

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - MINUTES
December 2, 1975

Chair, Lezlie Labhard
Vice Chair, David Saveker
Secretary, Charles Jennings

- I. The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Lezlie Labhard, at 3:15 PM in Ag 241.

All members were present except William Krupp.
Member with excused absence was Milton Drandell.
Guest in attendance was Art Duarte.

- II. The minutes for the meetings of Oct. 28 and Nov. 4 were approved.

III. Business Items

- A. It was M/S/P (Saveker) that the Executive Committee approve the following committee appointees and Senators:

George Suchand - Business and Social Sciences - Fairness Board
Dave Ciano (for Don Cheek) - Prof. Cons. Serv. - Fairness Board
Barb Hallman (for George Kastner) - Comm. Arts & Hum. - Election Comm.
Fred O'Toole (for Robert Huot) - Comm. Arts & Hum. - Const. and Bylaws
Joe Boone (for Leonard Wall) - Science and Math. - Budget, Senator
Paul Sheffer (for Richard Kombrink) - Eng. and Tech. - Const. and Bylaws

IV. Discussion Items

- A. Guidelines for Faculty Sponsorship of Events (Jones) - Dr. Jones presented a report of her discussions and conclusions concerning the Nuclear Forum and surrounding events.

It was M/S/P (Buffa) to postpone the discussion until the next meeting of the Executive Committee so that the committee could study the report.

The committee acknowledged receipt of the report and thanked Dr. Jones for her work in preparing it.

- B. Campus Security Advisory Boards (Olsen, Wenzl, Murphy) - It was M/S/P (Saveker) to note receipt of the resolution and take no further action.
- C. Resolution in Support of Collegial Governance (Moore) - This item was postponed until Larry Moore could be in attendance to present it.

- D. "Military Time" (Olsen) - It was M/S/P (Weatherby) to make this a business item and that the Executive Committee unanimously support the use of the traditional twelve hour designation of time for all university documents and schedules.

V. Announcements

- A. Membership on the Consultative Committee for Selection of Dean of Science and Math (Buffa) - The following persons were elected to the committee: SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS; Norman Eatough, Thomas Hale, Aryan Roest, Arthur Rosen, Daniel Stubbs, AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES; Leslie Vanoncini, ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN; Wesley Ward, BUSINESS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES; Reginald Gooden, COMMUNICATIVE ARTS AND HUMANITIES; James Simmons, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY; James Golden, and HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION; William Armentrout.

It was questioned if it were possible for such a committee to be comprised of all department heads.

It was agreed by consensus to discuss this matter at the next meeting of the Executive Committee.

It was suggested that other campuses be consulted as to what procedures are used on other campuses.

- B. Lezlie Labhard read Dr. Kennedy's reply to the Senate's invitation to the December 9 meeting of the Academic Senate.
- C. Barton Olsen expressed concern that there was confusion among faculty members over the terms "serious and compelling reasons" included in policy for withdrawals from class after the third week of instruction. There was discussion among committee members expressing many different views concerning withdrawal policy.
- D. Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty (Labhard)(Attach. V-D)

The meeting was adjourned by the Chair, Lezlie Labhard, at 4:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted,


Charles Jennings
Secretary

Memorandum*attention
Clay Sommers*

To : C. Mansel Keene, Vice Chancellor
Faculty and Staff Affairs
The California State University and Colleges
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90036

Date : November 13, 1975

File No.:

Copies : Hazel J. Jones
School Deans
Donald L. Shelton
Lezlie Labhard

ACADEMIC SENATEFrom : Robert E. Kennedy *REK***NOV 17 1975****CAL POLY - SLO**

Subject: Report of the CSUC Ad Hoc Committee on the Procurement
and Retention of a Quality Faculty

The final report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty has been reviewed. As with the draft, copies of the final report were provided to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the school deans, and the Chair of the Academic Senate with a request for their comments and recommendations. It is noted that the recommendations contained in the final report remains substantially the same as those in the draft. Since the comments stated in my September 26, 1975 memorandum to Clayton L. Sommers concerning the draft report are still applicable, I am attaching a copy of that memorandum rather than readdressing each recommendation.

The following comments pertain to the modified recommendations contained in the final report:

Recommendation #5 - Relative Values of the Criteria

The objective of insuring that teaching effectiveness receives the primary emphasis at all levels of personnel review is endorsed. The recommendation as written, however, may present some problems. For instance, though teaching effectiveness is regarded as the primary evaluative criterion, different departments place different emphasis on the other criteria. Consequently, the phrase "uniformly applied" does not recognize the importance of maintaining unique and diverse educational programs. It is suggested that the phrase "uniformly applied" be deleted from the language of this recommendation.

Recommendation #12 - Written Campus Standards and Procedures

It is noted that recommendations #12 and 13 of the draft report have been combined in the final report as recommendation #12. Since the wording of the first part of this recommendation has been made compatible with the provisions cited in Title 5, only my previous comments regarding recommendation #13 are now applicable. The application of standards to measure personnel

C. Mansel Keene
Page Two
November 13, 1975

action criteria in higher education might tend to jeopardize the concept of professional judgement as it relates to the faculty evaluative process. As stated in my previous memorandum, caution should be exercised to use the term "standards" only when it has been determined that "standards" either do in fact exist or can reasonably be developed. It is again suggested that the term "criteria" be substituted for the term "standards" in this recommendation.

Recommendation #25D - Improving the Operation of the Academic Department

Though the proposal to abandon a 5% salary differential has been deleted from the final report, perhaps recommendation #25D should specifically include the salary differential as a viable approach to compensate the departmental chairmanship for valuable administrative responsibilities. The problems associated with implementing a special sabbatical leave program for the department chairmen still exist. Please refer to the comments contained in my previous memorandum addressing recommendation #26D and the subject of special sabbatical leaves for department chairmen.

Recommendation #26 - This new recommendation for developing a program designed to facilitate the professional development of faculty members is endorsed.

Attachment

Attach. V-D, 12/2/75
Exec.Comm.Minutes

Memorandum

: Lezlie Labhard, Chair, Academic Senate
Academic Senate Executive Committee Members

Date : December 1, 1975

File No.:

ACADEMIC SENATE

Copies :

DEC 2 1975

CAL POLY - SLO

From : Hazel J. Jones *HJ*
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Report on Nuclear Forum

At the November 4 meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee, I agreed to write a report about the events surrounding the Nuclear Forum and to clarify, if possible, what actually happened.

In my efforts to reconstruct the events, I talked in person or by phone to fourteen people, each of whom reported what he recalled having happened. No one had kept a log and memories of events varied; nonetheless, it was still possible to reconstruct a general sequence.

The following persons provided information for the purposes of this report:

William Alexander, Political Science
Bob Cichowski, Chemistry
Randall Cruikshanks, Political Science
Stan Dundon, Philosophy
James Fitts, History
Robert Frost, Physics
Bill Langworthy, Chemistry
Dick Nelson, Biological Sciences
Herman Voeltz, History
Fred Wolf, Special Services

Harvey Billig, M.D.
James Ekagren, M.D.
David Lenderts, M.D.
Donald Smilovitz, M.D. } French Clinic/French Hospital

The report and conclusions are attached.

Report on Nuclear Forum

December 1, 1975

by

Hazel J. Jones

In mid-August, Dr. James Ekagren telephoned Fred Wolf to ask about the use of Cal Poly facilities for a nuclear energy forum being planned for October 17-18. Wolf explained the options open to off-campus groups: co-sponsorship with an on-campus group or a lease agreement. Wolf asked Ekagren for a formal written request as a followup to the telephone call. Ekagren reported, "We dropped the ball....We never did send one."

Plans for the forum, according to Dr. David Lenderts, had been developing over several months among an informal group of physicians, who in February or May (he didn't recall which) had understood that Cal Poly was going to sponsor, but later he heard Cal Poly wasn't interested. During the summer, publicity about the forum had gone to different areas of the state. Lenderts said the intent had been to call the event a County of San Luis Obispo Forum to be held at Cal Poly, but that someone garbled the information and the printer produced a brochure that stated the forum was sponsored by San Luis Obispo County and by Cal Poly, not by the Committee of 95 Physicians. Lenderts said there were typographical errors on the inside of the brochure. At the bottom of the last page of the brochure, four Cal Poly departments were listed as co-sponsors: Biology, Physics, Chemistry, and Political Science. The brochure had been printed by Industrial Printing (Lenderts thought the printer was in San Jose; another physician said it was in Palo Alto). The front page error was subsequently blocked out; later the list of department co-sponsors was blocked out; still later the entire program was re-printed, listing the Committee of Physicians as the sponsors, correcting the typos on the inside pages, and eliminating the names of departments as co-sponsors.

Lenderts commented, "We didn't want or ask for the campus to co-sponsor."

Dr. Billig reported that after Ekagren talked to Wolf about holding the forum on campus, Billig called Bob Mott to see whether the gym was available, since he understood that the Theatre was already scheduled. Mott said the gym could be used. Bob Cichowski contacted Billig in late August to see whether some forum speakers might be involved in the program he was planning for the American Chemical Society conference. Cichowski talked to Billig in August and in early September about forum plans and on September 8 sent a publicity letter about the forum to SCALAS (an American Chemical Society newsletter). Cichowski reports that, on September 18, Billig said the forum brochure was about ready to go to press and that the publicity committee was meeting on September 20 with the publisher. Cichowski believes that the brochure was held another couple of days in order to see whether campus departments were going to co-sponsor.

On September 23, the Chemistry Department voted unanimously to "sponsor the Nuclear Forum." The decision was conveyed by memo from Langworthy to Vice President Jones, Dean Fisher, and Fred Wolf.

On September 23, the Physics Department voted unanimously to co-sponsor the forum. The decision was conveyed by memo to Fred Wolf.

In late September, Wolf called Dr. Donald Smilovitz and Dr. Harvey Billig to explain the campus policies and requirements for co-sponsored events--- i.e., publicity must be cleared with the campus public affairs office; tapes and recordings become campus property; facility costs for co-sponsored events are absorbed by the University.

On September 30, the Biology faculty, by a majority vote, voted to co-sponsor the forum. The decision was conveyed by telephone to Fred Wolf and to Bob Cichowski.

The Philosophy Department at its first faculty meeting discussed the possibility of sponsorship but postponed the matter in order to obtain more information. Later, the item came before the faculty again, but no action was taken. Dr. Dundon stated that he had heard from a county official who had heard it from someone else that campus co-sponsorship would not be allowed.

The Political Science Department (date unknown) voted unanimously to endorse the conference. This information was conveyed by Randall Cruikshanks to Drs. Lenderts and Billig, members of the Physicians Committee, but not to Fred Wolf.

On September 29, an evening meeting was held at French Hospital. Since Fred Wolf could not be present, he asked Cichowski to convey in person to the physicians the information about campus policies and procedures covering co-sponsored events. Cichowski did so and said that the physicians felt it was impossible to comply with the campus regulations since the planning committee had already advertised the forum, the program and speakers were set, and arrangements had been made for televising and taping (KCBX had a grant to do tapes).

September 30 - Vice President Jones gave President Kennedy a Xerox copy of a draft of the forum program and told him that some of the departments wanted to co-sponsor the event. President Kennedy questioned the wisdom of becoming co-sponsors without involvement in the program planning and wondered if faculty knew the difference between co-sponsorship and endorsement. He said the forum seemed to be balanced and the use of University facilities was appropriate. He hoped individual faculty members would participate.

Jones conveyed the President's opinions to Wolf who in turn telephoned Langworthy, Chemistry, and Frost, Physics, to report the President's opinions. Wolf asked Langworthy to call Nelson, Biological Sciences.

On the morning of October 1, Dr. Cruikshanks telephoned Dr. Jones to express concern about the campus requirements for co-sponsored events. He reported that some of the physicians were angry and upset about the restrictions and asked wasn't there something that could be done. Jones said she didn't know whether rules could be set aside and told Cruikshanks the President was concerned about after-the-fact departmental sponsorship and Cruikshanks said, "That might take care of it."

On the afternoon of October 1, a meeting was held on campus. Among those present were Wolf, Frost, Cichowski, Cruikshanks, Ekagren, Billig, Dave Farmer (a lawyer representing the physicians), McCaleb, and Steve Burrell (KCBX). Among the topics discussed were the physicians' concern about co-sponsorship, objection to the University's regulations, costs without co-sponsorship, and leasing of facilities. Cichowski recalls asking Wolf about departments co-sponsoring and says Wolf said departments were out.

The physicians' attorney examined a lease agreement and said it looked satisfactory. Cichowski stated that the actual facilities cost was less than the maximum figure quoted (\$480), in part because he organized assistance from campus people to help set up the gym and take down equipment afterwards.

On October 8, a meeting was held on campus to complete the arrangements. Among those present were Charles Fishman, M.D., and his secretary; Bob Cichowski, George Cockriel, Robert Baldrige, Bill Adams, Dan Lawson, Dennis Ruthenbeck, Dick Tartaglia, Marcus Gold, Steve Burrell (KCBX), two or three Physics faculty, a student, and Fred Wolf.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The President's opinion about the appropriateness of departmental co-sponsorship was interpreted in some quarters as a decision against co-sponsorship.
2. Some of the physicians on the planning group objected to the campus regulations and wished to be free of campus co-sponsorship.
3. No one person at any given time knew all the details or plans.
4. The stories circulating on campus, as well as among the physicians, about sponsorship and forum arrangements were a mixture of fact, rumor, and gossip.
5. Jones could have emphasized more concisely to Wolf that she was conveying the President's opinion, not a decision.
6. The Physics and Chemistry Departments faculty continued to consider themselves as forum co-sponsors whether or not they were listed on the final program and each contributed department discretionary funds.
7. Had the physicians placed a formal written request for use of the facilities, arrangements might have proceeded more smoothly. (Ekagren's comment: "...a kind of disorganized program on this end.")
8. Even though the physicians had placed no formal written request for the campus facilities, it still would have been helpful if Wolf had, in mid-August, sent the physicians a copy of the Guidelines covering use of campus facilities. (Some people seemed to think that the campus regulations were made up just to create a roadblock.)
9. The differentiation between co-sponsorship and endorsement was not clear to some people.

Respectfully submitted,


Hazel J. Jones