Chair, Lezlie Labhard
Vice Chair, David Saveker
Secretary, Charles Jennings

I. Minutes - Academic Senate, October 14, 1975

II. Reports
   A. CSUC Academic Senate (Olsen, Wenzl, Murphy)
   B. Administrative Council (Weatherby)
   C. Academic Council (Saveker)
   D. Foundation Board (Labhard)
   E. President's Council (Labhard)

III. Committee Reports
   A. Budget (Nielsen)
   B. Curriculum (Sullivan)
   C. Election (Buffa)
   D. Instruction (Greffenius)
   E. Personnel Policies (Beecher)
   F. Student Affairs (Culver)
   G. General Education and Breadth Requirements (Williamson)
   H. Constitution and Bylaws (Gold)
   I. Long-Range Planning (Saveker)
   J. Personnel Review (Kann)
   K. Research (Thomas)
   L. Fairness Board (Langford)
   M. Faculty Library (Lutrin)
   N. Distinguished Teaching Awards (Roberts)

IV. Business Items
   A. Disabled Students Day (Culver - Student Affairs)(Attachment IV-A)
   B. Candidates for Graduation - Recommendation of (CAM 619.1)(Greffenius - Instruction Committee)(Attachment IV-B)
   C. Records and Privacy (Beecher - Personnel Policies; Culver - Student Affairs)(Attachment IV-C1,2)
   D. Academic Promotions CAM 342.2 (After 60/40, What?)(Beecher - Personnel Policies)(Attachment IV-D)
   E. Merger P.E. Departments (White)(Attachment IV-E)

   -[signature]-
   12/9
VI. Announcements (Labhard unless noted otherwise)

A. Procurement and Retention of Quality Faculty (Executive Committee Action) (Attachment VI-A) (Murphy)

B. Committee Membership (Labhard) Changes - new 1st Jan

C. Constitution Changes (Labhard) (Attachment VI-D)

D. Fresno Meeting of Senate Chairs (Attachment to be distributed)

E. Fifth Annual Academic Retreat - Asilomar (Attachment to be distributed)

F. Kennedy presentation December 9, definite

G. Marley Visit (January 13 or February 10) no response

H. Reactions to Fall Conference, to Senator office

I. Consultative Committee for the Selection of Dean of Science and Math in year

J. Science and Math representatives on the Personnel Review Committee; Walt Elliot and Gerald Farrell

K. Scoresheets (Attached)
RESOLUTION ON DISABLED STUDENT AWARENESS DAY

Background Rationale: In September 1974, some thirty administrators participated in a Disabled Persons Awareness Day. The purpose of this participation was to bring into balance our entire campus population on the situation facing disabled students.

As a partial result of this exercise, Mr. Robert Bonds, Coordinator of Student Community Services, suggested that the Academic Senate: (1) support a Disabled Student Awareness Day; (2) that each department participate in a 5 hour exercise; and (3), that an evaluation of such involvement be sent to the coordinator of Disabled Student Affairs, president of Disabled Student Services, and Chair of the Academic Senate.

WHEREAS, The problems of disabled students are often overlooked by the faculty, staff and students at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, We can all benefit from the experiences of others; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support a Disabled Student Awareness Day late Winter quarter, in which each Department would designate one faculty member to participate in a five hour exercise in which he/she would assume the role of a disabled student; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a steering committee be appointed composed of designated faculty members. A date, publicity and design specifics of the exercise will be the responsibility of the steering committee with consultation from the president of Disabled Student Services. It is hoped that each faculty participant share the experience at the departmental level and submit an evaluation to the coordinator of Disabled Student Affairs, president of Disabled Student Services, Student Affairs Committee, and the Chair of the Academic Senate.

Student Affairs Committee
10/24/75
RESOLUTION REGARDING DISTRIBUTION OF THE LIST OF CANDIDATES FOR GRADUATION

Background Rationale: Much discussion has centered on the procedure of distributing the list of Candidates for Graduation to each faculty member because of the cost and time involved, as well as the value/usefulness of the list.

On March 19, 1975 the Instruction Committee was asked to investigate this procedure and make a recommendation to the Senate. A survey of faculty was undertaken and based on this survey and discussion among the committee members, the following resolution was prepared by the Instruction Committee:

RESOLVED: That the List of Candidates for Graduation be arranged alphabetically by department or instructional area and one copy of the list be distributed to each department or instructional area.

Instruction Committee
10/21/75

Attach. IV-B, 11/18/75
Ac. Sen. Agenda
RESOLUTION REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INFORMATION AWARENESS COMMITTEE

Background Rationale: The Personnel Policies Committee has reviewed Professor Richard Kranzdorf's memo requesting the creation of an Academic Senate Committee on Records and Privacy and offers the following resolution:

WHEREAS, No faculty committee exists charged with overseeing the collection of personnel files or machine readable personnel data, and

WHEREAS, the more efficient collection and central storage of personnel data is being recommended by the CSUC Ad Hoc Committee on Procurement and Retention of Quality Faculty, and

WHEREAS, the faculty have an obligation to advise the administration in developing criteria for computing personnel data in the future; now, be it therefore

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate create a committee called the Information Awareness Committee to be charged with discovering what files on persons or groups of persons exist, who has access to these files, and how the files are used. This committee shall be advised by the Administration of any future expanded uses or creation of additional files containing personnel data.

Personnel Policies Committee
10/27/75

Attach.IV-C1, 10/28/75
Ac.Sen. Agenda
RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF AN ACADEMIC SENATE DATA COLLECTION 
AND INFORMATION AWARENESS COMMITTEE

Background Rationale: Reference: Information Practices Act of 1975 (SB 852) 
Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 
Freedom of Information Act of 1967

Within the past several years there has been a growing concern over the amounts of information being collected by local, state and federal agencies on private individuals. Often, information dealing with an individual's First Amendment rights is included in data storage systems. Additionally, private individuals have been frustrated in obtaining information regarding governmental decisions and actions in non-security matters. The three acts above are an initial step to correct (1) the problems of data collection and (2) allowing greater citizen access to government decision making procedures.

The following resolution seeks to extend these same rights to the university community at Cal Poly.

WHEREAS, Growing technological advances in the area of data collection, storage and retrieval system can threaten 1st Amendment guarantees, and

WHEREAS, National concern has focused on the problems involved with such record keeping and potential abuse and misuse; and

WHEREAS, State and federal legislation has been enacted to give citizens the right to know the extent of data collection and to allow them access to government records, and

WHEREAS, Records on the students, staff and faculty at Cal Poly are being maintained, and

WHEREAS, The students, staff and faculty at Cal Poly have a right to know the extent of such data collection as well as having a right to know how decisions are reached which affect the university community; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate create an Information Awareness Committee which shall determine: (1) who has personnel data information; (2) what information is being collected; (3) who has access to such information; (4) procedures for the disclosure of such information; (5) how personnel records are used; and any other areas of record keeping deemed appropriate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this same committee shall have access to all information pertaining to decision making at Cal Poly as it affects the students, staff and faculty.

Student Affairs Committee 
10/27/75

Attach. IV-C2, 10/28/75
Ac.Sen.Agenda
ACADEMIC PROMOTION CAM 342.2 (AFTER 60/40, WHAT?)

Background Rationale:

The proposed additions to the Campus Administrative Manual were generated by the demise of the quota system of promotion known as 60/40. Assuming that promotions should be granted on the basis of merit and that available dollar resources may not always be sufficient to promote all of those meriting promotion, the Personnel Policies Committee devised a set of procedures by which relative merit could be most accurately determined. In addition, once it was agreed that merit would be determined by the several schools, the Committee sought to develop a formula by which promotion funds allocated to the University would be disbursed to the schools.

In arriving at its recommendation the Committee consulted a variety of on- and off-campus sources including the school deans (see attachment), and some of the local university faculty. The Committee now asks that the Academic Senate endorse the proposed additions to the Campus Administrative Manual and forward its approval to President Robert E. Kennedy.

Proposed CAM 342.2 Change:

C. Procedures to be Utilized in Anticipation of Inadequate Budgetary Support

1. The School-wide priority list shall contain the names of those recommended to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor and be generated in the following manner:

   a. At the primary level of evaluation, the department or program, all tenured Associate and Full Professors, chaired by the department head or program leader, will meet in order to rank those positively recommended for promotion to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor. This partial departmental ranking will be complete by January 10. (by either the tenured faculty or by the department head)

   b. All tenured Full Professors, chaired by the Department head or Program leader, will upon receipt of the departmental ranking of those recommended to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor meet in order to determine the position of those recommended for promotion to Full Professor on the departments' completed list. The result will be one priority list containing the names of those recommended to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor; the chairperson shall insure that this completed list retains the relative ranking of those recommended for promotion to Associate Professor and that the completed list is forwarded to the school dean by February 10.
c. The school dean, acting as chairperson, shall present these completed departmental lists to an ad hoc committee comprised of one Full Professor from each Department elected by the department's full time (probationary and tenured) faculty. The ad hoc committee will blend the lists of the several departments into one school-wide priority list. The chairperson shall insure that the ad hoc committee does not upset the priority rankings of the individual departments.

d. Each of the above groups shall determine its own procedures for implementing its responsibilities.

2. The school dean shall forward the completed school-wide priority list, along with the names of any applicants recommended negatively at all three levels of evaluation, by March 10.

3. In developing criteria for ranking, schools and departments shall use only those criteria used in the original promotion procedures.

4. Promotion funds allocated to the University will be distributed to the several schools according to a ratio of eligible faculty members in the individual schools to the total eligible faculty in the University. Surplus promotion funds allocated to any of the schools will be redistributed equitably amongst the other schools.

D. Effective Date of Promotions.
Memorandum

To: School Deans
   Everett Chandler

From: L. Beecher, Chair
      Personnel Policies Committee, Academic Senate

Subject: School-Wide Rank-Ordered Promotion Lists

The Personnel Policies Committee of the Academic Senate is preparing recommendations on promotion policy. To assist in the usefulness of its deliberations, the Committee would appreciate receiving before its meeting of April 28 a written description of the method you use in determining the position of each individual on the school-wide rank-ordered promotion list. Please send a copy of the policy to me, Lloyd Beecher, History. Thank you.
Memorandum

To:             Dr. L. Beecher, Chair
                Personnel Policies Committee,
                Academic Senate

From:          Clyde P. Fisher, Dean
                School of Science and Mathematics

Subject:       School-wide Rank-ordered Promotion Lists

Date:          April 16, 1975

In response to your memo of April 15, 1975 regarding the subject item, please find attached a copy of our School Council Minutes in which the procedure and items of consideration were described. Every staff member in the School, other School Deans, several members of the administration received copies of our School Council Minutes. The representative on your Committee, therefore, from the School of Science and Mathematics, would be completely informed about the materials from this School.

I. NOMINATIONS FOR DISTINGUISHED ALUMNI 1975-76
No department presented any nominations for distinguished alumni from the School of Science and Mathematics.

II. REPORT OF CONSULTATION REGARDING PROMOTIONS
Dr. Fisher reported on his consultation with two committees, one composed of department heads and the other of one tenured full professor from each department. A total of six meetings were held to discuss promotions and development of the school-wide priority list. Each group asked Dr. Fisher to develop a tentative priority list for discussion. Dr. Fisher did this and presented a list of factors he considered and factors he did not consider in developing the list (see the factors below). Both groups agreed with the items presented and reviewed the personnel folders of many of the candidates individually. The committee of department heads endorsed the priority list and the committee of tenured full professors recommended inclusion of some assistant professor candidates on this list. Dr. Fisher was unable to implement this recommendation as it would have violated the priority order developed by the individual departments. The priority list is being forwarded to the President. Following is a list of items used in developing the list and agreed to by both committees consulted.

ITEMS CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCHOOL-WIDE PROMOTION PRIORITY LIST

The following items were considered to have operational value in the development of the list.

1. Technical eligibility and meeting of department, school and university criteria for promotion.

2. Tenured faculty and department head evaluations of candidates' overall level of performance evaluation and priority listings of those recommended.

3. The individual candidate's overall evaluations during the previous four years by the department head and dean.

4. The evidence of promotability supplied by the candidate.

5. Personal knowledge of leadership activities in department, school and university affairs.

6. Personal evaluation of the overall level of performance (contribution) of the candidates relatively.

7. Recommended only if the candidate was recommended both by a majority of the tenured faculty and the department head.
The following items were explicitly not considered in the development of the priority list.

1. Departmental percentage at each rank or combined ranks.
2. Not on recency of the receipt of the terminal degree.
3. Not on the basis of race, age, or sex.
4. Not on seniority.
5. Not on the individual or accumulative cost of promotion on the priority list. The list was developed on the basis of "merit and ability," not dollars.

Four "problems" were identified by the dean in the development of the priority list and discussed with the department heads and the Ad Hoc Committee as follows:

1. Lack of criteria and procedures previously agreed upon for the individual departments and the school for use in developing a priority list.
2. Lack of interdepartmental or intradepartmental agreement on criteria for exceptional consideration.
3. Lack of comparability of criteria and procedures among the departments in such areas as student evaluations of faculty, methods of providing "evidence" or even definitions of "evidence."
4. Lack of interdepartmental agreements regarding informing candidates and/or the department of location on the priority list.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Beecher

From: Jon M. Ericson

Subject: Policy on Promotion Ranking

Date: 4-17-75
File No.: 
Copies: Hazel Jones

Following consultation with a school-wide committee of tenured full professors and similar consultation with the School Council, my policy for ranking was to evaluate each candidate's credentials against the "Factors of Consideration" outlined on the Faculty Evaluation Form (and in CAM 342.2B.) There was agreement that relative emphasis to those factors should be given in this way:

- Teaching Performance: 50%
- Professional Growth and Achievement: 20%
- Service to University and Community: 20%
- Other: 10%

My aim was to evaluate merit and ability in each factor. While significant strength in each factor was not required to warrant a positive decision, significant weakness in any one of the first three factors resulted in a non-promotion decision. The criteria was applied with greater intensity in accordance to the level of promotion in question.

Following the establishment of my own (tentative) rank order, further consultation was held with the school-wide committee. As the attached memo indicates, I made changes in my ranking to make it possible for the committee's top priority candidate to be placed in a high position on my priority list.
Before promotion decisions are announced by the University, I wish to thank you and your committee for the great amount of work you each did as you prepared your recommendations. I found the consultation valuable, and I welcome suggestions to make it more valuable in the future.

The final list submitted from this office to the President ranked seventeen candidates for promotion. With the exception of two candidates who received non-promotion recommendations from me, each of the candidates ranked by you in the top nine are so ranked on my list. With the same exception, those presented in the top six are all included in your top eight. In sum, under normal budget circumstances (10 - 12 promotions in the School), we would find a .85 correlation in your rankings and those gaining promotion. Because we cannot assume that many promotions, I made two changes in the top five positions in my list to make it conform to your relative ranking.

As you recall, there were eighteen candidates for promotion. Of these, only the one who had received negative recommendations at all levels was omitted from the priority list. My evaluations resulted in eleven positive and seven negative recommendations. Each of the seven with non-promotion recommendations from me has been invited to confer with me, and where those conferences were held I felt they were positive and constructive.

Promotion decisions can be complex and discomforting. They deserve our best effort towards objectivity and consistency. This year I feel we have given it our best effort and I wish to thank each of you for your contribution.
You have requested information of the Student Affairs Division regarding the method we use in determining the position of each individual on the school-wide rank-ordered promotion list. I submit the following for your consideration:

1. Class and rank positions within the Division of Student Affairs are primarily located in the Counseling Department. Of the eleven class and rank positions in Counseling, five are currently at the Professor level, two are at the Senior level, and four are Intermediate Instructors.

2. The State-wide classification structure requires that "academic related" positions such as Student Affairs Officer III, IV, and V be subject to reclassification not promotion.

3. Any reclassification or promotion within the Division of Student Affairs is subject to Student Services funding (including our remaining class and rank positions) and does not relate in a competitive fashion to the more traditional class and rank positions on the academic side of the ledger.
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Beecher, Chairman
   Personnel Policies Committee, Academic Senate

From: J. Cordner Gibson

Date: April 22, 1975

File No.: 

Copies: Hazel Jones

Subject: SCHOOLWIDE RANK OF PROMOTION RECOMMENDATIONS

As you can imagine, it is very difficult to rank twelve faculty who have been
recommended for promotion.

The personnel committee, in the departments where the department is large enough to
have such a committee, and the department heads are key elements in the total ranking
evaluation. The procedures outlined in CAM as well as the policies and procedures of
the School of Agriculture and Natural Resources were followed very carefully.

In the School of Agriculture and Natural Resources we use a Personnel Advisory
Committee made up of the full professors that are tenured. This committee meets
and evaluates the candidates. I review the applications with the committee and
they make recommendations as to the ranking. One of the inputs that is used is
the comments from key student leaders in the department. I have a practice of once
a quarter inviting the student club leaders to my home for a "State of the School"
discussion. In our winter quarter meeting I ask their comments on those faculty who
are being considered for promotion. Any comments that are of value are related to
the Personnel Advisory Committee as just one of the aspects in the total evaluation.

I would say that our system has worked well through the years. The Personnel
Advisory Committee makes the recommendations on what the rank order should be.
I accept their recommendations and submit these recommendations then as the
recommendation from the School of Agriculture and Natural Resources to the president.

As I indicated, this has been an effective approach for our school and I hope that
this information will be helpful to you and your committee as you start the
deliberations on promotions.

JCG:njp
Memorandum

To: Professor Lloyd Beecher, Chairman
   Personnel Policies Committee, Academic Senate

Date: April 28, 1975

File No.

Copies:

From: Robert G. Valpey, Dean
   School of Engineering & Technology

Subject: School-Wide Rank-Ordered Promotions Lists

In response to your memorandum of April 15, 1975, requesting information concerning the School of Engineering and Technology on the above subject, I can offer the following information.

Two committees were consulted in the preparation of my recommendations to the President. The first committee was an ad hoc committee of faculty representatives, one tenured full professor from each department, elected by the department members. The second committee was an executive session of the School Council -- more accurately described as the department heads.

All of the promotion recommendation materials, including the evaluations and recommendations by the department heads, but excluding my own evaluations and recommendations, were placed in a special file in my office. These were made available in advance of the committee meetings to each member of both committees for individual review. Members were encouraged to make notes and to make a tentative personal priority list.

I then met with each committee separately. I presented my own tentative list and my reasons for suggesting the position of each individual on the list. There was a great deal of discussion, and, interestingly enough, it was rather obvious which members had done their "homework" and which had not.

The committees did not establish rigid criteria for priority, but rather used their professional judgment in weighing all factors in making a recommendation. There was one unstated criterion that was never violated, however: individual departmental priority lists were kept in tact. That is, members of department X who were placed in order A, B, C might have ended on the school list as A = 3, B = 7, C = 9, but never B = 3, A = 7, etc.

After receiving the views of these two committees, arrived at by consensus, and which differed from one another only by the placement of one individual, I made my recommendation to the President without variation from the committee recommendations except to reconcile the placement of the one individual.
Memorandum

To: L. Beecher, Chair
Personnel Policies Committee, Academic Senate

From: Carroll R. McKibbin, Dean
School of Business and Social Sciences

Subject: School-Wide Rank-Ordered Promotion Lists

Date: May 14, 1975

I apologize for not meeting your earlier deadline. It was an oversight that I very much regret.

The procedure used by our School this past year in establishing a School-wide promotion list was as follows:

1. The Dean met separately with the ad hoc committee and the School Council.

2. Each individual in each group was given a matrix which included the names of candidates for promotion on one side and the required criteria for promotion on the other. Each committee and Council member was asked to review the files of candidates and to place an "x" in each square where the School criteria for promotion was satisfied.

3. The Dean established a rank order based on the number of endorsements for promotion that each candidate received.

4. The Dean met with the combined groups giving them the rank order and invited discussion. In the case of one tie, the Dean initiated the tie-breaking placement and invited additional response to that particular matter.

5. The resulting list was submitted to Vice President Jones.

I am not sure of the specific mandate of your committee, but if it is appropriate, I would like to suggest for your consideration a couple of things. First of all, I do not think it advisable that Deans meet with the School Council and ad hoc committee together, at least initially. Secondly, I do not like the idea of members of these two groups "voting" as such. In effect that is what we do, but I prefer to look at this as a matter of endorsement of successful fulfillment of School criteria rather than one individual "voting for another".
Memorandum

To: Lloyd Beecher, Chairman
   Personnel Policies Committee

From: George Hasslein

Subject: Schoolwide Rank order of Promotion Lists

Attached is a brief memo from Paul Neel, the School's Director of Faculty, which describes this year's ranking procedure. Actually the process was considerably more complex in that many months were devoted by a faculty committee exploring criteria for ranking. One committee disbanded shortly before the deadline and another committee completed the work.

Mr. Paul Neel is in charge of this operation for our School. He has considerable file material on the subject to share.

encl
Ranking Procedures Used by the School of Architecture and Environmental Design
Academic Year 1974-75

Step I

The Principal Tenured Faculty, exclusive of the directors, ranked those faculty candidates which were deemed promotable by the tenured faculty and directors during this cycle. Prior to actually placing the names in a ranked order, each member of this first consultative body was asked to consider, while preparing his ranked list, certain summary materials which had been submitted by those deemed promotable. The list under consideration was composed of two groups; those under consideration for promotion to Associate and those under consideration for promotion to full Professor. The list to be ranked was in alphabetical order. The vote was by secret ballot. After the vote was taken, the individual ranked lists were averaged by the tenured faculty committee charged with administering the vote procedure. The composite list was submitted to the Dean for his consideration.

Step II

The directors completed a ranking procedure which was exactly the same as noted under Step I. The resultant composite was submitted to the Dean for his consideration.

Step III

Upon receipt of the two lists mentioned above, the Dean began his deliberation; the result of which was the preparation of his ranked list. At the point where this list was brought into existence, the two advisory lists dissolved.

Step IV

The Dean submitted his ranked list to the President.

Step V

The Principal Tenured Faculty, exclusive of the Directors, was advised by the
Chairman of the Committee on Ranking that the ranking procedure was complete and that none of the results would be circulated. The Committee was discharged by the Director of Faculty.
RESOLUTION RE POSTPONEMENT OF MERGER OF THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS

WHEREAS: The members of the Women's Physical Education Department believe that the decision for a merger was made without adequate consultation; and

WHEREAS: The members of the Women's Physical Education Department agree conceptually with the merger action but believe that justification is insufficient for a merger at this time since specific guidelines for attaining equity for faculty positions, as set forth by the Affirmative Action Policy, have not been met as yet; now therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend to President Kennedy postponement of the merger of the Women's and Men's Physical Education Departments.

Attach. IV-E, 10/28/75
Ac. Sen. Agenda
The Problem

The members of the Women's Physical Education Department are unanimously in favor of maintaining the present two-department structure of the Men's and Women's Physical Education Departments.

In June, 1975, President Kennedy made the decision that the two departments should merge on or before September, 1976.

Background

1. In April, 1975, President Kennedy called a meeting to discuss, (1) Crandall Gym Remodel, (2) Men's Physical Education and Women's Physical Education department problems, and (3) Recreation Administration major. In attendance were Hazel Jones, David Grant, Carl Cummins, Robert Mott, and Mary Lou White.

As a result of this meeting, the president stated that (1) the Recreation Administration major would not be implemented until the problems of the two departments were settled, and (2) that there should be a committee to make recommendations for resolving the problems.

2. Meetings were held during the remainder of the spring quarter, 1975, with a committee composed of three members each from the Men's and Women's Physical Education departments, along with David Grant and Carl Cummins, who also acted as chairman.

After intensive identification, review, and discussion of the problems no agreement was reached regarding departmental structure. The representatives of the Men's Physical Education department, along with Dr. Cummins, favored a merger; while the representatives of the Women's Physical Education department favored the establishment of combined committees, but under a 2-department structure. (Copies of both proposals available.)

3. In June, 1975, Vice President Jones and Dean Cummins met with President Kennedy and the result was the decision that the two Physical Education Departments should merge. (Memo attached.)

Rationale

1. The members of the Women's Physical Education Department believe that the decision for the merger was made
   a. without adequate consultation
      There was never a meeting of the faculties of both departments; therefore, information given to faculty members (in separate meetings) was second-hand and one-sided.
   b. without adequate consideration of all the facts presented during the committee meetings
   c. without adequate consideration for the wishes of the entire faculty of the Women's Physical Education Department
   d. without adequate justification

WPE 10/24/75
2. The members of the Women's Physical Education Department are not opposed philosophically to a one-department structure, but believe it should be delayed until such time as
   a. a specific plan is developed to assure equity in staffing
   b. problems regarding facilities (such as faculty offices, dressing and shower areas) can be adequately resolved.

Concluding Statement

The members of the Women's Physical Education Department favor a one-department structure, but believe that such consolidation would not automatically adjust present inequities, nor eliminate existing problems.
Men’s Physical Education Department

Appointment of Acting Coordinator of New Recreation Administration Major

The Men’s Physical Education Department was surprised and disturbed to learn that a decision has been made to appoint Ms. E. Pollaton as acting coordinator of the new Recreation Administration major. The surprise was caused by the fact that the efforts of Mr. Tom Lee over the past 6-7 years with regard to this major program have apparently been overlooked or ignored. Mr. Lee has provided the primary impetus in developing this program and is presently advising all of the students (both men and women) who will transfer into this major when it becomes operational this summer. In order for a new program to be successful, the leadership needs to be positive, flexible, experienced, accessible and easily identified with the program. Due to his efforts on campus and in the local recreation program, the students as well as the community relate recreation with Mr. Lee.

We were disturbed that the decision was based not on the educational principle of what is best for the students or the university, but rather on the arbitrary justification of “equity” for the Women’s Physical Education Department.

We were also disturbed that no provisions were made to admit new students into the new major or to increase the quotes for the Physical Education Departments to offset the transfer of possibly large numbers of students from Physical Education into the new major. Hypothetically, it is possible that the acting coordinator would choose to teach all the Recreation Administration classes in the Women’s Physical Education Department; thereby, causing a significant reduction in the number of student credit hours generated by the Men’s Physical Education Department. This coupled with the loss of major students to Recreation Administration could have a demoralizing effect on the Men’s Physical Education and Athletic programs in terms of staffing and budget.

At a time when college physical education is faced with a problem of placement of graduates and developing viable, alternate employment opportunities other than teaching, the combined resolve of all professionals should be directed toward solving these and other vexing problems. We should not be competing for student credit hours, duplicating efforts in curricular and budgetary areas, specializing in redundancy at the departmental level and quibbling over the administration of a program which should fall under the non-segregated umbrella of health, physical education, recreation and athletics.

Should it be felt that further consultation is necessary concerning this matter, representatives of the Men’s Physical Education Department would be pleased to participate in such consultation.
To: Dean Carl C. Cummins  
School of Human Development and Education  

Date: June 16, 1975  

From: Hazel J. Jones  
Vice President for Academic Affairs  

Subject:  

Attached is a copy of the basic document concerning the decisions to merge the two Physical Education Departments into one department.

This agreement is the result of 1) lengthy discussions between faculty representatives of the Woman's and Men's Physical Education Departments in a series of ten meetings held throughout Spring Quarter, 1975; 2) discussions held separately with faculty of the two departments in meetings with Dean Carl C. Cummins and Vice President Hazel J. Jones on May 10 and May 12, 1975; and 3) meetings of Dean Cummins, Vice President Jones, and President Kennedy.

The attached document has now been approved by President Kennedy and is to be implemented immediately.

Please distribute copies to the faculties in Men's and Women's Physical Education Departments and take the necessary steps for implementation.

As you know, the document represents both agreement and compromise positions, but most important, it represents good faith efforts to resolve problems, the resolution of which will enable us to combine the considerable talents and energies of our capable faculties to continue to provide quality education for the young woman and man who choose to come to Cal Poly.

I wish to express my appreciation to all those who gave so much time and thought in those marathon sessions.

Attachment
1. Women's PE and Men's PE Departments shall merge into one department on or before September, 1976.

2. A seven person PE Advisory Council shall be established immediately. The Dean of the School, in consultation with the appropriate tenured faculty, shall appoint three members from each department, who, with him or his designee, shall be responsible for overall planning for the merger and for a period of at least one year after the merger.

Duties of the Advisory Council shall include but not be limited to the following:

a. Development of guidelines and policies covering the goals and structure of the Department of Physical Education.

b. Establishment as soon as possible of the committees needed to conduct the work of the department. These committees shall become operative immediately and shall have equal number of representatives from Men's and Women's PE programs. Committees such as the following shall be established: curriculum; scheduling and facilities; budget; and personnel (including such personal matters as appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion).

c. Establishment of guidelines and plans and appointment of an ad hoc search committee for a department head who shall be appointed on or before September, 1976.

d. Periodic assessment of the University's compliance with requirements as stated in Title IX.

It is understood that the PE Advisory Council shall consult with and keep the faculties in PE fully informed of their work. The Advisory Council shall have the responsibility for making recommendations to the School Dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

It is further understood that the student credit units will continue to be accumulated under one heading.
June 26, 1975

R. E. Kennedy
Dave Grant
Carl Cummins
Robert Mott

Mary Lou White
Mary Stallard
Evelyn Pallaton
Sonja Murray
Carolyn Shank
Anne Groefstra
Nan Ja Min Suhr

Decision to Merge Physical Education Departments

All members of the faculty of the Women's Physical Education department have received copies of your memo of June 16, addressed to Dean Carl Cummins. We have discussed the contents and, although we find some portions of the document quite acceptable, we do believe that many of the facts presented in our meetings during the spring quarter have been ignored.

First of all, a statement was made to the effect that the document represents both agreement and compromise positions. We do agree that there should be established committees to work cooperatively to conduct the business of the departments. We also agree that student credit units should be combined for the two departments. We feel, however, that this document does not represent a compromise. A compromise is defined as "a settlement reached by mutual concessions", and we believe that this has not occurred, particularly in relation to the 81 item of the document which states that the departments shall merge into one on or before September 1975. The members of the Women's Physical Education department are opposed to a merger at this time. We stated this position during our meetings of spring quarter, 1975. We find no justification stated for this merger, and in fact it came as a surprise to all of us. We believed that a merger date should not be decided until after a trial period of at least a year. During this period of working in combined departmental committees the feasibility and equity of a combined department could be explored in depth to ascertain advantages and disadvantages, necessary changes in staffing to ensure the unbiased impartiality, and harmony of such a merger.

We are in favor of establishing an advisory council. However, we believe that a four person council would be more workable; therefore, we suggest that two persons from each of the departments be selected by their respective departments to be members of this council. We further suggest that this group select its own chairperson from among its members. We have been requested by Dean Cummins to formulate the Advisory Council and begin meetings as soon as possible this summer. We would prefer to begin the meetings in the fall, since the majority of our faculty is not available during the summer period, and at the present time only one member (untenured) is on full-time staff this summer. In addition, it would be impossible for any consultation to be held with all faculty members since some are out of town and cannot be reached.

Although we expressed the desire for combining of certain committees, equal representation will impose a disproportionate burden on members of the Women's Physical Education faculty because of the disparity in members of faculty members between the two departments. This would necessitate Women's Physical Education faculty members serving on several committees, and such conditions would naturally result in sacrifice in the teaching area.
One of our major concerns which we expressed during our several meetings was related to adjustment in staffing. Many facts and figures were presented during our meetings, indicating the inequities which exist as far as staffing of the Women's Physical Education department. Nothing is mentioned in the document concerning staffing, and we would hope to see a plan implemented immediately to begin an equalization of faculty positions between the two departments. There is no way that loads, including committee responsibilities, can be lessened until the proportion of women faculty to men is increased.

We shall appreciate your consideration of our concerns and are requesting a meeting with you and Dean Cummings soon in the hope that a better understanding can be achieved.
Dr. Robert Kennedy, President
CPSU, San Luis Obispo

Dr. Gerald Marley, Chair
CSUC Academic Senate

Leslie A. Labhard, Chair
Academic Senate

Report of the CSUC Ad Hoc Committee on the Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty

At its meeting of October 28, 1975, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate voted unanimously to reject the Report of the CSUC Ad Hoc Committee on the Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty. The Executive Committee felt that certain omissions (e.g. faculty working conditions) and inclusions (e.g. additional steps in the full professor rank) were so objectionable that suggesting piecemeal revisions was an inadequate method of expressing disapproval. The Executive Committee felt that its action was especially appropriate, since the faculty has already submitted its recommendations concerning the Draft Report. Since none of these recommendations are incorporated in the Final Report, further effort in this direction would appear to be redundant.

The Executive Committee is quite interested in questions concerning the procurement and retention of a quality faculty. If at any time, the Chancellor and Trustees want to consult us on this matter, (other than to solicit our comments on completed documents), we will willingly cooperate....

Attach VI-A, 10/28/75
Ac. Sen. Agenda
Memorandum

To: Lezlie Labhard, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Robert E. Kennedy

Subject: Approval of Amendments to Constitution

You received a copy of the correspondence addressed to me, dated October 27, 1975, from Vice Chancellor C. Mansel Keene concerning two amendments to the Constitution of Cal Poly's Academic Senate, Staff Senate and Joint Assembly.

As indicated by Vice Chancellor Keene, it is the opinion of legal counsel that the Chancellor's approval of campus constitutional amendments is no longer required, and that the campus president may approve such amendments provided they are consonant with policies, regulations, and procedures of the Chancellor and the Trustees.

In light of this information, my approval on August 27, 1975, of the preamble to Article III and the added language in Section 1.c. of the same Article (see attached) can now be considered as the final approval. Appendix VII of the Campus Administrative Manual will be revised accordingly in the next general revision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SENATE COMMITTEE</th>
<th>REFERRAL DATE</th>
<th>RESPONSE DATE</th>
<th>CONTENTS OF RESPONSE</th>
<th>FURTHER ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Athletic Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>4-9-74</td>
<td>6-26-74</td>
<td>Forwarded to Chandler for Final Statement</td>
<td>Delay due to Student Fee Referendum, Legislative action, &amp; organization consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comm. on Professional Responsibility-Bylaws</td>
<td>Personnel Pol.</td>
<td>2-73</td>
<td>6-3-73</td>
<td>Referred to Chancellor's Legal Staff</td>
<td>Approved in concept 10-31-74 Referred back to Const./Bylaws Comm. Referred to Chancellor's C.O. about EO 113, office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Steady State Staffing</td>
<td>Personnel Pol.</td>
<td>4-7-75</td>
<td>4-30-75</td>
<td>Ref. to Dir. Pers. Rel. to check with Expect Legal Office advice by the end of June.</td>
<td>Referred to Chancellor's Legal Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parking Resolution</td>
<td>Rhoads</td>
<td>4-7-75</td>
<td>4-30-75</td>
<td>Ref. to Dir. Pers. Rel. for study &amp; review with C.O. in relation to systemwide report on St.St.Staff.</td>
<td>President's Memo 6-9-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Library Space</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>6-18-75</td>
<td>6-27-75</td>
<td>Will consider Senate resolution in exploring better utilization of space in the Mil. Science area, snack bar area, &amp; A-V area.</td>
<td>Final Approval 11-5-75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**ITEMS REFERRED TO PRESIDENT**

**Fall 1975**

**November 1975**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SENATE COMMITTEE</th>
<th>REFERRAL DATE</th>
<th>RESPONSE DATE</th>
<th>CONTENTS OF RESPONSE</th>
<th>FURTHER ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Preamble, Const. Amendment</td>
<td>Const. &amp; Bylaws</td>
<td>8-13-75</td>
<td>8-27-75</td>
<td>Approved as edited.</td>
<td>Final Approval 11-5-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Senate
#### Items Referred to Senate Committees

#### Fall 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date Referred to Committee</th>
<th>Referred By Whom</th>
<th>Date Response Requested</th>
<th>Date Recommendation Made</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action Taken by Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic Calendar General Guidelines</td>
<td>7-10-75 Instruction</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Fall '75</td>
<td>May 14, 1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Executive Committee Minutes 6/3/75 Ex. 201 replaced by Ss 804, Effective Jan. 1, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. After 60/40 What?</td>
<td>10-29-74 Instruction</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Fall '75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Grievance Proced.</td>
<td>11-26-74 AdHoc Comm. Johnston</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Fall '75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student Evaluation of Faculty</td>
<td>4-21-75 AdHoc Comm. Ellerbrock</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Prior to Personnel Actions 75-76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CAM 619.9 (Candidates for Graduation rec. of)</td>
<td>3-19-75 Instruction</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>4-22-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Budgetary Process/Faculty Input</td>
<td>5-6-75 Budget</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Spring '76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Items Referred to Senate Committees 1975-1976

<p>| 1. Proposed Records &amp; Privacy Comm. | 7-3-75 FPC | Executive | 10-28-75 | | | |
| 2. Disabled Student Affairs Request | 9-23-75 St.Af.Comm. | Executive | 10-28-75 | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DATE REFERRED TO COMMITTEE</th>
<th>REFERRED BY WHOM</th>
<th>DATE RESPONSE REQUESTED</th>
<th>DATE RECOMMENDATION MADE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN BY SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. San Diego Resolution Reciprocity &amp; Foreign Internat. Universities</td>
<td>11-4-75</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Telephone Installation Charge</td>
<td>11-4-75</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Degrees from Non-Accredited Inst.</td>
<td>11-4-75</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Closure Calif. Ent.</td>
<td>11-4-75</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Faculty Input on School Councils</td>
<td>11-4-75</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Feb. Ex.Comm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Definition of Grades</td>
<td>11-4-75</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: Lezlie Labhard, Chair, Academic Senate
   Academic Senators

From: Five Senators of the School of Architecture
      and Environmental Design: Amanzio, Batterson,
      Loh, Phillips, Wolff

Subject: Items for Clarification and Discussion Regarding Proposed
         CAM 342.2 Changes (After 60/40 What?)

Date: November 24, 1975

File No.: 

Copies:

C.1.a. In order to make the time frame and due dates more flexible for the
       various programs within the University, it is suggested that the
       January 10 date be redefined as "a date as established by the indi­
       vidual departments or programs."

C.1.b. What procedures should be recommended if the Department Head or
       Program Leader of a newly formed department or program is not tenured
       or if no tenured faculty exists to decide upon ranking?

C.4. Should not funds be distributed to the several schools according to a
      ratio of eligible and promotable faculty? This would seem to be more
      consistent with the spirit of the document as stated in C.1 where the
      School-wide priority list contains only the names of those recommended
      for promotion.
C. Procedures to be Utilized in Anticipation of Inadequate Budgetary Support

1. The School-wide priority list shall contain the names of those recommended for promotion to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor and be generated in the following manner:

   a. At the primary level of evaluation, the department or program, all tenured Associate and Full Professors, chaired by the department head or program leader, will rank in order to rank those positively recommended for promotion to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor. This partial departmental ranking will be complete by January 10.

   b. All tenured Full Professors, chaired by the Department head or Program leader, (when eligible as defined by Title 5) will upon receipt of the departmental ranking of those recommended to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor set in order to determine the position of those recommended for promotion to Full Professor on the department's completed list. The result will be one priority list from each department or program area containing the names of those recommended to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor; the chairperson shall ensure that this completed list retains the relative ranking of those recommended for promotion to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor and that the completed list is forwarded to the school dean by February 10.

   c. The school dean, acting as chairperson, shall present these completed departmental lists to an ad hoc committee comprised of one Full Professor from each department elected by the department's full time (probationary and tenured) faculty. This ad hoc committee will blend the lists of the several departments into one school-wide priority list. The chairperson shall ensure that the ad hoc committee does not upset the priority rankings of the individual departments.

d. Each of the above groups shall determine its own procedures for implementing its responsibilities.

2. The school dean shall forward the completed school-wide priority list, along with the names of any applicants recommended negatively at all three levels of evaluation, by March 10.

3. In developing criteria for ranking, schools and departments shall use only those criteria used in the original promotion procedures.

4. Promotion funds allocated to the University will be distributed to the several schools according to a ratio of eligible faculty members in the individual schools to the total eligible faculty in the University. Surplus promotion funds allocated to any of the schools will be redistributed equitably among the other schools.

ED. Effective Date of Promotions.
I. Executive Committee Meeting with Campus Senate. Tacoma, Oct. 1, 1967.

The committee recommended:

1. That the outline for the next session of the Senate be presented on the committee meeting.

2. That the outline for the next session of the Senate be presented to the Senate for discussion.

3. That the outline for the next session of the Senate be presented to the Senate for discussion.

4. That the outline for the next session of the Senate be presented to the Senate for discussion.

5. That the outline for the next session of the Senate be presented to the Senate for discussion.


The conference was held at the University of Washington, Seattle, on August 11, 1967.

The agenda of the conference involved panel presentations and informal group discussions moderated by one person. The participants included a panel to summarize the issues and recommendations of the conference.

1. The main points presented in the paper were the following:

   a. The need for access and diversity in education.
   b. The need for access and diversity in education.

2. The issues addressed at the conference were:

   a. The need for access and diversity in education.
   b. The need for access and diversity in education.