

R. Kennedy

AGENDA

SLO FACULTY-STAFF COUNCIL
Tuesday, October 12, 1965
Meeting No. 1
3:15 p.m. - Staff Dining Room

RECEIVED
OCT 7 1965
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- I. READING OF MINUTES
- II. WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS
- III. DISCUSSION ITEM
 1. Appointment of AD HOC Consultative Committee on Presidential Selection
- IV. BUSINESS ITEM
 1. Selection of replacement for Norman Gould on the Agenda Committee
Nominees: Mansfield Clinnick, Mead Johnson
 2. Resolution from Academic Council, San Jose State College (Attachment)
 3. Preliminary Report of the Special Committee of the Academic Senate, C.S.C., to Study and Evaluate the Ad Hoc Report (Attachment)
- V. COMMITTEE REPORTS
 1. Personnel (Faculty)
 2. Personnel (Non-Faculty)
 3. Curriculum and Instruction (Attachment)
 4. Communications
 5. Student Affairs
 6. Professional Ethics
 7. Facilities and Fiscal Affairs (Attachment)
 8. Research
 9. Ad Hoc Constitution

Academic Senate Report - LaVerne Bucy
- VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS
 1. Letters from President McPhee (Attachments)

2. Outstanding Teacher Selection Committee appointed
3. Appointment of Don Hensel to Publications Policy and Procedures Guidelines Development Committee
4. State College bulletins and senate minutes are in the faculty reading room of the library
5. Announcement of Applied Arts Division Selection -- Replacement for Norman Gould
6. Attachments: Constitution of Faculty-Staff Council, List of Members, Committees of Faculty-Staff Council

THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL OF SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE

WHEREAS the people of California have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in the California State Colleges; and

WHEREAS it is essential to staff the State Colleges with well qualified professors, if this huge investment is to yield the dividends which it should yield for our State; and

WHEREAS the staffing problem for the State Colleges is an extremely difficult one because of the extraordinary number--well over 1,000--of new and replacement professors needed each year; and

WHEREAS this difficult problem is made still more complex by the fact that faculty salaries in competing institutions are rising all across the country; and

WHEREAS this strong pressure from competing institutions will make it essential to improve faculty salaries in the California State Colleges by at least 10%, for the 1966-67 academic year, in order to attract even a minimum number of qualified professors; and

WHEREAS THE VALUE TO OUR STATE, OF WHATEVER FACULTY RAISES ARE FINALLY APPROVED, DIMINISHES SIGNIFICANTLY WITH EACH PASSING MONTH--FOR THE RECRUITING EFFORT FOR THE 1966-67 ACADEMIC YEAR HAS ALREADY BEGUN, AND WILL REACH ITS PEAK EARLY IN 1966; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the Academic Council of San Jose State College, that the Governor and the Legislature are urgently requested to consider authorization, at the earliest possible time, of an additional salary increase of at least 10% for State College faculty members, for the 1966-67 academic year; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Academic Council recommends that consideration of this matter, along with any tax questions that may be connected with it, be placed before the Legislature at the current Special Session, if at all possible, so that the pay increases to be authorized will be available in time to have a maximum positive impact upon recruitment efforts, and thereby provide the maximum return to the citizens and taxpayers of California.

Preliminary Report of the Special Committee
of the Academic Senate, C.S.C.,
to
Study and Evaluate the Ad Hoc Report

INTRODUCTION

- I. This report is a working paper prepared for the Academic Senate, C.S.C., in response to the charge given by the Academic Senate at its meeting of March 25, 1965. It is intended as an aid to members of the Senate and other interested parties in evaluating the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee, and it does not purport to speak for the Senate as a whole or for its officers. It does, however, represent the views of the special committee. Members of the Senate's special committee are:

William Rogers, Chairman, representing Executive Committee

Richard Axen, representing Faculty Affairs Committee

John Clark, representing Student Affairs Committee

James Heath, representing Finance Committee

Warren Olson, representing Executive Committee

Mitchell Marcus, representing Educational Policies Committee

The special committee has based its analysis and its recommendations upon the full documentation of the Ad Hoc Committee, including the responses from the several colleges and the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Neither the college reports nor this report is restricted exclusively to commentary on the "procedures and policy" charge of the Ad Hoc Committee. Rather, the colleges and this report view this as a unique opportunity to take a searching look at the full operations of the system during a critical initial period, hoping that a clarification of assumptions and perceptions will lead to changes in the system that will better prepare it for the crucial responsibilities in the years ahead.

The tentative nature of this working report is in part a reflection of time pressures and the limited perspective of a six-man committee. It is expected that Senate disposition of the report will allow time for the analysis and reactions of the individual campuses.

Rather than attempting a line by line or item by item analysis and emendation of the Report, the special committee has considered major elements under headings which bring together diverse treatments in various sections

of the Report. Thus this report is organized under the following headings:

1. Consultation in Policy Formation
2. Communication
3. Centralization, Delegation and Administration
4. Educational Planning
5. Fiscal Planning

In utilizing this approach it is appreciated that many specific points in the Ad Hoc Report of concern to individual colleges are not mentioned, but seemingly this focus concentrates on essentials and is the best use of limited time.

II. A miscellaneous section has been included with one important problem which the special committee raises for consideration:

1. Graduate Studies

III. In addition, a concluding section is devoted to an item by item analysis of the 46 recommendations of the Ad Hoc Report.

1. Consultation in Policy Formation

Section IV of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee attempts a delineation of the policy-formulating and administrative roles of the various agencies and officers within the state college system. In general terms it sets out the powers and duties of each. Despite its unfortunate yoking of policy formulation and administration, the section makes clear a hierarchical concept of organization which unrealistically fails to consider the key roles of the faculties, their local college senates and councils, and their system-wide voice, the Academic Senate of the California State Colleges.

Certainly there is no arguing with the fact that the legal responsibility for policy-making lies with the Trustees. Powers and responsibilities are delegated by them, and no one would wish them to abdicate their legal duties. Nor can there be question of the function of the Chancellor as the chief administrative officer, delegated to carry out the policies approved by the Trustees. But these policies are approved by the Trustees as a lay board, acting upon recommendations channeled to them from the faculties of the several colleges, through the Academic Senate, and through the Chancellor. Only through such a grass-roots procedure can the rich professional, scholarly, and administrative competences of the faculties of the California State Colleges be brought to bear on policy making for the system.

Yet there runs through Section IV and through the entire report a tone indicating an attitude which denigrates the professional, scholarly, and administrative abilities and responsibilities of the faculties and their representative assembly, the Academic Senate. There is little or no indication of willingness to consider seriously enough the advice of the Senate, let alone to delegate powers and responsibilities to it as permitted by law and as proved workable in our sister system, the University of California. Instead there is a constant, conscious, and deliberate attempt to hedge in the Academic Senate, as evidenced in the treatment of "Consultation in Policy Formulation," Section III, page 11 of the Report. It is clear that the view expressed here is that policy formulation will result from a multitude of consultations with various officers and bodies, with the Chancellor and the Trustees free to pick and choose from among them. Although it is true as the Report states "that counsel will not be long forthcoming from a source if its advice is consistently refused," there is little comfort for the faculties and their voice, the Academic Senate, in the knowledge that the alternative to having advice spurned is the privilege of giving no advice. (Perhaps a more realistic statement would be that advice consistently disregarded will find other ears and other channels.)

This denigration of the faculties and of their constituent assembly, the Academic Senate, is palpably obvious in paragraph two of the entry under Chancellor, on page 41 of the Report. "Moreover, before presenting proposals, the Chancellor will determine the pattern of consultation that is appropriate for each item and will seek advice of the Council of Presidents and the Academic Senate in matters in which they have consultative responsibility." Here there is far too much latitude for selection of mode of consultation and of consultees to bypass the direct, normal channels established on each campus and in the Academic Senate. The invitation to "crash consultation" and inadequate consultation is obvious.

Furthermore, it is insufficient to remark that "such consultation will be in depth and the consultants' recommendations carefully considered." (p. 41, Report) Such a statement betrays in tone and substance a paternalistic attitude and rationale. Policy determination must be a continuous process, through established channels, with roots in the faculties and administrative staffs of the several colleges as well as in the Chancellor's office and staff. Policy should move through these channels to the Academic Senate, through the Chancellor, to the Trustees for action. Again, all agree that the legal power rests with the Trustees; and all agree that the Trustees can and should delegate powers to the Chancellor, to the Academic Senate, to the several colleges, and to the several college presidents. But a multiplicity of sources of policy recommendations and routes of policy determination must converge in the Academic Senate. Only thus may the entire system be involved in real rather than ritualistic participation.

That such routing may take time is true; that it may involve multiple examination of policy problems at several organizational levels is equally true. But over-riding these objections is the vitally significant value of full and orderly participation of the faculties and the Academic Senate in the formative stages of policy development and in the review of the final recommendations which the Chancellor will send to the Trustees. The importance of such systematic routing may be best understood by reflection upon the fact that virtually every major problem of the past two years has arisen in large measure from by-passing of the faculties and the Academic Senate: the joint doctorate, year-round operations, credential-major limitation, salary cuts, etc.

In effect, it must be recognized that the function of policy determination must operationally be delegated to the Academic Senate. Decision making will, of course, rest, as required by law, with the Trustees. But all policy will be the result of the broadest possible participation and, most importantly, routed through the Academic Senate. There is no demand that the Senate's recommendation be accepted in every case, but there is absolute necessity that the Senate be consulted with as full and as timely presentation of data as possible. The present practice of members of the Chancellor's staff meeting with the committees will insure full cooperation at all stages of policy development. Involvement of representatives of the college presidents can complete the participation.

To implement such a mode of operation, the following procedure is suggested:

- 1) The Chancellor shall present to the Academic Senate full and timely information on all policy matters and on such other matters as he deems advisable so that the Academic Senate may recommend to him and to the Board of Trustees.
- 2) In those areas where the Board of Trustees have delegated functions of policy decision to the Chancellor, the Chancellor shall refer back to the Academic Senate for reconsideration those of its policy recommendations with which he dissents. After such reconsideration, should the Chancellor still dissent, he shall act in accordance with his own best judgment and, in writing, notify the Academic Senate of his action and his reasons for such action.
- 3) In those areas where the Board of Trustees retain functions of policy decision, the Chancellor shall submit to the Board all policy recommendations and

other communications which the Academic Senate requests him to submit. The Chancellor may, when he desires, request further consultation with the Senate or its officers, or he may refer back to the Senate any recommendation on which he desires further consideration. After such consultation or reconsideration, should the Senate once again submit recommendations on the same matter, the Chancellor shall submit such recommendations to the Board of Trustees. The Chancellor may, of course, transmit his own recommendations differing from or contrary to those of the Academic Senate.

4) When the Board proposes, on a given matter, to take action that differs substantially from the recommendations of the Academic Senate, the Board shall normally refer the recommendations through the Chancellor, back to the Senate or its Executive Committee for additional consideration and recommendation.

(The Chairman of the Academic Senate attends all meetings of the Board of Trustees and is available to present, explain, or amplify recommendations of the Academic Senate. It is respectfully suggested that he be extended privileges of the floor at such meetings.)

Although the Board may legally "in acting upon...policy, follow the Chancellor's proposal (differing from that of the Academic Senate) without further reference to the Academic Senate," (p. 42, Report) such a practice should be more honored in the breach than in the observance. With the period of consultation on a crash basis...deemed closed (p. 13, Report) the goal and the practice must be complete opportunity for consideration of policy.

The Academic Senate commends the Board of Trustees for its action along these lines in its adoption of procedure as outlined on page 17 of the Report, "when the Board of Trustees proposes to take action that differs substantively from the recommendation of the Academic Senate on a given matter along lines not previously considered by the Senate, the Board refers the recommendation involved back to the Senate or its representatives, through the Chancellor, for additional advice." The Academic Senate respectfully suggests a change whereby the phrase "along lines not previously considered by the Senate" shall be deleted as contrary to the implied intent of the Board. Indeed, it is most important that substantive differences along any lines be the subject of full consideration and communication. Such consideration is most effective before adoption of policy, and is far less disruptive of order and morale.

The rationale of the policy and the procedure outlined here is simple. It is that policy can become viable only when those who must be governed by it have had a real opportunity to shape that policy and that policy authoritarian in origin, even though wise and thoughtful, suffers limitations in acceptance both deleterious and unnecessary.

Finally, in relation to policy formulation, it must be noted that the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee repeatedly indicates limitations upon areas of concern for the Academic Senate. Such limitations cannot be supported. The Academic Senate has as its legitimate concern the entire spectrum of affairs in the state college system. Operations thus far have clearly demonstrated the complete interrelation of fiscal-support, personnel and educational matters and none of these

or any others are without widespread ramifications. No artificial barrier must separate the faculties and their representatives, the Academic Senate, from vital areas of their legitimate concern. Indeed, above all, the Academic Senate of the California State Colleges must be the clearing house for all policy, the operationally effective policy recommending body for the system. All other groups, committees, agencies, and individuals within the system and those outside which have legal or educational interest in policy development for the California State Colleges may contribute to the extent of their interest and concern. But their contributions must come through established channels on the several campuses or in the Chancellor's or Board's offices and be routed through the Academic Senate to the Chancellor and to the Trustees, to the extent that delegation of powers demands.

2. Communication

One of the shibboleths of American life today is the epithet "failure of communications." There is a tendency to blame communications for lack of success, to ascribe conflict to misunderstanding or semantic lesion, to attribute opposition to lack of information. But close examination often demonstrates that what is described as "lack of communication" is far more than mechanical failure but, rather, an unwillingness to trust others, a grasping for power, and a misunderstanding of role.

The special committee accepts the recommendation in the Ad Hoc Report for greater emphasis on full and well-planned communication within, between and among the various groups which compose the State College System. In addition, the following specific recommendations are appended:

- 2.1 That all communication of a substantive, regulatory or action nature be confirmed promptly in writing;
- 2.2 That insofar as possible, the Chancellor's staff establish a master schedule of annual informational needs which may be employed by the colleges, the Chancellor and the Trustees to permit long range planning and to avoid duplication of effort;
- 2.3 That communication and interpretation of the System to the public, the press and the Legislature be academically oriented; that there be less effort to ingratiate, and greater attempts to inform in terms of facts;
- 2.4 That the communications coming from the Chancellor to the college faculty come from academically oriented staff capable of quality leadership comparable to the best to be found at the individual colleges;
- 2.5 That insofar as possible, and to a total degree, unless need is demonstrable, the decision making processes and internal operations of the local Colleges shall be held on the level of the local Colleges; that communication shall flow to and from the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees as needed; but that every use by the Chancellor of regulatory communications mandating similarity of instructional and operational practices shall be evaluated in terms of its tendency to unnecessarily centralize control.
- 2.6 That it is axiomatic that a far-flung system such as the California State Colleges will have at its disposal a clear, direct, and efficient system of communications. Certainly the mechanics of such a system must include, in addition to the slow U.S. mails, a system of leased telephone lines connecting the Chancellor's Office and the several Colleges, particularly those distant from Inglewood.

3. Centralization, Delegation, and Administration

The writers of the Ad Hoc Report make it clear that when a number of highly independent colleges are brought together in one system, the question of centralization vs. autonomy assumes momentous proportions. They candidly admit that the balance between centralization and autonomy is a long way from being determined and they take a rather firm stand on the side of autonomy in Recommendation #21 which states that "Statewide policies and standards be adopted only when it is clearly better to have decisions in a given area made on this basis..." Further, the Report states that "diversity and uniqueness are values strongly supported by all segments of the State College System" for the stature of the system depends largely on the strength and recognition achieved by the individual colleges. Hard on the heels of that statement, however, is the assertion that too much autonomy might result in the colleges becoming too much alike; therefore, the "Board of Trustees and the Chancellor must take the lead in assuring diversity and differentiation of programs among the Colleges." What is given with one hand seems to be taken away by the other.

The ambivalence displayed in these statements is crystallized in the conditions for delegation of authority on page 22. Such conditions include: "long experience and a sound administrative record," giving final authority only to those who can be held accountable for its exercise, and making certain that the quality of local decisions is demonstrable. Recommendations #22-24 reflect the spirit of the provisos for delegation by making it very clear that the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor will "parcel out" authority to the colleges on a closely-guarded basis. The value previously placed on autonomy is not negated by these recommendations, but one does wonder whether real diversity and uniqueness can either survive or be nurtured if authority is to be delegated so very cautiously.

In examining the position on delegation of authority in the Report, one cannot help but become aware of two assumptions which underlie it. The first is that the administrations and faculties of the several colleges are not fully capable of assuming full responsibility for the colleges, nor can they be depended upon to make correct decisions in all cases. (An assumption which evidently neglects the long history of most of the colleges as quite independent entities.) A second assumption is that the Chancellor's Office is capable of assuming responsibility for all the colleges and can be counted upon to make decisions superior to any made by a highly autonomous college. On the basis of these assumptions, it follows that the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor must keep a tight rein on the colleges until such time that the colleges demonstrate their maturity and responsibility. In short, a "paternalistic" theory of administration undergirds the Report, and, in effect, constitutes a prima facie resolution of the centralization-autonomy issue.

If the foregoing comments are accurate, certain observations are appropriate. First, we should question how diversity and uniqueness can ever be developed in a college unless that college's autonomy is emphasized and implemented through a real delegation of authority. Diversity and uniqueness, real educational excellence, cannot be legislated into existence; rather, they must grow out of the experience, the gropings, failings, and successes on the basis of which the

college determines its own nature, its own peculiar qualities. One cannot imagine a Harvard College achieving its uniqueness under the aegis of system-wide policies and super-Deans. We cannot have it both ways; we cannot teeter for an eternity on a mysterious and ever-shifting dividing line between centralization and autonomy in the hope that educational excellence and stature will result. Rather, the State Colleges ought to decide whether the possible gains attendant upon maximum college autonomy justifies relinquishing centralized authority. It is axiomatic that we will never know unless we try.

An alternative approach to that which appears to animate the Report is that the Board of Trustees and Chancellor assume that the administration and faculty of each college are competent and capable of assuming responsibility and making wise decisions; that on the basis of such confidence each college be given maximum freedom to work its own way toward educational excellence. Were such an approach adopted, college personnel, especially administrators, would not be fearful of real uniqueness and would not feel compelled to glance nervously over their shoulders to determine whether their superiors in the hierarchy are displeased. Courage rather than timidity, confidence rather than fear, and strength rather than weakness would characterize college administration and policy-making if an attitude of trust underlay meaningful delegation of authority. No president wishes to be simply an errand boy between his college and the Chancellor's Office, and no faculty can function most adequately when the destiny of the college lies in hands far-removed from the reality of the concrete situation. If the relations between the segments of the State Colleges are founded upon respect and trust, and if real autonomy is given each college, it is probable that those to whom authority is delegated would be willing to accept real responsibility and to be criticized if mistakes are made. That errors will occur under any mode of delegating authority cannot be doubted; the real question is whether it is better to have those errors committed in an atmosphere of trepidation and mistrust, or in an atmosphere of confidence and mutual respect.

Further, given the real need for diversity in the State Colleges, for each college to develop a distinctive personality, the greatest freedom possible must be granted to each college. While there must be a level of commonalty among the colleges, it must be realized that the richness of educational program and intellectual climate which are the basic constituents of a college's personality will continue to develop only when maximal college autonomy is granted. Releasing each college from the stultifying shackles of systemwide uniformity would also make it possible for departments within each college to experiment, to engage in self-criticism, and to seek more meaningful ways to educate. The benefits of real freedom are incalculable. To deny that freedom to the State Colleges is to make certain that they never rise above a dull, gray mediocrity.

If the Board of Trustees and Chancellor were to opt for a kind of administration which sought to stimulate growth and development in the colleges by maximizing their autonomy rather than trying to enforce excellence from above, a somewhat slower process of change would have to be expected. However, such a choice would also remove a considerable workload from the Chancellor's Office and would allow his staff to devote more time to genuine systemwide concerns and problems. In addition, establishing an aura of trust would necessitate the

Chancellor's gathering a staff whose academic qualifications and experience would make possible their entering into a relation of trust with the faculties, not to mention reducing turnover in the Chancellor's staff.

The entire problem of administrative staffing is in fact integrally related to these matters of centralization, delegation, and administration. The establishment of an aura of trust will offer inducements to attract new and sorely needed administrators, gifted with imagination and creativity, motivated by educational aims, and capable of the kind of professional leadership which moves by patient and sincere persuasion rather than by tactical delay, strategic maneuver, and direction by fiat.

Should the approach delineated here be acceptable, a somewhat more hospitable stance toward faculty organizations might be taken than that expressed on page 26 of the Report. In recognizing and respecting the right of individuals and groups to organize and advocate (Recommendation #27), the Chancellor and Trustees must also recognize that such groups have an autonomous status and are not part of the official structure of the State Colleges. Consequently, it is unrealistic and illogical to expect independent faculty organizations to use the regular consultative channels in every instance. Cognizance must be taken of the valuable function independent faculty organizations fulfill, namely, that of serving as catalysts and sources of new ideas and approaches to common problems. A health educational system should thrive on controversy and in so doing be able to avoid the dangers inherent in the kind of conflict which ensues once points of view are suppressed or discouraged. It would, then, seem unwise to pretend that autonomous organizations are part of the establishment, thus denying their right to act and express their views in what they deem to be appropriate ways.

In summation, it certainly appears that this section of the Report and the recommendations therein can be clarified if the controlling assumptions are brought into view. In so doing the dominant issue turns on the age-old controversy between those who believe that excellence, and virtue are best attained through control from above, as opposed to those who would seek to develop these qualities through the autonomous action of the basic units.

4. Educational Policy

The close interrelationship between process and policy becomes evident when one specifically analyzes the educational policy decisions that have emerged in the past several years. Such an analysis makes the case for the consultative procedure, the decentralized administration, and the fiscal policy advocated in other sections of this report. College after college criticized specific Chancellor-Trustee policies in such areas as the Master Curricular Plan, teacher education, the joint-doctorate, year-round operation, educational TV, and applied curricula. They saw these deficiencies as end-products of procedures that concentrated authority in the Chancellor-Trustee hierarchy and that failed to utilize the wisdom and good-will engendered by meaningful rather than ritualistic consultation.

Both in the Report and in the documents submitted by the Chancellor the attitude appears to be that there have been no flaws in the policies, but that the only complaint of the colleges has been that they were not consulted.

In the face of the accumulated, documented criticism of policy after policy, the Ad Hoc Report blandly states:

It became apparent to the Committee that the points of friction or grievance within the system have been related more to procedural than to substantive matters. The concern of the Colleges relates more to the manner of operation than to the results thus far achieved. (Report, p. 22)

To see no significant relationship between the procedures employed in developing policy and the actual policy that emerges, to assume that an inadequate Chancellor's staff could develop a Master Curricular Plan or a plan for year-round operation without benefit of counsel from the colleges, the assert that a lay Trustee group new to its task and operating on a part-time basis, achieved the "right" answers even though employing inadequate procedures is a gross misunderstanding of cause and effect relationships and borders on deliberate self-deception. Such an attitude makes the concessions in the Report for consultative procedures and decentralized authority appear to be mere empty gestures, not necessary conditions to viable policy. Somehow or other the revealing and candid recognition early in the Report that Trustee actions were primarily actuated by a drive to change the system in an a priori "right" way before vested interests coalesced and the capacity to resist unwise changes developed never penetrated the total analysis.

The attitude of the Trustees seems to have been that changes should be made at a time of change, when system-wide operations are fresh and new, and patterns not yet fixed. (Report, p. 4)

Most of the educational policy decisions that have been made by the Chancellor and the Trustees over the past three years and which have resulted in disillusionment sufficient to produce the Ad Hoc Report are not a part of the past. Attention to them would serve primarily to document the case that ill-considered

procedures lead to non-acceptable policy and to systemwide friction. To delineate the disparity between the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations and college reports several issues can serve as examples leaving more extensive analysis of educational policy to those who might care to read the original documents. This latter course of action is strongly recommended to those in responsible positions, for the candid, incisive, constructive criticisms developed by the individual colleges under crash circumstances and the essential concurrence of these reports on basic points is impressive.

Example #1:

The Master Curricular Plan was severely criticized by the colleges, yet the Ad Hoc Committee admits only to a procedural deficiency in developing the Plan.

Example #2:

Recommendation #42 of the Ad Hoc Committee assumes mistakenly that the only error in the Trustee's teacher education policy stems from one unfortunate attempt to restrict the units in academic majors and minors as well as professional education. Disclaimer of intent to restrict only the units in professional education and a temporary suspension of this offending clause was expected to produce harmony in the ranks. As college report after report substantiates, this was not the perception of the colleges. They saw the "guidelines" as primarily aimed at restricting college initiative and creativity in this area so as to placate the State Board of Education. Disclaimers of this intent did not satisfy the colleges, and certainly Recommendation #42 of the Ad Hoc Report, concluding as it does with the phrase "within the guidelines established by the Board of Trustees" and hinting at future guidelines, does not persuade that the Chancellor and the Trustees have profited from this incident.

Nor will Recommendation #43 quiet the criticisms voiced by the college reports. The colleges, and the Statewide Academic Senate, asked for freedom to structure their teacher education policies according to the needs of prospective teachers as determined by an all-college group. Recommendation #43, responding to the persistent criticism that the Chancellor and the Trustees have displayed no desire to face outward and fend off the pressures from the Legislature, the State Board of Education, and the State Department of Education, restricts such a protective role to resisting coercion primarily from the State Board of Education, and then only if attempts are made to influence the "content of majors and minors." Apparently they see the content of general education or professional education as best determined by such outside agencies.

Example #3:

Although the inadequate support for such basic programs as research, masters programs and prospective joint-doctoral curricula cause con-

sistent dissatisfaction to the individual colleges which is documented in their reports, slight attention is given to these major problems. The Ad Hoc analysis of the policy for year-round operation fails to take into account the basic educational objections of most colleges to this Chancellor-Trustee decision. It is a prime example of the defensive attitude that permeates the Report and frequently distorts facts and issues.

Example #4:

The standard statement presented over the years on the topic of the proper role of the applied fields in the State College system has supported "balanced development." The actions of the Trustees and the Chancellor's office, however, have left the impression at many colleges that a minor role is the actual trend and desire. One college comments as follows:

The (college) has been somewhat concerned from time to time by what might become a habit of dividing the academic world up into the "good guys" and the "bad guys." Education, home economics, industrial arts, journalism, certain phases of engineering, etc., like all other programs, may be meritorious or bad, reasonable in cost or unreasonable, and full of solid material from basic disciplines or vacuous.

...An irony of the recent development of the California State Colleges is that in important respects they may be going counter to the main movement of American culture and perhaps even to some serious needs of the people they are supposed to serve. Grave concerns to recent Presidents of the United States and other leaders are (1) school dropouts, (2) vocational displacement owing to automation, and (3) the "hidden" poor, whom the benefits of the affluent society do not reach.

...The state colleges seem now to be devaluing and disassociating themselves from the production of teachers in these crucial specialties.

The Ad Hoc Report took cognizance of the concerted criticism by again simply recognizing a "balanced development."

Example #5:

Probably the most all-embracing concern developed in the college reports is stated as follows:

There is a conviction that the State Colleges have in fact been relegated by the Master Plan, as it is being administered, to a second-class, as well as to a secondary role in public higher education in California, despite a legislative mandate to the contrary.

As an appropriate solution to this dilemma, this college recommends:

It behooves the Board and the Chancellor to spell out the needs of the system, and to insist on nothing less than equality with the University of California for comparable missions.

If they are met, as in the past, with sympathy and inaction, it behooves them to resign in protest to dramatize the crisis. Let them explain to the public, through the press, why they have resigned. Let them point out from experience the wisdom of investment in excellent education and the folly of false economy in this area.

Or, if they are willing to continue as before, let them frankly concede that excellence is not a realistic goal. And let them recognize that this honest admission will invite concerned faculty and students to respond by going elsewhere.

The broad statement of the problem encompasses all of the deep concerns in the system over such educational problems as graduate work, research opportunities, and quality of undergraduate education. The suggested solution did not fall within the charge of the Ad Hoc Committee. But recent Chancellor-Trustee actions in going to the public to explain the relationship between excellent education and adequate finances would indicate an acceptance of this grave responsibility.

5. Fiscal Planning

The Ad Hoc Report deals with most of the fiscal matters presented to the committee by the various colleges; line item budgets, delays in processing, adequate contingency funds, salary savings, etc. However, there are some items where additional stress would seem to be warranted even though there may have been only one or two colleges making the complaint. Unquestionably one of the most serious problems in the eyes of the faculties is the determination of educational policy by the Department of Finance. It would seem that the final report should indicate that the Trustees of the California State Colleges have a major responsibility to put an end to this distortion of educational aims and values.

It is further indicated in the complaints of the faculties that the Chancellor's Office also has allowed fiscal factors to limit and control educational aims. In the specific case of the joint-doctorate, it has been bitterly resented by the faculties that proposals for this degree are being seriously considered while funds are inadequate even for the present masters' program. Until and unless the present graduate program is fully supported, there seems to be no financial possibility of attempting to invoke the joint-doctorate.

Another area where the faculties appear to feel that there has been a lack of fiscal responsibility has been in respect to the analysis of actual costs of operation for the year-round program. This is, also, omitted in the Report presented by the Ad Hoc Committee.

An area of concern that is not mentioned in the Report, but which shows in present operations, is the failure to delegate fiscal responsibilities. The Chancellor's Office has fought hard to gain certain privileges from the Department of Finance. Yet this same staff appears to be just as reticent in delegating responsibility to the colleges as has Finance to them. This delegation of fiscal responsibility is just as important for effective operation, for the development of autonomy, and for the educational effectiveness of the colleges as any other responsibilities.

In this same vein, it is to be noted that fiscal actions by the Chancellor's staff often appear to be highly arbitrary. In many cases budget modifications have been openly stated as being based upon "what Finance would accept" rather than upon educational values. It is essential that persons dealing with budgets not only have experience in academic institutions, but that they understand and appreciate that educational values are primary. It is important as well that they consider college budgets in terms of over-all balance rather than arbitrarily deleting individual items without regard for the imbalance thus created. And, it is imperative that these persons offer college officials an opportunity to re-balance their budgets when cuts do seem to be undeniably essential. Lastly, college officials should participate with members of the Chancellor's staff when readjustments in their budgets are to be considered by Finance, as was their privilege in the past.

There are a number of other minor points. However, what seems to be most significant is that the recommendations, while suitable as far as they go, are not adequate to convey the seriousness of fiscal problems nor the broad reach of these throughout the various elements of the system. No area needs complete overhaul more than this, and the range extends from the highest governmental bodies down to faculty level.

II. MISCELLANEOUS

Reference is made to the questions and concerns of the faculties of many of the State Colleges over the proposal for a joint-doctorate under the Master Plan. The prerequisites to a sound doctoral program are basic to its success. With this thought in mind the Academic Senate has recommended:

"That...its Educational Policies Committee...undertake or direct an immediate study of such factors as faculty assigned time, library facilities, materials and resources, and other factors prerequisite to any strong graduate programs; and that the Academic Senate inform the several Colleges of this study and invite their respective Academic Senates or Academic Councils to undertake similar consideration at each institution; and that the Chancellor be requested to join with the Academic Senate and the several college faculties in formulating recommendations which will be mutually acceptable." (See: Report on Actions Taken by Chancellor and Trustees on Senate Motions and Recommendations at Meetings of Oct. 8-9, 1964...Jan. 7-8, 1965 - Report No. 2 dated March 2, 1965)

"Action Taken: Proposal accepted by the Chancellor."

III. ANALYSIS OF AD HOC REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Academic Senate accepts the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Report with the exception of those enumerated below for which considered modifications or appropriate substitutions have been indicated. In each instance the original recommendation(s) of the Ad Hoc Report will be quoted in full and followed by the modified or substituted recommendation of the Academic Senate:

Recommendations 1 and 9 (See pages 13 and 17)

1. The consultative roles of the various segments within the system as set forth in Section IV of this report be formally adopted.
9. The following procedures recently instituted by fully implemented:
 - (a) The Chancellor submits to the Board all recommendations of the Senate that are developed in consultation with members of his staff and which the Academic Senate requests him to submit;
 - (b) when the Chancellor does not accept a particular Senate recommendation, an attempt is made to reconcile differing views through further consultation before the recommendation is presented to the Board;
 - (c) when the Board of Trustees proposes to take action that differs substantively from the recommendation of the Academic Senate on a given matter along lines not previously considered by the Senate, the Board refers the recommendation involved back to the Senate or its representatives, through the Chancellor, for additional advice.

In place of Recommendations #1 and #9 of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee, the Academic Senate recommends the following consultative procedure:

1. The Chancellor shall present to the Academic Senate full and timely information on all policy matters and on such other matters as he deems advisable so that the Academic Senate may recommend to him and to the Board of Trustees.
2. In those areas where the Board of Trustees have delegated functions of policy decision to the Chancellor, the Chancellor shall refer back to the Academic Senate for reconsideration those of its policy recommendations with which he dissents. After such reconsideration, should the Chancellor still dissent, he shall act in accordance with his own best judgment and, in writing, notify the Academic Senate of his action and his reasons for such action.
3. In those areas where the Board of Trustees retain functions of policy decision, the Chancellor shall submit to the Board all policy recommendations and other communications which the Academic Senate requests him to submit. The Chancellor may,

when he desires, request further consultation with the Senate or its officers, or he may refer back to the Academic Senate any recommendation on which he desires further consideration. After such consultation or reconsideration, should the Senate once again submit recommendations on the same matter, the Chancellor shall submit such recommendations to the Board of Trustees. The Chancellor may, of course, transmit his own recommendation differing from or contrary to those of the Academic Senate.

4. When the Board proposes, on a given matter, to take action that differs substantially from the recommendations of the Academic Senate, the Board shall normally refer the recommendations through the Chancellor, back to the Senate or its Executive Committee for additional consideration and recommendation.

The Academic Senate commends to the attention of the Trustees the rationale of this procedure as outlined on pages 5 and 6 of the Preliminary Report of the Special Committee, which strongly stresses the necessity for prior consultation on the entire spectrum of affairs in the state college system.

Recommendation 11 (see page 18)

11. The Chancellor, in consultation with the Chancellor's Council of Presidents and the Academic Senate, seek to determine what form of relationship between the two groups will give optimum support to the consultation and policy formulation processes of the California State Colleges, and also study methods for achieving this relationship.

In place of Recommendation #11 of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee, the Academic Senate recommends that the analysis of Messrs. Mathy and McClatchy in the Appendix of the Ad Hoc Report, and that the implied recommendations of Mr. McCallum that the Council of Presidents and Academic Senate seek to develop a single policy-recommending body be implemented in the following manner:

The Council of Presidents shall continue to meet, but only as a staff or cabinet meeting on administrative matters and an informal policy-formulating group. All policy-recommendations shall, however, be routed through the Academic Senate, which shall constitute the single, final policy-recommending body. To insure full participation of the College Presidents in deliberation of the Academic Senate, the College Presidents shall elect 5 of their number to be seated as full, voting members of the Academic Senate.

The Academic Senate accepts all of the recommendations regarding communication in the Ad Hoc Report. However, it appends the following statements and recommendations representing additional important considerations.

One of the shibboleths of American life today is the epithet "failure of communications." There is a tendency to blame communications for lack of success, to ascribe conflict to misunderstanding or semantic lesion, to attribute

opposition to lack of information. But close examination often demonstrates that what is described as "lack of communication" is far more than mechanical failure but, rather, an unwillingness to trust others, a grasping for power, and a misunderstanding of role.

Specifically, the Academic Senate recommends:

1. That all communication of a substantive, regulatory or action nature be confirmed promptly in writing;
2. That insofar as possible, the Chancellor's staff establish a master schedule of annual informational needs which may be employed by the colleges, the Chancellor and the Trustees to permit long range planning and to avoid duplication of effort;
3. That communication and interpretation of the system to the public, the press and the Legislature be academically oriented; that there be less effort to ingratiate, and greater attempts to inform in terms of facts;
4. That the communications coming from the Chancellor to the college faculty come from academically oriented staff capable of quality leadership comparable to the best to be found at the individual colleges;
5. That insofar as possible, and to a total degree, unless need is demonstrable, the decision making processes and internal operations of the local Colleges shall be held on the level of the local Colleges; that communication shall flow to and from the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees as needed; but that every use by the Chancellor of regulatory communications mandating similarity of instructional and operational practices shall be evaluated in terms of its tendency to unnecessarily centralize control;
6. That it is axiomatic that a far-flung system such as the California State Colleges will have at its disposal a clear, direct, and efficient system of communications. Certainly the mechanics of such a system must include, in addition to the slow U.S. mails, a system of leased telephone lines connecting the Chancellor's Office and the several Colleges, particularly those distant from Inglewood.

Recommendation 21 (See page 23)

21. Statewide policies and standards be adopted only when it is clearly better to have decisions in a given area made on this basis rather than on the basis of individual College policies or administrative judgment.

The Academic Senate recommends that statewide policies and standards be adopted only when there is agreement among the colleges, the Academic Senate,

the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Trustees that decisions made on this basis would be more efficacious than on the basis of individual college policies and administrative judgment.

Items A - F (See pages 21-22)

In the continuing discussion of the centralization-autonomy issue, certain considerations affecting delegation should be noted:

- A. Wherever time-consuming and unnecessary paperwork appears to clog communications, the matter may well be one for delegation.
- B. The development of curricula has always been deemed to be delegated to the Colleges. The controls imposed by the Colleges' master plans, over-all in character, are for the benefits of the orderly development of the system and do not impose undue restrictions.
- C. Where the policy is clear and responsibility can be fixed, fiscal and personnel decisions should be delegated to the Colleges.
- D. Long experience and a sound administrative record in a College should facilitate delegation.
- E. Final authority for a given matter can be placed only in the hands of personnel who can be held accountable for the way it is exercised.
- F. It is important that the quality of local decisions be demonstrable, for otherwise the practice of extensive delegation would be difficult to justify to legislative and fiscal officers of the state and to the public as well, particularly when a local decision is subject to criticism.

The Academic Senate notes that the items enumerated as A - F do not have the status of recommendations but do have recommendatory force. It should be noted that Items A - F are in basic conflict with the position taken by the Academic Senate in its statement on Centralization, Delegation and Administration.

Recommendation 22 (See page 24)

- 22. In the delegation of authority to the Colleges, the objective should not be total delegation but rather the optimum level which supports local initiative and individuality but does not impair essential systemwide policies.

The Academic Senate recommends that in the delegation of authority to the colleges, the objective should be as nearly total delegation as possible.

Systemwide policies and procedures should be instituted when their existence will serve to foster local initiative and individuality, as when there is mutual agreement that a systemwide approach is necessary to reach an objective which delegation of authority cannot achieve.

Recommendation 25 (See page 25)

25. The Academic Senate continue to be recognized as the official systemwide voice of the faculty to act in a consultative and advisory manner to the Chancellor in the formulation of systemwide policies, particularly in the area of academic policy and professional status.

In place of Recommendation #25 of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee, the Academic Senate recommends that:

The Academic Senate be recognized as the official systemwide voice of the State Colleges to recommend policy to the Chancellor and to the Board of Trustees and to make policy in those areas delegated to it by the Chancellor and the Trustees.

Recommendation 28 (See page 26)

28. Regular consultative channels be used by all persons and groups within the system, including use by the faculty of local senates and the Statewide Academic Senate, both for advancement of proposals and for resolution of problems.

The Academic Senate accepts recommendation 28 but adds that it is recognized, however, that faculty or staff organizations, as independent organization drawing their membership from the personnel of the colleges, cannot be expected to express their views only through regular consultative channels.

Recommendation 29 and 30 (See page 27)

29. The staff positions in the Chancellor's Office be increased in number and certain positions be raised in classification. (The 1965-66 budget request of the California State Colleges moves in this direction.)
30. Adequate staffing must be available both in the Chancellor's Office and in the Colleges to meet increasing requests for information and analyses made by the Coordinating Council and other outside agencies.

The Academic Senate acknowledges that the problems of staffing and of organization of the Chancellor's Office are indeed serious and demand immediate attention. Yet there should not be haste in augmenting staff before Management and Educational Surveys determined (1) which tasks assumed by the Chancellor's staff properly fall within their purview or that of the Chancellor's Office itself, (2) which demands for gathering of information and for production of reports

internal or external may be considered legitimate, (3) and which positions call for specially trained, experienced, or educationally oriented personnel other than those already on the staff. Most importantly, the problems of centralization and delegation must be in large measure solved before staff augmentation, lest Parkinsonian expansion and hardening of administrative arteries set in prematurely to retain and increase unnecessary centralization and control to the detriment of educational excellence.

The Report raises the question of staff time consumed in facilitating consultation rather than in staff research and analysis. Such a question demonstrates in its very posing a lack of understanding of the real nature of better research and leadership. Consultation is in large measure a basic part of staff research and analysis. And consultation offers an unparalleled opportunity for the kind of educational direction detailed in the section of the Preliminary Report, Centralization, Delegation, and Administration.

In place of recommendations 29 and 30, the Academic Senate recommends that the proposed Management and Educational Surveys be completed before permanent augmentation of the Chancellor's staff. During the interval prior to the Surveys, the Senate suggests the use of college experts as recommended in items 33 and 34. (See page 28)

Recommendation 31 (See page 28)

31. Additional steps be taken to clarify and coordinate the work of the Chancellor's Office and the Colleges, including a professional study of the operations of the system.

The Academic Senate submits the following resolution addressed to this subject:

WHEREAS, The Report (March, 1965) of the Ad Hoc Committee on Development of Policies and Administrative Procedures recommends that "Additional steps be taken to clarify and coordinate the work of the Chancellor's Office and the Colleges, including a professional study of the operations of the system";* and

WHEREAS, The Report further states that "Adequate staffing must be available both in the Chancellor's Office and in the Colleges..."; and

WHEREAS, The finest of academic leadership, academic plans and educational philosophies may be frustrated by inadequate staffing and inefficient procedures; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State Colleges requests the Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges to make immediate request to the Legislature of California for funds for a Management Survey and an Educational Survey of the Office of the Chancellor, together with such related surveys of the operations of the State Colleges as may be re-

quired; and be it further

RESOLVED: That such a Management Survey should be conducted by a private management consulting firm which has had substantial previous experience in surveys of higher education, and that the Educational Survey be conducted by distinguished educators drawn from the field of Higher Education; and be it finally

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State Colleges be consulted both as to the selection of the consulting firm in the Management Survey and as to the consultants to the Educational Survey.

(Approved by the Academic Senate, C.S.C., May 1, 1965)

*Italics added

Recommendation 37 (See page 33)

37. Academic decision-making on matters of systemwide concern take into account the aspirations of the individual colleges.

The Academic Senate recommends that Number 37 be altered to read:

Academic decision-making on matters of systemwide concern be guided by the aspirations of the individual colleges.

Recommendation 42 and 43 (See page 35)

42. Experimentation and adaptation to local needs in the development of teacher education programs on each campus be encouraged, within guidelines established by the Board of Trustees.
43. The content of majors and minors be determined by the individual Colleges and not by outside agencies, including the State Board of Education.

The Academic Senate recommends that its policy on teacher education developed and approved in November, 1963 be made the official policy of the California State Colleges.

Recommendation 41 (See page 34)

41. Balanced development of both the liberal arts and the applied fields in the context of today's complex society be supported.

The Academic Senate recommends that the relationship of applied and liberal arts curricula be the subject of a comprehensive study so that the term "balanced development" used in Recommendation #41 and in other documents may be supplanted by a complete and rational plan and policy for relative development of applied and liberal arts curricula in the several State Colleges.

Recommendation 44 (See page 38)

44. The Department of Finance permit the Board of Trustees, within broad policies, to:

- (a) Transfer funds between budget categories;
- (b) establish a contingency reserve fund to cover costs of excess enrollment and other unanticipated expenses, with authority given to the Trustees to transfer funds into this fund from any other account;
- (c) authorize one or two colleges to operate under a program budget during the 1966-67 fiscal year;
- (d) establish the State College operating budget under a single appropriation for the entire system;
- (e) reduce salary-savings requirements to a reasonable level;
- (f) approve budget transactions relating to appointment of personnel and establishment of new positions;
- (g) delegate to the Colleges decisions relating to sabbatical leaves, appointment of faculty at advanced salary steps, and reclassifications of positions within available funds (when adequate guidelines are developed);
- (h) operate within the guidelines of administrative reorganization adopted by the Board of Trustees and approve adjustments in staffing and in position level indicated by these guidelines, within available funds; and
- (i) enter into contracts in excess of \$1000 (the existing limitation) involving procurement of services and/or materials when such contracts have been previously approved as to form for general content.

(Some of these changes may require legislative action.)

The Academic Senate accepts recommendation 44. It add, however, that:

The Board of Trustees **should** extend to the several State Colleges the same principles of fiscal flexibility which it currently seeks from the State Department of Finance.

Recommendation 46 (See page 39)

46. As soon as possible, all local personnel decisions, except for appointment of College presidents and the approval of appointments of vice-presidents and major deans, be made at the College level.

The Academic Senate recommends that 46 be altered to read:

As soon as possible, all local personnel decisions, except for the appointment of College presidents, be made at the College level.

Finally, the Academic Senate recommends for the consideration of the State College Board of Trustees a general attitude or posture which in effect:

1. Makes the primary function of the State College Board of Trustees that of establishing basic policy for the State College System.
2. Makes a corollary function of the Trustees one of looking outward from the College System toward the people of the State, the Governor, the Legislature, the Coordinating Council, the State Board of Education and all other external agencies which work with or affect the operation of the State Colleges.
3. Makes the primary function of the Chancellor, the Academic Senate and the Council of State College Presidents that of recommending policy along lines previously described; and on the part of the Chancellor and Presidents, the functions of administrative control of the Colleges.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty-Staff Council

FROM: Curriculum and Instruction Committee

SUBJECT: Monthly Report

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE

San Luis Obispo

- I. The Chairman of the Faculty-Staff Council has relayed to the Curriculum and Instruction Committee a request from President McPhee asking

- (1) what, if any, changes the faculty feels are essential to make in the General Education list for the 1966-67 catalog, and
- (2) is there a consensus among the faculty that the general education pattern and course lists need extensive revision for the 1967-68 catalog?

It is anticipated that the 1966-67 catalog material will be put in final form before the end of November.

The committee proposes the following reply to President McPhee:

- (1) The Faculty-Staff Council does not feel that it is essential to make changes in the General Education list for the 1966-67 catalog (except for routine corrections of changed course numbers).
- (2) The Curriculum and Instruction Committee of the Faculty-Staff Council will review the entire list of General Education courses with the intention of preparing a report in time for Council and administrative consideration of possible additions or other changes in the 1967-68 catalog.

- II. It has been called to the attention of the committee that the Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges plans an extra day for its January meeting which would be devoted to a discussion of education policy especially concerning the diversity of curricula. Some faculty representation will be invited -- anyone may attend.

The committee suggests that the Cal Poly faculty should be represented at this meeting.

- III. The greatest part of the work of the committee during the past year has been the study of proposed changes in the college catalog. Since the Faculty-Staff Council recommendations on these changes were forwarded to the President in June, final decisions have been, or soon must be, made on these proposals to permit completion of the catalog copy in November. It would be helpful to the committee if the Faculty-Staff Council could receive a report early in the year on these decisions.

The committee proposes that the Faculty-Staff Council suggest to the President that it would facilitate the work of the Council if information about the catalog decisions could be forwarded to the Council as soon as is convenient.

M E M O

To: Dr. Glen Noble, Chairman, Faculty-Staff Council Date: 9/29/65
From: M. Gold, Chairman, Facilities and Fiscal Affairs Comm.
Subject: Study of Possible Work Week Changes in Various
Service Offices

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE

SAN LUIS OBISPO CAMPUS

Last May the Facilities and Fiscal Affairs Committee was charged with studying possible changes in the work week for various service offices on this campus. This charge had arisen from requests of faculty members to have some of these offices kept open during the lunch hour. Preliminary investigation revealed that staffing on Saturday mornings and the distribution of work load throughout the week was also involved.

To collect as complete a picture of the situation as possible the Committee:

1. Distributed a questionnaire concerning the need for keeping offices open, services required and possible usage.
2. Interviewed those in charge of the various offices concerning
 - a. An extension of office hours to cover the lunch period,
 - b. Staffing on Saturday mornings,
 - c. The gains and/or drawbacks from such action.
3. Gathered some data on the number of personnel available to meet the $5\frac{1}{2}$ day week, and the work load on Saturday morning.
4. After study of the above 3 items requested a meeting with the Adm. to discuss the problem further.
5. Met with Vice-President Kennedy and J. Landreth (Personnel and Business Management Specialist) and apparently reached an agreement that it was a function of the line administration and would best be handled by them. Further study by the Administration before any action would be taken was assumed by the Committee to be necessary.
6. Agreed among themselves to let the Administration investigate and initiate such action as they felt advisable before continuing any action themselves.

As 2 months have elapsed since the meeting above (5) with no indication of administrative action it is now proposed that an Ad Hoc Committee composed of some members of the previous Facilities and Fiscal Affairs Committee; representatives of the Faculty-Staff Personnel Committees (Academic and non-Academic) and other appropriate personnel be appointed to further study the situation.

July 2, 1965

Dr. Glenn Noble, Chairman
Faculty-Staff Council
California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo, California

Dear Dr. Noble:

This will acknowledge your letter of June 9 in which you transmitted the recommendations adopted by the Faculty-Staff Council at its final meeting of the year on June 8. Because of the many activities during the final week of school, coupled with local campus and Chancellor's office budget hearings, it has not been possible for me to respond until this time.

My response to the recommendations as enumerated in your letter is as follows:

1. The Council of State College Presidents, members of the Chancellor's staff and others have been working very hard all during the Legislative Session to improve the salary situation within the state colleges. Because of the confusion surrounding the final week of the session, and the Special Session of the Legislature just concluded yesterday, it is not yet known exactly what salary increases will be granted. You and the Faculty-Staff Council should know, however, that every attempt was made to include the Librarians in the category of teaching faculty for whatever pay raises are approved.
2. The report of the Curriculum and Instruction Committee will be reviewed in detail by the Cabinet sub-committee on Catalog which reviews all catalog proposals for the entire college. I know that the recommendations of the Faculty-Staff Council, as in the past, will be given careful consideration during this review. When final decisions on catalog proposals are made, a report on the actions taken on the Faculty-Staff Council recommendations will be provided for you.

3. As you indicated in your letter, a copy of this recommendation has already been forwarded to the committee responsible for planning the Fall Staff Conference and I am sure that this committee will carefully consider the recommendations set forth in the Communications Committee report. In regard to the last item relating to the series of open-houses for new faculty, I would be more than pleased to arrange such meetings. However, because of the nature of these activities and because we will continue to hold the President's Reception, I would prefer to arrange such affairs in my Conference Room in the Administration Building. These details can be worked out, however, after the opening of the school year in September.
4. We appreciate the fact that the Faculty-Staff Council wishes to work with the administratively-organized research committee in developing and encouraging an atmosphere conducive to "research and creative activity." We are also appreciative of the report's statement that "encouragement should be given to a balanced program of research and creative activity consistent with Cal Poly's philosophy and objectives..."

The words "balanced" and "consistent", which I underlined, are important concepts to our understanding of what we should be emphasizing within the area of our operations. Although we have a set of "Research Guidelines" which I approved following the Faculty-Staff Council's review and recommendation, a review of those guidelines indicates that they could be interpreted differently by different persons. We definitely want our "research and creative activity" to be balanced in the sense of not having all such projects being initiated by faculty in one department which could have several disadvantages that need not be discussed here.

We are even more concerned that the "research and creative activities" be consistent with Cal Poly's philosophy and objectives. I would interpret this to mean that such activities should fall into the categories of special studies designed to provide better application of known principles and laws that will be practically useful to our own students, to our own faculty, to our college, and to the occupational fields for which we educate young men and women. In other words, I do not believe we should be attempting any research or studies designed to generate new, basic knowledge not heretofore available to experts in the respective disciplines concerned. We should, however, concentrate on "research and creative activity" designed to improve our own capacity as an institution of higher education which places first priority upon the teaching function.

Because I'm not certain, as yet, that everyone on the faculty would agree with what is meant by the phrase "consistent with the philosophy and objectives of Cal Poly," I feel it is important that our administratively approved research committee continue its operational function of screening and recommending research projects. Until we have more experience in handling such proposals, the guidelines are

only general statements which can be interpreted in different ways. During this next year, I hope that we can further clarify the guidelines with examples of interpretations which will be more meaningful to many people.

We currently are having several members of the staff investigate possible Federal support of different types of investigative studies. I would hope that faculty members who are aware of possible sources of outside funds for "research and creative activity" will report these to Mr. Tom Dunigan, Director of Institutional Studies.

My comments above can be construed as general agreement on several key points in the Faculty-Staff Council's Research Committee report. Since I do not consider the one paragraph statement a deviation from the existing "Research Guidelines," I do not see that an endorsement of the statement by me is either needed or appropriate. May I suggest that if the Faculty-Staff Council wants my action on such an item, that the Research Committee prepare it in a form that would clearly indicate its relation as an addition or amendment to the previously approved guidelines statement.

I appreciate very much the thoughtful consideration which the Faculty-Staff Council and its committees have given to these important segments of the College's operations and future. I am also confident that under the leadership of you and your fellow officers that activities of the Faculty-Staff Council next year will be both constructive and helpful to the total college program.

Sincerely,

Julian A. McPhee
President

July 9, 1965

Dr. Glenn Noble, Chairman
Faculty-Staff Council
California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo, California

Dear Dr. Noble:

This is a belated follow-up to my April 30 letter to you in which I acknowledged receipt of your letter of April 22 with which you transmitted the recommendations of the Faculty-Staff Council on three separate items. As you will recall, in my April 30 letter I indicated that I had not had time to study the proposals recommended to me by the Faculty-Staff Council. I have now had an opportunity to review the recommendations and would comment as follows:

1. Master of Science Degree in Biology.

Your letter indicated that the Faculty-Staff Council had almost unanimously approved the recommendation of the Curriculum and Instruction Committee that the proposed master of science degree in Biology be forwarded to me for my endorsement. The proposal to establish a master of science degree in Biology is currently being processed through regular line channels. When it reaches me with the recommendations of the various individuals and groups responsible for the evaluation of such proposed new curricula, I will certainly carefully consider the recommendation of the Faculty-Staff Council. Since this is the first proposal for a subject-matter master's degree, I feel that we must carefully review all of the ramifications.

2. Non-Academic Salary Matters.

Your letter indicated that the Faculty-Staff Council had recommended the report of your Facilities and Fiscal Affairs Committee that the Chancellor's office give equitable time and attention both to staff and faculty matters. I have written to the Chancellor's office several times and have discussed with members of the Chancellor's staff the importance of providing non-academic staff with equal opportunities to be consulted on matters that

July 9, 1965
Dr. Glenn Noble

- 2 -

pertain to their welfare. I will use the resolution which was passed by the Faculty-Staff Council as the basis of another attempt on my part to obtain more attention to non-academic staff matters by the Chancellor's office. I will send you a copy of this correspondence as soon as it is sent.

3. Teaching Service Area.

We will use the report of the Teaching Service Areas Ad Hoc Committee which was approved by the Faculty-Staff Council as the basis for a policy and procedure statement to be developed for the Employees' Handbook. This policy and procedure statement will be processed for inclusion in the Handbook in accordance with the usual steps which we follow in amending the Handbook. Copies of this Handbook insertion will be sent to you as soon as it is available.

I hope these follow-up actions to your latest Faculty-Staff Council recommendations will be satisfactory. I want to apologize for the delay in reacting to these recommendations; however, the pressures of the last two months made it impossible to do otherwise.

Sincerely,

Julian A. McPhee
President

cc: Robert E. Kennedy
Dale W. Andrews

CONSTITUTION -- FACULTY-STAFF COUNCIL

PREAMBLE

We, the faculty and staff members of California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo campus, adopt this Constitution for the purpose of establishing a representative council in conformance with the policy adopted by the Trustees of the California State Colleges which:

Encourages, in general, the maximum delegation of responsibilities to release responsible initiative within the colleges.

Encourages, in academic affairs, the use of democratic processes which involve faculty consultation in policy making.

Encourages, in student activities and student affairs, the use of appropriate democratic procedures for policy making.

Requires that a representative body be established at each college with such powers and duties as the Trustees may in each instance approve.

This Constitution and By-Laws have been developed to assure optimum contribution by all individuals to the objectives of the college as defined by the Education Code of the State of California:

"22606. The primary function of the state colleges is the provision of instruction for undergraduate students and graduate students through the master's degree in liberal arts and sciences, in applied fields and in the professions, including the teaching profession. Presently established two-year programs in agriculture are authorized, but other two-year programs shall be authorized only when mutually agreed upon by the Trustees of the State College System and the State Board of Education. The doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the University of California. Faculty research is authorized to the extent that it is consistent with the primary function of the state colleges and the facilities provided for that function."

"24751. In addition to the functions provided by Section 22606, the California State Polytechnic College shall be authorized to emphasize the applied fields of agriculture, engineering, business, home economics and other occupational and professional fields. This section shall be liberally construed."

ARTICLE I

Name

Section 1. The name of this organization shall be the Faculty-Staff Council of the California State Polytechnic College, hereinafter referred to as the Council.

ARTICLE II

Objectives

Section 1. The objectives of the Council are:

- a. To provide official representation for all members of the faculty and staff of the College in matters which affect the general welfare of the College and its educational purposes and effectiveness.

- b. To initiate policy and procedural recommendations to the President of the College. The Council may recommend policy on, but not be limited to, the following:
 - (1) Curriculum - To provide advice in the formulation of educational policy and procedures including but not limited to curriculum and criteria for the granting of degrees. To review established and proposed educational policies and procedures.
 - (2) Students - To provide advice in the formulation of policies and procedures related to admissions, guidance, student activities and affairs.
 - (3) Facilities - To provide advice in the formulation of policies and procedures related to College buildings, grounds, and equipment.
 - (4) Personnel - To provide advice in the formulation of personnel policy including but not limited to selection, leaves, tenure, grievances, termination of employment, and promotion.
- c. To receive proposals from faculty and staff members related to policies and procedures - To provide an alternative means other than administrative channels for receiving proposals on policies and procedures from faculty and staff members and to recommend action on such matters to the President of the College.
- d. To provide consultative services to the President of the College - The Council will consider all matters referred to it by the President.
- e. Communications - To serve as a channel through which information of College-wide interest and concern may be freely collected, disseminated, and discussed by faculty and staff members.
- f. Professional ethics - To serve as a means of review and recommendation regarding professional ethics.

ARTICLE III

Membership

Section 1. Ex-officio members shall be:

- a. The Dean of the College (1) 1
- b. The Heads of the Divisions of Agriculture, Applied Arts, Applied Sciences, Engineering, Business Management, and Student Personnel 6

Section 2. Elected Members:

- a. Elected members of the Council shall be elected from the tenured faculty and staff of the College and from the employees of the College auxiliary enterprises. All faculty and staff members shall be eligible to vote in such election.

BY-LAWS

California State Polytechnic College Faculty-Staff Council - San Luis Obispo Campus

Section 1 - MEMBERSHIP (Article III)

- a. Ex-officio representatives shall be voting representatives, and shall have all other rights accorded representatives of a democratic organization including the right to voting membership on committees, the right to participate in Council discussions and the right to make a motion or second a motion leading to Council action on an issue.
- b. Elected members shall be tenured employees of the college and employees of the college auxiliary enterprises. They shall have all of the rights and privileges accorded members of a democratic organization...
 - (1) The Chairman of the Council shall appoint an Election Committee during the month of April each year that shall be responsible for announcing openings for three-year terms of office to those divisions and departments of the college where vacancies for representatives will occur. They shall conduct an election to fill all vacancies during the month of May.

Section 2 - OFFICERS (Article IV)

- a. The Chairman, Vice Chairman, and Secretary of the Council shall be elected in March of each year for one-year terms of office by and from among the representatives of the Council.
- b. An Election Committee appointed by the Chairman shall make nominations of officers and provide for receiving further nominations from representatives at a meeting of the Council.
- c. To be eligible for nomination and election as Chairman, Vice Chairman, or Secretary, a representative must already have been elected by his division or department for membership to the Council during the year in which he would be holding office.
- d. It shall be the responsibility of the Chairman to conduct all meetings of the Council, appoint special committees, serve as chairman of the Agenda Committee, and serve as the representative of the Faculty-Staff Council upon call by the President of the College of the Council membership. He shall be a non-voting member of all committees of the Council.
- e. Vice Chairman - It shall be the responsibility of the Vice Chairman to serve in the capacity of the Chairman during his absence.
- f. It shall be the responsibility of the Secretary to record the minutes of all Council meetings, provide copies of the minutes of all meetings to representatives, provide written notices of meetings to representatives and handle correspondence of the Council. The Secretary shall also record the minutes of the Agenda Committee.

Section 3 - ORGANIZATION (Article V)

- a. Standing Committees, with the exception of the Agenda Committee, shall each have five members selected from among the representatives with other non-voting members from the faculty and staff-at-large appointed by the Chairman of the committees for consultative purposes as needed.
- b. The Chairman and the voting members of each Standing Committee, unless otherwise provided for by this Constitution and By-Laws, shall be appointed by the Council Chairman and approved by the Agenda Committee.
- c. The Chairman of the Council shall be Chairman of the Agenda Committee. The Secretary of the Council shall be secretary of the Agenda Committee. The Vice Chairman is also a member of the Agenda Committee. There shall be four other members of the Agenda Committee elected by secret ballot by representatives of the Council during the month of March of each year. The Election Committee shall make nominations of members for the Agenda Committee and provide for receiving further nominations from representatives at a meeting of the Council.
- d. The Agenda Committee shall make recommendations designed to expedite the business of the Council. It shall meet prior to every meeting of the Council and shall prepare an appropriate agenda.
- e. Special Committees shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Council. The Chairman of a Special Committee shall be a member of the council. Other members of a Special Committee may be members of the Council or they may be selected from the college faculty and staff-at-large.
- f. The chairman of each standing committee shall submit monthly written reports to the Chairman of the Faculty-Staff Council for distribution with each agenda.
 - (1) Proposals for Faculty-Staff Council recommendations to the President of the College
 - (2) A statement of other actions taken by the committee. (Confidential items shall be summarized as completely as is proper.)
 - (3) A list of subjects currently under study by the committee.

Section 4 - MEETINGS (Article VI)

- a. Regular meetings shall be held on the second Tuesday of each month during the academic year.

Section 5 - AMENDMENT OF BY-LAWS

The By-Laws of this Constitution may be amended by a majority vote of the representatives present in a regular meeting of the Council in a secret ballot.

- b. The department heads within each of the four instructional divisions shall elect one (1) of their group to the Council. 4
- c. Seven (7) representatives shall be elected at large by the full-time (excluding Department Heads and Division Dean) staff of the Agricultural Division. Each department within the division may nominate a maximum of two names to the divisional slate, but no department may have more than two members on the Council at any time. 7
- d. Seven (7) representatives shall be elected at large by the full-time (excluding Department Heads and Division Dean) staff of Applied Arts Division. Each department within the division may nominate a maximum of two names to the divisional slate, but no department may have more than two members on the Council at any time. 7
- e. Seven (7) representatives shall be elected at large by the full-time (excluding Department Heads and Division Dean) staff of Engineering Division. Each department within the division may nominate a maximum of two names to the divisional slate, but no department may have more than two members on the Council at any time. 7
- f. Seven (7) representatives shall be elected at large by the full-time (excluding Department Heads and Division Dean) staff of Applied Sciences Division. Each department within the division may nominate a maximum of two names to the divisional slate, but no department may have more than two members on the Council at any time. 7
- g. Four (4) representatives shall be elected at large by the full-time (excluding Department Heads and Business Manager) staff of the Business Management Division. Each department within the division may nominate a maximum of two names to the divisional slate, but no department may have more than two members on the Council at any time. 4
- h. Four (4) representatives shall be elected at large by the full-time (excluding Department Heads and Business Manager) staff of the Business Management Division. Each department within the division may nominate a maximum of two names to the divisional slate, but no department may have more than two members on the Council at any time. 4
- i. Four (4) representatives shall be elected by the Auxiliary Services (excluding Foundation Manager) with (1) elected by the personnel of the El Corral and three (3) elected by the personnel of the Foundation. 4
- j. One (1) representative shall be elected (excluding the Head Librarian) by the Library Staff. 1
- k. One (1) representative shall be elected (excluding the Department Head) by the Audio-Visual department staff. 1

- Section 3. Members shall have all the rights and responsibilities of members of a democratic organization.
- Section 4. Members shall be elected in May for terms of three academic-years with initial provisions to provide for approximately one-third of the elected members of the Council to be replaced annually.
- Section 5. Vacancies in membership shall be filled in the same manner as specified for members except that no department shall have more than two (2) representatives on the Council.

ARTICLE IV

Officers

- Section 1. The officers shall be a chairman, vice chairman, and a secretary elected in March from the elected representatives.
- Section 2. The terms of the chairman, vice chairman, and secretary shall be of one-year duration, commencing on April 1 of each year.

ARTICLE V

Organization

- Section 1. There shall be eight standing committees: Agenda, Curriculum and Instruction, Student Affairs, Facilities and Fiscal Affairs, Personnel, Communications, Professional Ethics, and Research.
- Section 2. The chairman may appoint special committees from among the members and ask non-members also to serve on such committees.
- Section 3. The chairman of the Council shall be chairman of the Agenda Committee.
- Section 4. The responsibility of the Agenda Committee is to develop the agenda for each meeting, to allocate studies to various committees, and to approve appointments to all committees.
- Section 5. The action of any committee may be overruled at any time by a majority vote of the Council.

ARTICLE VI

Meetings

- Section 1. Meetings shall be held monthly during the academic year and may be held on special call of the chairman, or on petition of 25% of the membership.
- Section 2. The presence of two-thirds of the membership shall constitute a quorum.

- Section 3. The faculty members of the Council may meet as a sub-council to consider matters of primarily faculty concern.
- Section 4. The non-faculty members of the Council may meet as a sub-council to consider matters of primary concern to non-faculty staff members.

ARTICLE VII

Actions

- Section 1. The Council shall report to the College President its activities, recommendation, and suggestions at least annually.

ARTICLE VIII

Parliamentary Authority

- Section 1. The parliamentary authority shall be Roberts' Rules of Order.

ARTICLE IX

Amendment

- Section 1. Amendment to this Constitution may be made by a two-thirds vote of the Council membership or by a majority vote in a faculty and staff initiative.

MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY-STAFF COUNCIL 1965-1966 ROSTER

Terms Expire in June on the Date Indicated

	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>
AGRICULTURE	R. Johnson W. Troutner	H. Rickard G. Salo	B. Dickson R. Wheeler H. Rhoades
APPLIED ARTS	J. Healey M. Johnson	R. Anderson D. Grant	W. Curtis F. Tellew
APPLIED SCIENCE	R. Frost D. Montgomery	M. Clinnick W. Thurmond H. Walker	A. Miller D. Hensel
ENGINEERING	R. Adamson R. Graves	J. Rapp R. Williams	J. McCombs G. Seeber F. Crane
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT	R. Tartaglia	C. Nolan	O. Casey B. Fitzgerald
STUDENT PERSONNEL	I. Gow	M. Eyler J. Holley	D. Lawson
AUXILIARY SERVICES	P. Dillon J. Fredericks	J. Hamp	E. Dorrough
AUDIO-VISUAL			M. Gold
LIBRARY		P. Turner	
INSTRUCTIONAL DEPT. HEADS	E. Hyer	G. Noble J. McGrath	W. Schroeder

EX-OFFICIO: Andrews, Chandler, Cummins, Fisher, Hayes, Nelson, Smith

FACULTY - STAFF

Committee Membership

1965 - 1966

AGENDA

Glenn Noble (Chm.)
Roy Anderson
Mary Eyler
Jerald Holley
Herman Rickard
Robert Adamson

PERSONNEL (FACULTY)

Edgar Hyer (Chm.)
B. A. Dickson
Clyde Fisher
Glenn Seeber
Howard Walker

PERSONNEL (NON-FACULTY)

Richard Tartaglia (Chm.)
Paul Dillon
Everett Dorrough
Juanita Fredericks
I. Gow

CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION

Robert Frost (Chm.)
Roy Anderson
Donald Hensel
Jack Rapp
H. Rhoads

COMMUNICATIONS

William Troutner (Chm.)
R. L. Graves
John Healey
Mead Johnson
Dan Lawson

STUDENT AFFAIRS

Fuad Tellaw (Chm.)
Orlan Casey
Everett Chandler
John McCombs
Catherine Nolan

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Pearl Turner (Chm.)
Mansfield Clinnick
William Curtis
David Grant
Glenn Salo

FACILITIES & FISCAL AFFAIRS

Marcus Gold (Chm.)
Bernard Fitzgerald
Joseph Hampl
Richard Johnson
Robert Williams

RESEARCH

William Thurmond (Chm.)
Franklin Crane
Allen Miller
Walter Schroeder
Robert Wheeler

AD HOC CONSTITUTION

LaVerne Bucy (Chm.)
George Mach
James McGrath
David Montgomery

MEMORANDUM

November 3, 1964

TO: LaVerne Bucy, Chairman Faculty/Staff Council, San Luis Obispo

FROM: Faculty Personnel Committee - Wesley Ward, Chairman, Warren Anderson, Howard Brown, Norman Cruickshanks, Clyde Fisher, Norman Gould, Philip Overmeyer

SUBJECT: Motion For Council (Faculty) Acceptance of Proposal Criteria for President and Vice President of the College

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE

San Luis Obispo, California

This list of criteria was prepared by the Sub-Committee on Criteria for Selection of Administrative Personnel - Philip Overmeyer, Chairman, Ena Marston, Glenn Noble, Joy Richardson, Oscar Reece. The final wording was modified by the Personnel Committee and those changes will be discussed before council action.

It should be noted that the sub-committee on criteria is continuing its study on criteria for other administrative levels and will have a final report at a later date.

Motion:

Be it resolved that the Faculty/Staff Council, San Luis Obispo, California State Polytechnic College accept as its guideline in matters of council participation in the selection of President and Vice President of the College the following criteria.

Leadership.	He must have demonstrated qualities of leadership.
Experience.	He should have experience in administration, preferably also in teaching.
Education.	He should possess an earned doctorate or equivalent attainment in his chosen field.
Orientation.	His genuine interests should encompass the arts, sciences, agriculture, and engineering within the framework of sections 22606 and 24751 of the State of California Education Code. He should be an enthusiastic advocate of occupationally-centered higher education.
Academic freedom.	He must understand and be in sympathy with academic freedom.

Academic standards.	He must display and demand high academic standards and be able to recognize true scholarship.
Consultative procedures.	He should be willing to employ consultative procedures on policy matters which affect the faculty and staff.
Delegation.	He should be willing to delegate responsibility and the commensurate authority.
Representation.	He must be able to represent effectively the entire college when dealing with the Chancellor, Trustees, the Board of Education, the public, and students.
Personality.	His personality should be friendly and outgoing.
Character.	He must be of high moral character.
Age.	He should preferably be in the 40-55 age group.
Health.	His health should be sufficiently good to permit him to carry out his obligations vigorously and effectively.

ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING OF JULY 28-29, 1965

1. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Chancellor Dumke reported that in spite of the failure to gain the 15.8% pay raise requested, the colleges had made a fairly successful record in the recent legislative session. The support of research (\$200,000 for released time to carry on research elsewhere), recognition of the need for excellence (\$100,000 for outstanding teacher awards and the publishing of scholarly contributions) and the creation of a legislative interim study to recommend ways to untangle the fiscal snarls that have beset the colleges are all examples. Dr. Dumke thanked the several Trustees, Chairman Livingston of the Academic Senate and the numerous others who devoted time to attend the various hearings.

2. STAFF CHANGES

Dr. Melvin Angel from Fresno State College is the new Associate Dean in the Division of Student Affairs in the Chancellor's Office. The Board offered a unanimous resolution of appreciation and gratitude to Mr. John Richardson who is leaving the position of Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs. This position will be filled by Mr. Harry Brakebill of San Francisco State College as of September first.

3. COORDINATING COUNCIL

Mr. Luckman reported on changes in personnel and mentioned the legislative action putting three more persons on the Council. These will be lay people with no college association. The Council delayed action on policies covering redirection of new students and priority for local residents. The State Colleges indicated great reluctance to be committed to such a policy. A committee is to report on this matter at the November meeting.

4. RETIRING CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS

Mr. Luckman complimented the members of the Trustees for devoting many hours of diligent effort in the cause of higher education without recompense. He indicated that he believed strong and vigorous presidents make strong and vigorous schools. Whenever external groups or a "faculty cabal" take control, quality falls. Growing pains should not obscure the successes of our State Colleges.

As to the future, staff on tenure can each be expected to receive about \$400,000 before retirement. There is substantial lifetime commitment on the part of the state which raises the question of whether the state is getting its money's worth. Tenure, because of its vase cost, must have a sound basis in quality. Teaching ability is not sufficiently evaluated. (See resolution, item 12). Mr. Luckman also stressed that teaching must be for the future. We must not offer "cut flowers" to students but rather "garden plots," in which each student can develop his capacities.

5. JOINT DOCTORATE

Mr. Heilbron pointed out that all parties concerned had approved the principles of operation although the Academic Senate, C.S.C., had questioned the adequacy of support and had requested a delay until levels of such support now under study could be specified and achieved. Permission to proceed with the degree at San Diego State College was granted.

6. ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN

Since the 6.6 acres requested was not funded, the San Francisco State College plan will be based upon an FTE of 13,000 but the programs requested based on the higher estimate (15,000) were accepted.

The program at Sacramento State College was accepted with the proviso that a proposed curriculum in government would be temporarily withheld pending the appointment of a new president.

7. OUT OF STATE TUITION

Although the Coordinating Council, the Academic Senate and the Trustees had advocated that the fee be set at \$540, the Legislature set the amount at \$600 and declared that the difference (about \$142,000) would have to come from current budget were a lesser amount charged. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate called attention to this as unwarranted legislative interference in educational policy. However, under the circumstances, the money factor ruled and the fee was set at \$600.

8. EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

San Diego State College was given authority to seek local funds to the amount of available government matching funds.

9. STUDENT STORES

A first reading was given to an order which will limit the patrons of college bookstores to college personnel and those participating in college sponsored educational programs.

10. EXTENSION SALARIES

The Board set the basic pay for professors and associates at \$275 per unit and assistant professors and instructors at \$215 per unit in lecture courses. Student fees were set at \$13.

11. SALARY INCREASE

Due to the exceedingly fine balance of funds with current staffing, confirmation from the colleges will be required to assure the adequacy of appropriated funds to support the 10% increase. The pay will be retroactive to July first, but probably will not be forthcoming until the paycheck received October first.

12. TEACHER EXCELLENCE

Mr. Luckman stated that with funds now granted for awards and in the light of his previous statements, he wanted to know what was being done to evaluate quality. He suggested the need for a sort of progress report to see whether the faculties were really "keeping up." Such studies are being done elsewhere.

The Trustees adopted a resolution calling for all elements of the system to propose a means or various means for the evaluation of teaching and institutional excellence by January, 1966, and for the results of a study based on these methods to be available by June, 1966. Senate Chairman Livingston pointed out that one procedure for the entire system might not be appropriate; the faculties of the colleges have worked out different criteria and procedures. Mr. Luckman said that was a matter for the Academic Senate--the procedures should be adjusted by that body to suit the circumstances.

13. NEW CAMPUS SITES

General areas were agreed upon for site selection for Palos Verdes (South Bay), Kern, Venture, Contra Costa and San Mateo-Santa Clara. The first two are authorized for construction, the others for site purchase only.

14. NEW CHAIRMAN

Mr. Albert Ruffo is the new chairman, Mr. Donald Hart is the new vice-chairman of the Board of Trustees. The Board adopted a rule that vice-chairmen either of the board or of its committees are not to be considered as being "in line" for the corresponding chairmanship. The composition of the committees of the Board for 1965-66 is:

FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. George Hart, Chairman
Mr. Cory, Vice Chairman
Mr. Bartalini
Mr. Bautzer
Mr. Don Hart
Mr. Palmieri
Mr. Thatcher

CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS
AND GROUNDS COMMITTEE

Mr. Palmieri, Chairman
Mr. Ridder, Vice Chairman
Mr. George Hart
Mr. Luckman
Mr. Meriam
Mr. Spencer
Mr. Warren
Mr. Anderson, ex-officio

REPRESENTATIVES TO THE
COORDINATING COUNCIL

Mr. Ruffo
Mr. Heilbron
Dr. Dumke
(Alternates: Mr. Don Hart, Mr. Luckman)

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. Meriam, Chairman
Dr. Ramo, Vice Chairman
Mrs. Conley
Mr. Cory
Mr. Heilbron
Mr. Luckman
Mr. Thatcher
Dr. Rafferty, ex-officio

GIFTS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. Bautzer, Chairman
Mr. Thatcher, Vice Chairman
Mr. Bartalini
Dr. Ramo
Mr. Spencer

AUDIT COMMITTEE

Mrs. Conley, Chairman
Mr. Spencer, Vice Chairman
Mr. Bartalini

FACULTY AND STAFF AFFAIRS
COMMITTEE

Mr. Warren, Chairman
Mr. Heilbron, Vice Chairman
Mr. Bautzer
Mrs. Conley
Mr. Don Hart
Dr. Ramo
Mr. Ridder
Mr. Unruh, ex-officio

ORGANIZATION AND RULES
COMMITTEE

Mr. Luckman, Chairman
Mr. Don Hart, Vice Chairman
Mr. Cory
Mr. Heilbron
Mr. Ridder