CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE - AGENDA

February 9, 1982

UU 220 3:00 PM

Chair, Tim Kersten
Vice Chair, Ron Brown
Secretary, Harry Sharp

I. Minutes

II. Announcements

III. Reports

Administrative Council (Brown)
CSUC Academic Senate (Hale, Riedlsperger, Weatherby)
Foundation Board (Kersten)
President's Council (Kersten)

IV. Committee Reports

Budget (Conway) General Education and Breadth (Wenzl)
Constitution and Bylaws (Rogalla) Instruction (Gooden)
Curriculum (Butler) Long Range Planning (Simmons)
Distinguished Teacher Award (Ruehr) Personnel Policies (Murray)
Election (Mosher) Personnel Review (Brown)
Faculty Library (Barnes) Research (Dingus)
Fairness Board (Rosenman) Student Affairs (Scriven)

V. Business Items

A. Resolution on Assigned Time Utilization (Dingus) (Second Reading) (Attachment)

B. Resolution on Promotion Policies (Murray) (First Reading) (Attachment)
RESOLUTION ON ASSIGNED TIME UTILIZATION

WHEREAS, Professional development of faculty is recognized as a second priority of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo; and

WHEREAS, It is recognized that teaching loads sometimes greatly limit the amount of time individual faculty can devote to activities that promote their professional development; and

WHEREAS, There are usually a few funded but unfilled positions at department, school, and university levels each year; and

WHEREAS, These unfilled positions can be used to provide release time for faculty so they can pursue activities that will contribute to their professional growth and development; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That an accounting of the number of funded but unfilled positions be made at the university and school levels; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends that the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Deans develop procedures that provide faculty in a school an opportunity to utilize assigned time for engaging in professional growth and development activities.
RESOLUTION ON PROMOTION POLICIES

Background: Due to the lack of funds for promotion of all recommended candidates, it has become necessary to rank order those candidates so recommended. CAM does not prescribe procedures for ranking. Currently, candidates are ranked at the department level and the deans arrive at a school rank order after consulting with a standing or ad hoc committee comprised of either the chair of the tenured faculty or a tenured professor selected from each department. It is believed that inconsistent standards and practices between and within departments and schools now exist. In view of these inconsistencies, and the lack of an established procedure in CAM, the Personnel Policies Committee was charged with the duty to develop procedures for ranking candidates recommended for promotion.

WHEREAS, CAM does not specify a procedure for ranking candidates recommended for promotion; and

WHEREAS, Current ranking procedures are inconsistent among the various departments and schools; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the procedures described in CAM Section 342.2.B.2, Items (a) through (f) be replaced by the following procedures.

342.2.B.2 A. - F.

2. Procedures Used in Applying Promotion Factors

a. Primary Level Committee

The primary level of evaluation is either the department or an equivalent level in the case of schools or divisions not subdivided into departments. The Primary Level Committee shall consist of the department head and all tenured members of the department, or an elected committee of same, having rank higher than that of the person eligible for promotion. The PLC shall elect a member as chairperson. The primary level evaluation shall be accorded the most significance.

Each year the PLC will recommend for or against promotion those members of the department who are eligible and who request consideration for promotion. The recommendation will be based on the promotional factors listed in CAM 342.2.B.1. and approved school and/or department criteria.
The PLC will write the reasons for the recommendation positive or negative of each candidate considered for promotion, using the positive approach of specific examples of achievement relative to any appropriate items. In support of the evaluation, the PLC shall provide reliable evidence which will validate the recommendation. The recommendations of the PLC shall be signed by committee members. The recommendations may be unanimous or the majority opinion of the committee members. In those instances where the PLC recommendation represents a majority opinion of the committee members, the filing of a minority recommendation by individual members of the committee whose opinions differ from the views expressed in the majority recommendation is permitted and encouraged.

Since professional improvement, as well as promotion, is a goal of this evaluation program, the department head will discuss with each member the content of the recommendation made on the individual. If the individual is not recommended for promotion by the PLC, the person shall be invited by the department head and committee chair, in writing, to discuss the PLC's recommendation. The individual may submit additional information to the PLC's recommendation. The recommendation on each academic employee shall be signed by the individual before it is submitted to the school dean or division head.

After consideration of members of the department who are eligible and who request consideration for promotion, the PLC shall rank order all persons recommended for promotion. Rank order position of each person recommended for promotion shall be based on the promotion factors and criteria used in making the committee's recommendations, and the PLC shall write reasons for the ranking. In ranking persons recommended for promotion, the committee shall separately rank persons recommended for promotion from assistant to associate professor, and shall rank persons recommended for promotion from associate to professor. The department shall establish its own ranking procedures according to CAM 341.1.C.

By February 10, the department head will submit to the Dean the PLC written recommendations for each individual considered for promotion, and rank order for persons recommended for promotion from assistant to associate, and rank order for persons recommended for promotion from associate to professor. To insure consideration, minority recommendations, and individually signed statements by members of the PLC shall accompany the majority recommendation at the time it is forwarded to the dean.

b. Secondary Level Committee

The secondary level committee shall consist of the school dean and one member of professor rank from each department within a school elected by department tenured and probationary, academic rank employees. The Dean shall be chair of the SLC. In the event a department does not have a tenured member of professor rank, a member of associate rank may be elected, but without eligibility to vote and/or deliberate on candidates being considered for promotion to professor. Members shall serve for two-year, staggered terms. The secondary level committee shall review the PLC recommendations to insure there is sufficient evidence to support the PLC recommendations and rankings. Where such evidence is inadequate, the SLC shall provide a statement to the PLC with a request for additional evidence. The PLC shall have five working days to respond to the SLC's request for additional evidence.
The SLC will recommend for or against promotion based on the promotional facts listed in CAM 342.2.B.1. and approved school criteria. The SLC will write three reasons for the recommendation on each person considered for promotion. The recommendations of the SLC shall be signed by committee members. The recommendations may be unanimous or by majority vote of the committee members. Where the SLC recommendation is only the majority vote of the committee members, the filing of a minority report by members of the committee not voting with the majority is permitted and encouraged.

If the individual is not recommended for promotion by the SLC, but is recommended by the PLC, the school dean or division head shall invite, in writing, the individual to discuss the decision with the dean and SLC, and submit additional information. When the school dean or division head disagrees with the PLC's recommendation, a copy of the recommendation shall be sent to the faculty member.

After considering all persons for promotion within the school or division, the SLC shall meet and rank order all persons recommended for promotion. Rank order position of each person recommended for promotion shall be based on the promotion factors in CAM 342.2.B.1. and approved school criteria, and the SLC shall write reasons for the ranking. In ranking persons recommended for promotion, the SLC shall rank persons recommended for promotion from assistant to associate professor, and shall rank persons recommended for promotion from associate to professor.

342.2.B.3 Allocation of Funds

Funds for promotion are provided by the state according to a formula based on the salary required for promotion of all eligible candidates. In the event that the promotion funds so provided are not adequate to promote all recommended candidates then the following procedures shall be implemented:

The state fractional allocation (SFA) shall be computed by dividing the amount of budget allocations by the amount required to promote all eligible candidates. The promotion funds so obtained by the University shall be divided into two separate funds, namely that for promotion from assistant to associate professor (associate fund) and that for promotion from associate to professor (professor fund). The division shall be based on the SFA as applied to the salary requirement for promotion of all eligible candidates in each of the two above categories in each school.

Promotions will be made in each school and in each category in the order of ranking as determined by the ranking process described in CAM 342.2.B.2. Funds which are insufficient to fund an entire position in each category, and any unused funds due to a lack of recommended candidates in either category will be allowed to be pooled within each school in order to promote the next person or persons in either category. The rank order established by a Primary Level Committee cannot be altered by the Secondary Level Committee without strong supporting documentation.

Remaining funds in each school insufficient to fund an entire position and unused funds from each school, will be returned to a common University pool. These funds will then be used to fund the promotion in any school which needed the least additional funds for promotion of a candidate prior to the funds being returned to the University pool.

In the event that more than one position qualifies for these additional returned funds, priority shall be given to the promotion to the associate professorial level.