatory university wide evaluations would be adopted this quarter (spring) and that the results would not be published but would go into the individual's personnel file in order that the evaluation could be used for promotion, retention and tenure matters the following year.
Mr. Lowry indicated that he felt Executive order no. 70-8 would be violated if such a procedure were to be adopted at this point in time. Mr. Ericson felt that 70-8 referred to anonymous material only and that tabulated material such as this would not be part of that (70-8) consideration. Mr. Ericson indicated that he did not understand that any decision on a standard form for the evaluation had been decided -- either for the spring quarter or for the future.

Mr. Lowry elaborated further on his previous comments indicating that 70-8 refers to this campus specifically and that Title 5 and 70-8 should not be referred to as being related.

Dean Higdon said that he did not feel there was any ambiguity about the Academic Council meeting. He said that appropriate steps were being taken at that time to implement the evaluation and that it was to be done the spring quarter and the results were to go into the various personnel folders.

Several senators spoke against the implementation of the evaluation -- many objecting especially to the manner in which they felt it was being done. Mr. Stubbs quoted from a letter written by President Kennedy in which the President stated that the administration would not take any unilateral action regarding faculty evaluation.

After further discussion a vote was taken on the matter. (Secret ballot.)

```
FOR the RESOLUTION . . . . 37
AGAINST the RESOLUTION . . . 5
ABSTENTION . . . . . . . . . 1
```

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.