I. Minutes - Academic Senate - March 9, April 6, 1976.

II. Reports
   A. Statewide Senate (Olsen, Wenzl, Murphy)
   B. Administrative Council (Weatherby)
   C. Academic Council (Jennings)
   D. Consultative Committee - Dean, Science and Math (Eatough)
   E. Consultative Committee - Dean, Ag. and Nat. Resources (Rogalla)
   F. Consultative Committee - Director, Library (Sparling)
   G. Executive Committee (Jennings)
   H. Foundation Board (Labhard)
   I. President's Council (Labhard)
   J. Dept. Heads Council (Labhard)

III. Committee Reports
   A. Budget (Nielsen)
   B. Curriculum (Cirovic)
   C. Election (Schaffner)
   D. Instruction (Greffenuis)
   E. Personnel Policies (Beecher)
   F. Student Affairs (Culver)
   G. Gen.Ed. & Breadth Req. (Riedlsperger)
   H. Constitution and Bylaws (Gold)
   I. Long-Range Planning (Dundon)
   J. Personnel Review (Kann)
   K. Research (Thomas)
   L. Fairness Board (Eatough)
   M. Faculty Library (Krupp)
   N. Dist. Teaching Awards (Roberts)

IV. Business Items
   A. CAM 342.2 - Academic Promotions (Beecher - Att. IV-A).
   B. Naming Buildings (Murphy - Att. IV-B).
   C. Faculty Input in the Budgetary Process (Schaffner - Att. IV-C).
   D. Curriculum Packages (Cirovic)
      1. School of Architecture and Environmental Design
      2. School of Engineering and Technology
   E. Reinstatement - Students

V. Discussion Items
VI. Announcements

A. Academic Senate Resolution on Consultative Procedure - Curriculum Package This has been referred to the Academic Council by President Kennedy.

B. Academic Senate Resolution regarding CAM 341.1 - Consultative Procedures on Personnel Matters This has been referred to Don Shelton for review by Vice President Hazel Jones and other personnel as appropriate.

C. Academic Senate Resolution regarding C/NC Grading for Post Baccalaureate and Graduate Students This has been referred to the Academic Council by President Kennedy.

D. Dennis Friend Memorial Fund Contributions may be sent to the ASI Business Office in the University Union.

E. Title 9 Information on file in the Senate Office.

F. Turnaround Time for the Academic Senate Office

G. Correspondence RTK Policy or procedure revision in CAM (see RTK, VI-A)

H. Parking Spaces

I. Guidelines for Non-Sexist Use of Language

J. Report from the Vice Chair
Proposed CAM 342.2 Change

C. Ranking procedures to be utilized when the University President requests a Priority list.

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 (when of appropriate rank), will meet in order to rank 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. Upon receipt of the departmental ranking of those recommended to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor, all tenured Full Professors, chaired by the department head or program leader (when of appropriate rank) will meet in order to determine the position of those recommended for promotion to 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. This completed list will retain 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. If a department or program does not have a faculty member of appropriate rank and status, the school council, at the dean's request, shall select a committee of three appropriately ranked tenured 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 both tenured and non-tenured faculty within the affected department or program.

d. The school dean, acting as a voting 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 ad hoc committee will not make changes in the relative priority rankings established by the individual departments.

e. If a department or program has no Full Professor eligible to serve on the school-wide committee, the school council, at the dean's request, shall select a tenured full professor from a closely-related department or program area within the school to represent the affected
Proposed CAM 342.2 Change (cont.)

department or program on the school-wide committee. The appointed full professor shall consult with the faculty of the affected department or program.

f. Each of the above groups will establish, adopt and make explicit its own procedures and criteria for ranking.

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 (see CAM 342.2.B,2.e & h), by March 10. Each candidate for promotion shall be informed in writing by the appropriate administrative officer of the number of promotable candidates and his or her priority on both the departmental and school-wide list as soon as the respective lists have been generated.

3. In developing criteria for ranking, schools and departments shall use only those criteria used in the original promotion procedures, and comply with the CAM 341.1.C, requirement that promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor.

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.

$\mathcal{D}$. Effective Date of Promotions.
RESOLUTION ON THE NAMING OF BUILDINGS

Background Rationale: The naming of buildings in the memory of deceased individuals or in the honor of living individuals is a sensitive matter that should be handled with discretion. However, in a matter of such permanence, the need for discretion should not preclude reasonable consultation with the various segments of the campus community. The purpose of this resolution is to provide for such consultation in an atmosphere conducive to rational discourse.

WHEREAS, The naming of campus buildings in the memory of deceased individuals or in the honor of living individuals is a matter that affects the morale and working conditions of all faculty (and all segments of the campus community), therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the President be urged to consult with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate before the selection of any such name.

Murphy
March 19, 1976

Att.IV-B, Ac.Sen.
Agenda, 4/13/76
RESOLUTION REGARDING FACULTY INPUT IN THE BUDGETARY PROCESS

Background Rationale: Ever since the inception of the Cal Poly Academic Senate, the Budget Committee has been an integral part of the "committee system" of the Academic Senate. The Bylaws of the Academic Senate gives the Budget Committee the responsibility: "to review and make recommendations concerning the budget plans as they affect the University." However, the actual procedures of how the Budget Committee is to be directly involved in the year by year instructional budgetary process from its beginning to its finalization has never been clarified. Consequently, the Budget Committee has served in a de facto capacity, concerning itself primarily with reviewing the university instructional budget after it has been formulated. Only partial advantage has been taken of the past opportunities to introduce faculty input into the budgetary decision making process.

Present day economics seem to indicate that it is essential that the faculty at Cal Poly become more actively involved in the budgetary decisions which affect the instructional programs at the University. The classroom instructors should have a viable voice in how monies are allocated which impact on their job security, facilities, and instructional materials. In order to involve the instructional faculty more directly in the budgetary decision making process at Cal Poly, the following recommendation is offered for consideration by the Academic Senate.

WHEREAS, Budgetary policies of the California State University and Colleges and the State of California having direct impact on funding for the instructional programs of CPSU-SLO, and

WHEREAS, Presently the faculty at CPSU-SLO has varying degrees of input through the departments and schools and has taken only partial advantage of opportunities through the Academic Senate's Budget Committee, and

WHEREAS, There is a need to define and make more uniform the nature of faculty input into the instructional budgetary planning and administration; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, CPSU-SLO, endorse the Academic Senate Budget Committee's recommendations on the instructional budget process to provide:

1) That the Academic Senate Budget Committee establish a regular meeting schedule which corresponds to the time schedule of the university budget development process. Accordingly, the Director of Business Affairs and the Vice President for Academic Affairs would confer with the Budget Committee on all fiscal matters which affect the formulation and the allocation of the instructional budget.

Att. IV-C, Ac.Sen.
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2) That all subsequent instructional budgetary committees formed by the university administration should have two (2) faculty members from the Budget Committee appointed to it with voting rights and appropriate Academic Senate recommendation.

3) That the deans of the seven instructional schools, together with the Academic Senate Caucus of each instructional school, should set up procedures for more direct faculty input into instructional allocations within the respective schools. One member of the Academic Senate Budget Committee should be a member of this group in each instructional school with voting rights and appropriate Academic Senate recommendation.