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CHANGES TO CREDIT-NO CREDIT GRADING POLICY

Background and Rationale

The rationale for the recommended changes to the Credit-No Credit grading policy is the elimination of ambiguities which appear in CAM and in the Catalog with respect to graduate courses and internship programs.

Two criteria were kept in mind when this recommendation was developed. They were:

1. That all 500 level courses (graduate courses) are to be taken for a letter grade; and
2. That any 400 level or below courses (undergraduate courses) may be taken for credit-no credit if not listed as the student's major ("M" courses).

The recommendation also takes into consideration Title V, which states that certain graduate courses may be designated for credit-no credit but at least a 'B' must be earned before credit is given. This differs from undergraduate credit-no credit where at least a 'C' must be earned anyhow, it was decided to reinforce this by not allowing a credit-no credit grade for a graduate level course.

This recommendation is consistent with the present data processing system for computing credit-no credit which only allows a credit to be given if at least a 'C' is earned.

Recommendation

The Student Affairs Committee recommends that the following revisions to the Catalog and to CAM be approved by the Academic Senate for recommendation to President Kennedy.

I. Changes to the Catalog (p. 48)

Credit-No Credit Grading

The course description will indicate those courses offered only on a Credit-No Credit grading basis. Exclusive of courses offered only on a Credit-No Credit grading basis, students may elect to take additional courses on a Credit-No Credit grading basis within the following limits:

1. Up to 2 courses (not to exceed 8 units) per student per quarter may be elected on a Credit-No Credit grading basis, and further, a maximum of 8 courses (not to exceed 45 units) per student may be elected on a Credit-No Credit grading basis.

2. Courses designated as "M" courses in the student's major may not be elected on a Credit-No Credit grading basis.

3. A student must have not less than a 2.0 (C) grade point average in his cumulative Cal Poly course work to be eligible to elect a course on a Credit-No Credit grading basis.

4. No graduate level course (500 level) may be taken on a Credit-No Credit grading basis.

5. No courses taken on a Credit-No Credit grading basis may be used to satisfy graduate program requirements.

6. Nonmatriculated students in the Extension Program, Summer Session and Workshops must meet the same requirements as matriculated students to elect courses on a Credit-No Credit grading basis. (The 2.0 GPA requirement is waived in the case of nonmatriculated students having no previous course work recorded at Cal Poly.)

Students desiring to elect a course on a Credit-No Credit grading basis must be currently enrolled in the course and must complete the appropriate form available from the Records Office. Such declaration for Credit-No Credit grading must be filed not later than the end of the 7th week of instruction of the quarter. Students may not change from one grading system to the other after the end of the normal no-penalty withdrawal date of the quarter.

A final grade of CR (Credit) will be recorded for academic performance equivalent to a grade of "C" or above; a final grade of NC (No Credit) will be recorded for academic performance equivalent to a grade of "D" or "F."
II. Changes to CAM

457 Internship Guidelines

A. Objectives

The objectives of internship programs are to:

1. Provide educational experiences at the undergraduate and graduate levels which are directly related to curricula and student’s goals
2. Develop student awareness of employment demands, responsibilities, and opportunities
3. Provide potential career experience with an opportunity for continuing formal education
4. Provide an opportunity for the student to apply principles and techniques learned on campus in problem-solving situations and to gain a better understanding of the decision-making and implementation process

B. Definitions

1. Part-time Internship Program

An evaluated education program of closely supervised work experience in a nearby (commuting distance) business, industry, or government facility. The program is designed to acquaint students with actual work situations while attending classes during a portion of the day, and for which the student receives remuneration and/or university credit. The off-campus Work-Study Program can be utilized for this purpose. (Example: Student spends 4 hours per week at the Mens Colony.)

2. Full-time Internship Program

An evaluated education work experience of full-time nature in a business, industry, or government facility. The program is designed to introduce the student to a particular occupational area during one or more quarters away from classes, and for which the student receives remuneration and/or university credit. A cooperative educational program may be regarded as a type of full-time internship program. (Example: Student works full time for San Francisco firm.)

C. Criteria

1. Educational values obtained from the program must be clearly stated and understood both by the university and the employer. The educational values must be commensurate with the academic credit offered both as to curriculum level and equivalent hours.

2. Remunerative aspects, if any, should be at a level commensurate with the job to be performed.

3. Course credit may be given according to the following:
   a. Preparation time required by the student outside of working hours is comparable to that of courses offered on campus.
   b. Undergraduate interns may receive up to 12 units of credit on completion of the equivalent of a full quarter’s internship and submission of an acceptable final report. A maximum of 12 units may be credited toward the bachelor’s degree.
   c. /\ Graduate students on internships may earn up to 9 units toward the master’s degree.
   d. Grading may be on a Credit-No Credit basis for undergraduate level internships and shall be on a letter grade basis for graduate level internships.
c. Credit-No Credit Grading

1. Courses Subject to Exclusive Credit-No Credit Grading

All undergraduate courses meeting one or both of the following criteria may be graded exclusively on a Credit-No Credit basis on approval of the Academic Vice President:

a. Lecture and activity (including two-hour laboratory) courses offered for less than 2 units of credit (excluding variable credit courses in which the variable credit obtainable via a single registration extends to 2 or more units).

b. Courses designed primarily as orientation to a major field of study.

2. Policy on Credit-No Credit Grading

The following criteria govern the implementation of a Credit-No Credit grading system at this campus:

a. The Credit-No Credit grading system is available to all students.

b. Only two courses (not to exceed 8 units) may be taken per student per quarter on a Credit-No Credit grading basis; a maximum total of 15 courses may be elected per student for Credit-No Credit grading.

c. Courses in the student's major (designated with the "M" on his major curriculum sheet) may not be taken for Credit-No Credit grading.

d. No graduate level course may be taken on a Credit-No Credit grading basis.

e. No course taken on a Credit-No Credit grading basis may be used to satisfy graduate program requirements.

f. A student shall not enroll for a course on a Credit-No Credit basis if he has twice failed that course.

g. The student may declare for either Credit-No Credit or conventional letter grading (ABCD/F) at registration and may not change from one system to the other after the end of the normal no-penalty withdrawal date of the quarter. The Registrar will establish and announce procedures whereby such declaration may be made.

h. Students will be given a grade of "Credit" for accomplishment equivalent to a grade of "C" or better. "No Credit" will be given for accomplishment equivalent to "D" or "F" grades. Instructors will submit conventional letter grades to the Registrar's Office where they will be converted to Credit-No Credit grades, where appropriate, before recording on transcripts.

i. The applicant for a Credit-No Credit grade must have at least a 2.0 grade point average in his cumulative Cal Poly work.

j. Units earned in courses for which the grade was "Credit" will count toward satisfaction of degree requirements.

k. Grades of "Credit" or "No Credit" will be disregarded in determining the student's grade point average.
The committee assumes that appropriate individuals and organizations will work to undo the budgetary damage done to student/faculty ratios in recent years. However, since the timing of success is unpredictable, it is assumed that there will be no immediate substantial change in existing state standards for budgeting and support of CSUC campuses.

4) The suggestion that "departments and schools when hiring new full-time faculty should consider the balance and recency of education and experience." (VI.E-ad hoc report) This is questionable and implies age discrimination.

5) Emphasis on a pre-established number of lecturers (10%). The use of the lecturer classification as a means of maintaining flexibility is a practical approach, and could ultimately be a means of reduction of faculty without terminating those who are tenured. The PPC, however, feels that a quota would introduce weaknesses into the instructional program. Lecturers are not likely to bring stability to a department. Their loyalties, desires to work toward long-term departmental goals and willingness to assume departmental responsibilities are likely to be influenced negatively by the tenuous nature of their appointments. The recruitment of new faculty is bound to be affected adversely by such a system. Additionally, a further danger exists in the likelihood that departments and/or schools will over-react by appointing lecturers exclusively (see VI.G.3 of ad hoc report), "where projected enrollment makes uncertain the future staffing needs of that program or department." If the hiring of lecturers seems to be the most expedient solution to the problem, then we must consider revisions to existing restrictions as to number of years one can hold a full-time lecturership, number of years creditable toward tenure if placed on rank and class, grievance rights, etc. Clear-cut guidelines must be developed and utilized. Some concern has been expressed that current probationary faculty might be affected adversely by an over-enthusiastic application of a lectureship quota which could be extended to a denial of tenure for these individuals. We might well ask, "What commitments (moral or legal) have been made to current faculty members? Have they been told that 'satisfactory performance' will lead to tenure and promotion?" (Furniss p. 3)

The Personnel Policies Committee therefore recommends that the Academic Senate advise the President:

1) That Section 6.F. of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Steady State Enrollment and Staffing which recommends the hiring of a set quota of lecturers is inconsistent with sound academic planning. It should be specifically noted that the recommendation of the Academic Council that the quota be applied school-wide transforms an idea supposedly justified on academic flexibility into one of administrative flexibility and, by the terms of the ad hoc committee report, cannot conceivably be justified.

2) That the hiring of lecturers be considered as one means of maintaining programmatic flexibility but that such hiring be based on needs defined by specific departments.

3) That clear-cut guidelines be developed regarding the status and rights of lecturers, whether full or part-time.
4) That the faculty be apprised of how Steady State Enrollment and Staffing will affect administrative and staff personnel.

5) That the remainder of the ad hoc committee's proposed guidelines, with the exception of J.3, which should be deleted, be considered as basic to maintaining sound personnel policies and procedures without specific reference to steady state enrollment.

6) That a new ad hoc committee be appointed with an appropriate number of faculty members; and

7) That the original report be returned to the new ad hoc committee with instructions to:
   a) review basic assumptions;
   b) review age distributions of faculty to determine whether regular replacement in departments or divisions is a real rather than a theoretical problem;
   c) include areas previously omitted, i.e., policies and procedures regarding tenure, promotion and layoff and the affirmative action program, as these are liable to be affected by a steady state.

Personnel Policies Committee Vote - 5/0/3
VII. COMMITTEES

B. Elected Committees and Other Committees

6. Committee on Professional Responsibility

a. The Committee on Professional Responsibility shall be comprised of a senior member and junior member elected by and from each school from the tenured members in the associate or professor ranks and a senior member and junior member elected by and from the Professional Consultative Services from the tenured members in the associate or professor ranks. The senior member and junior member from each school must be from different departments, where applicable. The senior members and junior members shall serve two-year, staggered terms, with a maximum of two consecutive terms. The junior member becomes the senior member at the start of the second year of the term and the newly elected member from that school becomes the junior member. Administrators and department heads are not eligible for membership. The chairman shall be elected from and by the committee. A functional committee is dependent upon a quorum, which shall consist of a member from each school and Professional Consultative Services.

b. When cases of disregard for the principles of professional responsibility occur, there is both a right and a duty to call the lapse to the attention of the individual concerned. If such a breach of professional responsibility is alleged, the matter should be investigated and a recommendation made by a faculty committee on Professional Responsibility. The procedures and standards of this committee should be consistent with the guidelines issued by the Academic Senate of the California State Universities and Colleges (AS-382-70/FA 1 and 2,12/17/70).

c. Any employee of the University who teaches as part of his assigned duties, or who is eligible to vote in the election of University Academic Senators, or who is eligible to serve as a voting member of the Academic Senate, may be charged with unprofessional conduct.

d. In the event a breach of conduct is believed to have occurred and an informal resolution is unobtainable, the ensuing procedures shall be followed:

Attachment V-B
d. (continued)

1. Allegations of unprofessional conduct shall be made in writing with copies going to the person so charged and to the members of the Committee on Professional Responsibility. Allegations shall be accompanied by full documentation and evidence. If it is the committee's determination that an allegation is not accompanied by sufficient evidence, or is from too extraneous a source to merit investigation, it shall return the document with an explanation to the initiator and inform the accused of the charge and of the committee action.

2. The Committee on Professional Responsibility shall investigate each allegation and determine if indeed an act of unprofessional conduct has been committed, in which case the committee will make every effort to resolve the case to the satisfaction of those concerned.

   a) Allegations to be heard by the Committee on Professional Responsibility shall be limited to matters of unprofessional conduct.

   b) In cases where disciplinary action is initiated by the University for other than unprofessional conduct or when disciplinary action has been initiated by the University and unprofessional conduct is one of a number of grounds, allegations will not be heard by the Committee on Professional Responsibility except if a case is already being heard by the Committee on Professional Responsibility at the time when disciplinary action is initiated. They shall have ten days to complete their investigation.

3. The Committee on Professional Responsibility shall begin its inquiry within 10 days of receiving the allegation. The committee may at any time discontinue the inquiry if the facts do not provide sufficient evidence to support it. This constitutes the completion of its inquiry and dismissal of the allegations. If the committee does carry its inquiry to completion, a report presenting its conclusions and their bases shall be prepared for the personnel file of the person charged with unprofessional conduct. If the allegation is dismissed by the committee all material pertaining to these allegations and only these allegations shall be removed from the personnel file. The faculty member so charged shall receive a copy of the report and a copy shall be retained by the committee. The committee shall notify the author of the allegation of unprofessionalism and that it has acted upon his accusation.

4. The actions open to the committee include:

   a) dismissing the allegation
   b) securing mutual understanding between the parties concerned
   c) administering an oral recommendation that conduct be improved so as to be consistent with professional responsibility
   d) preparing a written report with suggestions for conduct consistent with professional responsibility or preparing a written report exonerating the faculty member.
   e) referral (see section 5).
5. When, in the judgment of the committee, the nature of the case suggests such a conclusion, the committee shall recommend the initiation of formal disciplinary action to the President of the University.

e. In appearance before the Committee on Professional Responsibility, the following rules and procedures pertaining to the person charged with unprofessional conduct shall be observed:

1. He shall be given the opportunity to submit evidence refuting the allegation.

2. He shall be provided with a copy of all evidence presented to the committee and shall be given a reasonable time (no longer than 10 days, but an extension of time may be granted upon written request of the person charged) to respond to any evidence submitted.

3. He shall have the right to be accompanied by a person of his own selection who shall have the right to participate in the hearing.

4. He shall have the right to submit questions through the committee chairman to the individual making the allegation. The answers solicited shall be made available to him and to the committee.

f. The investigation and proceedings of the committee shall be kept in strict confidence by all concerned, except as it is otherwise necessary on the part of the Committee on Professional Responsibility in resolving the allegation.
In response to President Kennedy's request that the guidelines proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Steady State Enrollment and Staffing be referred to "all the appropriate consultative bodies for input and/or concurrence prior to university-wide utilization," the Personnel Policies Committee of the Academic Senate was assigned the task of analyzing and making recommendations on this critical matter. The committee recognizes that faculty resentment is clearly evident over the fact that the ad hoc committee of twelve was composed of nine non-faculty members, yet the thrust of the report is aimed at teaching faculty with little if any reference to resource faculty, administrators or staff. Further concern based upon action of the Academic Council is that the ad hoc report may well be a fait accompli, in spite of the request for faculty input which has been developd with care after a considerable amount of time and energy expended. In the interest of equity, any plans for faculty reduction also should be balanced with specific plans calling for reducing the number of administrators and comparable replacement of administrators on a regular basis. Because the complexity of Steady State Staffing precludes superficial prognostication and hasty, ill-defined methods of implementation, the Academic Senate must, therefore, seek significant faculty input in all future studies that might effect staffing changes as well as Senate participation on budgetary matters which affect the faculty directly.

Admittedly, the ad hoc committee chose to omit the following: 1) promotion policies and procedures; 2) layoff policies and procedures; 3) tenure and permanent status policies and procedures; and 4) the affirmative action program. The Personnel Policies Committee believes that any recommendation on Steady State Staffing must include these areas and in addition should also include an analysis of the status and rights of part-time faculty and lecturers. Additionally the ad hoc report should be questioned because of:

1) Excess emphasis on the declining number of 18-24 year olds, with little regard for the apparent increase in numbers of non-traditional students whose needs could only be met by flexible programs and sufficient faculty to meet those needs. Non-traditional students are those unemployed or unemployable due to lack of skills, older returning students seeking a second career, older women seeking to acquire new skills, etc. Providing programs for such students could offset declines in the traditional "college-age" population.

2) The use of Winter Quarter 1974 as a base upon which to plan. To do so presupposes continuation of teaching conditions which were an outgrowth of a period of rapid growth but which are highly questionable, i.e.:
   a) faculty overloads;
   b) increased faculty/student ratio;
   c) more advisees per advisor;
   d) an extended teaching day without reasonable schedule adjustments for some who are expected to teach both late night and early morning classes; lack of released time for new course development or major committee assignments, etc.

3) The assumption according to Part III A of the ad hoc committee report "that there will be no substantial changes in existing state standards for budgeting and support of CSUC campuses." The PPC would urge that Part III A be revised to read:

Attachment VI-A
The committee assumes that appropriate individuals and organizations will work to undo the budgetary damage done to student/faculty ratios in recent years. However, since the timing of success is unpredictable, it is assumed that there will be no immediate substantial change in existing state standards for budgeting and support of CSUC campuses.

4) The suggestion that "departments and schools when hiring new full-time faculty should consider the balance and recency of education and experience." (VI.E-ad hoc report) This is questionable and implies age discrimination.

5) Emphasis on a pre-established number of lecturers (10%). The use of the lecturer classification as a means of maintaining flexibility is a practical approach, and could ultimately be a means of reduction of faculty without terminating those who are tenured. The PPC, however, feels that a quota would introduce weaknesses into the instructional program. Lecturers are not likely to bring stability to a department. Their loyalties, desires to work toward long-term departmental goals and willingness to assume departmental responsibilities are likely to be influenced negatively by the tenuous nature of their appointments. The recruitment of new faculty is bound to be affected adversely by such a system. Additionally a further danger exists in the likelihood that departments and/or schools will over-react by appointing lecturers exclusively (See VI.G.3 of ad hoc report), "where projected enrollment makes uncertain the future staffing needs of that program or department." If the hiring of lecturers seems to be the most expedient solution to the problem, then we must consider revisions to existing restrictions as to number of years one can hold a full-time lectureship, number of years creditable toward tenure if placed on rank and class, grievance rights, etc. Clear cut guidelines must be developed and utilized. Some concern has been expressed that current probationary faculty might be affected adversely by an over-enthusiastic application of a lectureship quota which could be extended to a denial of tenure for these individuals. We might well ask, "What commitments (moral or legal) have been made to current faculty members? Have they been told that 'satisfactory performance' will lead to tenure and promotion?" (Furniss p. 3)

The Personnel Policies Committee therefore recommends that the Academic Senate advise the President:

1) That Section 6.F. of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Steady State Enrollment and Staffing which recommends the hiring of a set quota of lecturers is inconsistent with sound academic planning. It should be specifically noted that the recommendation of the Academic Council that the quota be applied school-wide transforms an idea supposedly justified on academic flexibility into one of administrative flexibility and, by the terms of the ad hoc committee report, cannot conceivably be justified.

2) That the hiring of lecturers be considered as one means of maintaining programmatic flexibility but that such hiring be based on needs defined by specific departments.

3) That clear-cut guidelines be developed regarding the status and rights of lecturers, whether full or part-time.
4) That the faculty be apprised of how Steady State Enrollment and Staffing will affect administrative and staff personnel.

5) That the remainder of the ad hoc committee's proposed guidelines, with the exception of J.3, which should be deleted, be considered as basic to maintaining sound personnel policies and procedures without specific reference to steady state enrollment.

6) That a new ad hoc committee be appointed with an appropriate number of faculty members; and

7) That the original report be returned to the new ad hoc committee with instructions to:
   a) review basic assumptions;
   b) review age distributions of faculty to determine whether regular replacement in departments or divisions is a real rather than a theoretical problem;
   c) include areas previously omitted, i.e., policies and procedures regarding tenure, promotion and layoff and the affirmative action program, as these are liable to be affected by a steady state.

Personnel Policies Committee Vote - 5/0/3
RESOLUTION RE RESTORATION OF CSUC INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, Since 1963 the International Programs of The California State University and Colleges have provided CSUC students an invaluable opportunity to expand their professional and personal education by a year of study overseas; and

WHEREAS, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, has recognized the value of such a structured overseas educational experience by sending a large number of students overseas each year in the International Programs; and

WHEREAS, Such overseas education has been offered at a cost which places it within the financial reach of all students; and

WHEREAS, The Governor's Budget for 1975/76 has deleted all General Fund support for the International Programs; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CPSU, SLO urges the restoration of budget support to the International Programs and the continuation of this worthwhile academic program.
RESOLUTION RE RESTORATION OF FUNDS FOR NEW FACILITIES

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, is currently operating with 13,500 FTE in facilities designed for 11,011 FTE; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, has the highest utilization of lecture and classroom space in the California State University and College System; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, has the second highest utilization of laboratory classroom space in the California State University and College System; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, increased its FTE in 1974-75 by 1,319 over the previous year without expansion of teaching and faculty and staff facilities; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, is receiving applications for admission for Fall 1975 at a rate higher than last year; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, was 310 spaces below requests for on-campus housing for 1974-75, creating a major problem in the community and in student and family morale in Fall 1974; and

WHEREAS 168 faculty and support staff presently housed in Tenaya Residence Hall since Fall 1972, must be relocated elsewhere on the campus when said Hall is returned to the student residence inventory; and

WHEREAS This relocation together with a revised enrollment projection for 1975-76 of 13,800 FTE (an increase of 316 over 1974-75) will create a need for space which the University does not now have for some 220 faculty, department heads and support staff; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, with a FTE of 13,500 continues to operate with a library designed for only 6,000 FTE (44.4% of FTE for 1974-75 and 43.5% of FTE for 1975-76); and

WHEREAS These above stated facts contribute to a deterioration of quality education offered at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, because of resulting overcrowding of inadequate facilities and falling faculty morale; and

WHEREAS Governor Brown's budget has omitted all construction and planning funds for new high priority facilities for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, without regard to the pressing needs of faculty, staff and students at the University; therefore
BE IT RESOLVED That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, oppose the Governor's cut of all capital outlay for new facilities at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, gives its total support to the efforts of President Kennedy to seek restoration of all funds originally budgeted in the CSUC System Capital Outlay Program for 1975-76 for this University; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Chairman of the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to President Kennedy for the purpose of conveying the support of the Academic Senate for the President's efforts to have the Governor restore all funds necessary to continue with construction and planning in the 1975-76 year; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Chairman of the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President to be forwarded to the Governor and appropriate legislative committees, for the purpose of conveying the opposition of the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, to the Governor's cut of all capital outlay for new facilities.
## ITEMS REFERRED TO SENATE COMMITTEES 1974-75

### Still Pending

<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>Academic Calendar</td>
<td>7-10-74 Instruction</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td>4-8-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exams</td>
<td>10-29-74</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 60/40 What?</td>
<td>7-10-74 PPC</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>2-25-75 Exec Comm</td>
<td>Attachment VI-A, A.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady State Staffing</td>
<td>9-17-75 PPC</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>3-11-75 Senate</td>
<td>Agenda 3/11/75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate C/NC</td>
<td>10-29-74 Student Affs.</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td>1-14-75</td>
<td>3-11-75 Senate</td>
<td>Attachment V-A, A.S.</td>
<td>Agenda 3/11/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Proced.</td>
<td>11-26-74 AdHoc Comm.</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnston &amp; Coyes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate as an item in budget</td>
<td>11-27-74 Budget</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td>2-25-75</td>
<td>2-25-75</td>
<td>No action necessary by Senate at present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation of Faculty</td>
<td>1-7-75 PPC</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td>4-1-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Policy CSUC</td>
<td>1-22-75 Instruction</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>2-11-75</td>
<td>2-11-75</td>
<td>Attachment IV-A; A.S.</td>
<td>Agenda - 2/11/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit by Evaluation</td>
<td>2-4-75 Instruction</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passed Unanimously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forwarded to P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>COMMITTEE</td>
<td>DATE REFERRED</td>
<td>DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED</td>
<td>CONTENTS OF RESPONSE</td>
<td>FURTHER ACTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Textbook</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>1/17/75</td>
<td>1/31/75</td>
<td>Referred to Academic Council for Recom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Opposing CSUC Copyright Policy</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>2/13/75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Re Restoration of Promotions</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2/13/75</td>
<td>2/24/75</td>
<td>Forwarded to Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education and Breadth Require. Passed 5/28/74</td>
<td>Gen. Ed. &amp; Bread.</td>
<td>2/25/75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Members of the Academic Senate CSUC
    Chairs of Campus Senates/Councils
FROM: Charles C. Adams  C C C A
RE: Legislative Analyst's Report on the 1975-76 CSUC Budget

At this point we have no further word regarding a meeting of the Executive Committee with the Governor. I called his office last week, attempting to underscore the intra-system urgency of the promotions matter. His scheduling secretary promised to get back to us this week.

Since my last memo on the subject of promotions, the report of the Legislative Analyst has been made public. This report adds another dimension to the promotions issue. It also contains other recommendations which may be of interest to you. I shall comment on some of his major responses to the Governor's budget for the CSUC. Remember that the Budget Analyst simply recommends actions to the Legislature; the fact that the report recommends that the Legislature add something to the budget does not mean that the item or amount is automatically in the budget. It may or may not be added, and, if it is added by final legislative action, it can be vetoed by the Governor.

Attached (Attachment I) is the summary of the recommendations of the Analyst. Most of them are pretty clear, but some explanation may be helpful on a few.

Promotions
1. This would restore the number of promotions to 1,129. The report specifically omits 55 positions which were included in the Trustees' Budget "to be allocated by the Chancellor's Office on the basis of special justification." (See Attachment II.)

Practice Teaching
6. This addresses a deletion of a requested increase, not a cut in former levels of support. The increase is in the Governor's budget as it now stands.

Library Acquisitions
7. The Analyst argues that the system can achieve the goal of 40 volumes per FTE student approved by the Legislature in 1972-73 and can do so six years earlier than the original target date of 1985 even at a reduced acquisition rate. Hence, the reduction.

Attachment VII-C
Student Fees

13. and 14. These represent a kind of "double-whammy" relating to student fees. #13 would eliminate any continuation of this year's new General Fund support of "instructionally related" activities and #14 upholds the Governor's proposed budget policy of "no General Fund support for student services or instructional supplies and services traditionally funded through student fees..."

The consequences must be either curtailed services, materials, and activities--or--higher student fees.

Social Security

19. The Governor's budget does not provide for mandated OASDI rate increases; presumably the system is expected to "eat" the cost. The Analyst would provide for such increase.

External Degrees

The Analyst supports the Governor's elimination of all state support for external degree programs, arguing that existing programs be self-supporting and that new ones be funded out of the Innovative Projects program.
Memo to Senators and Chairs  
February 19, 1975  
Attachment 1

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES—Continued

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES  
Item 345-347 from the General Fund Budget p. 931  
* Item 347 provides for salary increases and is discussed on page 149 of the Analyst's Report. The amounts are not included in these totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Analysis page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Faculty Promotions</td>
<td>Augment $659,147</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Innovative Projects</td>
<td>Recommend technical adjustment to reduce Budget Item 346 (innovative projects) by $289,751 and augment Budget Item 345 (support) by an equivalent amount</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Innovative Projects</td>
<td>Recommend $174,429 be transferred from Budget Item 345 (support) to Budget Item 346 (innovative projects)</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>International Program</td>
<td>Augment $773,007</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>San Diego Educational Television</td>
<td>Recommend Chancellor's office develop formulas for funding the academic needs of the Department of Telecommunications and Film and Instructional Television and report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by November 1, 1973</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Teacher Credentialing Programs</td>
<td>Reduce $344,987</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Volume Acquisition</td>
<td>Reduce $2,308,542</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Bakersfield Library</td>
<td>Reduce $1,429,930</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Library Transactors</td>
<td>Recommend Chancellor's office submit a report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY OF MAJOR ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Faculty Promotions. Augment $659,147. Recommend additional General Fund support for faculty promotion.
2. Innovative Projects. Recommend technical adjustment to reduce Budget Item 346 (innovative projects) by $289,751 and augment Budget Item 345 (support) by an equivalent amount.
3. Innovative Projects. Recommend $174,429 be transferred from Budget Item 345 (support) to Budget Item 346 (innovative projects).
4. International Program. Augment $773,007. Recommend General Fund support for the International program be continued.
5. San Diego Educational Television. Recommend Chancellor's office develop formulas for funding the academic needs of the Department of Telecommunications and Film and Instructional Television and report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by November 1, 1973.
6. Teacher Credentialing Programs. Reduce $344,987. Recommend increased state support for practice teaching be deleted.
7. Volume Acquisition. Reduce $2,308,542. Recommend number of library volumes authorized by the CSUC system be reduced to 413,000 annually.
8. Bakersfield Library. Reduce $1,429,930. Recommend acquisition needs of Bakersfield Library be accommodated from within the volumes authorized for the entire system.
9. Library Transactors. Recommend Chancellor's office submit a report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee.
10. Inadequate Equipment Support. Augment by $306,290. Recommend additional funds to provide communications and computing equipment essential to the instructional program.
11. Insufficient Personnel. Augment by $163,679. Recommend 19 specified technical personnel be added to the computer support program.
12. Computer Support Formulas. Recommend Chancellor's office in conjunction with Department of Finance examine feasibility of developing formulas to provide a basis for both equipment allocations and staffing levels.
13. Instructionally Related Activities. Reduce $3,152,222. Recommend General Fund support for instructionally related activities be eliminated.
14. Student Services Fee. Recommend proposed budget policy of no General Fund support for student services or instructional supplies and services, traditionally funded through student fees, be fully implemented. This requires technical adjustment to reduce Budget Item 347 (salary increase) by $2.8 million.
15. Financial Aid Requests. Augment $50,000. Recommend alternative computer systems for the awarding of financial aid be tested and evaluated.
17. Educational Opportunity Program. Recommend Chancellor's office evaluate the probable impact of federal BEOG's support and report to the fiscal committees during the budget hearings.
18. Fullerton Pilot Project. Reduce $85,621. Recommend General Fund support for the Fullerton pilot project be eliminated.
19. OASDI Rate. Augment $1,129,566. Recommend funds be provided to cover the OASDI rate increase.

Note: The beginning page number of the discussion of each item in the Analyst's Report is cited in case you wish to research any of these items further.
Memo to Senators and Chairs  
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Attachment 2

Faculty Promotion Policy

Historically, faculty promotions in the CSUC system have been governed by a 60-40 policy which limited to 60 percent the number of faculty which could be employed at the upper two academic ranks (professor and associate professor). The base from which the 60-40 distribution was determined included all full-time equivalent faculty in the CSUC system identified as “instructional faculty” in the annual budget. As a result of a 1966 agreement between the Department of Finance and the CSUC system, the 60-40 distribution was considered to be a systemwide limitation, not a binding constraint on individual campuses. Also, it should be noted that while promotional policy is set by the CSUC Board of Trustees, each campus determines who among the eligible faculty is to be promoted.

Table 14 shows the percentage of faculty in the upper two ranks on each campus and systemwide for the period 1971-72 through 1973-74.

The origin of the 60-40 policy is obscure, but the concept of limiting the percentage of faculty in the upper two ranks existed prior to the formation of the CSUC system in 1961. Apparently, the policy evolved from an understanding between the Department of Finance and the Department of Education which then administered the college system. In 1974 the Legislature adopted ACR 70 which resolved

“That the faculty of the California State University and Colleges should be promoted on the basis of merit and ability and should not be denied promotion on the basis of arbitrary quotas for the rank of associate or full professor.”

This resolution was opposed by the Department of Finance. Originally, it was also opposed by the CSUC Board of Trustees, but in September, 1973 they reversed themselves and passed a resolution in support of ACR 70, then pending in the Assembly.

1975-76 Faculty Promotion Funds

We recommend that the General Fund be augmented by $659,147 for faculty promotions.

Although it is an essential element of the annual CSUC budget request, it is very difficult for the trustees to estimate accurately the amount of faculty promotion money required. The trustees have stated that all meritorious faculty should be promoted, but actual promotion decisions are made in the spring by faculty evaluation groups in consultation with campus administrators. The budget request, however, must be prepared in the spring and the fall of the previous year—almost a full year in advance of the actual decisions. As a result, the Chancellor’s office must rely on certain indicators to determine the amount of money to request. The only alternative would be an open-ended appropriation. This would require approximately three times more General Fund support than the Chancellor’s office estimate.

Faculty in Upper Ranks, 1971-72 to 1973-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>$877,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>$829,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>$930,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>$954,222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Trustee’s estimate

We feel the $250,000 contained in the 1975-76 Budget for faculty promotions substantially understates the actual needs of the CSUC system. The only available comparative information we have suggests that the length of time spent in each of the four ranks by CSUC faculty is comparable to their UC counterparts. The Department of Finance provided the full amount of faculty promotion money requested by the UC system.

The only portion of the faculty promotion request we cannot support is the 55 positions to be allocated by the Chancellor’s office “on the basis of special justification.” Budgets must be predicated on the best available estimates, campus by campus, of the resources required. If the budgeted request was carefully developed it should be sufficient to meet the needs of the 19 campuses. We recommend augmentation of $659,147 for faculty promotions.
RESOLUTION RE RESTORATION OF CSUC INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, Since 1963 the International Programs of The California State University and Colleges have provided CSUC students an invaluable opportunity to expand their professional and personal education by a year of study overseas; and

WHEREAS, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, has recognized the value of such a structured overseas educational experience by sending a large number of students overseas each year in the International Programs; and

WHEREAS, Such overseas education has been offered at a cost which places it within the financial reach of all students; and

WHEREAS, The Governor's Budget for 1975/76 has deleted all General Fund support for the International Programs; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CPSU, SLO urges the restoration of budget support to the International Programs and the continuation of this worthwhile academic program.
RESOLUTION RE RESTORATION OF FUNDS FOR NEW FACILITIES

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, is currently operating with 13,500 FTE in facilities designed for 11,011 FTE; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, has the highest utilization of lecture and classroom space in the California State University and College System; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, has the second highest utilization of laboratory classroom space in the California State University and College System; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, increased its FTE in 1974-75 by 1,319 over the previous year without expansion of teaching and faculty and staff facilities; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, is receiving applications for admission for Fall 1975 at a rate higher than last year; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, was 310 spaces below requests for on-campus housing for 1974-75, creating a major problem in the community and in student and family morale in Fall 1974; and

WHEREAS 168 faculty and support staff presently housed in Tenaya Residence Hall since Fall 1972, must be relocated elsewhere on the campus when said Hall is returned to the student residence inventory; and

WHEREAS This relocation together with a revised enrollment projection for 1975-76 of 13,800 FTE (an increase of 316 over 1974-75) will create a need for space which the University does not now have for some 220 faculty, department heads and support staff; and

WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, with a FTE of 13,500 continues to operate with a library designed for only 6,000 FTE (44.4% of FTE for 1974-75 and 43.5% of FTE for 1975-76); and

WHEREAS These above stated facts contribute to a deterioration of quality education offered at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, because of resulting overcrowding of inadequate facilities and falling faculty morale; and

WHEREAS Governor Brown's budget has omitted all construction and planning funds for new high priority facilities for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, without regard to the pressing needs of faculty, staff and students at the University; therefore

Attachment VI-C
BE IT RESOLVED That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, oppose the Governor's cut of all capital outlay for new facilities at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, gives its total support to the efforts of President Kennedy to seek restoration of all funds originally budgeted in the CSUC System Capital Outlay Program for 1975-76 for this University; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Chairman of the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to President Kennedy for the purpose of conveying the support of the Academic Senate for the President's efforts to have the Governor restore all funds necessary to continue with construction and planning in the 1975-76 year; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Chairman of the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President to be forwarded to the Governor and appropriate legislative committees, for the purpose of conveying the opposition of the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, to the Governor's cut of all capital outlay for new facilities.
<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>Academic Calendar General Guidelines</td>
<td>7-10-74</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>4-8-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exams</td>
<td>10-29-74</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 60/40 What?</td>
<td>7-10-74 PPC</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>2-25-75 Exec Comm</td>
<td>Attachment VI-A, A.S. Agenda 3/11/75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady State Staffing</td>
<td>9-17-75 PPC</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>3-11-75 Senate</td>
<td>Attachment V-A, A.S. Agenda 3/11/75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate C/NC</td>
<td>10-29-74 Student Affs.</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td>1-14-75</td>
<td>3-11-75 Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Proced.</td>
<td>11-26-74 AdHoc Comm.</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staffing</td>
<td>11-27-74 Budget</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td>2-25-75</td>
<td>2-25-75</td>
<td>No action necessary by Senate at present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate as line item in budget</td>
<td>1-7-75 PPC</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td>4-1-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation of Faculty</td>
<td>1-22-75 PPC</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>2-11-75</td>
<td>2-11-75</td>
<td>Attachment IV-A; A.S. Agenda - 2/11/75</td>
<td>Passed Unanimously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Policy CSUC</td>
<td>2-4-75 Instruction</td>
<td>Exec Comm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forwarded to P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>COMMITTEE</td>
<td>DATE REFERRED</td>
<td>DATE RESPONSE RECEIVED</td>
<td>CONTENTS OF RESPONSE</td>
<td>FURTHER ACTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Textbook</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>1/17/75</td>
<td>1/31/75</td>
<td>Referred to Academic Council for Recom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Opposing CSUC Copyright Policy</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>2/13/75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Re Restoration of Promotions</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2/13/75</td>
<td>2/24/75</td>
<td>Forwarded to Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Members of the Academic Senate CSUC  
Chairs of Campus Senates/Councils

FROM: Charles C. Adams

RE: Legislative Analyst's Report on the 1975-76 CSUC Budget

February 19, 1975

At this point we have no further word regarding a meeting of the Executive Committee with the Governor. I called his office last week, attempting to underscore the intra-system urgency of the promotions matter. His scheduling secretary promised to get back to us this week.

Since my last memo on the subject of promotions, the report of the Legislative Analyst has been made public. This report adds another dimension to the promotions issue. It also contains other recommendations which may be of interest to you. I shall comment on some of his major responses to the Governor's budget for the CSUC. Remember that the Budget Analyst simply recommends actions to the Legislature; the fact that the report recommends that the Legislature add something to the budget does not mean that the item or amount is automatically in the budget. It may or may not be added, and, if it is added by final legislative action, it can be vetoed by the Governor.

Attached (Attachment I) is the summary of the recommendations of the Analyst. Most of them are pretty clear, but some explanation may be helpful on a few.

**Promotions**

1. This would restore the number of promotions to 1,129. The report specifically omits 55 positions which were included in the Trustees' Budget "to be allocated by the Chancellor's Office on the basis of special justification." (See Attachment II.)

**Practice Teaching**

6. This addresses a deletion of a requested increase, not a cut in former levels of support. The increase is in the Governor's budget as it now stands.

**Library Acquisitions**

7. The Analyst argues that the system can achieve the goal of 40 volumes per FTE student approved by the Legislature in 1972-73 and can do so six years earlier than the original target date of 1985 even at a reduced acquisition rate. Hence, the reduction.

Attachment VII-C
Members of the Academic Senate CSUC
Chairs of Campus Senates/Councils

February 19, 1975

Student Fees

13. and 14. These represent a kind of "double-whammy" relating to student fees. #13 would eliminate any continuation of this year's new General Fund support of "instructionally related" activities and #14 upholds the Governor's proposed budget policy of "no General Fund support for student services or instructional supplies and services traditionally funded through student fees..."

The consequences must be either curtailed services, materials, and activities--or--higher student fees.

Social Security

19. The Governor's budget does not provide for mandated OASDI rate increases; presumably the system is expected to "eat" the cost. The Analyst would provide for such increase.

External Degrees

The Analyst supports the Governor's elimination of all state support for external degree programs, arguing that existing programs be self-supporting and that new ones be funded out of the Innovative Projects program.
Memo to Senators and Chairs
February 19, 1975
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CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES—Continued

SUMMARY OF MAJOR ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Faculty Promotions. Augment $639,147. Recommend additional General Fund support for faculty promotion.
2. Innovative Projects. Recommend technical adjustment to reduce Budget Item 346 (innovative projects) by $289,751 and augment Budget Item 345 (support) by an equivalent amount.
3. Innovative Projects. Recommend $174,429 be transferred from Budget Item 345 (support) to Budget Item 346 (innovative projects).
4. International Program. Augment $778,007. Recommend General Fund support for the International program be continued.
5. San Diego Educational Television. Recommend Chancellor's office develop formulas for funding the academic needs of the Department of Telecommunications and Film and Instructional Television and report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by November 1, 1975.
6. Teacher Credentialing Programs. Reduce $944,987. Recommend increased state support for practice teaching be deleted.
7. Volume Acquisition. Reduce $2,308,342. Recommend number of library volumes acquired by the CSUC system be reduced to 413,000 annually.
8. Bakersfield Library. Reduce $142,930. Recommend acquisition needs of Bakersfield Library be accommodated from within the volumes authorized for the entire system.
9. Librarians Transactors. Recommend Chancellor's office submit report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by November 15, 1976 which details the savings associated with the installation of library transactors on each campus. This report should contain estimates of (a) the adjustments required in the library staffing formula due to the increased labor productivity, and (b) the yearly savings which will accrue due to the reduced book loss rate.
10. Inadequate Equipment Support. Augment by $506,290. Recommend additional funds to provide communications and computing equipment essential to the instructional program.
11. Insufficient Personnel. Augment by $163,679. Recommend 19 specified technical personnel be added to the computer support program.
12. Computer Support Formulas. Recommend Chancellor's office in conjunction with Department of Finance examine feasibility of developing formulas to provide a basis for both equipment allocations and staffing levels.
14. Student Services Fee. Recommend proposed budget policy of no General Fund support for student services or instructional supplies and services, traditionally funded through students fees, be fully implemented. This requires technical adjustment to reduce Budget Item 347 (salary increase) by $2.8 million.
15. Financial Aid Requests. Augment $50,000. Recommend alternative computer systems for the awarding of financial aid be tested and evaluated.
17. Educational Opportunity Program. Recommend Chancellor's office evaluate the probable impact of federal BEOC's support and report to the fiscal committees during the budget hearings.
18. Fullerton Pilot Project. Reduce $85,621. Recommend General Fund support for the Fullerton pilot project be eliminated.
19. OASDI Rate. Augment $1,129,566. Recommend funds be provided to cover the OASDI rate increase.

Note: The beginning page number of the discussion of each item in the Analyst's Report is cited in case you wish to research any of these items further.
Memo to Seniors and Chairs
February 15, 1975

Attachment 2

Faculty Promotion Policy

Historically, faculty promotions in the CSUC system have been governed by a 60-40 policy which limited to 60 percent the number of faculty which could be employed at the upper two academic ranks (professor and associate professor). The base from which the 60-40 distribution was determined included all full-time equivalent faculty in the CSUC system identified as "instructional faculty" in the annual budget. As a result of a 1966 agreement between the Department of Finance and the CSUC system, the 60-40 distribution was considered to be a systemwide limitation, not a binding constraint on individual campuses. Also, it should be noted that while promotional policy is set by the CSUC Board of Trustees, each campus determines who among the eligible faculty is to be promoted.

Table 14 shows the percentage of faculty in the upper two ranks on each campus and systemwide for the period 1971-72 through 1973-74.

The origin of the 60-40 policy is obscure, but the concept of limiting the percentage of faculty in the upper two ranks existed prior to the formation of the CSUC system in 1961. Apparently, the policy evolved from an understanding between the Department of Finance and the Department of Education which then administered the college system.

In 1974 the Legislature adopted ACR 70 which resolved

"That the faculty of the California State University and Colleges be denied promotion on the basis of arbitrary quotas for the rank of associate or full professor."

This resolution was opposed by the Department of Finance. Originally, it was opposed by the CSUC Board of Trustees, but in September, 1973 they reversed themselves and passed a resolution in support of ACR 70, then pending in the Assembly.

1975-76 Faculty Promotion Funds

We recommend that the General Fund be augmented by $659,147 for faculty promotions.

Although it is an essential element of the annual CSUC budget request, it is very difficult for the trustees to estimate accurately the amount of faculty promotion money required. The trustees have stated that all meritorious faculty should be promoted, but actual promotion decisions are made in the spring by faculty evaluation groups in consultation with campus administrators. The budget request, however, must be prepared in the spring and the fall of the previous year—almost a full year in advance of the actual decisions. As a result, the Chancellor's office must rely on certain indicators to determine the amount of money to request. The only alternative would be an open-ended appropriation. This would require approximately three times more General Fund support than the Chancellor's office estimate.

Table 15 shows the first year cost of faculty promotion for the period 1971-72 to 1973-74.

The 1975-76 Trustee's Budget requested $954,222 for the promotion of 1,184 faculty. The basis for the trustee's request for faculty promotion funds is a campus by campus analysis of a number of key variables, including the number of faculty at each step and past promotion trends as well as any special factor unique to individual campuses.

Table 15 shows the 1975-76 request and the actual cost for each of the three previous years. In each of the past three years the Department of Finance has provided the full amount of faculty promotion funds requested by the trustees. This year, however, although the estimated cost is only 2.6 percent higher than the actual cost in 1974-75, the Department of Finance reduced the request by 74 percent (the 1975-76 Budget provides $250,000). No explanation for the reduction is contained in the budget.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First Year Cost of Faculty Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>$777,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>$829,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>$930,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>$954,222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Trustee's estimate.

We feel the $250,000 contained in the 1975-76 Budget for faculty promotions substantially understates the actual needs of the CSUC system. The only available comparative information we have suggests that the length of time spent in each of the four ranks by CSUC faculty is comparable to their UC counterparts. The Department of Finance provided the full amount of faculty promotion money requested by the UC system.

The only portion of the faculty promotion request we cannot support is the 55 positions to be allocated by the Chancellor's office "on the basis of special justification." Budgets must be predicated on the best available estimates, campus by campus, of the resources required. If the budgeted request was carefully developed it should be sufficient to meet the needs of the 19 campuses. We recommend augmentation of $659,147 for faculty promotions.