I. Session was called to order by Chairman Alexander in the Faculty Dining Room at 3:15 p.m.

II. Members present were:

W. Alexander  M. Gold  D. Nickell  H. Scales
R. Anderson  D. Grant  M. O'Leary  M. Smith
A. Andreoli  C. Hanks  B. Olsen  N. Smith
W. Boyce  S. Harden  R. Pautz  J. Stuart
M. Brady  D. Head  J. Peterson  D. Stubbs
S. Burroughs  H. Honneger  C. Quinlan  L. Voss
R. Burton  A. James  R. Ratcliffe  J. Weatherby
T. Carpenter  C. Johnson  H. Rhoads  R. Wheeler
R. Cleath  T. Johnston  R. Ritschard  M. Whitson
F. Coyes  J. Lowry  J. Rogalla  M. Wilks
R. Frost  J. Mott  A. Rosen  M. Wills

Ex-Officio (Voting):

G. Clucas  J. Ericson  C. Gibson
C. Cummins  C. Fisher  C. Russell (for Higdon)

Guests:

E. Cairns  J. Emmel
E. DeVoros  J. Sullivan

III. Business Items

A. Curriculum Committee - Dwayne Head

MSC (D. Head, sec. R. Ratcliffe) that the Academic Senate endorse the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee regarding Catalog changes requested by the School of Communicative Arts and Humanities for 1972-73, as amended. (See Attachment A, Agenda, June 1, 1971.) The approved amendment (D. Grant, sec. C. Johnson) changed the prefix of Eng 123, 124 and 125 to Lang 123, 124, 125 and was passed by voice vote with four (4) abstentions. The motion (D. Grant, sec. M. Smith) to delete the Committee Action "reject" and add "endorse" (p.1.) on Eng 104 and Eng 105 was defeated when only 6 members voted in favor of the amendment. A motion (R. Cleath, sec. M. Smith) to table the Committee Action (p.8) to reject dropping Sp 201 failed to pass when only 11 members voted in favor of the amendment. A motion (R. Cleath, sec. R. Burton) to change "reject" (p.8) to "endorse" dropping Sp 201 failed to pass when only 6 members voted in favor of the amendment. D. Head noted a correction to be made (p.9) to have the Committee Action on Dr 322 read "Endorse with prerequisite Dr 220." The main motion, as amended, passed by a unanimous voice vote.

B. Curriculum Committee Dwayne Head

MSC (D. Head, sec. D. Hanks) that the Academic Senate endorse the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee regarding Catalog changes for Graduate Programs college-wide, as amended. (See Attachment B, Agenda,
June 1, 1971.) Committee Chairman Head noted that on p. 5, Hist 470 as endorsed by the committee be deleted. The amendment and the main motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

C. Curriculum Committee - Dwayne Head

MSC (D. Head, sec. N. Smith) that the Academic Senate endorse the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee to approve the addendum to the catalog changes requested by the School of Engineering and Technology (submitted as substitute p. 7 of Attachment A, Agenda, June 1, 1971). The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

D. Personnel Policies Committee - Howard Rhoads

MSC (H. Rhoads, sec. C. Johnson) that the Academic Senate recommend to the President that the revised Faculty Evaluation Form, as amended, proposed by the Personnel Policies Committee be approved for use in the regular personnel processes of the college. (See Attachment C, Agenda, June 1, 1971.) An alternative for the department head portion of the form suggested by the Personnel Policies Committee, as page 2, was submitted as an amendment (A. Rosen, sec. J. Lowry) to replace the entire page. The amendment was approved by a vote of 30 for and 15 against. The amended form deleted the three rating categories and the recommendation blocks suggested in the revised form (page 2) proposed by the Personnel Policies Committee. An additional amendment (J. Stuart, sec. M. Gold) to delete the words "... for the following reasons:" and to insert the words "Comments and/or recommendations:" (page 3) was approved by a unanimous voice vote. A motion (A.Andreoli, sec. M. O' Leary) to add the words "... and to the person being evaluated" to the footnote on p. 2 (after the words "to the Personnel Review Committee") was defeated by a vote of 20 for to 21 against. The main motion then passed by a unanimous voice vote.

E. Constitution Study Committee - Corwin Johnson

Senator Johnson presented the first reading of committee proposals for amendments to the By-Laws concerning the three changes that follow:

1. Add to the By-Laws a provision to govern the recall procedures of members of the Academic Senate.
2. Add a provision concerning procedures for the recall of Statewide Academic Senate members from Cal Poly.
3. Corrections of titles of college officials to read: "Associate Dean of Contingency Funds, Director of the Computer Center, Director of Educational Opportunity Programs, Director of the Foundation."

IV. Information Items

A. Constitution and By-Laws Committee - Corwin Johnson

Senator Johnson submitted and discussed the Committee report which contained a review by John Lowry, Chairman of the Subcommittee for the Study of the Organization of the Academic Senate in regard to the future organization of the Cal Poly Academic Senate, dated May 10, 1971.

B. John Stuart, Academic Senate Vice Chairmen requested that all committee chairmen submit annual committee reports to him by the second week in June, 1971.

V. After a Senate accolade for a job well done, Chairman Will Alexander adjourned the final session of the 1970-71 Academic Senate at 5:05 p.m.
**CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE**
San Luis Obispo, California
October 13, 1970

**Academic Senate Committees - 1970-1971**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>1970-71 Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUDGET COMMITTEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Tom Meyer 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Al Draves 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Wallace Burt 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Arts</td>
<td>James Peterson 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Nelson Smith III 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>Dale Federer 1972--Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Charles Hanks 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRICULUM COMMITTEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Herman Rickard 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>George Ikenoyama 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Joseph Weatherby 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Arts</td>
<td>Clifton Swanson 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Tom Carpenter 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>Dwayne Head 1971--Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Howard Walker 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. S. I. Representative</td>
<td>Jean Lemaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECTIONS COMMITTEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Roland Pautz 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Maurice Wilks 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Walter Rice 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Arts</td>
<td>Murray Smith 1972--Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>George Hoffman 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>Sheldon Harden 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Ronald Ritschard 1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>John Rogalla 1972--Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Benjamin Polk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Howard Smith 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Arts</td>
<td>James Emmel 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Otto Davidson 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>Stuart Chestnut 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Harry Finch 1971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Howard Rhoads 1971--Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Sat Rihal 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Weston McCormac 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Arts</td>
<td>Barton Olsen 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Warren Anderson 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>Sarah Hardeman 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Arthur Rosen 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. S. I. Representative</td>
<td>Ken Murray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Earl Cosma 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Andrew Merriam 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>William Boyce 1971--Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Arts</td>
<td>James Rice 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Herbert Miles 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>James Webb 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Dave Thomson 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. S. I. Representatives</td>
<td>Paul Banke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russell Redman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONNEL REVIEW COMMITTEE (elected)

Agriculture
Emmett Bloom
Frank Thrasher - Alt.

Architecture
Robert Asbury
Charles Quinlan - Alt.

Business
Dominic Perello
Phillip Overmeyer - Alt.

Communicative Arts
Robert Andreini
William Johnson - Alt.

Engineering
George Hoffman
Laurence Talbott - Alt.

Human Development
Stuart Chestnut
James Jensen - Alt.

Science
Robert Frost - Chairman
George Mach - Alt.

Student, ex-officio
Terry Gomes

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Agriculture
Harry Markos 1971

Architecture
David Saveker 1973

Business
John A. McKinstry 1973

Communicative Arts
Robert Burton 1973

Engineering
Harold Cota 1971

Human Development
Harry Scales 1972

Science
Norman Eatough 1972

Carl Cummins, Dean, Human Development
Don Nelson, Director, Business Affairs
Gene S. Brendlin, Foundation Manager
Howard Burroughs, Director, Research and Development
A.S.I. Representative

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Agriculture
Gerald Westesen 1971

Architecture
Ameen Noshy 1971

Business
Erling Breckan 1972

Communicative Arts
Robert Huot 1972
LIBRARY COMMITTEE (Cont.)

Engineering Harry Honegger 1971
Human Development James Webb 1972
Science Charles Dills 1972

Michael Emmons, Consultive Services 1971
Dale Andrews, Academic Vice President
Harry Strauss, Librarian

STUDENT PERSISTANCE COMMITTEE

Agriculture Robert Hooks
Architecture Thomas Johnson
Business Mary Jane Kobayashi
Communicative Arts Max Darnielle
Engineering William Oliver
Human Development James Jensen
Science Hewitt Wight

Rod Carruthers - Graphic Communication, Department Head

FAIRNESS BOARD

Agriculture Glenn Salo 1971
Architecture Robert Asbury 1971
Business
Communicative Arts Robert Cleath 1971
Engineering
Human Development
Science

Student Personnel Division
Student from A.S.I.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Agriculture Gordon Van de Vanter
Architecture Ross Carron
Business Norman Cruikshanks - Chairman
Communicative Arts Bernice Loughran
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION (Cont.)

Engineering
Warren Anderson

Human Development
Robert Sorensen

Science
Glen Noble

Student from A.S.I.

Library representative

Student Affairs Division

NOMINATIONS TO COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEES

Academic Council - John Stuart
Administrative Council - Sheldon Harden
Advisory Committee on Marine Science and Technology - Tom Carpenter
Athletic Advisory Commission - Charles Elston
Automatic Data Processing - Wayne McMorran
Campus Planning Committee - Tom Meyer
College Committee on Committees - Dean Piper
College Convocations and Speeches Coordination Committee - Rod Keif
College Store Advisory Committee - Roy Anderson 1971 and Bill Troutner 1972
College Union Board of Governors - Bill Johnson 1971 and Harry Finch 1972
Commencement Committee - Barron Wiley
Coordinating Committee for Teacher Education - Tom Johnston
Creative Arts Review Committee - Robert Johnston and Ralph Vorhies
Disaster Committee - Bill Phaklides
Discrimination Study Committee - Nancy Jorgensen
Foundation Board - Will Alexander
Graduate Study Committee - Vic Wolcott
Instructional Materials Program Committee - Herman Rickard
Learning Resources Committee - K.G. Fuller and Erland Dettloff
Off-campus Facilities Use Committee - Paul Dempsey
President's Council - Will Alexander
Race Relations Committee - Robert Hansen 1971 and Mary Jane Kobayshi 1972
Registration and Scheduling Committee - Boyd Johnson

APPOINTMENTS TO STUDENT COMMITTEES

Student Affairs Council - Timothy Barnes
Student Executive Cabinet - Earl Cosma
Student Publishers Board - Keith Neilson

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Enrollment Quotas
Daniel Stubbs, Chairman
Derek Price
James Simmons
John Stuart
Tom Dunigan

Faculty Allocation
Roy Anderson, Chairman
Dave Cook
Edgar Hyer
Lezlie Labhard
Alexander Landyshev
SPECIAL COMMITTEES (Cont.)

Full Utilization
Sarah Burroughs, Chairman
Dick Johnson
Bill Brown
Al Andreoli
Max Riedlsperger
Derek Price

Constitution Study Committee
Corwin Johnson, Chairman
Al Andreoli
Dale Federer
John Lowry
Michael O'Leary
Ron Ratcliffe
John Stuart
Robert Wheeler
Milo Whitson
TO: Members of the Executive Committee

FROM: Howard Rhoads, Chairman
       Academic Senate

SUBJ: College-Wide Committee Membership

Enclosed you will find a listing of the various college-wide committees which the Academic Senate must be concerned with.

I have listed the names of those who were on each committee last year and extended a blank space to indicate which schools must appoint a committee member for the current year and the date that the appoint would end. Please review these committee assignments and be prepared to recommend somebody as a replacement wherever such a person is needed.

It is my intent that we should make these appointments at our first Executive Committee meeting in the fall and then notify the entire Senate of those who have been appointed as soon as possible.

I would expect that the members of the Executive Committee will contact their nominees prior to submitting the names to the Executive Committee for action in order to be sure that the person nominated is willing to serve if appointed.
COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEES
1971-1972 Academic Year

STUDENT PERSISTENCE COMMITTEE (CAM Committee, appointed by President on recommendation of Academic Senate Chmn)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Robert Hooks</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Thomas Johnston</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Mary Jane Kobayashi</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Arts</td>
<td>Max Darnielle</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>William Oliver</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>James Jensen</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Hewitt Wight</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>Rod Carruthers,</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graphic Communications</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION (CAM Committee, appointed by President on recommendation of Academic Senate Chmn)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Gordon Van De Vanter</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Ross Carron</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Norman Cruikshanks</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Arts</td>
<td>Bernice Loughran</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Warren Anderson</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>Robert Sorenson</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Glen Noble</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI Representative</td>
<td>Not nominated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Representative</td>
<td>Not nominated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Div.</td>
<td>Not nominated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not nominated by Academic Senate
OTHER COLLEGE-WIDE COMMITTEES (One Year appointments by President on Recommendation of Academic Senate Executive Committee except as indicated)

COMMITTEE

Academic Council
Administrative Council
Advisory Committee on Marine Sci. & Tech.
Athletic Advisory Commission
Automatic Data Processing
Campus Planning Committee
College Committee on Committees
College Convocations & Speeches Coord. Com.
College Store Advisory Committee
College Union Board of Governors

Commencement Committee
Coord. Com. for Teacher Education
Creative Arts Review Committee

Disaster Committee
Discrimination Study Committee
Foundation Board
Graduate Study Committee
Instructional Materials Program Com.,
Off-Campus Facilities Use Committee
Presidential Poly House Advisory Com. (New)
President's Council
Race Relations Committee
Registration & Scheduling Committee

1970-71
John Stuart
Sheldon Harden
Tom Carpenter
Charles Elston
Wayne McMorrnan
Tom Meyer
Dean Piper
Rod Keif
Roy Anderson - 1971
Bill Troutner - 1972
Bill Johnson - 1971
Harry Finch - 1972
Barron Wiley
Tom Johnston
Robert Johnston
Ralph Vorhies
Bill Phaklides
Nancy Jorgensen
Will Alexander
Vic Wolcott
Herman Rickard
Paul Dempsey
Will Alexander
Robert Hansen - 1971
Mary Jane Kobayashi - 1972
Boyd Johnson

1971-72
Harry Scales

Bill Troutner - 1972 - 1973
Harry Finch - 1972 - 1973
Howard Rhoads
Howard Rhoads - 1973
Mary Jane Kobayashi - 1972
One of the first concerns of the budget committee was to attempt to grasp the function and scope of its operation. Members of the committee were concerned that the deliberations of the group be worthwhile and that the recommendations of the committee would have some weight in administrative deliberations. The work of the preceding committee was reviewed.

During the academic year of 1970-71 the budget committee met and considered the following matters:

1. Committee function
2. Review of the 1970-71 budget
3. Parking on the Cal Poly campus
4. Developing a formula for budgeting for equipment replacement
5. Support for EOP students at Cal Poly

Results of the deliberations of the budget committee:

1. The committee members seemed to agree that the group should review the budget and make recommendations to the senate for consideration and possible recommendation to the President. The members of the committee also felt it advisable to become informed as the process of consultation with Deans and department heads in making the budget proposal. It was felt that the members of the budget committee had a responsibility to inform members of the college community about the budget making process.

2. Members of the budget committee reviewed the 1970-71 budget and asked questions concerning it and possible cuts. It seemed that the members of the committee could not hope to become astute enough to find errors or methods of substantially changing the budget since most of the budget is computed according to formulae developed in the Chancellor's office. One area in which the committee might be of service to the college is in providing data to support the contention that Cal Poly is an unique institution and should be excluded from some of the formula computations.

3. Parking on the Cal Poly campus. Parking problems were referred to the committee. Members of the committee recommended that the matter be sent to the executive committee of the Academic Senate with the comment that the members of the budget committee felt that the matter was not properly the concern of the committee. Later in the year, the members of the committee supported President Kennedy's position in regard to fee increases. Dr. Kennedy opposed any increase in parking fees on this campus.

4. Mr. Ken Kimball and a group of students in the Industrial Technology department undertook a study of the equipment needs of the Mechanical Engineering department. They were hopeful of determining the amount of obsolescence of equipment and its effect on the education of students.
The State College system does not adequately budget for equipment replacement. In the past the only way to get new equipment for a new major or to modernize equipment was to build a new building and move. Present trends in bonds and utilization formulae make it unlikely that new buildings will be forthcoming. Some method of equipping laboratories with up-to-date equipment is essential. The study conducted by Mr. Kimball and his students was inconclusive.

5. The budget was severely cut in the provision of funds for EOP students. The budget committee met with Carl Wallace and Richard Martinez and members of their staff. Because of the excellent results obtained and the dire need of the students the committee agreed to make a recommendation to the Academic Senate supporting the EOP program. The recommendation was made and approved by the Senate.

Summary and Conclusions:

The budget committee failed to render the service it could have rendered as a consultative group because of the difficulty in scheduling meetings. Many matters that were of concern to the entire college were not considered by the committee until after the time for action was past. In matters of budgeting, the Chancellor's office frequently asked for a reaction from the Cal Poly campus before the budget committee had an opportunity to meet and react.

Recommendations:

1. That a suitable block of time be found for committee meetings this year. I believe that the committee should meet for a minimum of two hours each time it meets. Our one hour meetings last year were not as productive as the two hour meetings. Perhaps two meetings per month would be adequate.

2. That the committee address the problem of budgeting for a stable enrollment. When the enrollment reaches 16,000 or what ever number is finally decided to be desirable, how will change and growth be achieved? At present and for the last 30 years change has come as the result of growth in numbers. When growth in numbers ceases, new formula and new concepts will need to be developed in order to keep the offerings of Cal Poly current.

3. That members of the committee make every effort possible to hold emergency meetings if a matter needing their study and support is submitted for consultation and the date for responding comes before a regularly scheduled meeting.
The Committee recommends no changes in the Constitution of the Academic Senate at the present time and adopted the attached sub-committee report as a report of the entire committee.
MEMORANDUM - - - - -

To: Corwin Johnson, Chairman  
Constitution Study Committee

From: John Lowry, Chairman  
Subcommittee for Study of the Organization of the Academic Senate

Subject: Future Organization of the Academic Senate, California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo

SUMMARY: This subcommittee was appointed by Corwin Johnson, Chairman of the Constitutional Study Committee, to determine whether the organization of the Academic Senate should be changed as enrollment and faculty at California State Polytechnic Colleges increased. The Committee used "Guidelines for Planned Enrollment Growth, 1970-71 to 1980-81" as a guide to future enrollment and faculty size. The Committee recommends that the present organization of the Senate be retained through 1980-81, for the reasons noted below.

CONSIDERATIONS: In its study of the question of representation to the Senate, the Committee took particular note of the following considerations:

A. As the state colleges are now organized and legally established, no system of consultation can be effective unless there is mutual trust and good faith between administration and faculty. In an outright confrontation, consultative procedures have had no legal force.

B. The Academic Senate, as presently constituted, has been reasonably effective as a consultative and advisory body to the President.

C. Inclusion of the academic deans as ex officio voting members of the Senate has not, in the opinion of members of the Committee, resulted in domination of the Senate by the administration. It is a fact that the deans have seldom voted en bloc; the Committee has no evidence that any member of the Senate has been reluctant to express his point of view because the deans were present.

D. Inclusion of the state-wide academic senators is highly desirable and should be continued.

E. Faculty representation is provided on the other consultative bodies to the President, including the Administrative Council, the Academic Council, the President's Council, and the Associated Students. The present procedures for consultation on problems of mutual concern between the Staff Senate and the Academic Senate are workable and effective. No change in the latter procedures appear to be necessary.

F. The fact that the Academic Council (which is essentially a consultative body of the academic deans) constitutes what is, in many cases, a review body of Senate actions poses a potential problem. See Recommendations, following.
RECOMMENDATIONS: In view of the considerations noted above, the Committee recommends that the present formula for representation to the Senate be retained. Although a definition of wieldy is difficult, assuming that the present Senate is not unwieldy, the Committee believes that the additional members would not make the Senate unwieldy. The present and future make up of the Senate, in accordance with the guidelines cited in the SUMMARY, are tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATE MEMBERSHIP</th>
<th>1971-72</th>
<th>1980-81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Social Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development &amp; Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 (estimated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-wide Senators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The potential problem alluded to in F. of CONSIDERATIONS arises because policy recommendations originating in either the Academic Senate or the Academic Council are routinely referred by the President to the non-originator for comment and recommendations. Although substantive changes recommended have (to the Committee's knowledge) always been referred to the originator for rebuttal arguments, there is no mechanism for insuring that this course of action will be followed. As a case in point, consider the recommended Consultative Procedures In Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion recommended to the President by the Academic Senate in March, 1971. The Academic Council has recommended substantive changes in this document, although some of the changes were not brought up in the Senate by the same deans who are recommending them as members of the Academic Council. It seems only reasonable that the appropriate Committee of the Senate should, as a matter of course, be provided an opportunity to comment on the post hoc arguments presented by the deans in their role of reviewing authority. The alternative would appear to be adopting a strictly adversary posture between the two bodies.
Memorandum

To: John Stuart, Vice-Chairman
   Academic Senate

From: Dwayne Head

Date: July 1, 1971

File No.:

Copies:

Subject: Curriculum Committee Annual Report

During the past year the Curriculum Committee studied the following topics and sent recommendations to the Academic Senate on each of them:

1. Two-year catalog
2. General Education Breadth Requirement
3. Catalog changes for the 1972-73 college catalog

The committee was not able to complete study of the Instruction Committee's recommendation to investigate the whole structure and system of prerequisites for courses or the Standard Teaching Credential Requirements.

Attachment
ATTACHMENTS TO CURRICULUM COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR 1970-71 ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN UP-DATE

The rejection of the proposal of the B.S. degree in Speech Pathology and Auditory for inclusion in the 1971-76 Academic Master Plan was based upon the Curriculum Committee's concern for the small size of the program and the high cost for implementing the program. The Curriculum Committee wishes to convey to the Senate that the degree proposal was well thought out and planned, and consistent with the Cal Poly philosophy of offering degrees with a specific career orientation.

The Speech Department should be encouraged to re-submit this proposal at a later date when the fiscal climate would assure optimum support for this program.
I. Summary of Committee Action 1970-71

A. Amendments to By-Laws

At the request of the Constitution Study Committee of the Academic Senate the Election Committee suggested changes in the By-Laws that pertained to the duties and activities of the Election Committee.

B. Regular Elections

The Election Committee conducted all Senate elections as required in the By-Laws.

C. Special Elections

The Election Committee conducted special elections to establish a consultative committee for selection of an Instructional Dean for the School of Engineering and Technology and to approve the Statement of Professional Responsibilities and the Implementation of the Professional Responsibilities Statement as requested by the Academic Senate, CSC.

II. Pending Actions 1971-72

A. None
Memorandum

From: Robert Asbury, Chairman

Subject: Fairness Board - Annual Report - 1970-71

Date: June 14, 1971

1. The Board met in January 1971 for the purpose of electing a chairman and to prepare a draft of procedures and problems to be considered by the Board. Robert Asbury was elected Chairman.

2. A copy of the procedures and problems to be considered by the Board (attached) was forwarded to Col. William Boyce, Chairman of the Student Affairs Committee, for review as requested by Mr. Will Alexander, Chairman of the Academic Senate. It is my understanding that this document was then to be submitted to the Senate for approval as no official action regarding the function of the Fairness Board has ever been taken by the Senate.

3. The Board processed one case during the year, involving a charge of unfairness regarding a grade. The Board unanimously agreed that there was not sufficient evidence to support the charge.

4. Current Board members are:

   Dick Anderson - Human Development and Education
   Robert Asbury - Architecture and Environmental Design
   Don Hensel - Communicative Arts and Humanities
   Roger Keech - Engineering and Technology
   Shirley McCandless - ASI Representative
   Gene Rittenhouse - Student Personnel Division
   David Roach - Science and Mathematics
   Glenn Salo - Agriculture and Natural Resources
   Roger Sherman - Business and Social Science

Robert Asbury, Shirley McCandless, Glenn Salo and Don Hensel will retire from the Board at the end of this academic year. Anderson, Keech, Rittenhouse, Roach and Sherman are appointed to terms ending in June 1972.

Attachment
I. Types of Problems to be Considered:

A. Grading
   1. Individual
   2. Group
      a. High Grades Where a protest is made concerning one section
      b. Low Grades as opposed to another section of the same class.

B. Housing and Cafeteria
C. Parking and Traffic Violations
D. Registration
E. Disciplinary
F. Health Services
G. Curricular Evaluations, Deviations, Substitutions
H. Other

II. Board Composition appointed by the Chairman of the Academic Senate for a term of two years in overlapping terms.

A. One tenured faculty member from each of the instructional divisions.
B. One tenured member from the Student Personnel Division.
C. One representative from the Student Body. Qualifications for student member would require a minimum of a 2.5 gpa, not less than junior standing and consecutive attendance at Cal Poly for at least the three quarters preceding his appointment.
D. Chairman to be elected by the Committee.

III. Procedures:

A. Prior Action
   1. No complaint will be accepted unless the individual or group has carried the problem through normal channels to the division head level.

B. Initiating Action:
   1. Form of complaint would require:
      a. Statement of Complaint
      b. Background of details
      c. Witnesses where applicable
      d. Documents
      e. Proof of effort to resolve conflict within normal channels.
   2. May be submitted by:
      a. Student(s) or
      b. Faculty or Staff member on behalf of student(s), e.g., a student's adviser.

C. Review Process:
   1. Acceptance or Rejection of Complaint for Study
      a. Evidence sufficient
      b. Complaint sufficiently serious
      c. Proper procedure followed
D. Concluding Action:
1. Quorum of 5 members essential to balloting.
2. Results of the preliminary study should be relayed to student and staff member(s) involved that the case 'does' or 'does not' merit further study.
3. Step 2 -- Board reviews any rebuttal.
   a. If Board agrees with defendant's action, no further action.
   b. If Board disagrees, then Step 3 taken except when defendant changes his mind and agrees with the Board.
4. Step 3 -- The Chairman of the Board will relay the decision to the staff member.
5. Step 4 -- If the problem is not resolved by the faculty member, and/or if the Fairness Board considers further action as necessary, then a summary report should be presented to the President of the College for appropriate action.

E. In general, testimony before the Board will be held in confidence with only final decisions of the Board being communicated as expressed in III - D.4.

IV. FAIRNESS BOARD PROCESS

Problem originates between student and Cal Poly

Student and/or his faculty representative takes his problem through appropriate line channels* for resolution.

Student feels that problem has not been properly understood or resolved.

Student formulates a written complaint:

A. States complaint
B. Gives background of details
C. Indicates witnesses that may be called
D. Attaches relevant documents
E. Proof of effort to resolve conflict within line channels.*

Submits to any member of the Fairness Board

Before complaint is accepted, Fairness Board member may refer student back to a line channel that has been overlooked, or to other student resources of the college, such as Health Center, Counseling Center, etc.

Fairness Board reviews complaint and declares the complaint to have:

**MERIT**

Board hears plaintiff and defendant. If a resolution of problem occurs, Fairness Board hearing ceases.

If complaint is unresolved, Fairness Board will recommend action to the President of the College.

**NO MERIT**

Student and/or faculty representative may rebut with new evidence.

Merit

No Merit

* EXAMPLE OF LINE CHANNELS: Instructor Advisor Department Chairman Dean of School

NOTE: Complaints regarding race, creed, color or sex are to be referred to Discrimination Study Committee.
Memorandum

To: John Stuart
   Vice Chairman, Academic Senate

From: William Curtis, Chairman
       1970-71 Committee on Distinguished Teacher Awards

Subject: Annual Report of the Committee

The Committee on Distinguished Teacher Awards 1970-71, met and selected three persons to receive the award. The award will be given, to my knowledge, during the Fall Conference.

Another task assigned to the Committee was to propose guidelines for subsequent committees. Attached is our report.

Attachment
MEMORANDUM

To: Howard Rhodes
Chairman, Academic Senate

From: William Curtis
Chairman, 1970-71 Committee on
Distinguished Teacher Awards

Subject: Recommendations for procedural guidelines for the Committee on Distinguished
Teacher Awards

I. Procedural Guidelines

A. Eligibility of faculty nominees for the Distinguished Teacher Award

1. Each nominee must be employed as a full-time instructor or
department head (or equivalent) during the year of his nomi-
nation and be in at least his third year of employment.

2. Faculty members who are classified as lecturers are not
eligible.

3. Faculty members who are serving in their terminal year,
except those about to retire, are not eligible.

B. Nomination procedures

1. Nominations will be accepted from individual students,
student organizations, societies and faculty members
(including department heads). However, a nomination
of a faculty member by his own department head will not
be accepted.

2. A nomination form, with suggested criteria, will be
distributed to the faculty in the Cal Poly Report.

3. Nominations will be accepted in any format, but the
suggested criteria of distinguished teaching should be
presented to the students in the student newspaper and
on posters to be distributed to the academic departments.

C. Deadlines for committee responsibilities

1. The committee should be formed early in the fall quarter.

2. Solicitation of nominations should be fully publicized at
the beginning of the winter quarter.

   a. In Cal Poly Report
   b. In Mustang Daily
   c. On posters
   d. By memo to each academic department
3. The nomination deadline should be on Monday of the sixth week in the winter quarter.

4. The committee should reduce the list of nominees to a manageable level by the end of the seventh week of the winter quarter. A manageable level refers to the number of persons whom the committee members could actually observe in the classroom. It is suggested that this number be no more than four more than can actually win the award. For example, if there can be three winners, the number of instructors whose classes would be visited would not exceed seven. Likewise, if five winners were to be selected, the number of final nominees could be nine.

5. The names of the final winners will be sent by the committee chairman directly to the college president by the end of the seventh week of the spring quarter. This deadline should also apply for the Trustees' Distinguished Teaching Award, with supporting documentation.

D. Committee membership

1. The committee should be composed of seven faculty members, hopefully one from each school.

2. These committee members should be former recipients of the award who are willing to serve. They are to be appointed by the chairman of the Academic Senate.

3. The chairman of the Academic Senate should designate the chairman, who should have been a member of the committee during the previous year.

4. The terms of the committee members will be for two years, with the exception noted in "5" below.

5. To assure some continuity for 1971-72, four of the present committee should serve again for a second year. The terms of the remaining three should expire in June, 1971. Lots should be drawn to determine this distribution if all seven would like to continue for a second year. Beginning in the fall quarter, 1972, and from that date thereafter, all new appointments will be for two years.

6. No committee member may serve consecutive terms. An interval of at least one year should elapse between terms.

E. Visitations

1. Each nominee's classroom will be visited by each committee member at least once. It is hoped, however, that the nominees will be visited during both the winter and spring quarters.
2. It is the nominee's responsibility to report to the committee the dates on which class activity will not demonstrate the process of teaching. Such occasions would include such activities as examination dates, scheduled tapes or movies, and field trips.

F. The committee will submit an annual report to the chairman of the Academic Senate, featuring new proposals and revisions in the established procedures. The committee will destroy the record of annual nominations.

II. We endorse a recommendation made by the 1965-66 Committee on Distinguished Teacher Awards to the Faculty-Staff Council. It is extracted from the annual report of the committee, dated June 27, 1966:

"Since the award of Outstanding Teacher is an appreciable academic honor, the college catalog should include this along with other academic items under each instructor's name. Also a separate listing might be made in the catalog and perhaps also on a plaque which may be displayed in the new Student Union. Further it is felt very desirable that a small plaque be given the individual for display in his office or on his name plate outside his office. The announcing of the award should be done early enough in the spring so that adequate publicity about excellent teaching can be accomplished."
Accepting the charge, the Instruction Committee shall be responsible for recommendations which impinge directly on the quality of teaching, much discussion occurred in meetings throughout the school year. Meetings were regular for Fall and Winter quarters. A single meeting was held Spring quarter since no critical matters were before the Committee and the absence of a compatible meeting time for all members.

Earliest discussion concerned grading systems. The general consensus was that no single system is without fault and that we had legal definition of a grading system in Title 5; thus, no action was required.

A subcommittee was established to develop guidelines for use of the video tape recorder for faculty self-evaluation. John Heinz has coordinated the use of this tool very well and the procedure should be maintained in the future.

Grade changing procedures were reviewed and changes in the form and its distribution were recommended to the Senate and upon concurrence on to the president.

Waiver of course fees and tuition for faculty and staff members enrolling in courses to upgrade their performances at Cal Poly was recommended to the Senate and upon concurrence on to the president.

Other topics which have been discussed but remain in the discussion stage are (1) final examination procedures and practices, (2) abuse of W and E grades, and (3) development of guidelines for grading. These are unfinished business items.

Another item has been directed to the Committee too late for formal action this year. It is proposed revisions for Title 5 developed by an Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the Chancellor of the State Colleges.
The Personnel Policies Committee received and acted upon numerous items during the 1970-71 year. Members of the committee were: Larry Voss, Sat Rihal, Art Rosen, Wes McCormac, Warren Anderson, Sarah Hardeman, Bart Olsen, and Ken Murray (student representative). All members of the committee performed their assigned tasks well and the successful completion of many policy assignments speaks highly for their efforts.

Early in the school term, it became evident that too many matters were before the committee to function effectively as a full committee, and yet make progress in a timely fashion. Subsequently, a subcommittee structure was initiated with each subcommittee studying specific problems and presenting recommendations to the full committee in draft form for consideration, approval, or change prior to moving the items to the Academic Senate floor. In my opinion, this procedure worked very well since items of special interest to the various committee members were studied in some detail and the subcommittee structure was small enough to function effectively.

ITEMS CONSIDERED, ACTIONS TAKEN, AND PRESENT STATUS

1. Interim Policy & Procedures Statement on Faculty Personnel Files

The senate version of the spring of 1970 was modified slightly by President Kennedy as the result of other consultation and re-submitted for comment to the committee. As a result of our comments, the document was again slightly modified and adopted as Administrative Bulletin 70-8, October 15, 1970.

2. Academic Senate Constitution & Bylaws Change

As per request of the Executive Committee, the Personnel Policies Committee recommended a change in the language of bylaws section VI. - B. - 2., dealing with the operations of the Personnel Review Committee. The change was adopted by the Senate on October 13, 1970.

3. Grievance & Disciplinary Action Procedures

In the early fall, the trustees set a public hearing to consider changes in Title 5 relative to the subject procedures. The Personnel Policies Committee reviewed the proposed changes and prepared a response statement which was adopted by the Senate on November 10th.
4. **Terminal Notice Dates for Lecturers with Prior Service Before Appointment as Regular Faculty**

A change in the notice date was recommended, modified slightly on the senate floor, and passed. Approval by President Kennedy has been indicated.

5. **Consultative Procedures in Appointment, Re-Appointment, Tenure & Promotion**

Were developed to specifically cover minimum consultation procedures and, with minor amendment, were passed by the senate and recommended to the President for adoption as College Policy at the February senate meeting. President Kennedy has not acted upon the recommendations to date.

6. **Code of Professional Responsibilities**

As per Executive Committee request, the Personnel Policies Committee recommended to the CSC Academic Senate's Faculty Affairs Committee certain changes in the proposed document but indicated agreement in principle.

7. **Policy on Hiring of Close Relatives**

The existing policy was studied and compared with policies of other local jurisdictions and other California State Colleges. As a result, the Academic Senate recommended to the President that the existing policy be modified to be less restrictive and a similar action was taken by the Staff Senate. To date, President Kennedy has not acted upon the recommendation.

8. **Trustee Proposals to Change Title 5 Sections Dealing with the Procedures for Conferring Tenure**

A statement was prepared and submitted to the Senate. With slight modification the statement was adopted as presented.

9. **Procedure for Faculty Evaluation of Department Heads**

A recommendation for a procedure was modified slightly and adopted by the Senate as a recommendation to President Kennedy.

10. **Recommended a "Procedure for Selecting A Representative of California State Polytechnic College to the California State Colleges' Academic Council on International Programs."**

Adopted by the Senate and transmitted to the President.

11. **Recommended a Position Statement on the Trustees' Proposed Title 5 Policy Changes Dealing with the Method of Dismissal of Tenured Academic Employees.**

Adopted by Senate.
12. **Recommended a Position Statement Against the Trustees' Proposed Title 5 Policy Changes which would Require Individual Certification of Attendance for Pay Purposes.**

   Adopted by Senate.

13. **Presented to the Senate a Draft of a Proposed Revision of the Faculty Evaluation Form.**

   Action of Senate at the last Senate meeting is not known at the time of this writing.
ACTIVITIES AND/OR PROGRAMS PENDING

1. Procedure for faculty evaluation of administrators other than department heads.

2. Policy statement on the employment of "lecturers."

3. Examination of the "Interim Policy & Procedures Statement on Faculty Files" and revision if necessary.

4. Examination of the procedures for awarding sabbatical leaves and policy statement revision.

5. Examination of apparent inequities in "Equivalent Unit Allowances for Labs" and possible policy statement.

6. Policy statement on restrictions and/or encouragement of faculty members taking graduate courses for credit at Cal Poly. (Fees, units, etc.)

7. Examination of the 35% principal rank limitation at Cal Poly as compared with the systemwide policy and the application of the quotas by departments, schools, etc.

8. Examination of possible problems in application of the systemwide grievance procedure.

9. Examination of CAM 315.2-4 (d) dealing with election procedures for a Dean's Selection Committee.
Memorandum

To : John Stuart, Vice Chairman
    Academic Senate

From : George R. Mach, Chairman
       Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate


Date : June 10, 1971

During the fall quarter, the Personnel Review Committee reviewed reappointment recommendations, tenure recommendations, and recommendations on applications for leave with pay. During the winter quarter, reappointment recommendations on first year faculty were reviewed. During the spring quarter, promotion recommendations were reviewed. No committee reviews or action are pending now.

All applicable conditions in the Academic Senate bylaws and the College Administrative Manual were followed and all reports were made on time as scheduled. Representatives from two additional schools made the maintenance of a quorum more difficult. Increases in the size of the faculty and in the number of deans and department heads involved without a corresponding increase in the time allowed for our reviews compounded the difficulty. Committee members and faculty members whose cases were being reviewed felt the press of time. For example, there simply was not time to interview or consult all of the deans and department heads involved in many cases.

The Committee has given considerable attention this spring to the analysis, revision, and possible formalization of some of its procedures in an attempt to make its reviews more efficient. An improvement might be the development of well-defined procedures which could be promulgated to all who might be involved with the Committee during its reviews.

The student member and alternate proved to be very valuable members of the Committee and they are to be commended for their faithful and positive contributions. Committee officers elected for the 1971-72 year are: Leon Maksoudian, chairman; Charles Quinlan, vice chairman; Pearl Turner, secretary.
Memorandum

To: John Stuart, Vice Chairman Academic Senate

From: W. M. Boyce, Chairman Student Affairs Committee

Subject: Report of the Student Affairs Committee

The report of the Student Affairs Committee for the 1970-71 Academic year is attached.

Attachment
1. **PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS OF MUSTANG STADIUM:** On 8 October 1970, the committee forwarded to the Chairman of the Academic Senate, at his request, certain recommended uses of Mustang Stadium in the event that the stadium were improved and enlarged as a result of the city of San Luis Obispo's annexation of the campus.

2. **REVIEW OF NEW STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES:** On 2 October 1970, the committee forwarded a report to the Chairman of the Academic Senate, at his request, concerning consultative methods followed by the Chancellor's Office in establishing subject procedures. The committee found no cause for Academic Senate concern.

3. **USE OF LIBRARY LAWN:** On 16 October 1970, the committee recommended to the Academic Senate that the Library Lawn be used for college-sponsored activities only and be limited to certain days and times. Academic Senate endorsed and forwarded recommendation to President.

4. **STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY:** On 9 February 1971, the committee introduced as an information item a proposed policy on the subject to the Academic Senate. Subsequent open hearings, poorly attended, were held on the proposal on 26 February 1971 and 1 March 1971. The proposal was revised by the committee on 4 March 1971 and introduced again as an information item at the March meeting of the Academic Senate. The proposal was again revised to a minor extent and introduced as an action item at the Academic Senate meeting of 13 April 1971. It was defeated by the Academic Senate primarily because the results of the evaluation would have been placed in the evaluated faculty's official personal files. The Academic Senate referred the proposal back to committee. In April 1971, the committee again revised the proposal, and it was reintroduced as an action item at the Academic Senate meeting of 11 May 1971. The proposal was again rejected by the Academic Senate primarily because the results of the evaluation would be revealed to Department Heads and tenured faculty, and as a consequence, must be made a part of official personnel files. It became evident at the Academic Senate meeting of 11 May 1971 that the Senate did not object to student evaluations but also did not desire to have any faculty input into the evaluation process or criteria. A motion made by the committee chairman to have the Chairman of the Senate appoint an ad hoc committee of five Senators to meet with the Student Advisory Council and develop a joint compromise proposal on evaluations was defeated. The committee took no further action on the matter.

5. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:** None.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

William M. Boyce, Chairman