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

II. Minutes of Senate meeting, January 16, 1973.

III. Business Items

1. Academic Titles. Continuation of Personnel Policies Committee's recommendation of December 5, 1972 Senate meeting. (See Attachment 2 of Academic Senate Agenda of November 14, 1972.) For report of Ad Hoc Committee see Attachment 1 (Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Titles). Report to be made by R. Alberti.

2. Personnel Policies Committee recommendation re: Professional Responsibility. See Attachment 2. For additional background the Executive Committee is providing Attachment 2a.-- Dan Stubbs.

3. Executive Committee and Constitutional and Bylaws Committee statement re: membership of Senators on Academic Council -- C. Johnson.

IV. Information Items

1. Mary Brady from the Library will represent the Professional Consultative Services on the Election Committee.


4. Harry Scales from Human Development and Education replaces Sarah Burroughs on the Graduate Studies Committee.

5. Frank Thrasher is resuming his duties on the Personnel Review Committee.

6. Harry Fierstine has accepted the appointment to the Instructional Innovation Committee.

7. The question as to whether Academic Deans should teach at least one class each quarter was referred to the Instruction Committee by the Executive Committee.

8. Barton Olsen will speak briefly on the new Salary Schedule.
The Committee determined from its inception that its purpose was to collect additional factual information relative to the use of academic titles. No policy recommendation is included in this report.

1. CAM Section 393 states:
"The appropriate professorial title (i.e. Professor, Associate Professor, etc.) may be used by a faculty member in lieu of his corresponding payroll classification title (i.e. Principal Vocational Instructor, Senior Instructor etc.). Payroll classification titles will continue to be used by the College for official purposes.
The above authorization does not alter current style guidelines for college-initiated news releases, the Cal Poly Report, or other official college publications."

2. From the 1972-73 catalogs of CSUC campuses:
   a. The 1972-1973 catalog of each of the other 18 California State Universities and Colleges lists faculty members by academic rank.
   b. In sixteen of those institutions, the teaching ranks which appear in the catalog are those of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor and Instructor (exclusive of Lecturers, Adjunct faculty, Librarians, Counselors, Student Affairs personnel).
   c. At California State University, Chico, the ranks of "Principal Vocational Instructor" and "Senior Vocational Instructor" appear as the only title for five members of the faculty of Agriculture.
   d. At California State University, Los Angeles, the rank of "Vocational Instructor in Education" appears as the only title for three members of the faculty of Education.
   e. Since the doctorate appears to be of some concern in these deliberations, it may be of interest to look at some data in relevant fields at CSU, Fresno (per 1972-73 catalog):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>With Doctorate</th>
<th>Without Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>(none shown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind. Arts &amp; Tech.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. From the 1972-73 Budget for the California State Colleges, the following data are relevant:
   a. The term "vocational instructor" (with appropriate rank -- Junior, Intermediate, Senior, Principal) appears as follows:
      1) Chico has 5 positions in Instruction, one in College Farm.
      2) Fresno has 20.5 in Instruction, one in College Farm, two in Independent Operations, one in Continuing Education.
      3) Humboldt has four in Instruction.
      4) Los Angeles has one in Continuing Education.
      5) San Francisco has two in Continuing Education.
      6) Pomona has 196.1 in Instruction, two in College Farm, 6 in Independent Operations (eg. AID).
      7) San Luis Obispo has one in College Farm, 14.4 in Independent Operations (eg. AID).
      8) 17 campuses (all except Bakersfield and San Jose) have one Vocational Instructor in the Building Program.

   b. The terms junior, intermediate, senior, and principal instructor are used to describe non-vocational instructional faculty at Cal Poly, Pomona, and all instructional faculty at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. All other campuses use the designations instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, except as noted in (a) above.

   c. A copy of the "Instruction" portion of the 1972-73 Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo budget is attached.

4. From Title 5, California Administrative Code, the following data are relevant:
   a) The term "vocational instructor" is used only in Section 42902, which refers to vocations, and makes reference to "an instructor or vocational instructor."
   b) Sections 43560, 43569 refer to "instructor, assistant professor, professor: references are to tenure rights and termination notices.
   c) All other references are to "academic employees" only.
   d) Section 42711 Faculty reads "The faculty of each state college shall consist of specialists qualified to give the instruction in each authorized curriculum. The doctorate or equivalent attainment shall be the desirable qualification for appointment to a college faculty position. Equivalent attainments may be accepted: (a) in those fields where the doctorate is not common, and (b) in vocational fields where experience may be substituted for academic training.

5. From the Board of Trustees, CSUC, September, 1970 (Endorsing the Report of the Trustees' Ad Hoc Committee on Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty--PartI):
   "2. All colleges should adopt the following principles and guidelines as a basis for the development and operation of their faculty personnel policies regarding appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases.
    i. The procedures should specify that possession of the doctorate or the appropriate terminal degree is a normal prerequisite for promotion beyond the rank of Assistant Professor; exceptions may be made in those instances where the faculty members may be uniquely qualified. ..."
6. Within the guidelines established by the Trustees, actual determination of eligibility for promotion, and interpretation of "those instances where the faculty member may be uniquely qualified," are matters left to the individual campuses.

7. From Larry Voss, Senator and Director of Personnel Relations, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo:

a. Letter dated January 23, 1973: "... My contact with Cal Poly, Pomona indicated that they are using the instructor ranks and the vocational ranks as payroll titles only. The Pomona campus is following the same practice as we do in allowing faculty members to use the equivalent traditional academic ranks in official correspondence, etc.

The current classifications and class codes that would be affected by a proposed change in Cal Poly's rank structure are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Code</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2460</td>
<td>Instructor, C.P.C. (AY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2461</td>
<td>Instructor, C.P.C. (12 Mo.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2459</td>
<td>Instructor, C.P.C., Overseas Contract Assignment (12 Mo.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2462</td>
<td>Vocational Instructor (AY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2463</td>
<td>Vocational Instructor (10 Mo.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2464</td>
<td>Vocational Instructor (12 Mo.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2468</td>
<td>Vocational Instructor, Building Program (AY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2469</td>
<td>Vocational Instructor, Building Program (12 Mo.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2466</td>
<td>Vocational Instructor, Overseas Contract Assignment (12 Mo.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. In addition, Mr. Voss has indicated to this Committee that there are no systematic restrictions against the use of titles other than those used for payroll purposes, so long as the established payroll codes and titles are used for payroll documents. In other words, so long as the term "Principal Vocational Instructor" appears in payroll documentation, an individual in that code could be called "Professor," "Director of XYZ Programs," "Chief of ABC Services," or whatever, in other institutional and/or personal material -- including "official university documents" such as the catalog, etc.

8. From Clay Sommers at the CSUC Chancellor's Office, via Senator Corwin Johnson, comes a confirmation of item 7.b. above.

9. In the Schools of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and the School of Science and Mathematics at CPSU SLO (and perhaps in other schools as well), it is current procedure to extend offers of appointment at, for example, "...the rank of Associate Professor (payroll title: Senior Vocational Instructor)"

10. There is evidently some question regarding the implementation of the Class I/Class II (without/with doctorate) salary increment for those vocational faculty in the upper ranks. A change could affect the Class II equivalency for vocational faculty without the doctorate who are in the upper ranks. Thus it would appear appropriate to recommend any change be effective either (1) after assurance that the salary of such persons would not be affected; or (2) after the proposed elimination of the Class I/Class II designations is accomplished.
11. With item "10" as a qualification, this Committee finds no evidence of CSUC system policies which would place any faculty member or class of faculty members in jeopardy as regards salary, appointment, reappointment, promotion, or tenure, should the November 2, 1972 recommendation of the Personnel Policies Committee be adopted.

12. As a footnote, the members of this Committee observe that several other alternatives may exist, and submit the following without recommendation:
   a. no change.
   b. change to use of "traditional" academic titles (e.g. Associate Professor) in selected fields only;
   c. allow individual faculty members to choose between alternative titles (e.g. Associate Professor or Senior Vocational Instructor) in, for example, the University Catalog;
   d. change all faculty members to "traditional" academic titles (e.g. Associate Professor).

13. The Committee believes it has fulfilled its commission and asks to be discharged.
Personnel Policies Committee Recommendation
January 30, 1973

Bylaws of Committee on Professional Responsibility

1. 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 in each school or division 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 University and Colleges (AS-382-70/FA1&2, 12/17/70).

2. Any employee of the University who is eligible to vote in the election of University Academic Senators or who serves as a voting member of the Academic Senate may be charged with unprofessional conduct.

3. The faculty of each school and the professional and consultative services shall elect a Committee on Professional Responsibility comprised of tenured members. Within each school or division with five or more departments, the Committee on Professional Responsibility shall consist of five members with no more than one member from any single department. If a school has fewer than five departments, then the committee shall consist of one member from each department. Elections shall be held each spring, supervised by the Academic Senate Elections Committee. The term of service shall be three years beginning on September 1 following the elections. An exception shall be made with regard to the 1973 elections when the term of office (one, two, or three years) shall be specified by the Elections Committee. Each school or division committee shall elect, annually, its own chairman from and by its members.

A committee member shall not serve if either a member of his own department or subdivision or degree program is charged with unprofessional conduct or a member of his own department, subdivision or degree program makes a charge of unprofessional conduct against a member of his school or division or degree program.

4. In the event a breach of conduct has been committed and an informal resolution is unobtainable, the ensuing procedures shall be followed.

a. 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 of his school or division. 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.

b. The appropriate 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.

c. 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. 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. 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 that it has acted upon his accusation.

d. The actions open to the committee include:

1) dismissing the allegation.
2) securing mutual understanding between the parties concerned.
3) preparing a written reprimand to be included in the accused member's personnel file.
4) administering an oral reprimand.
5) referral (see subsection 4e).

e. 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).

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

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

b. 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) to respond to any evidence submitted.

c. He shall have the right to be accompanied by a faculty member of his own selection who shall have the right to participate in the hearing.

d. He shall have the right to submit questions through the committee chairman to the faculty member making the allegation. The answers solicited shall be made available to him and to the committee.
6. 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.
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STATEMENT ON
PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND PROFESSIONAL SELF-DISCIPLINE

The fundamental purpose of a statement of professional responsibility is to establish a guide to responsible performance that is consistent with the highest ideals of the academic profession. It thus establishes an ideal to which faculty members can and should aspire, rather than a minimum standard to which faculty members must adhere. Hence, such a statement is not intended to serve primarily as a reference for disciplinary action. Nevertheless, when cases of gross disregard for principles of professional responsibility occur, the faculty has both a right and duty to call the lapse to the attention of the individual concerned and to expect that the irresponsible behavior will be discontinued.

Most departures from responsible professional behavior are likely to be minor lapses which can be corrected simply by calling the matter to the attention of the person involved. Ordinarily such matters are handled within the faculty member's academic unit.

If a breach of professional responsibility is alleged which cannot be or is not, adequately handled thus informally within the basic academic unit, the matter should be taken up at the institutional level. Each college should have a Committee on Professional Responsibility. The members of such a committee should be chosen with special attention to the high regard in which they are held by the academic community. To this committee any member of the academic community may refer allegations of unprofessional conduct.

As quickly as may be feasible, the Committee on Professional Responsibility should begin an inquiry into the facts of any case it is asked to investigate. The Committee may at any time discontinue the inquiry because the facts do not provide sufficient evidence to support the allegation. The Committee may also decide at any time that the case involves only minor matters which properly should have been referred to the basic academic unit for informal resolution and so refer it, with or without recommendations.

If the Committee on Professional Responsibility does carry its inquiry to completion, it should prepare a report which presents its conclusions and the basis for those conclusions. A copy of the report should go to the faculty member whose behavior was questioned and a copy to the person(s) requesting Committee consideration of the case, and a copy should be retained by the Committee. 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.

The intent underlying this procedure is to provide a mechanism whereby the faculty can call serious disregard for professional responsibility to the attention of an offending faculty member without the necessity of subjecting him to formal disciplinary action. It is expected that in most instances the weight of an adverse conclusion by the Committee on Professional Responsibility will bring about a correction of irresponsible behavior.
Implementation of the Statement on Professional Responsibility and Professional Self-Discipline

If grossly irresponsible behavior should continue, however, it may be necessary for the possibility of formal disciplinary action to be considered. Nevertheless, formal charges of unprofessional conduct should not be filed unless and until the corrective procedures outlined above have been tried. The college administrative officer who has general charge of disciplinary procedures should consult with the Committee on Professional Responsibility before proceeding with any disciplinary action based on charges of unprofessional conduct.

When formal disciplinary action is based on charges of unprofessional conduct, the faculty disciplinary action committee should be given the final determination as to whether sanctions should be imposed and the form they should take. Consideration should be given to a wide range of sanctions other than dismissal, such as warnings and reprimands, to provide a more versatile disciplinary response to various degrees and kinds of unprofessional behavior. But primary emphasis should be placed on preventive action. Apparent failures to meet professional responsibilities should be approached with a sustained attempt to inform, persuade, and improve; disciplinary action, regardless of the degree of sanction it may eventually suggest, should be a last resort.

FIRST READING

SECOND READING

ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC
Memorandum

To: Barton C. Olsen, Chairman
Academic Senate

From: Corwin M. Johnson, Chairman
Constitution & Bylaws Committee

Subject: Membership of Academic Senate and Academic Council

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee has looked at your memorandum of August 15 on two occasions, the latest being today.

We reached the conclusion that this change would require minimal changes in our Constitution and Bylaws and that the main change would be in CAM since the Academic Council is defined by CAM rather than by our bylaws. Our bylaws could then be changed easily to accommodate the change, if the proposed change in CAM were acceptable to President Kennedy.

It appeared to the Committee that, if it is the desire of the Executive Committee to recommend the changes in CAM that would be needed to reach the objective outlined in your memo of August 15, either the Executive Committee or the Constitution and Bylaws Committee could easily bring this before the Senate. In fact, the material outlined in your memo is probably sufficient for that purpose.

If you and the Executive Committee desire, we will be happy to present this material as a recommended change in CAM at the February 13 meeting.

CMJ:eh
Memorandum

To: Members of the Executive Committee
   Academic Senate

Date: August 15, 1972

File No.: 

Copies: 

From: Barton C. Olsen
       Chairman, Academic Senate

Subject: Membership of Academic Senate and Academic Council.

The members of an ad hoc committee of the Executive Committee organized to study the relative faculty-dean membership in the Academic Council and the Academic Senate has met and suggests the following for consideration by the Executive Committee and the Constitution and Bylaws Committee:

1. The concept of having liaison between constituent groups on the campus is both needed and desirable.

2. At the present time the only faculty member present on the Academic Council is the Vice Chairman of the Academic Senate.

3. All seven school deans of the university are voting members of the Academic Council and the Academic Senate. This situation, in the view of the members of the ad hoc committee, represents an inordinate amount of influence, both real and potential, from one group upon two constituent assemblies. To adjust this condition the ad hoc committee recommends the following:

   a. The seven school deans remain as voting members of the Academic Senate.

   b. The Vice-Chairman of the Academic Senate not be a member of the Academic Council.

   c. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate is made up of a number of senators among whom are seven faculty (senators) who represent each of the seven schools. These specific representatives shall, each year, be voting members of the Academic Council. In this way the Academic Council more truly would represent the academic matters of the seven schools both from the position of the deans as well as from the teaching faculty.

   d. A direct linking pin would thus be provided between the Academic Council and the Academic Senate - via the Executive Committee. The important factor of academic continuity would thus be assured.