CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN LUIS OBISPO
ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA
April 23, 1974
3:15 p.m. Staff Dining Room

I. **Minutes** (March 5, March 12, April 9)

II. **Committee Reports**
   A. Curriculum - Sullivan (no action to be taken at this meeting)
   B. Election - Hooks
   C. Urgent Reports

III. **Business Items**
   A. Directions Committee Report - Weber (30 min)
   B. Final Examination Policy - Fierstine (30 min)
      (See Attachment VI-A, Academic Senate Minutes, 3/12/74)
   C. Faculty Evaluation/CAM - Coyes (15 min)
      (See Attachment III-D, Academic Senate Agenda, 4/9/74)
   D. Appointment of Instructional Department Heads/CAM - Coyes (15 min)
      (See Attachment III-D)
   E. Bookstore Policy on Faculty Non-Published Materials - Fierstine (10 min)
      (See Attachment III-C, Academic Senate Agenda, 4/9/74)

IV. **Discussion Items** (none)

V. **Announcements and Reports** (5 min)
   A. Collective Bargaining Seminars:
      Collective Bargaining: The Issue
      Pro: "Mac" Larsen, Secretary, CSUC Academic Senate
      Con: Clay Sommers, CSUC Dean, Faculty Affairs
      Collective Bargaining: The Membership Organizations
      Representatives of AAUP, ACSUP, CCUFA, CSEA, UPC
      Collective Bargaining: An Analysis
      Sara Behman, Associate Professor of Economics
      Homer Hoyt, Associate Professor of Education
   B. President's Response to Senate Actions: Department Head Evaluations
   C. Removal of the 60/40 Limitation on Promotions
      (See Attachment V-C)
Memorandum

To: Bob Alberti, Chairman
Academic Senate

Date: April 15, 1974

From: Personnel Policies Committee

Subject: Proposed Revision of CAM 315.5, Appointment of Instructional Department Heads

The Personnel Policies Committee proposes that the following revision of the original proposal (March 21, 1974), agenda item III-E, Attachment 3, April 9 Academic Senate Agenda, be considered as an agenda item for the Academic Senate.

315.5 Appointment of Instructional Department Heads

A. Instructional department heads are members of the University's administrative line organization and as such are directly responsible to the appropriate school dean for administration of their respective departments. They are appointed by the University President for indefinite terms. In reaching his decision on instructional department head appointments the President will consult with the dean of the school to which the department is assigned. The President will consult with the dean of the school to which the department is assigned, the departmental faculty, and any other individual or group he considers necessary in reaching his decision on instructional department head appointments. The dean will inform the faculty of all pertinent personnel information governing the appointment of the department head.

Variations in department size and proportion of tenured faculty make it necessary that guidelines governing consultation on such appointments be sufficiently flexible to be applicable to all situations. The school dean will confer with the President for determination of the nature and extent of the consultative procedures to be followed for each specific appointment under consideration. Consultative procedures will vary depending on the particular circumstances - the procedures usually will involve consultation with faculty members and may also include students, other University staff members, or knowledgeable outsiders. Faculty members consulted may include faculty from within or outside the department under consideration, and may be tenured and/or probationary; the students may be present and/or former ones.

B. Variations in department sizes suggest flexible guidelines governing faculty participation in the consultative process. Consequently, the department will decide by majority vote of the full time faculty (non-tenured and tenured) the procedures by which not more than three nominees are to be selected and presented in order of departmental preference to the school dean and the President. In the event that these procedures require the creation of ad hoc committees, their duties and membership shall be determined by a majority vote of the full time faculty. Departmental preference shall be established by secret ballot.

C. The department's full time faculty may decide, by two-thirds majority vote, not to follow these guidelines. In that case, the school dean will confer with the President or his designee in order to determine the nature and extent of the consultative procedures to be followed. In this situation consultative procedures will vary; depending on the particular circumstances, procedures normally will involve consultation with faculty members, and may also include students, other University staff members, or knowledgeable outsiders. Faculty members consulted may include faculty from within or outside the department under consideration, and may be tenured and/or probationary; the students may be present and/or former ones.

D. The appointment of acting, interim or temporary department heads will also be made by the University President following consultation with the appropriate school dean and the department faculty.

ATTACHMENT III-D
Memorandum

To: Deans, Department Heads
Chairman of the Academic Senate and Members of the Executive Committee
Chairman of the Personnel Review Committee
and Personnel Policies Committee
Presidents of Membership Organizations

From: Robert E. Kennedy

Subject: Removal of the 60/40 Limitation on Promotions

Date: April 15, 1974

The Board of Trustees, in September 1973, endorsed ACR 70 (Hearde), which was subsequently adopted by the Legislature and which expresses legislative intent that promotions within the California State University and Colleges be made on the basis of merit and ability. The Board reiterated its position on March 7, 1974 by emphasizing that the 60/40 systemwide upper/lower rank ratio limitation is not Trustee policy.

The Department of Finance has indicated that it regards the 60/40 distribution of faculty positions on a systemwide basis as a budgetary construct, which it is not prepared to waive.

At this juncture, therefore, we are faced with the need to take promotion actions for 1974-75 in an uncertain atmosphere related to ACR 70 and Board of Trustee policy on the one hand, and the position of the State Department of Finance on the other.

In order to administer the available promotion funds for 1974-75 within Board of Trustee policy and remain within the amount presently contained in the Governor’s Budget, the following principles shall apply:

1. Each campus may utilize the funds budgeted for faculty promotions without regard to the distribution of those promotions by rank.
2. Available promotion funds should not be expended if promotions are not clearly justified by merit and ability.
3. Promotions must be made on the basis of merit and ability, and presidents are responsible for making sure that all relevant promotion criteria are fully met.

The following four criteria which traditionally have been considered should be utilized:

a. Teaching effectiveness
b. Professional accomplishment
c. Campus Service
d. Community service

If additional funds beyond those currently in the Governor’s Budget are made available by the Legislature and the Governor, you should be prepared to promote the additional faculty who meet the above criteria without instituting new promotion review procedures. This will require a rank ordering of possible promotees based on availability of funds.

The effectiveness of the new promotions policy and the way it is received throughout the State will depend on the extent to which promotions are truly based on merit and ability.

Drs. F. W. Andrews
Clyde P. Fisher
Everett H. Chandler
Donald L. Shelton
James L. Landreth
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