

Academic Senate - Minutes
California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo

Academic Senate - Minutes
January 13, 1970

I. Session called to order in the Staff Dining Hall by Vice Chairman William Alexander at 3:20 p.m.

II. Those in attendance were:

A. E. Andreoli	C. Johnson	D. Price	D. Sobala
R. Asbury	J. Lowry	R. Ratcliffe	J. Stuart
S. Burroughs	T. Meyer	H. Rhoads	H. Walker
D. Federer	J. Mott	G. Rich	M. Wilks
R. H. Frost	R. Pautz	J. Rogalla	A. Wirshup
M. Gold	D. Piper	E. Smith	V. Wolcott

Guests:

Lorraine Howard Timothy Booney

Ex Officio (Voting) Members:

C. Cummins C. Fisher C. Gibson C. R. Russell

Ex Officio (Non-voting) Members:

R. Kennedy D. Lawson

III. Vice Chairman Alexander called for approval of the minutes of the December 2, 1969 minutes.

The secretary made the following notations for correction of the December 2 minutes.

- A. The name of J. Mott should be added to the list of those in attendance.
- B. Under heading IV, Announcements, number 1: regarding the recommendation of the Senate to President Kennedy dealing with salary warrants, the next to the last line of that paragraph should read, "whenever that day falls on Friday, was given tentative approval by the President," instead of "was approved by the President."
- C. Under heading IV, Announcements, number 4: the first sentence of that paragraph should read, "R. Frost of the Personnel Review Committee reported that his committee had submitted its report on Reappointment for Second Year and Tenure for third year employees."
- D. Under heading V, Business Items, number 2: regarding Spring Quarter Registration - 1970; the notation motion carried should be inserted after the line "motion seconded by E. Smith."

Motion was made to approve the minutes as amended. It was seconded and passed.

IV. Announcements

- A. Vice Chairman Alexander presented President Kennedy to the Senate who then made an announcement regarding possible reorganization within the College. He reported that all faculty would be receiving the same handout material, which he presented to each senator, concerning the tentative proposed reorganization within the College and in the respective schools. His comments centered around the proposal of the formation of seven schools within the College instead of the present five, and also with certain departmental changes within these schools.

He indicated that the Chancellor had given tentative approval to the seven school proposal and would approve the extra deans for the two new schools. The new deans would be selected according to the procedures outlined in the College Administrative Manual.

President Kennedy invited the faculty to respond to the proposal so that he would be better able to react to and implement the changes should they be fully approved.

- B. The vice chairman had no report to give in regard to previous senate action.
- C. In regard to committee appointments he indicated that these would be announced as they were filled.

D. Progress Reports

1. R. Pautz, chairman of the Student Affairs Committee reported that his committee had not been able to meet to consider the problems involved with the ASSIST evaluation program. He did ask that the Senate might give them some directions as to possible areas of consideration regarding the program.
 - a. One possibility was a review and renewal of the previous stand of the Faculty-Staff Council regarding publication of the evaluations.
 - b. Another possibility was to invite Cindy Arey before the Senate to tell what future direction was expected for the ASSIST program.
 - c. It was also mentioned that the Student Affairs Committee might act as a clearing house for gripes arising from the ASSIST program.
2. The Instruction Committee did not make a report.
3. The Personnel Review Committee reported that they meet two times in December to consider sabbatical leaves. The report indicated that only 24 applications had been received and that more could have been presented.
4. The Personnel Policy Committee presented the first draft of their report dealing with the policy on faculty personnel files. The policy proposal was presented in the January 13, 1970 agenda as attachment "A". An open hearing is scheduled for Tuesday, January 20, at 3:10 p.m. in the Staff Dining Hall, during which time the committee hopes to obtain contribution from interested faculty members, and will then try to have the information ready for the February meeting.

5. C. Johnson reported that the State-Wide Academic Senate would be meeting the last of this week and therefore he did not have much to report at this time. He did report that many of the items considered at the last meeting were tabled; he indicated that this was the most appropriate action that could have been taken at that time.

V. Business Items

- A. The second reading of the Amendment to By-Laws was presented as follows:

Recommended by the Executive Committee with the concurrence of the Staff Senate, that VI. Committees, B. Elected Committees and Other Committees, 4. Fairness Board, paragraph b, of the Academic Senate By-Laws be amended after the first sentence by the insertion of the following sentence. "In those cases involving non-classroom questions, the Chairman of the Fairness Board shall request of the Chairman of the Staff Senate the names of three staff members who shall be members of the Fairness Board until the case is resolved."

A question arose from the floor in regards to the choice of words "non-classroom." It was indicated that this was a bad choice of words and would be difficult to determine what would be "non-classroom."

R. Frost moved to refer the amendment back to appropriate committee.

Motion was seconded, but failed due to lack of support.

C. Johnson moved to amend the amendment by insertion of the word "non-instructional" in place of the word "non-classroom."

Motion was seconded and passed.

Motion was made to adopt the amended amendment in the By-Laws.

The motion was seconded and passed.

- B. Student Affairs Committee
Chairman Pautz presented his committee's proposed guideline for recognition of sororities and fraternities.

R. Pautz reported that his committee had met several times and after holding open hearings, which were well attended, the guidelines as presented in attachment "B" of the January 13 Senate agenda were developed following these meetings. He did indicate that there were two deviate groups represented at these meetings, those for, and those against recognition of the social sororities and fraternities. He also indicated there were three social groups desiring campus recognition at this time.

Mr. Pautz moved for the acceptance of the guidelines as presented.

G. Rich seconded the motion.

Considerable discussion was generated in regards to the recognition of the social sororities and fraternities by the campus and are listed below:

1. Why should these organizations be recognized?
2. Pautz indicated that his committee was not trying to answer this question, but trying to set up the basic guidelines that they would have to abide by to receive recognition.
3. The question arose as to the student body's position on recognition. Inasmuch as no representative from ASI was in attendance at the meeting, President Kennedy presented his conclusion as to the desire of the majority of the Intra-Fraternity Council, in that they did not care to be bound by regulations which would be applied if they were recognized and therefore were against recognition of such groups.
4. Several advantages for recognition of these groups were presented.
 - a. They are interested in providing a service to the college.
 - b. Several living groups do exist and as such reflect upon the college and as such may classify as a college responsibility.
 - c. Campus recognition is required for national recognition.
 - d. With national recognition financial aid may be available to these individual groups.
5. Disadvantages were also brought out.
 - a. Policing of regulations imposed on these groups would be very difficult as the Dean of Students does not have the manpower available.
 - b. Recognition would also allow these off-campus groups to use the campus facilities which are presently rather crowded.
 - c. Recognition would benefit only a very small percentage of the student body.
 - d. It was also indicated that recognition of off-campus social groups might dilute the students' participation in their departmental functions.
 - e. Others were against recognition because of the legal implications involving the college.
 - f. Frost moved to amend the guidelines to recognize other organized off-campus student living groups.

Motion seconded, but failed by a vote of 8 yes, 17 no.

6. D. Federer moved to refer the guidelines back to committee for further consideration.

Seconded by A. Andreoli

Several spoke against this motion in that it appeared that it was not the guidelines that were in question, but that it was the question of recognition as such.

The motion failed due to lack of support.

7. The question of voting on the guidelines was called for from the floor, and the motion to accept the guidelines failed by a vote of 5 yes, 19 no, and several abstentions.

- C. J. Stuart presented a resolution regarding the senate's position dealing with summer quarter which reads as follows: "The Academic Senate recommends to the President that every effort be made to encourage the Trustees, the Legislature and the Governor to support a fully-financed summer quarter for 1971 and thereafter.

Mr. Stuart moved for the adoption of this resolution by the Senate.

Motion was seconded and passed.

President Kennedy responded to the resolution by accepting the responsibility and also indicated that a letter was ready to be sent to those involved regarding the continuance of the summer quarter here at Cal Poly.

VI. Meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.