I. Minutes - Executive Committee - January 6, 1976

II. Business

A. CR/NC Grading for Post Baccalaureate and Graduate Students (Greffenus) (Attachment II-A)

B. Senate and Committee Membership (Labhard)
   1. John Connelly for Lou Pippin on the Senate and the Executive Committee - Winter quarter 1976 - School of Human Development and Education.

C. Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Sponsorship of Events
   Human Development and Education - Cliff Vines
   Comm. Arts and Humanities - Ed Mayo
   Science and Math - Robert Cichowski
   Business and Social Sciences - Cruikshanks
   Arch. and Env. Design - Ken Hagerd
   Ag. and Nat. Resources - H. Claggett
   Engineering and Tech. - Stul Larsen
   Prof. Consultative Services - Lloyd Hasek
   Student Representative -

D. Ad Hoc Committee on Information Awareness
   Human Development and Education -
   Comm. Arts and Humanities -
   Science and Math -
   Business and Social Sciences -
   Arch. and Env. Design -
   Ag. and Nat. Resources -
   Engineering and Tech. -
   Prof. Consultative Services -

E. Proposed Study of Sabbatical Leaves (Beecher - Personnel Policies Committee - Attachment II-C)

III. Discussion Items

A. Resolution re. CAM changes to Senate

B. Library Space Utilization

C. Curriculum packages
IV. Announcements

A. Report of Statewide Senate Meeting (Olsen, Wenzl, Murphy)

B. Governor's Budget 1976-77 (Labhard)
RESOLUTION REGARDING USE OF CR/NC GRADING FOR POST-BACCALAUREATE AND GRADUATE STUDENTS

Background Rationale: The 1975-77 Cal Poly Catalog states, "No courses taken on a Credit-No Credit grading basis may be used to satisfy graduate program requirements" (p. 51). On the other hand, CAM (457 C.3.c.) states internships, whether graduate or undergraduate, can be graded on a credit-no credit basis.

A proposal has been made that CAM be changed so as to be in agreement with the Cal Poly Catalog. The Instruction Committee was asked to study the proposal and make a recommendation to the Academic Senate. Five school deans support the proposal, one is opposed and one did not respond to a questionnaire.

Comments regarding the proposal:

1. The catalog statement and the first citation above from CAM seem to suggest that the use of credit-no credit grading should be restricted to undergraduate students.

2. Even with undergraduate students, the credit-no credit system may not be used with "M" courses and hence its inappropriate use in a degree program or credential program, which would be analogous.

3. Departments need to keep close supervision of all intern programs and a letter grade is more specific than a credit-no credit grade. Departments evaluating conditionally classified students need a more precise evaluation of a student's ability than simply a CR/NC mark.

RESOLVED: That CAM (457 C.3.c.) be changed so as to be in agreement with the 1975-77 Cal Poly Catalog (p. 51) which states, "No courses taken on a Credit-No Credit grading basis may be used to satisfy graduate program requirements".

Instruction Committee
12/9/75
Memorandum

From: Personnel Policies Committee

Subject: Proposed Study of Sabbatical Leaves (Executive Committee, Oct. 28, 1975)

After discussion as well as an interview with Joe Kourakis, the Personnel Policies Committee has concluded that CAM provides a framework (386.5,0) for changes in the acceptable uses of sabbatical leaves and that defining such changes can be carried out successfully only at the school level and therefore will not recommend the creation of an ad hoc committee to re-study the use of sabbatical leaves.
RESOLUTION TO FORM A SPECIAL AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY
SABBATICALS AND LEAVES

WHEREAS, The California Polytechnic State University has recently attained University status and must therefore attract and hold faculty with high academic and professional qualifications and advanced degrees, and

WHEREAS, As a University must meet new and expanded demands in education to provide for a diversity in course offerings, specialized areas of study, and graduate level work, and

WHEREAS, continuing academic and professional growth for the faculty is a necessary requirement for maintaining quality programs, that are current and relevant, and

WHEREAS, faculty qualifications for tenure and promotion are increasingly based on advanced degrees and continuing academic work, and

WHEREAS, costs of advanced education and loss of income during advanced study imposes unusual economic hardships on faculty; now be it therefore

RESOLVED: that a special ad hoc committee on leaves and sabbaticals be formed to study and develop guidelines and make recommendations on the issue of educational and leave benefits for academic personnel based on development of equitable programs for sabbatical leaves, developed, funded, and administered to meet the continuing educational needs of the University faculty and staff; and that the programs result in increased benefits to faculty for purposes of more effective teaching.

Joe Kourakis
10/27/75
Memorandum

Lloyd Beecher, Chairman
Personnel Policies Committee

Date: January 5, 1976
File No.: 
Copies: Hazel J. Jones
School Deans

From: Donald L. Shelton

Subject: Special Personnel Procedures

This is in response to your memorandum of December 12, 1975 in which you raised a question regarding the procedures to be followed on personnel matters when a department is faced with either (1) no tenured faculty; or (2) no faculty in either of the upper two ranks.

As the faculty tends to stabilize due to the enrollment ceiling and reduced turnover, I would expect few cases where these circumstances would exist. First, there are no departments (except Ethnic Studies) without tenured faculty or faculty in the associate rank. There are five departments which, exclusive of department heads, do not have professors among their ranks.

In cases where promotion to professor is being considered and a department contains no full professors, it is appropriate for the dean to suggest in writing to the person being considered the evaluation procedures which the dean proposes be followed. This can include use of tenured professors from within the school acceptable to the faculty members. Appropriately, input and information may be solicited from other faculty members, students, and other sources (see CAM 341.1A).

After the school dean and the faculty member have agreed upon the evaluation procedure to be followed, it should be submitted in writing and prior to the start of the evaluation cycle to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

If you have any other questions on this, I would be happy to discuss them with you.
Memorandum

(Date) January 26, 1976

File No.: 

Copies: Executive Committee

From: Lezlie Labhard, Chair
Academic Senate

Subject: Ritchie Amendment

"The Academic Senate, California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo, wishes to be on record as favoring merit consideration in personnel actions. We object to the attempt to gauge relative merit from within ranks which have already been judged meritorious. We believe the Ritchie proposal to be unworkable in terms of either validity or reliability and urge that it be rejected."
The Faculty Library Committee in its meeting this morning considered President Kennedy's memorandum addressed to Leslie Labhard, dated December 19, 1975, and concerned with the topic item, "Executive Committee Action -- Resolution re Library Space." The Committee expressed appreciation for President Kennedy's proposal to utilize part of the ROTC Armory for the storage of library books. Since paragraph three of his memo indicates that alternative solutions to the space problem are possible, the Committee is suggesting that an alternate proposal be considered.

The new proposal, which in the opinion of the committee members makes real sense when the factors of service and effective library staff utilization are considered, is attached as a separate statement. It is addressed to you rather than Leslie Labhard, because the Committee officially advises you directly, and because you may be in a strategic position to respond quickly when the "Library Space Modifications" are discussed in next Monday's President's Council Meeting.

A copy of the space proposal is also being directed to Leslie Labhard to enable consideration by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

Attachment
Dr. Hazel J. Jones,  
Vice President for Academic Affairs  

January 15, 1976

Lezlie Labhard, Chairperson,  
Academic Senate  
Carl Lutrin, Chairperson,  
Faculty Library Committee

SPACE UTILIZATION PROPOSAL

The following statement was moved and seconded by William Krupp and Carleton Winslow, and approved by the Faculty Library Committee on Thursday, January 15, 1976:

"The Faculty Library Committee appreciates President Kennedy's memorandum of December 19, 1975; however, instead of utilizing one-half of the ROTC Armory area as proposed, we feel that use of the present "Cellar" area is more desirable because it is contiguous to the existing library stack area, and by the appropriate placement of doorways this space could be readily be integrated into the existing library facilities" (See attached floor plans.) It is suggested that consideration be given to the moving of the "Cellar" facilities to the proposed area to be reserved in the Armory.

The conversion of the present "Cellar" area to library functions would, in the opinion of the Committee, provide better and direct service to students and faculty because it would provide a continuation of the open stacks rather than a closed and inaccessible storage area. A considerable saving of staff, time and resources would also be accomplished by this move.

It was agreed in committee that the above statement should be addressed to Hazel J. Jones, Vice President for Academic Affairs, with a copy being forwarded to Lezlie Labhard, Chairperson of the Academic Senate.

Attachment
PROPOSED AREA

Area involved:
(approximations)

1,680 sq. ft.
1,460 sq. ft.
220 sq. ft. diff.

FIRST FLOOR / STACK LEVELS 1&2

Stacks, 1st Level (Books)
Stacks, 1st Level Annex (Periodicals)

SECOND FLOOR / STACK LEVELS 3&4
RESOLUTION REGARDING POLICY AND PROCEDURE REVISIONS IN CAM

WHEREAS, The approved Preamble to the Constitution of the Academic Senate, Staff Senate, and Joint Assembly specifies that "Faculty members have a major role in the governance of the University through the Academic Senate...", and

WHEREAS, The Senate recommends policies and procedures to the President. On those occasions when the President rejects a Senate proposal, he informs the Senate in writing of the compelling reasons for such action", and

WHEREAS, the Personnel Policies Committee proposed the CAM section (315.5B) as it appeared prior to Revision #7, which was passed by the Senate, forwarded to and implemented by the President, and

WHEREAS, the President has promulgated a new revision in CAM 315.5B without consultation, implemented it retroactively, and without informing the Senate in writing of the compelling reasons for his action; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the President be urged to follow the same consultative process in the revision as well as the initiation of policies and procedures as is specified in the Constitution.

Max Riedlsperger
January 21, 1976
Memorandum


Date: 22 Jan 76

File No.: 

Copies:

Subject: Shelton Memo, of 5 Jan 76, re., Special Personnel Procedures

We proposed an additional paragraph to be inserted into CAM 341.1, A., to clarify the consultative procedures used for personnel matters. (see attachment)

In 341.1, insert after the first paragraph in A.:

If there is no full professor or associate professor in a department or program area which has personnel being considered for appointment, reappointment, non-reappointment, tenure/promotion, or termination, the following procedure shall be used:

The school council, at the dean's request, shall select three appropriately ranked/faculty, from closely-related departments or program areas within the school, who will prepare first level recommendations to the dean. This committee shall consult with the non-tenured faculty within the subjects affected Department or Program.

[Handwritten note: Feb. 10th This will be a business item for next meeting]
RESOLUTION REGARDING USE OF CR/NC GRADING FOR
POST-BACCALAUREATE AND GRADUATE STUDENTS

Background Rationale: The 1975-77 Cal Poly Catalog states, "No courses taken on a Credit-No Credit grading basis may be used to satisfy graduate program requirements" (p.51). On the other hand, CAM (457 C.3.c.) states internships, whether graduate or undergraduate, can be graded on a credit-no credit basis.

A proposal has been made that CAM be changed so as to be in agreement with the Cal Poly Catalog. The Instruction Committee was asked to study the proposal and make a recommendation to the Academic Senate. Five school deans support the proposal, one is opposed and one did not respond to a questionnaire.

Comments regarding the proposal:

1. The catalog statement and the first citation above from CAM seem to suggest that the use of credit-no credit grading should be restricted to undergraduate students.

2. Even with undergraduate students, the credit-no credit system may not be used with "M" courses and hence its inappropriate use in a degree program or credential program, which would be analogous.

3. Departments need to keep close supervision of all intern programs and a letter grade is more specific than a credit-no credit grade. Departments evaluating conditionally classified students need a more precise evaluation of a student's ability than simply a CR/NC mark.

RESOLVED: That CAM be changed to be in agreement with the 1975-77 Cal Poly Catalog and that administration supply the appropriate wording for CAM.

Instruction Committee
1/19/76

Agenda, 1/27/76
The proposed interim consultative procedure for the appointment of Director, University Library was reviewed by the members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate; eight persons responded to the request for comments/suggestions on the proposal. The major points presented include:

**Selection/Composition of the Consultative Committee**

1. Selection of the committee by a procedure similar to that for the selection of consultative committees for deans (nominations directly to the Academic/Staff Senate Election Committees -- no signed petitions) seems more expeditious.
2. The Library should have five representatives on the consultative committee (two persons from Technical Services, two persons from Public Services, and one staff person).
3. Professional consultative services should be represented in the manner suggested for the seven instructional schools, i.e., one representative from that area, excluding Librarians.

**Procedures for the Consultative Committee**

1. The consultative committee should work cooperatively in consultation with appropriate administrative personnel on the job description, proposed position vacancy announcements and deadlines, and guidelines as to appropriate procedures for the committee.
2. The consultative committee should interview as many candidates as feasible; candidates whose names are submitted to the President should definitely be interviewed.
3. The consultative committee should rank-order the list of final candidates and should set forth their reasons for this order for the President.

**Selection of the Director, University Library**

1. Should the President decide to appoint someone other than those persons recommended by the consultative committee, he should justify his appointment.

Should there be any questions on the above points, please feel free to call me for amplification/clarification. Thank you for the opportunity for review of the proposed procedure.
THE ACADEMIC SENATE CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY IN SAN LUIS OBISPO WISHES TO BE ON RECORD AS FAVORING MERIT CONSIDERATION IN PERSONNEL ACTIONS. WE OBJECT TO THE ATTEMPT TO GAUGE RELATIVE MERIT FROM WITHIN RANKS WHICH HAVE ALREADY BEEN JUDGED MERITORIOUS. WE BELIEVE THE RITCHIE PROPOSAL TO BE UNWORKABLE IN TERMS OF EITHER VALIDITY OR RELIABILITY AND URGE THAT IT BE REJECTED.

LEZLIE LABHARD, CHAIRPERSON

1653 EST
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Toll-Free Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>800 325 5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>800 648 4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>800 325 5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>800 648 4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>800 325 5400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
<td>800 257 2211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>800 257 2211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td>800 257 2211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>800 325 5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>800 257 2231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>800 648 4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>800 325 5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>800 325 5200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>800 325 5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>800 325 5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>800 325 5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>800 325 5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>800 257 2231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>800 257 2211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>800 257 2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>800 325 5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>800 325 5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>800 325 5200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>800 342 5700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>800 325 5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>800 325 5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>800 992 5700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>800 257 2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>800 632 2271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>800 325 5400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas 315, 518, 607 &amp; 716</td>
<td>800 257 2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas 212, 516 &amp; 914</td>
<td>800 257 2211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Except Manhattan</td>
<td>962 7111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>962 7111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>459 8100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>459 8100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>800 257 2231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>800 325 5400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>800 325 5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>800 325 5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>800 648 4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas 215 &amp; 717</td>
<td>800 257 2211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas 412 &amp; 614</td>
<td>800 257 2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>800 257 2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>800 257 2231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>800 325 5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>800 325 5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>800 325 5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td>800 648 4100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>800 257 2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>800 257 2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>800 648 4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINA</td>
<td>800 257 2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>800 325 5200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>800 648 4500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR DIAL WESTERN UNION’S INFOMASTER SYSTEM DIRECTLY:

FROM TELEX ................. 6161
FROM TWX .................... 910 420 1212