

**SENATE AGENDA**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE OF GROSSMONT COLLEGE**  
**April 15, 1996**  
Room 370, 11:10 a.m. - 12:20 p.m.

**I. PRELIMINARY ITEMS**

- A. Call to Order
- B. Approval of Agenda
- C. Approval of Minutes March 18, 1996

**II. ACTION ITEMS**

- A. Resolution to approve Don Ridgeway as the Associate Professor on the Academic Rank Committee, and Carmen Hernandez as the Assistant Professor.
- B. Resolution to appoint Peg Hovde to the Name Change Committee. The committee will meet on April 17 from 3:00-5:30 at the District Office conference room.
- C. Resolution to appoint Craig Milgrim to serve as the Senate Representative at-Large to the Curriculum Committee. The Committee meets Tuesdays from 2:00-4:00 and is currently discussing the lecture, lab, lecture/lab designation of units.

**III. SPECIAL INFORMATION ITEMS**

- A. Chancellor Atherton and Vice Chancellors Austin and McMahan will discuss Cuyamaca's self-sufficiency and other issues. (See attachment 1A for questions and Attachment 1B for minutes from the last District Strategic Planning/Budget meeting for options to fund Cuyamaca's self sufficiency.)

**IV. INFORMATION ITEMS**

- A. Revisions of by-laws of the Constitution of the Grossmont Academic Senate  
Section One: Duties of the officers  
From 2 . The Vice-President, delete section b. and "to co-sign with the President Senate checks" from section c., Add: 4. The President-elect. It shall be the duty of the President-elect:
  - a. to attend all meetings of the Senate, and Senate Officers Committee
  - b. to attend special committees such as District and Campus Budget and Strategic in order to become familiar with the duties of the President.
  - c. to attend State and Regional Academic Senate Meetings.
  - d. to chair the Committees On Committees and be responsible for monitoring committee business.
  - e. to perform duties as assigned by the President.Section Seven: Disbursements  
Replace section seven with: The President shall be responsible for payments following regular campus Budget procedures.

- Section Ten: Committees The Senate shall have the following standing committees: (Add)
4. Instructional Computing Committee
  5. Curriculum Committee
  6. Program Review Committee

#### IV. OTHER MATTERS

A. President's Report - The following are some of the issues to be discussed at the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges: COFO Faculty Equity Statement (See attachment #2), AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure (See attachment #3). For copies of Program Review, Plus or Minus Grading Options, and other resolutions contact Sheridan DeWolf or Peg Hovde.

There will be a special meeting of the Academic Senate on Monday, April 29, 1996.  
Agenda items are due to the Senate Officers Committee by Wednesday April 24 at 2 PM.  
**The next regular meeting of the Academic Senate is scheduled for Monday May 6, 1994 with agenda items due on May 1.**

The following questions were compiled by the Grossmont College Senate Officers Committee to be asked of the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors at the April 15 Grossmont Senate Meeting. If time permits we will take written questions from the floor.

### **CUYAMACA'S SELF SUFFICIENCY**

1. How much of the drive for Cuyamaca is for the good of the district vs. the good of the friendship between the Chancellor and Cuyamaca's President?
2. What is your definition of shared governance and how it works? Why bother the rest of us with shared governance? It seems to have little importance when it comes to making very big decisions for this district. It hasn't felt right in allocation of money from technology block grants, the entire bookstore process, and the Cuyamaca growth plan.
2. Is the Board or the District Office creating a fiscal problem by committing funds to the growth of Cuyamaca like the last board and district office did? The previous fiscal management of the district has generated a very high level of mistrust among the faculty at Grossmont. What has changed in the district that makes you believe that Cuyamaca can grow now when it hadn't grown for 18 years? Are we just repeating the same misdirection based on the same types of figures that fed the MGT report?
3. What are the consequences if Cuyamaca fails to grow at the rate of 8% per year for the next four years? Cuyamaca needs to grow at almost 11% per year to reach the numbers that were in the last board packet (4500 FTES from 3000 FTES) by the year 2000. What are the consequences if Cuyamaca does grow and we are not funded for the full growth?
4. What could have happened to this money if we did not have this goal?
5. Cuyamaca says there is no plan yet, they are at the same place we are with the Educational Master Plan. What is the \$600,000 based on? Who was involved with this decision? How do they know that they will need approximately 14 more employees in the next 4 years? What is this based on?
6. Explain why the growth is needed for the District to remain at CAP for state funding. What is the basis for the expected increase in the district's CAP?
7. Have other options have been explored for Cuyamaca College? How were the decisions reached? Was this done through shared governance or hastily thrown together after the February Board meetings?
8. Will this push for growth and innovative technologies be at the expense of the academic integrity of the curriculum? What about alignment/articulation? Students and the board expect the same level of instruction at both colleges, will this be possible?

9. What about productivity? Can you prove the need for additional full-time faculty at Cuyamaca College? Is the minimum class size for Cuyamaca 20? What is the average class size at Cuyamaca? Are the rooms being fully utilized throughout the day? Are the multi-section courses scattered across the day? Shouldn't these problems be addressed before we give more money to Cuyamaca?

10. Why are the new positions being rushed through? Why skip the normal process? Why is this whole thing being rushed? Wouldn't it be better with a year of planning?

#### THE FUTURE OF GROSSMONT COLLEGE

11. What are the district's and the board's commitments to Grossmont College? Is this college expected to bear the burden of the majority of the students without any increase in funding? This year there may be money, what about future years?

12. The Cuyamaca policy states that Cuyamaca will do this through "innovative experiences, technologies and environments." Where is Grossmont in this? Will we have support for projects of this nature?

13. If we are to be "two unique colleges", but Cuyamaca is to be a "comprehensive college", what does this mean to programs at Grossmont? Will programs be moved to the other college? How will this take place? The history so far has been that programs are moved with little input and often against the will of the Grossmont faculty involved. Will Grossmont programs be terminated or underfunded so that new programs can be started at Cuyamaca? What research goes into the decision to move or duplicate? Are variables like availability of qualified instructors, racial climate, history of the program, support services taken into account? How does the new "Dance" specialty program fit into the Cuyamaca Academic Master Plan? What other plans await us?

14. If Cuyamaca is to be the college for WorkForce Programs, what happens to the existing business and professional programs at Grossmont College? Will they be underfunded or discontinued? Will they be allowed to grow and prosper and continue to succeed? Please define WorkForce Program. How will you revise the current vocational programs at Cuyamaca? What will happen to the faculty in Cuyamaca programs if they are discontinued? Will they be retrained?

15. What about movement of faculty and management with retreat rights between campuses? If we are to be unique colleges, how do we function with district employees? Everyone is an employee of the district, but campuses need to hire for unique needs.

**GROSSMONT-CUYAMACA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

**JOINT BUDGET PLANNING AND STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**

March 22, 1996

1:30-4:00pm

Grossmont Room 543

**PRESENT:** D. Agosto, S. Amador, M. Amov, J. Austin, J. Buckley, S. Baker, E. Cardenas, P. Carmona, C. Chiriboga, E. Costa, J. Daniels, S. DeWolf, C. McMahan, K. Metli, S. Nicholson, B. Phillips, S. Rearic, G. Rowbotham, R. Sanchez, G. Standing, H. Toll, P. White, N. Yale.  
**Guests:** S. Haber, D. Parsons, S. Turner, T. Wiseman (for L. DeJesus)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES, MEETING OF MARCH 8, 1996:**

With insufficient opportunity to review the minutes, approval was deferred. Members were requested to review minutes and e-mail or phone changes to committee secretary. Minutes to be distributed districtwide via e-mail week of March 25.

**BUDGET ISSUES:**

Jim Austin deferred items A and B on the agenda to a later meeting (budget preparation timeline and budget preparation update), and established a sub-group on budget preparation (Rearic, Metli, Rowbotham).

Austin reviewed his memo of March 13th, detailing potential sources of funding for action initiatives supporting Cuyamaca College self-sufficiency. There was discussion about the funding option of transferring vacant funded positions from Grossmont to Cuyamaca. Austin clarified that there is a District procedure that specifies that positions that are vacant for over eighteen months are no longer college-specific positions, and they are available for the Chancellor to delete, transfer, or hold. This topic will be revisited at the next Cabinet meeting.

Austin also clarified the definition of "cap" and how the level of funding is determined. For 1994-95, actual FTES was 13,410, and the District was funded for 13,043. Theoretically, for 1995-96, the District's new base should be 13,043 plus one percent. The discussion and questions that ensued centered around the relationship of growth for Cuyamaca and "over cap" and, therefore, unfunded FTES. The District as a whole is already self-sufficient. Likewise, Grossmont as a whole is self-sufficient in spite of the fact that there are units within it that are not. In four years, after reallocating money from Grossmont to Cuyamaca, the District will still be self-sufficient. Some members of the group questioned whether the investment to reach a different kind of self-sufficiency would be worth it.

The counter argument had several components: 1) There is no projection that Grossmont will lose any money; 2) As Cuyamaca becomes more self-sufficient (i.e., contributing an equal amount to the District as Grossmont, proportional to size), it is possible that Grossmont's contribution to the District can be proportionately reduced; 3) Using the argument of weaker units within a strong whole, why is Grossmont "carrying" weaker units when it is feasible to strengthen those units so they don't continually present a drain on resources; and 4) All this discussion is about fiscal self-sufficiency. Self-sufficiency is two-pronged: fiscal and educational. The current thrust of educational self-sufficiency is equalization of the

fulltime/parttime instructor ratio. Although Cuyamaca is scheduled to add 14 fulltime instructors within the next four years, the ratio of fulltime instructors to parttime would still not equal Grossmont's.

The crucial factor is that the Governing Board has designated the fiscal and educational self-sufficiency of Cuyamaca College as one of seven goals for the District. How the District proceeds to fulfill this goal is the subject for discussion, not whether or not to fulfill it.

**PROCESS:**

Options developed at today's meeting will be looped out to constituencies. Charleen McMahan cautioned the committee members to come back to the next meeting with enough insight from their constituencies as to what they can live with, but not to make a rigid commitment to any particular option. Premature commitment to an option is positional; everyone will have a different position, and there will be stalemate.

**DEVELOPMENT OF ADDITIONAL OPTIONS FOR FUNDING OF CUYAMACA COLLEGE ACTION INITIATIVES SUPPORTING SELF SUFFICIENCY:**

The interest-based discussion is described on the attachment: 1) What are the interests related to the funding of CC; 2)

**NEXT MEETING:** Friday, April 19, 1996, 1:30pm, Cuyamaca Room E-113.

/ja 3-29-96  
d:\wp\meetings\spc\3'22'96.min

**GROSSMONT-CUYAMACA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
**Joint Committee – Strategic Planning and Budget Planning**

**Assignment:** Develop recommendations to the Governing Board regarding the identification of resources for the self-sufficiency of Cuyamaca College.

**Proposed costs:**

	Personnel	Other	Total
1996-97	\$300,000 (on-going)	\$300,000 (one-time)	\$600,000

Story

- \* 96-97 Strategies/recommendations
- \* \$300,000 ongoing; \$300,000 one time
- \* Long range goal - over 4 years; at 4th year, goal is \$1.5 million
- \* Attract new students and get funded
- \* Educational quality
- \* Board directive
- \* Long history - fear of being burned again
- \* Working in new environment - fiscal challenges and opportunities

Interests

- \* Grossmont and District Office services not negatively impacted (i.e., reduction in funds and quality)
- \* Able to explain what we are saying (clear to all) and communicated widely and frequently
- \* Benefits all students of the district
- \* Both campuses and District services benefit from funding increases to support visions at all sites
- \* Monitor and be realistic about funding source expectations
- \* Have contingencies if funding is not realized
- \* Promote quality instruction
- \* Avoid reward and punishment mentality - use an investment approach (civility)
- \* Allow flexibility to move toward other strategic directions of GCCCD
- \* Quality shared governance
- \* Process does not negatively impact staff (we can live with it)
- \* Brings us together - does not further divide us
- \* Want an efficient process that creates a recommendation to the chancellor that is an accurate representation to the Board
- \* Long range and short term perspective in evaluation of plan

Parking Lot

- \* Feedback to continual review of impact on human and facilities infrastructure
- \* Potential sources run through Formula in 1996-97 - see what happens
- \* Redirect funding to Cuyamaca for positions vacant over 18 months

## Options

### Immediate -

- \* \$300,000 one time dedicated from infrastructure block grant\* (1-time)
- \* Reduce District's 22% allocation (\$88,106 of projected 96-97 growth)(on-going)
- \* \$100,000 annual allocation to ECPAC (on-going)
- \* \$50,000 (estimated) balance of ECPAC allocation this year (1-time)
- \* Cuyamaca share of 1996-97 growth dollars offset part of continuing costs (96-97 estimate \$400,500)
- \* .5% contingency reserve used for continuing costs (\$240,000)
- \* .5% contingency reserve used for 1-time costs (\$240,000)
- \* Use Formula to distribute dollars
- \* Use \$200,000 unallocated as dedicated for Cuyamaca
- \* Use categorical funds to satisfy 1-time needs that qualify for funds (estimated technology and infrastructure grant for 1996-97 - \$800,000)
- \* Dedicate 1995-96 additional lottery (\$200,000), tax backfill (\$374,000), and GAIN and basic skills funding (\$300,000)

### Future -

- \* Pursue outside funding for one time needs (grants, philanthropic contributions, donations of technology, Barnes & Noble donation)
- \* Sell or lease assets
- \* Revenue generating enterprises (tennis lessons, RV park, circus)
- \* Create mechanism for internal contributions by employees



## COFO Faculty Equity Statement (Draft 6 - January 17, 1996)

We, the members of the Council of Faculty Organizations (COFO), recognize that the part-time and full-time faculty members of the California Community College System share common professional interests. The core of this common interest is our responsibility to provide educational opportunities of the highest quality to our students. To accomplish that purpose full- and part-time faculty must communicate effectively with each other, share institutional responsibilities and rewards, and create an academic community that is based on mutual respect. Part-time faculty must be recognized as competent, responsible and productive members of a distinguished and honorable profession. At the present time these conditions do not uniformly exist in the community colleges of California.

Providing students an excellent education and instituting fair working conditions for part-time faculty are complementary objectives. To this end, COFO supports the right of part-time faculty to participate in organizations and activities that shape the direction of the individual community college. All faculty should participate in departmental functions, assume organizational responsibilities, and contribute to the general well-being of the institution.

Full- and part-time faculty are required to meet the same minimum qualifications for employment and should be hired and evaluated using comparable processes. Students should have reasonable access to all faculty members—both full- and part-time. Since full- and part-time faculty have the same responsibilities to students, part-time faculty members should have the same support services, office space, choice of educational materials, and opportunities for professional development as their full-time colleagues.

Part-time faculty should be accorded fair compensation, professional respect and due process. It is the role of the Legislature, first and foremost, to protect part-time faculty from discriminatory treatment. Further, it is the recognized role and responsibility of individual bargaining agents to make contractual gains that will benefit part-time faculty which in turn will improve the educational quality of the institutions that employ them. However, we, the representatives to COFO, urge support of the following rights for part-time faculty: pro-rata pay, contractual consideration for full-time positions, health benefits, seniority or rehire rights, paid office hours, legitimate STRS pension opportunities and true professional status relating to teaching and learning issues.

We view the need for improving these conditions as self-evident, and we are confident that better communication and mutual respect between full- and part-time faculty, as well as frank discussions of these labor and educational issues, will lead to changes that will benefit community colleges and full-time faculty as well as the part-time faculty who are directly affected.

# 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure With 1970 Interpretive Comments

---

*In 1940, following a series of joint conferences begun in 1934, representatives of the American Association of University Professors and of the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) agreed upon a restatement of principles set forth in the 1925 Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This restatement is known to the profession as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.*

*The 1940 Statement is printed below, followed by Interpretive Comments as developed by representatives of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1969. The governing bodies of the two associations, meeting respectively in November 1989 and January 1990, adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.*

**T**he purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to ensure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher<sup>1</sup> or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.<sup>[1]</sup><sup>2</sup>

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

## ACADEMIC FREEDOM

- (a) Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
- (b) Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.<sup>[2]</sup> Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.<sup>[3]</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The word "teacher" as used in this document is understood to include the investigator who is attached to an academic institution without teaching duties.

<sup>2</sup>Bold-face numbers in brackets refer to Interpretive Comments which follow.

2. That all tenure claims of teachers appointed prior to the endorsement should be determined in accordance with the principles set forth in the 1925 *Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.
3. If the administration of a college or university feels that a teacher has not observed the admonitions of paragraph (c) of the section on Academic Freedom and believes that the extramural utterances of the teacher have been such as to raise grave doubts concerning the teacher's fitness for his or her position, it may proceed to file charges under paragraph (a)(4) of the section on Academic Tenure. In pressing such charges the administration should remember that teachers are citizens and should be accorded the freedom of citizens. In such cases the administration must assume full responsibility, and the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges are free to make an investigation.

### 1970 INTERPRETIVE COMMENTS

*Following extensive discussions on the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with leading educational associations and with individual faculty members and administrators, a joint committee of the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges met during 1969 to reevaluate this key policy statement. On the basis of the comments received, and the discussions that ensued, the joint committee felt the preferable approach was to formulate interpretations of the Statement in terms of the experience gained in implementing and applying the Statement for over thirty years and of adapting it to current needs.*

*The committee submitted to the two associations for their consideration the following "Interpretive Comments." These interpretations were adopted by the Council of the American Association of University Professors in April 1970 and endorsed by the Fifty-sixth Annual Meeting as Association policy.*

In the thirty years since their promulgation, the principles of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* have undergone a substantial amount of refinement. This has evolved through a variety of processes, including customary acceptance, understandings mutually arrived at between institutions and professors or their representatives, investigations and reports by the American Association of University Professors, and formulations of statements by that association either alone or in conjunction with the Association of American Colleges. These comments represent the attempt of the two associations, as the original sponsors of the 1940 *Statement*, to formulate the most important of these refinements. Their incorporation here as Interpretive Comments is based upon the premise that the 1940 *Statement* is not a static code but a fundamental document designed to set a framework of norms to guide adaptations to changing times and circumstances.

Also, there have been relevant developments in the law itself reflecting a growing insistence by the courts on due process within the academic community which parallels the essential concepts of the 1940 *Statement*; particularly relevant is the identification by the Supreme Court of academic freedom as a right protected by the First Amendment. As the Supreme Court said in *Keyishian v. Board of Regents* 385 U.S. 589 (1967), "Our Nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, which is of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned. That freedom is therefore a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom."

The numbers refer to the designated portion of the 1940 *Statement* on which interpretive comment is made.

1. The Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors have long recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. Both associations either separately or jointly have consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in their utterances as citizens, in the exercise of their responsibilities to the institution and to students, and in their conduct when resigning from their institution or when undertaking government-sponsored research. Of particular relevance is the *Statement on Professional Ethics*, adopted in 1966 as Associ-

7. The effect of this subparagraph is that a decision on tenure, favorable or unfavorable, must be made at least twelve months prior to the completion of the probationary period. If the decision is negative, the appointment for the following year becomes a terminal one. If the decision is affirmative, the provisions in the 1940 *Statement* with respect to the termination of service of teachers or investigators after the expiration of a probationary period should apply from the date when the favorable decision is made.

The general principle of notice contained in this paragraph is developed with greater specificity in the *Standards for Notice of Nonreappointment*, endorsed by the Fiftieth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors (1964). These standards are:

Notice of nonreappointment, or of intention not to recommend reappointment to the governing board, should be given in writing in accordance with the following standards:

- (1) *Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service*, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
- (2) *Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service*, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
- (3) At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.

Other obligations, both of institutions and of individuals, are described in the *Statement on Recruitment and Resignation of Faculty Members*, as endorsed by the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors in 1961.

8. The freedom of probationary teachers is enhanced by the establishment of a regular procedure for the periodic evaluation and assessment of the teacher's academic performance during probationary status. Provision should be made for regularized procedures for the consideration of complaints by probationary teachers that their academic freedom has been violated. One suggested procedure to serve these purposes is contained in the *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, prepared by the American Association of University Professors.

9. A further specification of the academic due process to which the teacher is entitled under this paragraph is contained in the *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*, jointly approved by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1958. This interpretive document deals with the issue of suspension, about which the 1940 *Statement* is silent.

The 1958 *Statement* provides: "Suspension of the faculty member during the proceedings is justified only if immediate harm to the faculty member or others is threatened by the faculty member's continuance. Unless legal considerations forbid, any such suspension should be with pay." A suspension which is not followed by either reinstatement or the opportunity for a hearing is in effect a summary dismissal in violation of academic due process.

The concept of "moral turpitude" identifies the exceptional case in which the professor may be denied a year's teaching or pay in whole or in part. The statement applies to that kind of behavior which goes beyond simply warranting discharge and is so utterly blameworthy as to make it inappropriate to require the offering of a year's teaching or pay. The standard is not that the moral sensibilities of persons in the particular community have been affronted. The standard is behavior that would evoke condemnation by the academic community generally.

#### ENDORSERS

Association of American Colleges and Universities .....	1941
American Association of University Professors .....	1941
American Library Association (adapted for librarians) .....	1946
Association of American Law Schools .....	1946
American Political Science Association .....	1947
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education .....	1950

Eastern Finance Association .....	1968
American Association for Chinese Studies .....	1968
American Society of Plant Physiologists .....	1968
University Film and Video Association .....	1968
American Dialect Society .....	1968
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association .....	1968
Association of Social and Behavioral Scientists .....	1968
College English Association .....	1968
National College Physical Education Association for Men .....	1969
American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association .....	1969
History of Education Society .....	1969
Council for Philosophical Studies .....	1969
American Musicological Society .....	1969
American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese .....	1969
Texas Junior College Teachers Association .....	1970
College Art Association of America .....	1970
Society of Professors of Education .....	1970
American Anthropological Association .....	1970
Association of Theological Schools .....	1970
American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism .....	1971
American Business Law Association .....	1971
American Council for the Arts .....	1972
New York State Mathematics Association of Two-Year Colleges .....	1972
College Language Association .....	1973
Pennsylvania Historical Association .....	1973
Massachusetts Regional Community College Faculty Association .....	1973
American Philosophical Association*** .....	1974
American Classical League .....	1974
American Comparative Literature Association .....	1974
Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association .....	1974
Society of Architectural Historians .....	1975
American Statistical Association .....	1975
American Folklore Society .....	1975
Association for Asian Studies .....	1975
Linguistic Society of America .....	1975
African Studies Association .....	1975
American Institute of Biological Sciences .....	1975
North American Conference on British Studies .....	1975
Sixteenth-Century Studies Conference .....	1975
Texas Association of College Teachers .....	1976
Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies .....	1976
Association for Jewish Studies .....	1976
Western Speech Communication Association .....	1976
Texas Association of Colleges for Teacher Education .....	1977
Metaphysical Society of America .....	1977
American Chemical Society .....	1977
Texas Library Association .....	1977
American Society for Legal History .....	1977
Iowa Higher Education Association .....	1977
American Physical Therapy Association .....	1979

\*\*\*Endorsed by the Association's Western Division in 1952, Eastern Division in 1953, and Pacific Division in 1962.