I. Minutes - Academic Senate November 18 & 25, 1975.

II. President's Presentation and Questions/Answers (Kennedy)

III. Reports
A. Statewide Senate (Olsen, Wenzl, Murphy)
B. Administrative Council (Weatherby)
C. Academic Council (Saveker)
D. Foundation Board (Labhard)
E. President's Council (Labhard)
F. Consultative Committee for the Selection of Dean of Science and Math (Eatough)

IV. 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)

V. Business Items
A. Academic Promotions CAM 342.2 (After 60/40, What?) (Beecher-Personnel Policies)
B. Records and Privacy (Beecher-Personnel Policies) (Attachment distributed, Academic Senate, November 18, 1975)
C. Merger P.E. Departments (White) (Attachment IV-E, Academic Senate Agenda, November 18, 1975)

VI. Discussion Items

VII. Announcements
A. Senate and Committee Membership Lists (Revised list to be distributed Winter 1976)
B. Gerald Marley - February 10 Meeting of the Academic Senate.
RESOLUTION REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INFORMATION AWARENESS COMMITTEE

Background: The Personnel Policies Committee and the Student Affairs Committee have reviewed Professor Richard Kromer's memo requesting the creation of an Academic Senate Committee on Records and Privacy and offer the following resolution:

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

WHEREAS, the core efficient collection and control 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 capturing 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 the faculty persons or groups of faculty persons exist, who have access to these files, and how the files are used. This committee shall be advised by the Administration of any future expanded use or creation of additional files containing personnel data; and, be it further

RESOLVED: that the Senate shall create an ad hoc committee to fulfill this charge until such time as a standing committee can fulfill the obligation; and, be it further

RESOLVED: both the ad hoc committee and the standing committee shall be composed of one member from each of the schools, one member from the professional consulting services and one ad hoc member, who shall be the Director of the Computer Center.

Personal Policies Committee
Student Affairs Committee
11/13/75
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 meet in order to rank by secret ballot those positively recommended by either the tenured faculty or department head for promotion to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor. This partial departmental ranking will be completed by a date as established by the individual departments or programs.

   b. All tenured Full Professors, chaired by the Department head or Program leader (as defined by item b) will upon receipt of the departmental ranking of those recommended to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor and Full Professor by either the tenured Full professors or the department head 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 all faculty committee comprised of one Full Professor from each department elected by the department's full time (provisional and tenured) faculty. The above committee will merge the lists of the several departments into the school-wide priority list. The chairperson shall ensure that the all faculty committee does not upset the priority rankings of the individual departments.

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

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

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

5. 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.

6. Effective Date of Promotions.
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.