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

II. Minutes of Senate meeting, November 14, 1972.

III. Business Items


2. Instruction Committee: Catalog Copy on Academic Disqualification and Grading. See Attachment 1.

3. Executive Committee: Resolution: "The Academic Senate California Polytechnic State University communicate to the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Trustees that:

(a) It deplores the lack of funding for the full implementation of the revised salary schedule and,

(b) In view of the limited funds available it is recommended that as a first priority the allocation of inequity funds be to additional salary steps in the Assistant Professor/Intermediate Instructor/Intermediate Vocational Instructor rank."

See Attachment 2.

IV. Discussion Item


V. Information Items

1. Faculty Office Hour Requirement. See Attachment 4.

2. Ad Hoc Student Evaluation of Faculty Committee: Continuing Function of the Committee. See Attachment 5.
Uniform minimum standards for academic probation or disqualification are in effect at all California State Colleges. Both academic progress toward degree objective and quality of academic performance are considered in the determination of a student's eligibility to remain in the College. A student becomes subject to academic probation or disqualification under either of the following conditions:

I. Academic progress:
   A. A student shall be subject to academic progress probation if, in any quarter, he fails to earn twice as many progress points as all units attempted during that quarter.
   B. A student shall be removed from academic progress probation and restored to good academic standing when, in any quarter, he earns twice as many progress points as all units attempted in that quarter.
   C. A student shall be subject to academic progress disqualification if during his second consecutive quarter of probation he has failed to earn twice as many progress points as all units attempted during that quarter.

II. Academic performance:
   A. A student shall be subject to academic performance probation if his overall grade point average or his Cal Poly cumulative grade point average falls below 2.0 (C).
   B. A student shall be removed from academic performance probation and restored to good academic standing when he earns a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 (C) for all academic work attempted and for all such work attempted at this college.
   C. A student on academic performance probation may be disqualified when his cumulative grade point average for all academic work attempted or for all such work attempted at this college is 7 or more grade points.
below 2.0 (C). Such a student shall be subject to disqualification when his academic record, as indicated in the sentence above, falls below the following standards:

1. If a freshman or sophomore student (less than 90 quarter units of college credits completed) is 22½ or more grade points below a 2.0 (C) average.

2. If a junior student (90 to 134 quarter units of college credits completed) is 13½ or more grade points below a 2.0 (C) average.

3. If a senior student (135 or more quarter units of college credits completed) is 9 or more grade points below a 2.0 (C) average.

A student subject to disqualification will be notified by the dean of the school in which the student is enrolled as a major as soon as possible following the end of the quarter in which his performance fails to meet conditions prescribed in I (C) or II (C) above; in any case, disqualification is to be effected no later than the close of the next quarter.

A student who is disqualified for inadequate progress or performance will not be readmitted until presentation of satisfactory evidence that he has improved his chances of academic success. The request for readmission will be referred to the dean of the school in which the student wishes to enroll.

ELIGIBILITY FOR STUDENT ACTIVITIES

Students on either academic or disciplinary probation may not participate on intercollegiate teams nor may they hold positions of leadership in chartered student organizations or coded student government groups. Students on probation may participate in such student organizations and groups as members but they may not hold an office or represent the College or the Associated Students, Incorporated in any official capacity.

ELIGIBILITY FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
GRADING SYSTEM

The following marking and grading system is in effect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Grade Points Earned Per Unit</th>
<th>Progress Points Earned per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>No Credit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Withdrew</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grades of CR, NC, AU, I, IP, and W are not assigned grade points or included in the computation of grade point average (total grade points earned divided by total units in which the student received a grade of A, B, C, D, or F). The grades of A, B, C, D, F, CR, NC, but excluding AU, I, IP, and W are used in determination of satisfaction of the progress point requirement (twice as many progress points earned as total registered units during the quarter). Courses for which the mark of AU, I, IP or W are recorded are not included in the registered unit total for purposes of the progress point calculation.

A final grade is that mark assigned to each student by the instructor signifying the conclusion of the course offering. The following marks constitute final grades: A, B, C, D, F, CR, NC. Once assigned, a final grade is the responsibility of the college-at-large and not of the instructor who initially assigned the grade.

A final grade can be changed only on the basis of error.
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1. Passing in classwork, but unable to take final examination.
2. Passing in classwork completed and in final examination, but some assigned work not completed.

Upon assignment of the temporary and provisional mark of "I," the instructor shall file a statement of reason with the Records Office including the requirement to be completed before assignment of a final grade.

The mark of "I" may be removed within one year from the time that it is recorded, by completing all required work. The removal of the "I" entitles the student to the number of units and grade points of the assigned final grade. If not removed within the one-year period, credit can only be obtained by repeating the course.

The mark of "IP" is not a final grade, but should be assigned for senior project courses, theses, or similar courses for which evidence of progress is not required to be submitted during the initial term of registration. The mark of "IP" may be removed by completing all required work within the time limit prescribed by the instructor. If not removed within the prescribed time limits, credit can only be obtained by repeating the course. The mark of "IP" shall be completely removed from the student's permanent record card upon assignment of a final grade.

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 per student per quarter may be elected on a Credit-No Credit grading basis, and further, a maximum of 15 courses 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 courses taken on a Credit-No Credit grading basis may be used to satisfy graduate program requirements.

5. 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.

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."

Repeating a Course

A student who has received a grade of "D," "F" or "NC" in a course taken at this University may repeat the course and have the new grade recorded along with the prior grade. The grade earned by repeating the course will be awarded the appropriate progress points and grade points earned; further, for up to 20 units of repeated "D," "F," the original grade will be disregarded and the repeated grade will be calculated in the grade points or progress points. The student must file a notice of intent to repeat a course in the Records Office prior to the last day to drop a class without penalty during the quarter in which he repeats the course.
Courses in which the student received an "F" may not be repeated for Credit-No Credit. Except where noted in the specific course description, a student may not enroll in (except as an auditor) or receive credit by examination for any course in which he has received a grade of "C" or higher, including "CR."

Withdrawals

Students may withdraw from a course with no penalty during the initial 10 instructional days of the quarter, by notification to the instructor. Beyond the 10th instructional day of the quarter and through the end of the 7th week of instruction, students may withdraw from a course and be assigned a "W," by processing a petition to withdraw, which is available from the Records Office. Beyond the 7th week of instruction and through the final day of instruction, students may withdraw from a course and be assigned a "W" if passing (Grade A-B-C-D) at the time of withdrawal or an "F" if failing at the time of withdrawal, by processing a petition to withdraw, which is available from the Records Office.
Background material (plus a comment or two) regarding the new salary schedule and merit salary adjustments. (Appreciations is extended to Gerald Murray of CSD, Assistant for his help in providing some of the information in the following.)

In October 1969 the Trustees considered a new salary schedule and then formed a committee consisting of three faculty members from the Statewide Academic Senate, three state college presidents, and two members of the Chancellor's staff to provide background material for consideration. A new salary structure was devised and distributed and then given considerable publicity. It was reviewed by the Council of Presidents. Four public hearings were held by the Committee. In addition, numerous hearings were held on most campuses. It was adopted by the Statewide Academic Senate and by a statewide faculty referendum. Subsequently the Board of Trustees approved the salary structure in November, 1970.

Four main provisions were included in the new salary structure:

1. A single salary structure (elimination of Class I).

2. Overlapping salary steps for the faculty.

3. Flexibility in step advancement on the basis of performance review (step increases may be granted, accelerated, or denied).

4. Additional performance reviews, including post-tenure reviews (a provision which had been desired by the Trustees, Legislature, and the Department of Finance).

The elimination of Class I and provision for overlapping steps would result in a reduction of the 5% differential between Assistant Professor Step 5 and Associate Professor Step 1. (The differential is currently 4.2% and is commonly called the "squiggle".) Specifically, the first item listed in "Transition Procedures" is "Associate and Full Professors will receive adjustments resulting in the restoration of the 5% intervals".

In discussions regarding review of full professors at Steps 5, 5, 7, a footnote indicates that "merit alone and not budget considerations must be the basis for advancement to Steps 5, 7, and 8."

---

3.1 million dollars was budgeted for use in the adjustment of salary inequities for instructional and instructional-related faculty. 1.2 million dollars was skimmed off the top for three items: 1) to provide 5% differential for 12 month department chairmen, 2) to provide inequity adjustment increases for certain academic administrators, and 3) to provide for increases for certain professional librarians. All of these increases were automatic, across the board, without regard to merit and without requirement of performance review.

1.9 million dollars was left for faculty to be used for adjustments due to salary inequities.

In June 1972 the Board of Trustees met and adopted resolutions authorizing the partial implementation of the new salary schedule and distributions of funds for merit review awards. In the documentation provided to the Trustees, the following is contained: "The funds available (1.9 million) are only 52.2%
of the estimated maximum $4.5 million needed for the total implementation of
the new salary structure. Thus, there is a valuable opportunity to make the

type of discriminative judgments envisioned both when the salary structure
was adopted by the Board of Trustees and when the Ad Hoc Report on the
Procurement and Retention of Quality Faculty was accepted by the Board.
While there is no guarantee that the remaining portion of the $4.5 million
implementation costs ($2.6 million) will be appropriated for 1973-74, efforts
are now underway to seek some advance agreements to obtain the needed funds
in 1973-74. However, the fact that the current funding permits only partial
implementation in 1972-73 makes it particularly necessary to use care in the
initial selection of individuals who will receive step adjustments in the
current implementation of this plan. It is anticipated that one of the main
effects of this initial implementation will be to permit step movements for
those now in Step 5 of either Class I or II of the Assistant Professor
rank who could not otherwise be promoted because of the 60-40 ration
limitation (60% in the upper two ranks) or who have not yet received tenure
and thus cannot be promoted to Associate Professor."

Comment:

All the funds appropriated for adjustment of salary inequities for non-
instructional staff and those allocated for 12 month department chairmen,
certain academic administrators and certain librarians, were made without
regard to merit or performance review. Only teaching faculty are required
to review, review, review — and be reviewed — before adjustments can be made.

Other actions by the Board of Trustees in that June meeting are interesting:

1. Increases from 1% to 5% were allocated to certain administrative and
   support classes.

2. 9.7% increases were allocated to instructional deans.

3. 5% differentials were allocated to certain department chairmen, division
   chairmen, associate deans, coordinators, academic planners, and related
   positions.

4. 1.7% to 10.2% increases were allocated to certain classes of professional
   librarians.

5. Living allowances of $100, $200, or $300 were granted to Presidents.

6. The salary schedule for Vice Chancellors was changed by removing the
   bottom three steps and adding three steps at the top.

7. The salary of the Executive Vice Chancellor was set at $46,500.

8. The salary for the Chancellor was set at $50,000 (which is more than
   Governor Reagan makes).

There were no review requirements regarding the above.
For the teaching faculty:

1. The Trustees requested that the legislature grant 13% cost of living increases, rather than the 7 1/2% which was granted.

2. The resolutions mentioned earlier were adopted.

The State Department of Finance and the Chancellor's office give the nature of the request as the reason for the different treatment for faculty.

The first Trustee Resolution contains the phrase "subject to certification by the Department of Finance of the availability of funds for this purpose." The Department of Finance has indicated that it would not certify for the following reasons:

1. Belief that the faculty cannot say "no" to each other.

2. Concern that everyone in the system would wind up Full Professor, Step 8.

3. The additional steps would become "normal" rather than be granted to the very "meritorious".

4. Lack of information concerning future costs (quotas were mentioned).
Memorandum

To: Bart Olsen, Chairman
   Academic Senate

From: Dan Stubbs

Subject: Recommendation from Personnel Policies Committee

The Personnel Policies Committee recommends to the Executive Committee that the following become a business item for the Academic Senate:

The Academic Senate recommends to the president that Administrative Bulletin 70-8, Paragraph II.C, read as follows:

1. Written evaluation of a faculty member received from any source shall be returned to the originator or destroyed by the file custodian unless the originator agrees to its inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file in accord with this policy.

2. Written evaluations which are not identifiable as to authorship shall not be retained. This restriction applies to written information relative to a faculty member's assignment, performance, and/or his personal conduct.

This restriction does not apply to student evaluations of faculty teaching performance which identify the source by specific course and class section and result from the implementation of established university procedures which are approved by the faculty member's school and department and which are for the exclusive use of the person being evaluated, the department tenured committee, and the department head.

This restriction need not apply to tenured faculty evaluation of teaching performance, other professional performance, service to the University and community, or relations within the department provided the evaluations or related statements are made in accordance with established consultative procedures for the department. A summary of these evaluations prepared by the tenured committee may be used as
evidence of merit in evaluations and recommendations submitted to the president. Any such summary must, however, indicate the members of the tenured committee who participated in its development and must be approved by a majority of that group. Individual members of the tenured committee need not be identified as to their approval or disapproval of such a committee report.

Of the four paragraphs presented, the first two were approved by a vote of 9 yes, 0 no; the third paragraph was approved by a vote of 8 yes, 1 no; and the fourth paragraph was approved by a vote of 5 yes, 4 no.
Memorandum

To: Dr. Barton Olsen, Chairman
   Academic Senate

From: Robert E. Kennedy

Subject: Faculty Office Hour Requirements

I indicated in my September 21, 1972 memo to you that I would have a CAM amendment prepared which would provide for exceptions to CAM 370.2, 6, a., dealing with faculty office hours, in order that hardship not be imposed on a few faculty members through strict interpretation of the current regulation. This has now been done. Effective immediately, the school deans may begin to implement the new provisions (as underlined below):

"6. Instructors' Schedules

   a. Office Hours

   In addition to scheduled classes each instructor must schedule and conduct at least one office hour each day (Monday through Friday) for consultation with students, except as otherwise provided in this section. Each instructor will post his office hours outside his office door.

   Exceptions to this policy may in the case of individual faculty members be approved by the school dean whenever in his judgment an exception is in the best interest of the instructional program. Such deviations from this policy for an individual must receive prior approval by the school dean, in writing, on a quarter-by-quarter basis, upon the recommendation of the department head."

The underlined addition to this section will be included in the CAM reprint scheduled for distribution next January.
Memorandum

To: Don Coats, Chairman
Ad Hoc Student Evaluation of Faculty Committee

From: Robert E. Kennedy

Subject: Continuing Function of the Committee

Date: November 15, 1972
File No.: Committee
Copies: Andrews, Olsen, Baggett, Lebens, Committee Members, School Deans

First, I wish to thank you and all of the members of the ad hoc Student Evaluation of Faculty Committee for the excellent work done in developing the Guidelines for Student Evaluation of Faculty. I publicly congratulated you and the committee for the very successful and timely completion of their assignment during the September 15 President's Council meeting. I extend to you and the committee members this more direct message of appreciation. It isn't often that a set of guidelines covering a topic with as much potential for controversy receives such widespread acceptance. Your guidelines were endorsed by the Academic Senate as well as by the ASI President and, as you know, have been promulgated as a statement of University policy.

Your September 6, 1972 "Committee Report and Recommendation" to me included the following:

"As a final recommendation, the committee suggests that an ad hoc committee be appointed following the completion of the first full year of the program for the purpose of evaluating the university-wide guidelines. Furthermore, it is recommended that the ad hoc committee membership be structured similar to the structure of this committee."

I endorse this recommendation, and ask that your committee remain intact to review the winter and spring quarter "trial runs" to see how they meet the guidelines, in addition to evaluating the guidelines themselves.

In forwarding their endorsement of the guidelines, the Academic Senate indicated that their Personnel Policies Committee "...shall review the effects of the implementation and make recommendations back to the Senate at an appropriate time." My response of October 24, 1972 to Dr. Olsen included in part: "...in accordance with their recommendation (i.e., the ad hoc committee's) I plan to appoint a university-wide ad hoc committee which will review each school's evaluation program(s) at the conclusion of this first year's cycle. That committee will be in a position to accept recommendations from the Senate's Personnel Policies Committee."

In view of their expressed interest in this matter, I am sure the Personnel Policies Committee will be in contact with you, probably via the Senate's three representatives on your continuing committee.
Memorandum

To: Bart Olsen, Chairman
   Academic Senate

From: Robert E. Kennedy

Subject: Guidelines for Academic Senate Personnel Review Committee

This is to confirm for you, and advise those receiving copies, the tenor of our discussion and understandings relative to the matter discussed by Dan Stubbs in his memorandum of November 6, 1972 to you. (A copy of Dan’s memo is attached for ready reference.)

As I explained by phone today, I am interested in preserving the primary authority and responsibility for initiation of recommendations on academic personnel matters at the level where professional judgment can be based on long-term, frequent observation—namely within the academic departments. However, I have no strong feeling that the precise language of CAM 341.1 A.—"Consultative Procedures"—is the only, or even the best, way to describe appropriate activities of the Senate’s Personnel Review Committee, and am perfectly willing to discuss this with the Senate’s Executive Committee. When this matter was discussed about a year ago by the group receiving copies of this memo, CAM 341.1 A. very explicitly stated that the final review committee "...shall be at the department, division, or school level." I still believe that when the Senate’s Personnel Review Committee is functioning as a "...university-wide level of review of faculty personnel actions relating to retention, tenure, promotions, terminations, and leaves with pay..." it should operate within campus-wide procedures as provided for in 5 Cal Adm Code 42701. This section provides that "...The campus-wide procedures shall be consonant with the regulations, policies and procedures of the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor and shall be approved by the president.”

In September, 1971, I approved a revision of CAM 341.1 which described the "campus-wide procedures" function of the Personnel Review Committee as follows:

"The Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate shall review only those cases in which differences in recommendations occur between levels of review or where a negative recommendation has been made at the department and dean levels. This review should be concerned with whether:

1. Established procedures were followed;
2. The recommended action was based on discrimination or prejudice;
3. Sufficient information was considered in the procedures to warrant the recommendation; and
4. All relevant information was considered."
When a revision of this section was being contemplated, I asked for and received consultative input from the Academic Senate as well as from the school deans, vice presidents, and the Director of Personnel. In coordinating the results of this very extensive consultation, language was chosen which would hopefully clarify meaning and result in uniform interpretation. It is obviously not exactly as drafted by the Senate's Personnel Policy Committee, but I do not believe it does violence to the Senate's recommendation or to CAM as revised in September of 1971. A particular point of difference we discussed by phone this morning had to do with whether a faculty member should be asked to request a review of his case by the Personnel Review Committee, or whether the committee under certain circumstances should automatically undertake a review unless the faculty members request that they not do so. I do not see that this is a fundamental difference, and am willing to review it with the Executive Committee. You all should know that this change was made as a result of additional consultative input, and in response to a complaint by last year's Review Committee that their workload was excessive. One complaint was that they were perhaps reviewing cases in which the faculty member concerned really didn't care whether the Review Committee looked into his case or not. Several advisers suggested that perhaps the workload of the Personnel Review Committee would be reduced to a more reasonable level if they were to review disputed cases only upon the specific request of the faculty members. I have no strong feeling on this point and would be happy to discuss it with the Executive Committee along with other points raised above. I am confident that we can reach a mutually satisfactory understanding on the questions raised by Dan Stubbs' memorandum.

I will not be able to meet with the Executive Committee until after Thanksgiving, but would be happy to either attend their first regular meeting after November 26 or schedule a special meeting here in the Administration Building fourth floor conference room as we did a year ago. Please let me know which you prefer so I can arrange my schedule accordingly.
This memo is in response to Tom Johnston's note of October 30, 1972, "Request for Clarification of C.A.M., Section 341.1." Once again, the Academic Senate Personnel Review Committee finds itself with two sets of instructions—those in the Academic Senate bylaws and those in C.A.M. This situation existed last fall and a meeting was held to discuss the problem. Attending that meeting was everyone named above except you and Tom Johnston. I recall that President Kennedy agreed, after checking with Chet Young, to two items:

1. That the C.A.M. sections dealing with the Academic Senate Personnel Review Committee would coincide with the appropriate sections of the Academic Senate bylaws, and

2. Proposals for changes in the Academic Senate bylaws sections dealing with the Academic Senate Personnel Review Committee would originate with the Academic Senate.

The principle involved, as I understood it, was simply that the Personnel Review Committee is a committee of the Academic Senate and, hence, its function should be specified by the Academic Senate, subject to approval of the university president.

Last spring the Academic Senate approved changes in the bylaws relative to the Academic Senate Personnel Review Committee. However, the C.A.M., Section 341.1, changes distributed this fall again do not agree with the Academic Senate bylaws. This, in effect, places Tom Johnston in the same predicament this fall as Leon Maksoudian found himself last year.

I am asking you, by means of this memorandum, to discuss with the Executive Committee what steps might be taken to prevent such conflicts from arising in the future.