I. Call to order in Faculty/Staff Dining Room at 3:15 p.m.

II. Approval of minutes of June 7, 1972

III. Discussion Item

Personnel Policies Committee: Bylaws changes relative to Professional Responsibility Committee. First Reading. No action. (See Attachment 1.)

IV. Information Items

A. Responses by Pres. Kennedy to previous actions of the Academic Senate. (See Attachment 2.)

B. New Academic Personnel Evaluation form -- This form will be used on an interim trial basis according to the president - (1972-1973). Personnel Policies Committee to evaluate the effectiveness of the form and report to the Senate on the forms at end of current year. (See Attachment 3.)


D. Committee assignments and Senate membership -- Barton Olsen.

V. Business Item

Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty. (See Attachment 4.)

Recommended for consideration by the president,
"The Academic Senate accepts the Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty and recommends their implementation on a trial basis during the current academic year with the stipulation that the Personnel Policies Committee shall review the effects of the implementation and make recommendations back to the Senate at an appropriate time."

Notes: 1. Joe Romney to be Senate Parliamentarian.

2. Next Senate Meeting is at 3:00 p.m., November 14, 1972, in Faculty/Staff Dining Room.
Personnel Policies Committee Recommendation

May 23, 1972

By Laws of Committee on Professional Responsibility (First Reading)

1. The scholar who joins the academic community assumes a responsibility to the teaching profession. His personal and professional conduct should always be such as to reflect credit upon himself, his colleagues and his profession.

2. There shall be elected in the manner to be described in sections 4 and 5, a Professional Responsibility Committee in each department or subdivision and a college Professional Responsibility Committee.

3. In the event a member of the faculty is convinced that a breach of conduct has been committed by a fellow member the ensuing procedure shall be followed.

   a. An allegation of unprofessional conduct on the part of a faculty member may be made only by a fellow faculty member. A faculty member is defined as one who holds an official instructional appointment at the college and is teaching six or more units.

   b. The allegation of unprofessional conduct shall be made in writing with copies going to the accused and the Professional Responsibility Committee of the department or comparable school subdivision of which the accused is a member. It shall be accompanied by full documentation and evidence. If it is the committee's determination that the allegation is not accompanied by sufficient evidence to merit investigation, it shall return the document with explanation to the initiator and so inform the accused.

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

   d. In the event the Department Committee on Professional Responsibility upon investigation finds validity in the allegation and determines that its magnitude and nature should be of concern to the College's faculties, the committee shall submit the case with all papers and evidence in its possession to the College Committee on Professional Responsibility.

   e. The College Committee on Professional Responsibility shall begin its inquiry within 10 days of receiving the case. The Committee may at any time discontinue the inquiry because the facts do not provide sufficient evidence to support the allegation. If the Committee does carry its inquiry to conclusion, a report presenting its conclusions and their bases shall be made with a copy going to the faculty member making the allegation of unprofessional conduct, a copy going to the faculty member accused and a final copy retained by the Committee.
f. The actions open to the committees include:

1) Dismissal of the allegation
2) Secure mutual understanding between the parties concerned
3) Prepare a written reprimand to be included in the accused member's personnel file
4) Administer an oral reprimand
5) Referral (See subsection 3-g)

g. When in the judgment of the committee, the nature of the case suggests such a conclusion, the committee may recommend the initiation of formal disciplinary action to the "Administrative Officer" (Section 5.0 of Administrative Bulletin 70-7).

4. Each academic department or comparable school subdivision shall elect a Committee on Professional Responsibility. The size of the committee, the number of alternates and its operating procedures shall be determined by the faculty of the department.

In the event an allegation of unprofessional conduct is made against a member or by a member of the Department Committee on Professional Responsibility, he shall relinquish his seat on the committee to an alternate in accordance with the committee's procedures until his case has been finalized.

5. The College Committee on Professional Responsibility shall be comprised of a member and an alternate elected by and from each school from the tenured members in the associate or professor ranks. The member and alternate from each school must be from different departments. The members and alternates shall serve a two year staggered term. The Chairman shall be elected from and by the Committee. A functional committee is dependent upon a quorum of all members or their alternates.

A Committee member shall be replaced by his alternate when the allegation involves faculty from his own department or at the request of the accused member. If both the member and his alternate are disqualified, the Committee shall select a temporary member from that school.

6. At both levels, the following rules and procedures shall be followed:

a. The accused shall have the right to be accompanied by a faculty member of his own choice when appearing before the Committee.

b. The accused shall be provided a copy of all evidence presented to the Committee and he shall be given a reasonable time (no longer than 10 days) to respond to any evidence submitted.

c. The accused shall be given opportunity to submit evidence refuting the allegation.

d. The accused shall have the right to submit questions through the Chairman to be answered by the faculty member making the allegation, the answers to be provided to the Committee and the accused.

e. The faculty member accompanying the accused shall be given the right to speak for the accused on his request.

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 Department Committee on Professional Responsibility in its efforts to resolve the case.
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Memorandum

To: Barton C. Olsen, Chairman
   Academic Senate

From: Robert E. Kennedy

Subject: Academic Senate Recommendations

Near the end of the 1971-72 academic year I received from Howard Rhoads, Academic Senate Chairman, several Senate recommendations to which I have not yet responded. Further consultation and analysis of these recommendations have been concluded to the extent that I am able to report the actions I propose to take on each of them. These reactions and opinions, as reported below, are based on the recommendations themselves and their accompanying rationale, and on the advice and counsel I have received from the school deans and vice presidents; they are intended to be helpfully responsive to the wishes of the faculty within the context of the overall best interest of everyone affected by them.

1. Faculty Evaluation of School Deans

The Senate endorsed, by a 27-22 vote, a recommendation that procedures be adopted to provide for mandatory faculty evaluation of instructional deans at the conclusion of each academic year. I am advised that the seven instructional deans abstained from voting in the Senate on this recommendation, and I have since consulted with each of them. While few objections were raised by the deans to the principle of being evaluated, whether by the faculty, the students, their colleagues, their staffs, or by anyone else with whom they come into periodic contact, a strong preference was expressed for making such evaluations voluntary until some experience has been gained through use of mutually-agreed upon, experimental evaluation programs.

In response to an earlier Senate recommendation that faculty evaluations of department heads be required, I reported to the Senate last year that I personally see no immediate necessity for formalizing the process to the extent that it becomes a campus-wide, mandated procedure. The situation with respect to faculty evaluation of deans is similar, except that contact between a dean and his faculty is generally more limited than that between the faculty and department heads. Attached is a copy of my March 10, 1972 memo to Howard Rhoads in which I explained my point of view with respect to faculty evaluations of department heads. After consultation with the deans, I have similar reservations with respect to the recommendation for mandatory evaluation of the deans by their faculty. I agree that personnel evaluations can be helpful in improving performance and I encourage each school dean and his faculty to work out their own system by mutual agreement. I am confident that, through good faith
efforts on the part of all concerned, useful procedures will evolve from successful pilot programs. On this basis perhaps university-wide guidelines could be developed later.

2. Changes in Faculty Office Hour Requirements

Consultative advice which I have received on this recommendation is that the proposal as submitted has the potential for creating several new problems. It was pointed out that as written the proposal would not permit a faculty member to schedule or hold more than two hours open per day for student consultation, even though many faculty members now follow an "open door" policy as far as students are concerned and are available to students for many more than two hours per day. While I'm sure that there was no intent on the part of the Senate to provide an upper limit on commendable student contact such as this, the recommended language is admittedly subject to this interpretation.

I have been advised to keep the present guideline of a minimum of one office hour per day for each of the five workdays per week on which a full-time faculty member is expected to be available for professional assignments. The principal objection to amending this requirement was that to do so, for campus-wide application, would significantly and materially reduce the effectiveness of our student counseling efforts, and would be a step backwards in our efforts to increase our effectiveness in this regard. It was further pointed out that the proposed amendment would be difficult to justify to the students as well as to their parents and the general public in that it could be made to appear that the faculty is authorized to arrange a three-day week for themselves; I know this would be an unwarranted assumption, but I also know the charge would be leveled and would be most difficult to counter.

In support of the request for modification of the present CAM regulation, it has been pointed out that the present CAM language, if strictly interpreted, does not allow for any exceptions. I am willing that this section be rephrased and augmented to include provisions for exceptions to be made when recommended by the department head and approved by the school dean, whenever in his judgment an exception is in the best interest of the instructional program. I am asking Dr. Andrews to have a revision of CAM 370.2, 6., a. prepared and processed as a CAM amendment. Strict interpretation of the present CAM language could impose a hardship on a few faculty members, to the detriment of our instructional program. I am quite willing that provisions for exceptions be established and set forth in CAM.

3. Proposed Revision of the Personnel Actions Sections of CAM 340-344

The numerous changes in these CAM sections have been reviewed and commented on by the school deans, vice presidents, and others, and have been compared to systemwide regulations promulgated by the Chancellor and Trustees. The consensus on these various suggestions and recommendations will be used in revising CAM 340-344. Most, but not all, of the Senate recommendations will be incorporated into CAM in time to be used in this year's personnel actions, the principal difference being in the role of the Personnel Review Committee. I plan to have these sections printed separately as soon as all questions
raised have been clarified, and will give them wide circulation in anticipation that they will be implemented on a pilot basis for the 1972-73 faculty personnel action cycle.

4. Publication of Academic Ranks in the Catalog

While I have reservations on this recommendation, I am aware that it is an almost universal practice among the colleges and universities of our system. Several of those with whom I have consulted also have expressed cogent arguments against the practice. They have pointed out that the timing of our Catalog press deadline makes it impossible to keep the Catalog up-to-date in this regard, and with the advent of our two-year Catalog, the ranks will be two years out-of-date during the second year of coverage, and would not even include the most recent promotions in the first year of publication. Also, the inclusion of some ranks and not others, on the basis that an individual can request his rank be excluded from the listing, would be puzzling to the students and be misunderstood by everyone else.

I understand that one of the reasons behind this recommendation is a rumor to the effect that a listing of all faculty members' ranks is considered somehow to be secret information. If this is in fact one of the motivating reasons, then I can assure you the procedure is unnecessary; publishing an out-of-date, partial list of faculty ranks would not solve this problem.

In view of the reservations which I have expressed, I would appreciate your taking up with the Academic Senate Executive Committee, or otherwise as you deem appropriate, an alternate solution which will make available to everyone on campus the current updated rank-status of every faculty member. Each year, early in the fall, we issue a new "Campus Directory" of telephone numbers, both office and home, for all employees. The publication is a computer printout which currently lists every faculty member as though he were in the rank of "Instructor." The abbreviation "Instr" is followed by an abbreviation for the department. Each summer, following the conclusion of the personnel action cycle, corrections on the computer card deck will be made to update the rank-status of all faculty. When the new directory is issued early in the fall quarter, it would contain the current rank and position status of every employee. As you know, Cal Poly's authorized salary schedule does not use traditional academic position titles; we have fought in the past to retain the special rank titles and the "vocational" scale in order to protect our faculty against the possibility that a statewide regulation for promotion to traditionally titled ranks would carry the traditional academic criteria, with no exceptions made for experience, etc. If we take steps to officially recognize faculty in the Catalog by titles of "professor," "associate professor," "assistant professor," or "instructor," we probably will have undermined the justification for maintaining the Cal Poly special salary schedule. This may be an appropriate time to consider this issue. I suggest you talk to Mr. Larry Voss, Director of Personnel Relations, who could assist in any discussion of the advantages and disadvantages to Cal Poly of a change at this time to the systemwide salary schedule.
However, I see no problem regarding the use of the appropriate abbreviations for the traditional academic ranks in the "Campus Directory," which is an internal publication that would not be looked upon as "official" by the Trustees, the Department of Finance, etc. I do not believe, however, that it would be appropriate in this directory to permit, by request, the omission of the rank or position title of any employee.

5. Administrative Bulletin 70-8

The Senate recommended that "Administrative Bulletin 70-8 with emphasis on paragraph II.C. become a permanent regulation in CAM and that it be enforced." Relative to AB 70-8 becoming a "permanent" regulation in CAM, my response dated February 29, 1972 to a similar recommendation by the Senate is still applicable. A copy is attached for ready reference. (The approved revisions to section II.A. and II.B. as described in my February 29 memo were included with CAM Change #6.)

Concerning section II.C., it is clear that this section needs to be rewritten, for its intent has been incorrectly interpreted as barring any reference to student ratings, or student evaluations, in faculty personnel recommendations. A ban on use of student ratings was certainly not my intent when I approved AB 70-8, and would be contrary to the intent of the Trustees when they endorsed the report of the ad hoc Committee on Recruitment and Retention of Quality Faculty, and when they adopted the revision of 5 Cal. Admin. Code 42701.

I asked that a proposed revision of the wording of section II.C. be drafted which would clarify this intent while preserving the principle that anonymous criticism should be given no weight as the basis for personnel recommendations. I have received a first draft of this revision, and include it here in strike-out, underline format for consultative input by the Academic Senate as you deem appropriate:

"AB 70-8, Paragraph II.C.:

1. Any adverse written evaluations received about a faculty member received from an on-campus source shall be destroyed or returned by the file custodian to the originator or destroyed by the file custodian if unless the writer does not agree to their inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file in accord with this policy.

2. No written evaluations in which the author is not identifiable which are not identifiable as to authorship shall not be retained. This restriction applies to written information relative to a faculty member's job performance and/or his personal conduct. This restriction does not apply to consideration by appropriate faculty committees or by the respective department head or dean of student ratings of faculty performance which identify the source by specific course and class section and are the result of implementation of established university procedures or procedures approved for use within the faculty member's school or department.
Please be assured that no action will be taken on changing section II.C. until all appropriate consultation has been concluded.

6. Proposed Layoff Procedures

The Senate has concurred with the proposed layoff procedures which were reviewed by the President's Council last year. I have approved them and asked that they be published in CAM when that document is reprinted.
Robert E. Kennedy  
Department Head Evaluation Form

Relative to your letter of January 10, 1972, and March 3, 1972, on this subject (copies attached), I am sorry that I have not been able to respond earlier. The recommendation of the Academic Senate on this subject, which I received last May, was widely reviewed by other interested and directly concerned groups and individuals during the fall and winter quarters. I indicated to Dr. Alexander during last summer that I would be subjecting the Senate's recommendation to this consultative process, and would issue an Administrative Bulletin based on the initial Senate recommendation "...with some adjustment in procedural detail as suggested by further study and consultation."

You may have observed that it has not been my practice to issue an Administrative Bulletin on a locally developed policy matter unless there has been substantial agreement on its essential elements. While I have found substantial agreement on the principle that a department head's effectiveness can be enhanced through constructive suggestions made to him by members of his departmental faculty, agreement has not been reached on how this principle should be implemented. In the absence of more general agreement, I do not have the basis necessary for issuing an Administrative Bulletin describing procedural details.

I personally see no immediate necessity for formalizing the process to the extent that it becomes a college-wide, mandated procedure. It may be that the process should evolve, in a manner similar to that which student evaluation of faculty is evolving—that is, through the establishment of pilot or experimental evaluation programs on a smaller scale. Department head evaluation proposals could be generated within departments or schools by mutual agreement between the faculty and the department heads. I would watch such experiments with interest. As with the program of student
evaluation of faculty now being carried out, I would want to be
advised of a proposed evaluation program prior to its being
implemented, and would personally monitor it through reports from
department heads and school Deans. Certainly, I would have no
objection to the voluntary use of one of the forms developed by
the Senate, in a manner agreed upon in advance by both the depart-
ment faculty and department head.

In the absence of a specific recommendation from the Academic
Senate, I cannot predict the reaction of the school deans and
others to a proposal for evaluation of the deans by their faculties.
If it is generally the same as the Academic Senate's department
head evaluation proposal, I have no reason to believe it will
achieve any higher degree of agreement. Perhaps it would be
equally productive to encourage small-scale experimental programs
and let the final decision evolve from successful experiences.
FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

NAME ____________________________ DEPARTMENT ____________________________

POSITION/RANK ____________________________ SCHOOL ____________________________

EVALUATED BY: ____________________________ (Date) ____________________________

Check appropriate blank

___1, ___2, ___3, ___4, ___5, ___6 year evaluation
___Tenure recommendation
___Annual Performance Evaluation
___Promotion recommended
___Other

FACTORS OF CONSIDERATION

Justification for Recommendations (CAM 341.1, D)
Evaluative statements should be validated with reliable evidence. If the evidence is not satisfactory, or if it does not appear to support the recommendations made, the file will be returned to the reviewing levels for amplification.

Inasmuch as this is the periodic evaluation, the evaluator should review effectiveness of the faculty member during this evaluation period. The evaluation should reflect both (1) points of merit and (2) suggested areas for improvement. If additional space is needed, use the reverse of the pages.

*I. Teaching Performance and/or Other Professional Performance: Consider such factors as the faculty member's competence in his discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of course, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student consultations, and other factors relating to his performance as a teacher.

Points of Merit:

*Non-teaching academic personnel are to be evaluated on their professional performance.
II. Professional Growth and Achievement: Consider such factors as the faculty member's original preparation and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, research and creative activity, participation in professional societies and publications.

Points of Merit:

III. Service to University and Community: Consider such factors as the faculty member's participation in academic advisement, placement follow-up, co-curricular activities, department, school and university committee and individual assignments, system-wide assignments, and service in community affairs.

Points of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:
IV. Other Factors of Consideration: Consider such factors as the faculty member's ability to relate with colleagues, initiative, cooperativeness, dependability and health.

Points of Merit:

Areas and Suggestions for Improvement:

V. Summary: Relate the faculty member's performance to your recommendation or evaluation. (Reference any resources used for evaluation; such as, student input, faculty colleagues, class visitation, conferences, and materials from faculty members.)
On the basis of the foregoing evaluation, I believe that the person being rated should have an over-all rating of:

1. ...has reached a high level of professional development and is making an outstanding contribution to the University which is readily recognizable.

2. ...fully meets the requirements of the present assignment and is making a valuable contribution to the University.

3. ...meets the requirements of the present assignment adequately and with more experience may make a greater contribution to the University.

4. ...does not meet satisfactorily the requirements of the present assignment.

I RECOMMEND (FOR OR AGAINST):

_____ Tenure  _____ Reappointment

_____ Promotion  _____ Merit Salary Increase

for the following reasons:

Department Head's Signature  Date

I have read the above evaluation:  Signature of person being evaluated  Date

COMMENTS OF PERSON BEING EVALUATED:

Note: The school dean or division head's evaluation statement will be sent to the next higher level of authority along with this form. A copy of the dean/division head's evaluation will be forwarded to the Personnel Review Committee. A copy will also be filed in the academic employee's personnel folder in the school/division office where it will be made available for review by the person evaluated.
On the basis of the foregoing evaluation, I believe that the person being rated should have an over-all rating of:

1. ...has reached a high level of professional development and is making an outstanding contribution to the University which is readily recognizable.

2. ...fully meets the requirements of the present assignment and is making a valuable contribution to the University.

3. ...meets the requirements of the present assignment adequately and with more experience may make a greater contribution to the University.

4. ...does not meet satisfactorily the requirements of the present assignment.

RECOMMENDED FOR:

[ ] Tenure  [ ] Reappointment

[ ] Promotion  [ ] Non-Reappointment

COMMENTS OF SCHOOL DEAN:

__________________________  ________________________
School Dean's Signature  Date
GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY

I. The primary purpose of student evaluation of faculty is to assist in improving the quality and effectiveness of the instructional program of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

II. Evaluation instruments should be developed with emphasis on those factors which students are especially capable of evaluating (e.g. course organization, quality of presentation, grading procedures, examinations, etc.).

III. All classes of every instructor shall participate in the Student Evaluation of Faculty Program at least annually.

IV. Only students officially enrolled in an instructor's class will be permitted to participate in the evaluation of the instructor's performance as part of the Student Evaluation of Faculty Program.

V. To initiate the program, the evaluation procedure will be administered twice during the 1972-73 academic year. The first evaluation will be in the final two weeks of the fall quarter, with the results being presented only to the instructor being evaluated for use in comparing student survey results with his self-evaluation rating. The results of the second evaluation will be used for both improvement of instruction and in partial substantiation of recommendations on faculty personnel actions regarding promotion, retention and tenure.

VI. The results of the program of Student Evaluation of Faculty shall be made available to the individual faculty member, his tenured colleagues and department head for their deliberations and recommendations regarding personnel actions, and for the individual's aid in improving his performance.
VII. To allow for obvious lack of similarity of various instructional programs, each of the seven schools shall be entitled to its own evaluation form. Additionally, it might be necessary for a department to develop its own evaluation instrument if its best interests will be served in that manner. The specific form, questions and methods of reporting results for the several types of instruction offered in any individual school or department shall be endorsed by the faculty, department head and dean of that department or school. Student opinion shall be considered in the development of the questionnaire.

VIII. During the specified evaluation period, faculty will provide the class time necessary for the process. During the evaluation process, the instructor shall be absent from the classroom, with the evaluation being administered in the classroom by students.