The meeting was called to order at 3:15 PM by Chair Tom Hale in UU 220.

Senators Absent: Grant Miller, William Phillips

The minutes of the October 12, 1976 meeting were approved.

III. Reports

A. CSUC Academic Senate Retreat - Tom Hale reported on the Statewide Senate Retreat and thanked the Senate for the opportunity to attend.

B. Administrative Council - Luther Hughes reported on the November 1 Administrative Council meeting. The University Master List was discussed with comments on how all other lists of alumni and "friends of the University" could be more effectively used to update the Master List. Additional items included the Annual Giving Fund program discussed by MacDonald and Bendiner who indicated initial requests for funds had been sent to alumni and friends of the University.

C. Academic Council - Bob Sennett reported the Academic Council disapproved the Academic Senate's recommendation on the Change of Grade policy but agreed and supported changes that were clerical errors. The item of Reassignment of Department Heads was deferred until the Academic Senate took action.

D. Foundation Board - Tom Hale indicated that Unitrusts was the major discussion topic of the Foundation Board. The "open door" policy of future meetings was discussed and various gifts accepted.

E. President's Council - Tom Hale reported President Kennedy's proposed 1977-78 Enrollment increase to 14,200 was the major discussion item at the President's Council meeting. The Annual Giving program was also discussed.

F. Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structure and Organization - Dr. Hazel Jones indicated the committee would meet later in November. Requests are already in for a School of Home Economics and Child Development and for a Division of Physical Education and Recreation.

G. Department Head's Council - McDonnell reported that the Council discussed the proposed Resolution Regarding Reassignment of Department Heads and indicated there was concern over the wording.
IV. Committee Reports

A. Budget - Conway indicated the budget committee members were meeting with School Deans to discuss budgeting at the School level. Requests were made for feedback on whether there should be a University-wide or school-wide procedures on budgeting.

B. Constitution and Bylaws - No Report.

C. Curriculum - Mike Cirovic reported the committee was gathering information on how curriculum proposals are developed in schools and departments.

D. Election - No Report.

E. Instruction - Greffenius indicated that because the faculty had a wide divergence of opinion on final exams and because the Committee felt there was significant flexibility in the current final exam policy, the Instruction Committee suggested the issue of final exams be dropped. This recommendation to the Academic Senate’s Executive Committee was accepted. Also the Committee indicated the definition of grades be left as school and departmental decisions and new instructors should be informed of department policy on grades.

F. Personnel Policies - Jim Bermann reported the committee had met and the first Business Item on the Academic Senate agenda was a result of their meeting.

G. Student Affairs - No Report.

H. General Education and Breadth Requirements - No Report.


J. Research - Art Duarte reported the committee had met and information on the CARE grant proposals would be in the next Encouraging Notes issue.

K. Fairness Board - No Report.

L. Faculty Library - H. Arthur DeKleine reported the Library committee had met with Dr. Alexander, the new Head Librarian and at the next meeting, cutting subscriptions of periodicals would be discussed.

M. Distinguished Teaching Awards - No Report.

N. Long Range Planning - Stan Dundon reported the committee was still struggling with techniques for Goals Inventory of schools and department.

O. Ad Hoc Committee on Information Awareness - No Report.

P. Faculty Sponsorship of Events - No Report.

Q. Implementation of ACR-70 - Max Riedlsperger reported their committee’s resolution would be presented later in the meeting as a business item.

V. Business Items

A. Resolution Regarding Recall of Department Head - It was M/S (Kersten) to approve the resolution.

It was M/S/F (Lang) to amend the resolution by substituting the words "such action, together with substantiating evidence" for (lines 13,14,15) "the termination of the department head's appointment together with evidence substantiating the recommended action."

It was M/S/P (Goldenberg) to amend the resolution by inserting the words "by secret ballot" on line 7 after the word "determines."

The amended motion passed (Attachment V-A).
B. Resolution Regarding Implementation of ACR-70 - After giving background information, it was M/S (Riedlsperger) to adopt the resolution (Att.V-B).

During considerable discussion of the random selection or lottery proposal, it was the decision of the Chair to allow the Committee Chair (Riedlsperger) to reply to each point of opposition. This decision was challenged by Drandell but upheld by majority vote of the senators.

It was M/S/F (Greffenius) to make a substitute resolution for the original resolution.

It was M/S (Bermann) to amend by deleting the words "random" and replacing with "by merit." After consulting with the Parliamentarian, the Chair ruled the amendment out of order because it changed the entire intent.

After further discussion, the original resolution failed.

It was M/S/P (Buffa) to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 PM.
RESOLUTION REGARDING RECALL OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

RESOLVED: That the following be made an addition to CAM:

315.5E The appointment of an instructional department head (as defined in AB 74-4, Section V) can be terminated by the University President. Under some circumstances, the tenured and probationary faculty of a department may become concerned with the department head's failure to provide desired professional and academic leadership. If a majority of the full time tenured and probationary faculty of a department, excluding the department head, determines by secret ballot that it is necessary to recommend review of the performance of a department head with a view towards termination of the appointment, such a recommendation should be made in writing to the University President with a copy to the school dean and to the concerned department head. The recommendation should provide a basis for review of the department head and contain a statement of reasons for requesting the termination of the department head's appointment together with evidence substantiating the recommended action. Upon receipt of this recommendation, the University President will consult with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the appropriate school dean, the tenured and probationary faculty of the affected department, and the department head concerned prior to taking action on the recommendation.

APPROVED

NOVEMBER 9, 1976

Attachment V-A
Resolution Regarding Implementation of ACR-70

Background Rationale: The proposed additions to the Campus Administrative Manual are intended to resolve the problem created by the elimination of the 60/40 quota which maintained a balance between the available funds for promotions, and the number of promotions recommended. Implicit in ACR 70 is the removal of artificial restrictions to promotions. Rather promotions shall be recommended "...in recognition of competence, professional performance, and meritorious service during the period in rank," as specified in CAM 342.2B.

After the Academic Senate in the academic year 1975-76 failed to approve the recommendations of the Personnel Policies Committee to establish procedures to determine a means of denying promotion to persons already recommended for promotion on the basis of relative merit, the matter was referred to an Ad Hoc committee to be created to further consider the problem. In arriving at its recommendation the Committee carefully studied the suggestions considered by last year's Personnel Policies Committee from a variety of on- and off-campus sources including the school deans, individual faculty members who submitted alternative plans for consideration and discussed the various alternatives with a number of local faculty members.

Operating Principles

1. The committee perceived as its charge the determination of an acceptable means of meeting the need of the university to balance expenditures for promotions with the amount of money available, while avoiding the potentially severe morale problem that might arise from denial of promotion to those who have been determined worthy of promotion under the merit-based evaluation procedure outlined in CAM 342.2.

2. The committee considers this need to be dictated not by academic, scholarly, or professional requirements, but rather to be an artificially imposed budgetary necessity.

3. The committee considers it difficult to determine relative merit among meritorious colleagues in the same or in closely related disciplines.

4. The committee considers it impossible to practically and fairly determine a merit ranking among those recommended for promotion in the widely varying disciplines within the university and even within the schools with their vary standards for terminal degrees, publications, work experience, HEGIS formulas, availability of research materials, labs, library facilities, etc., locally.

5. The committee considers that once an individual has been recommended for promotion, denial of promotion on the basis of questionable procedures is unacceptable.

Conclusion: Therefore the committee recommends a procedure which can accomplish the necessary budgetary limitation, while preserving among the faculty the reasonable expectation of promotion based on an evaluation of merit, once merit has been recognized at all of the consultative levels.

Attachment V-B
RESOLVED: That the following proposed CAM 342.2 changes be made:

j. Notices to faculty of approval of promotion, pending availability of funds, or nonpromotion are sent by the University President by May 1.

(Insert between 342.2 B 2 and 342.2 C)

3. Procedures for Establishing a Priority List of Those Approved for Promotion by the University President

a. Because external fiscal constraints may impose limitations of funds for promotions, funds will be divided among the schools/division by applying the wage-base formula used by the state to distribute funds among the campuses.

b. Within each school/division, in a manner to be determined by the School/Division Council, the name of each person approved for promotion will be drawn at random, in open meeting, with the drawing order indicating the priority listing. This ordering will take place no later than two weeks following notification of approval of promotion by the President.

c. A department/program may elect to rank its candidates. This rank order will be determined by the appropriate group within the department in consultation with the department head. In such instances the department will submit in place of each approved name, the department name to be selected randomly with all others. After the school random ordering process has been completed, the priority order of the first department identifier will be assigned to the first person on that department's ranked list, etc.

d. After the school/division priority is thus determined, promotions will be granted until the funds are exhausted or until each person has been selected.

e. Those approved for promotion but denied due to an insufficiency of funds, will automatically be placed at the top of the priority list of next year, while retaining their priority order, to be followed by those approved for promotion that year.

f. In case all funds allocated to a school/division are not exhausted in promoting all persons approved, the surplus funds will be sequentially allocated to schools/division in order of least deficit toward promotion.