REMINDER: THE MEETING OF JANUARY 17 HAS BEEN CONTINUED TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 24. PLEASE BRING YOUR AGENDA FROM LAST WEEK

I. Minutes:

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Reports:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):

These are the items remaining:

H. Statement re Full-time Status for Committee Membership-Rogalla, Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (p. 19).
I. Statement re Termination of Senate Terms-of-Office, Rogalla, Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee (p. 20).
J. Appointment of Estelle Basor to the Affirmative Action Faculty Development Program Review Committee (as replacement for Marylud Baldwin).
K. Appointment of James Howland as part-time representative to the Senate for Winter and Spring Quarters.
L. Appointment of representative to the Academic Council on International Programs (p. 21).
M. Academic Senate and committee vacancies (p. 22).

VI. Discussion Item(s):
A. Use of external peer reviewers for the State Faculty Support Grant proposals.
B. Opportunities for disadvantaged faculty.
C. Major issues for the Academic Senate to address this year.
D. Notice of Senate/committee vacancies in the Cal Poly Report.
E. Use of Consent Agenda for uncontroversial Senate resolutions.

VII. Adjournment: time certain 4:55pm
Background

The current schedule for Academic Senate elections requires nomination forms to be completed near or during winter quarter finals. This is a time of much faculty activity and completion of nomination – agreement to serve forms may not be given a high priority. A change in timing may increase the attention or priority given to service on the Academic Senate.

This resolution was passed by the C&BL Committee on November 8, 1988 with a vote of 5 For, 0 Against. One member was absent and the schools of AED and SM have no appointed representatives.

Resolution to Amend the Bylaws

to move nominations for Academic Senate from March to February.

Whereas, the personnel office can have the information needed by the elections committee early in February;

Whereas there have been problems in obtaining willingness to serve applications for Academic Senate in March;

Whereas, this has caused the need for Senate seats to be filled by appointment rather than election;

Whereas, there is a desire to have as full a democratic process in the election; therefore be it

Resolved, that the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be amended as follows:

Article VII I 5 b(2)

2. Election of Academic Senate members, the Research Committee, and the University Professional Leave Committee:

(a) At the March February meeting of the Senate, the committee shall announce impending vacancies in the Senate membership (according to the filled full-time equivalent faculty positions as of the first week of February, as listed by the university Personnel Office), and the Research Committee, and in the University Professional Leave Committee. At the same time, each caucus shall be notified in writing of its vacancies.
(b) By Friday of the following week, each caucus shall notify the Elections Committee, in writing, of any discrepancies in the number of vacancies in its constituency.

(c) During the last full week of March February, the committee shall solicit nominations for the impending vacancies. Accepted nominations shall include a signed statement of intent to serve from the candidate. For each school and Professional Consultative Services, the Elections Committee shall determine that each nominee is eligible to serve.

* Pending Revision
To: Charles Andrews, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Raymond D. Terry, Chair  
Instruction Committee

Re: Plus /Minus Grading

The Academic Senate Instruction Committee met on Thursday, January 12, 1989 to consider, in part, the question of whether the plus/minus grading system should remain optional.

Ten members of the Instruction Committee were present. The Committee was unanimous in favoring that the plus/minus grading system remain optional. Factors entering into this decision include:

1. The members of the Instruction Committee do not believe that employers, admissions officers and other persons who regularly interpret and evaluate transcripts look at individual course grades as representing a ranking. For example, if an instructor in a graduate course of six students assigns 5A and 1B, the individual receiving the grade of B has received the second ranked grade (on a system without plus/minus grading) or the fourth-ranked grade (if plus/minus grading is used). Nevertheless, his ranking in the class is sixth of six. Other examples could be constructed to show any kind of anomaly. In short, there is no correlation between the a priori ranking of a grade with respect to the grading system and the ranking of the individual in a particular class.

2. There is no way to make use of the plus/minus grading system mandatory. Even now, there is no way to force an instructor to use all of the available letter grades. As an anecdotal argument, in the Mathematics Department two years ago, one instructor (who believed that the prerequisite for the second, third or fourth quarter of calculus should be a grade of C or better in the previous quarter of calculus) effected such a D-stopper for students enrolled in his classes by simply announcing that he would only assign grades of A, B, C or F. Thus, if a student received what would normally be a grade of D, the instructor made a judgment concerning the student's ability to go on to the next quarter of the sequence and gave the student either a C or an F. By the same token, individual instructors will develop their own way of dealing with plus/minus grades.
3. The student body and a large number of faculty are opposed to implementation of the plus/minus grading system at all and are willing to tolerate it only if it is optional.

4. The Instruction Committee took into consideration the recommendation of the ASI representative to this committee.

Action completed: 1/12/89

Vote: 10-0 (Present for the meeting were 7 school members and 3 ex officio members.)
THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF A HIGH QUALITY FACULTY

CSU TASK FORCE REPORT

JULY 1988
challenge divide naturally into three groups: 1) procedures for recruitment and outreach, 2) incentives for recruitment and retention, 3) supply. Equity issues prevail in all three categories. Policy recommendations form the body of the report. The Appendix contains existing and possible new strategies to meet the challenge.

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY

A faculty representative of the rich diversity of the citizenry, able to offer a multi-cultural curriculum to a student body which will be increasingly ethnically and culturally diverse, will be an essential asset of the university.

1. Recommend: that it is the policy of the Board of Trustees to employ a faculty of the highest quality which increasingly represents and reflects the ethnic and cultural diversity of the State.

The goal and the commitment of the CSU are not new, but additional strategies and effort are needed as affirmative action hiring becomes more difficult. "The Master Plan Renewed" recommends that:

"Educational equity must have the commitment of the Governor, Legislature, the segmental governing boards, and the California Education Round Table and be a principal element in every aspect of institutional operations: The governing boards must exercise continuing oversight of their institutions' effectiveness in achieving educational equity. They must hold faculty and administrators accountable for the success of each institution in achieving equity, and themselves accept accountability to the people of the state. They must regularly assess and evaluate institutional progress toward equity, requesting reports by campus that rate... (3) faculty diversification, and (4) outreach efforts. They shall regularly report to the Governor and Legislature on progress made toward achieving educational equity."

In light of the charge from the Master Plan Commission and the predicted increased difficulties in hiring,

2. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees' Committee on Faculty and Staff Relations shall annually review a report, from each campus, which describes the hiring, retention, tenure and promotion of faculty, compares with the previous year the appointment and career progress of ethnic minorities, the disabled and women in fields in which they are underrepresented and highlights, in its summary conclusions, such achievements or lack thereof.
PROCEDURES FOR RECRUITMENT AND OUTREACH

I. Meeting the challenge of hiring large numbers of high quality faculty will require a) anticipation of the problems involved, b) recognition of the recruitment crisis as an opportunity for renewal, c) new strategies combined with existing successful approaches, and d) a well-organized response to effect change. Hiring is primarily the responsibility of the faculty and a successful response to the recruitment crisis particularly requires faculty involvement from the beginning.

3. Recommend: that Presidents charge their faculty and academic administrations with a collaborative effort in studying and planning for personnel turnover, the supply problem, the need for a more diverse and representative faculty, new recruitment strategies, the possibility of hiring from a wider range of sources, and possible adaptations and additions to criteria for hiring, retention, tenure and promotion.

II. Hiring of faculty is initiated at the department level on each campus. The allocation of a tenure-track position is made at the School or University level, advertising is usually approved at the School or University level and the actual appointment is made by the President or the President's designee. While affirmative action officers, deans and committees may help departmental hiring committees in their searches, the search is usually begun, directed and carried out at the departmental level. While the initiative and primary responsibility for hiring must remain with the department faculty, many departments have not hired tenure-track faculty for years; the campus and the Office of the Chancellor can provide information, support services and coordination to aid in hiring high quality faculty.

4. Recommend: that the Presidents, with the assistance of the Chancellor, undertake the responsibility to provide assistance, information, training and coordination of support mechanisms to departments as they seek to hire new faculty.

Fewer students electing academic careers in the 1980's and extensive hiring of faculty in the 1960's both contribute to the recruitment crisis. Hiring faculty at various stages in their professional lives and hiring professionals from non-academic positions can increase sources of supply and prevent the development of another "retirement cohort." New faculty from outside academe may need assistance in developing academic skills and credentials.

5. Recommend: that in order to broaden the pool of potential faculty applicants, the Chancellor, together with the Presidents, develop 1) incentives for attracting professionals from outside academe to commit themselves to an academic career; and 2) ways to assist them in acquiring academic skills and appropriate academic credentials.

6. Recommend: that the Presidents allocate positions and encourage departments to search for faculty who are at various stages of their professional lives, and the Board of Trustees seek a salary schedule to accommodate this.
Currently, new faculty positions are funded at Assistant Professor Step 8, and replacement positions are funded at the level of the previous incumbents only if they are immediately filled. Replacement positions revert to Step 8 if they are vacant on July 1. Tenure-track appointments now average $37,090 or 22% above Assistant Professor Step 8. The higher costs associated with hiring above Step 8 are compensated for by savings from replacement positions and by hiring part-time faculty. As fewer faculty fresh out of graduate school will be available, faculty with some experience are sought and projected student enrollment increases in the mid 1990's, it will be necessary to hire a larger proportion of new tenure-track faculty at higher steps, thus increasing the average cost of new faculty hires. In order to avoid increasing the proportion of part-time faculty, it will be necessary to seek a higher level of funding for new faculty positions, including replacement positions which revert.

7. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees seek the funding of new faculty positions at a more realistic level than the current Step 8 and seek further means of making competitive appointments.

III. Although the CSU campuses are part of one system and cooperate at several levels, in hiring they are each other's competitors. Advantages and economies of scale are possible, however, which would make cooperation in recruitment worthwhile and with which the Office of the Chancellor can assist.

8. Recommend: that the Chancellor and Presidents encourage and assist cooperation among campuses in recruiting faculty.

IV. Successful recruitment requires personal intervention by faculty and administrators such as visiting other universities to talk with graduate students, attending conferences, bringing candidates to campus. It requires a substantial investment of faculty and administrative time and travel. The CSU is prepared to undertake whatever can be done within the system, but that will not be enough without additional funding and increased flexibility in the use of funds.

9. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees seek both full funding for relocation expenses and additional funding for travel and associated costs of outreach and recruitment.

10. Recommend: that the Chancellor review and appropriately revise travel regulations to allow more flexibility in the use of general fund money.

11. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees 1) recognize the need for additional positions to enable the campuses to provide for greater emphasis on personal involvement of campus personnel in outreach and recruitment of new faculty and 2) request budget support for such new positions as appropriate.
INCENTIVES FOR RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

As competition for high quality faculty becomes more intense, universities will increasingly be compared by prospective candidates on factors which will affect the candidates' professional lives, salary, benefits and workload, of course, but also less tangible concerns such as what support will be available to enhance professional life, will there be help in curriculum development, what are the students like, and how will the candidate get along with fellow faculty members?

Anecdotal reports indicate that such questions are being raised with increasing frequency by prospective faculty members. These issues, tangible and intangible, affect both the recruitment of new faculty and the retention of present faculty.

I. Maintenance of competitive salaries is current CSU policy. Average faculty salaries by academic rank are competitive, however the maximum salaries are higher at comparison institutions. Competition among institutions will become more intense in order to maintain the quality of the faculty and will be particularly intense for the small, and continuously dwindling, pool of minority and women candidates in fields in which they are underrepresented.

12. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees affirm its support of a competitive salary schedule for faculty and, while maintaining a competitive base for entry level salaries, seek the support necessary to increase the maximum salaries that can be paid for all academic ranks.

II. Traditionally, improvements in benefits have involved increased coverage or higher employer contributions. It may be possible, however, to provide a wider array of benefits, at little cost increase, which would increase the competitiveness of the CSU, particularly in hiring new faculty who have had several years of experience as faculty elsewhere or in other professional fields.

13. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees 1) support in principle provision for individually variable benefit plans as well as retirement plans which would allow transferability of retirement funds from other states both by liberalizing current plans and by providing alternate retirement systems, and 2) direct the Chancellor to review the feasibility of and seek to implement such benefits as appropriate.

III. Housing is expensive in California and on several of the campuses may be a significant obstruction to enticing new faculty, according to a recent survey commissioned by the Trustees. Housing assistance centers have been established on the campuses and an agreement has been reached with a mortgage broker service. Housing costs are a part of the cost-of-living, however, and reducing these costs is beyond the control of the CSU. The usual way to attract employees to areas with high costs of living is to provide salary adjustments. Although economic comparability is considered in the selection of institutions chosen for salary comparisons, housing costs in particular are not reflected in the way CSU faculty salaries are set, nor are regional differences within California recognized.
14. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor explore more carefully the relationship between the salary structure, the level of salaries and issues raised by housing and the cost-of-living.

IV. A recurrent concern of students, faculty and the administration of the CSU is the size of the teaching load, particularly for faculty fresh out of graduate school who must develop courses while seeking to establish themselves professionally. A separate working group has been appointed to address workload and flexible staffing. In addition to encouraging the use of flexibility inherent in the present workload formula, the working group will investigate the extent to which CSU policy and practices on faculty workload are competitive with comparison institutions.

15. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees in its policies and legislative and budgetary programs see that CSU policies and practices in faculty workload ensure the CSU's competitive position in recruitment and retention.

V. Opportunities are necessary for faculty to meet the needs of a changing student body, contribute professionally, maintain currency in their fields in order to teach well and to develop the intellectual vitality that makes for good teaching and an attractive environment for prospective faculty. "The Master Plan Renewed" endorses support for research, scholarship and creative activity and professional development for better teaching, and in their 1988-89 budget request, the Board of Trustees included three proposals to provide support for faculty development, for research, scholarship and creative activity and for additional sabbatical leaves. Full funding of these three proposals would provide an excellent start of support for faculty.

16. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees seek additional support for faculty professional activities, including increased support for research, scholarship and creative activity, for faculty professional development and for sabbatical leaves.

Programs which assist new faculty in understanding how a campus works and introduce new faculty to each other and to colleagues with similar interests can provide an advantage to the CSU over other institutions, especially for highly sought after faculty such as ethnic minorities and women in fields in which they are underrepresented.

17. Recommend: that the Presidents encourage the continuation and expansion of programs to orient new faculty and programs to help new faculty form social and professional networks.

VI. The CSU is a major supplier of employees to the businesses and industries of California, but is nevertheless in competition with them. Unable to offer salaries which compete with entering salaries in many businesses, industries, the law, and medicine, academe sees undergraduates and graduate students electing not to train for academic careers and sees new Ph.D's choosing industry over the universities. Yet, it is in the long term interest of business and industry to encourage high quality people to enter academic careers and in competing, without also helping the universities, they are eating their own seed corn. A statewide campaign could be undertaken, much as
a development campaign might be, to involve the private sector in the needs of the university and to enlist cooperation and support in meeting the demands of students and for employees in the next decade or two.

18. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees establish a concerted statewide campaign to educate and involve the private sector in the needs of the university.

SUPPLY

Not only will more positions open up as current faculty retire, but fewer graduate students are preparing themselves for faculty positions and fewer are entering academic careers. As a major employer of academic professionals, the CSU has a responsibility to the nation and the state, as well as to the system itself, to seek to alleviate the "supply problem." "The Master Plan Renewed" recommends that:

"The Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall establish and the Governor and Legislature fund a statewide program for the early identification, recruitment, and training of minority and women undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate students for faculty and academic administrative positions. Additionally, the Regents of the University of California and the Board of Trustees of the California State University shall establish and maintain a program for articulation between CSU undergraduate and master's programs and UC doctoral and professional programs for the purpose of recruiting underrepresented minorities and women to advanced study."

A model Pre-doctoral program and a model Doctoral Incentive/Forgivable Loan Program are included in the Appendix.

19. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees seek a pilot Pre-doctoral program to identify and assist minority and women students in entering academic careers in fields in which they are underrepresented.

20. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees seek to expand loan programs and grants for graduate students, such as the Doctoral Incentive/Forgivable Loan Program, so that they may complete terminal degrees.

21. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees, working with the Regents of the University of California, urge their respective faculties to develop articulation of Masters programs in the CSU to Doctoral programs in UC.

22. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees call upon the University of California and the State of California to increase graduate programs in fields in which there are potential shortages.
One barrier to enrollment in a doctoral program by students who graduate from the CSU is that the majority of these students must work and can attend the university only on a part-time basis. However, doctoral programs at the University of California rarely permit part-time attendance.

23. Recommend: that the Board of Trustees call upon the University California and other universities granting doctoral degrees to permit, and where possible, to encourage part-time attendance in doctoral programs.

Expanding the supply of available high quality faculty also requires seeking additional sources of supply. One source is among the disabled, but hiring increased numbers of disabled candidates may require revisions in hiring practices and accommodations on the campuses.

24. Recommend: that the Presidents and Chancellor examine hiring practices and seek reasonable accommodations to the needs of the disabled.