Academic Senate - Agenda
Calif. State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo, California

Academic Senate - Agenda
March 9, 1971

I. Call session to order in Faculty Dining Room at 3:00 p.m.

II. Approve minutes of the February 9, 1971 meeting.

III. Business Items

A. Instruction Committee - John Rogalla

Resolved that the Academic Senate recommend to the President that he implement the PROPOSED POLICY AND PROCEDURES RELATING TO WAIVING OF REGISTRATION FEES FOR FACULTY AND STAFF. (See Attachment A, Agenda, March 9, 1971.)

B. Curriculum Committee - Dwayne Head

Resolved that the Academic Senate recommend to the President that the College prepare two-year catalogs beginning with the catalog for both the 1973-74 and 1974-75 academic years.

C. Personnel Policies Committee - Howard Rhoads

WHEREAS: the quality of the educational needs of the College is paramount

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Cal Poly Academic Senate recommend to the President that the section of the College Administrative Manual (311.5), which presently restricts the employment of close relatives, be changed to allow close relatives to be hired on a full-time permanent or part-time basis provided that this basic criterion is followed: the person to be hired is the best available with all of the customary hiring policies of the College being followed, but with the restriction that: (1) close relatives may not be hired in the same department except in unusual or emergency situations and then by permission of the President, and (2) in no case may a close relative be in a supervisory position, one over the other. Normal considerations for promotion and tenure should not be restricted by relationship.

(See Attachment B, Agenda, March 9, 1971.)

D. Budget Committee - Dale Federer

A report on the committee's action regarding proposed parking fees will be presented to the Senate at the regular meeting March 9, 1971.

E. Budget Committee - Dale Federer

A committee report on faculty participation in student assistance programs will be presented at the March 9 meeting of the Senate.
IV. Announcements

A. Dr. Robert Sorenson has been elected to complete the term of Dr. Pfeiffer as department heads representative from the School of Human Development and Education.

B. The Executive Committee has scheduled special meetings of the Academic Senate on April 27, May 18, and May 25, 1971, in addition to the regular meetings of the Academic Senate on April 13 and May 11, 1971. These special meetings will be utilized to consider the recommendations from the Curriculum Committee.

C. The following faculty have been appointed to the Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards for 1970-71: William Curtis, Kenneth Fuller, Donald Hensel, Rod Keif, John Merriam, Philip Overmeyer, and Wesley Ward.

V. Information Items

A. Report from Student Affairs Committee - Bill Boyce
   A continuation of the presentation on Student Evaluation of Teaching will be presented at the March 9 meeting of the Senate.

B. Report from Statewide Academic Senate - Corwin Johnson
   There will be a discussion of the "Alternative Proposal on Tenure from the Special Statewide Committee on Tenure Proposals." (See enclosure submitted to Senate members only with their copies of the Agenda for March 9, 1971.)

C. Personnel Policies Committee - Howard Rhoads
   Evaluation of Department Heads (see Attachment C, Agenda, March 9, 1971).

D. Elections Committee - Murray Smith
   Referendum on professional responsibilities (see Attachment D, Agenda, March 9, 1971).

VI. Adjournment
PROPOSED POLICY AND PROCEDURES RELATING TO WAIVING OF REGISTRATION FEES FOR FACULTY AND STAFF

(Note: If approved it is proposed that the principles included in this statement be included in Section 382.2 of the College Administrative Manual.)

Introduction

It is to the advantage of the college for members of the faculty and staff to keep up-to-date in areas which relate directly to the job responsibilities of the individual. Toward this end, it is the policy of the college that in these instances the registration fees (M. & S., Student Activity Card, College Union, and Facility fees) for faculty and staff may be waived.

Policies

A. Waiver of fees are limited to full-time faculty and staff holding regular appointments at the college.

B. Class work taken with a waiver of fees provision may not be counted toward a degree from Cal Poly.

C. Courses taken for credit must be directly related to the faculty or staff members' responsibilities at the college.

D. Courses taken with a waiver of fees provision are limited to one course per quarter.

E. Faculty or staff members taking courses by waiver of fees provision shall not be included as part of the college enrollment quotas.

Procedures

A. Faculty or staff members who wish to take a course and who wish to have the registration fee waived should use the following procedures.

1. Request for the waiver of fees should be presented to the faculty or staff members' department head including the course the individual wishes to take and the relationship of the course to the individual's responsibilities at Cal Poly.
Background Information On
CAL POLY CLOSE RELATIVE HIRING POLICY

I. The Personnel Policies Committee was requested by the Chairman of the Academic Senate to look into the existing policy and recommend changes if any were deemed desirable. The proposed resolution was passed by this committee on a six-to-three vote February 12, 1971.

II. Various groups and numerous individuals have expressed concern that the existing CAM policy (attached) might be unnecessary, perhaps discriminatory, prevented employment of relatives on a full-time permanent basis, discouraged applications from qualified individuals who were related to other College employees, and limits the educational function of the College by preventing or discouraging the hiring of individuals "most apparently qualified to do a particular job."

III. Other persons have voiced the opinion that the existing policy is necessary because, in the absence of such a rule:

1) A possibility for favoritism exists;
2) A possibility for charges of discrimination in hiring exists;
3) Evaluating supervisors might be reluctant to give low evaluations when an employee was known to be a relative of another College employee.

IV. A special sub-committee of the Personnel Policies Committee was assigned the task of investigating the status and effect of hiring policies within the State College System and at Cal Poly, and in other local State agencies.

a. State College System Personnel Officers were sent a questionnaire and 13 replies were received. Following is a partial summary of the response:

1) Does your College have a rule against hiring relatives?
   4 yes - 9 no

2) Has it ever had such a rule?
   - Most who answered "no" above said they had one in the past but had changed within the last nine years.

3) Are husband and wife teams currently employed?
   11 yes - 1 no
   - Both teaching?
     11 yes - 1 no
     - Both teaching full-time?
       10 yes - 1 no
     - Both teaching in the same department?
       8 yes - 5 no
     - Is tenure granted to both?
       6 yes - 2 no
   - Has this created problems?
     Unanimous "no"
b. Twenty department heads at Cal Poly were asked if they had turned down employment to qualified individuals because of the rule against hiring relatives.
Response: 13 yes - 7 no
Several of the "noes" indicated some individuals had not applied when the rule was made known and therefore did not have to be turned down.

c. Local State Agencies
1) None of the other agencies had a rule against hiring relatives.
2) All had at least one husband/wife team employed.
3) Atascadero State Hospital actively recruits husband/wife teams.
311.5 Employment of Relatives

A. Policy

Concurrent employment of close relatives within the College and its auxiliary enterprises is not authorized except under rare or unusual circumstances. A close relative is defined as a son, daughter, brother, sister, mother, father, husband, or wife.

This policy applies both to initial appointments and to reappointments.

Employees who become close relatives subsequent to their initial appointments are subject to this policy at the end of the reappointment period during which close relationship becomes established.

B. Exceptions to the Policy

It is recognized that circumstances may arise in which inflexible application of the policy would work to the detriment of the College's instructional program or essential supporting services. Such detriment could arise directly, through undue limitations being placed on the College's ability to provide faculty to carry out our instructional commitment; could arise indirectly, through unduly limiting the College's capacity to provide essential services; or could result from a qualitative limitation through reduction of the College's ability to appoint persons of outstanding talent or distinguishing qualifications.

When efforts to fill a position on a permanent basis have been intensive but unsuccessful, recommendations to employ a close relative temporarily (i.e., for one academic quarter or less) or on a part-time basis (i.e., half-time or less) will be considered when all of the following additional conditions exist:

1. The position is not under the direct or indirect supervision of a close relative.
2. The position is not in the same office or department as that of a close relative.
3. The applicant is not a close relative of an administrative or academic-administrative employee.

Recommendations for the appointment or reappointment of close relatives must be made by the department head, endorsed by the dean or division head, and submitted to the appropriate vice president for approval.

C. Student Close Relatives

Sections 311.5 A. and B. notwithstanding, enrolled students of this College who are close relatives of faculty or staff members may be employed as student assistants, or as hourly help, except that they may not work under the direct supervision of their close relatives.
RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS, the department head is selected to effectively administer a particular department, including optimum working relations with both his staff as well as the administration, and

WHEREAS, it is desirable that he be made aware of his effectiveness as well as areas of deficiency so that steps for improvement may be undertaken, and,

WHEREAS, only faculty members who have been in the department for an adequate length of time can form a base for detailed evaluation, and

WHEREAS, this evaluation should be carried out sufficiently often to provide adequate continuity in the evaluation process and,

WHEREAS, some flexibility in the evaluation instrument is desirable,

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED:

that the following recommendation on faculty evaluation of department heads be directed to the President:

1. Each department should evaluate its department head once a year.

2. Department members participating shall have been employed in that department for at least one year.

3. Evaluation shall be conducted by submission to the department head of the completed "Department Head Evaluation Form I" except that if a department decides, by majority vote of those eligible to evaluate, that they prefer Form II, the evaluation may be carried out with that form (copies of the forms are attached).
DEPARTMENT

The following questions are intended to suggest some of the important characteristics and functions of a department head. Comment only on those to which you feel qualified to respond and which pertain to aspects you feel are important to the successful functioning of your department. No signature is required since this evaluation will not be directed to other than the department head.

1. Does the department head handle administrative routines efficiently and effectively? This includes class assignments, budgets, committee assignments, department meetings, and curricular planning.

Comment:

2. Does the department head provide stimulating academic ideas (his own or others') at appropriate times?

Comment:

3. Is the department head receptive to suggestions made by his faculty and does he support their innovative efforts?

Comment:

4. Does the department head encourage faculty members to keep abreast of their field and occasionally even prod them to do research and/or take advanced graduate courses as appropriate?

Comment:

5. Is the department head alert to progress in his field? Does he make an attempt to maintain his own professional growth?

Comment:

6. Are the department head's actions sufficiently consistent so that the faculty can develop a sense of confidence in the direction of his leadership?

Comment:
7. Is the department head forthright and effective in the recruitment of faculty?
Comment:

8. Is the department head equitable and capable in his handling of personnel matters?
Comment:

9. Is the department head aware of any actual or potential conflict between individuals or factions on the faculty? Do his actions help to reduce rather than increase discord?
Comment:

10. Does the department head have good rapport with students, being courteous and interested in them as individuals?
Comment:

11. Does the department head encourage constructive discussion about the relation of the department to the college and school? Or do negative responses discourage free discussion?
Comment:

12. Does the department head make optimum use of the talent available in his department?
Comment:

13. Are there important functions not included above? If so, please comment on them.
Department Head Evaluation, Form II

DEPARTMENT

DATE

Please respond to the following questions. No signature is required since this evaluation will not be directed to other than the department head.

1. What are the strong points of the department head?

2. What are the weak points of the department head?

3. What suggestions do you have for improving the effectiveness of the department head?
Memorandum

- : William Alexander, President
  Academic Senate

- : Murray Smith, Chairman
  Election Committee of the Academic Senate

Subject: Referendum re Professional Responsibilities Statement

The results of the referendum re the adoption of the Professional Responsibilities Statement and the Implementation of the Professional Responsibilities Statement as determined by the Election Committee of the Academic Senate in a ballot count on February 24, 1971 is as follows:

I APPROVE THE STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC ....... 193

I DO NOT APPROVE THE STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC ............. 28

I HAVE NO OPINION ............... 2

I APPROVE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES STATEMENT ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC ........... 175

I DO NOT APPROVE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES STATEMENT ENDORSED BY THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSC ........ 37

I HAVE NO OPINION ............... 2
I. General Provisions

A. A meaningful evaluation of the teaching ability of the faculty by students is a valuable instrument to faculty seeking self-improvement in their teaching ability, and is one of several indicators helpful in evaluating faculty for reappointment, tenure and promotion.

B. Each department (or school which does not have departments) is encouraged to develop interest in student evaluation of the teaching ability of the faculty of that department. If students evidence a substantial interest, the department head or school dean will appoint, or request the students to appoint, a committee of students to work with an appointed committee of tenured and non-tenured faculty from his department (or school).

C. In general, the combined faculty-student committee for establishing evaluations procedures and criteria of each instructional department shall:

1. Consist of students and tenured and non-tenured faculty interested in developing an evaluation of faculty teaching ability, including those teaching abilities unique to that department.

2. Be composed of equal numbers of students and faculty.

3. Develop and establish a system or systems for student evaluation of faculty teaching ability that will be meaningful to the faculty of that particular department and that will have the general approval of the students, the faculty concerned, and the department head.

D. Student evaluations of the teaching ability of the faculty may be conducted by individual instructional departments, divisions or schools as determined by a consensus of the faculty thereof. Due consideration should be given to the appropriateness of the evaluation criteria and procedures applicable and meaningful to each instructional unit. If desired, certain standard criteria and procedures could be established for a school or division with additional separate criteria and procedures established for each instructional unit therein.

E. The implementation of the procedures developed, and within the criteria established, will be accomplished by students under the supervision of a student chairman of the Student Evaluation Committee formed within each instructional unit conducting an evaluation.

F. When completed, the students' evaluation of an instructor's teaching ability shall be included in the evaluated instructor's personnel file.

G. Regardless of the manner in which student evaluations are made, routed, documented or summarized, the results of the evaluation will be presented to the evaluated faculty member, together with all data and information gathered on his evaluation. The evaluated faculty member will be informed concurrently in writing that he has the opportunity to make written comments to his department head in response to the evaluation report within a reasonable period of time. Such response will be filed with and will be considered in conjunction with the evaluation report in all subsequent personnel actions effecting that faculty member.
II. Special Provisions

A. It is recognized that, because of differences in academic disciplines, size, student enrollment, student majors and the constitution of departments, particular detailed evaluation criteria or procedures may not be appropriate for a given department. However, departmental or other instructional units may wish to give consideration to the following:

1. What should be the frequency of the student evaluations? When should the evaluations be made during the academic year? Should all members of the faculty be evaluated during each evaluation period?

2. Should the student evaluations (or tabulations or summaries thereof) be submitted to all tenured faculty?

3. If the Department Head's teaching ability is evaluated, should the results be submitted directly to the Dean? If not, how should it be handled?

4. Should separate evaluation procedures and criteria be developed for service courses or for non-majors?

5. What constitutes "substantial" student interest in faculty evaluations?

6. Should student evaluations be reduced to summary form? Should the summarization or tabulations or individual evaluations be attested to as to validity and signed by the department head or other responsible individuals? If not, how should the results of student evaluations be placed in the evaluated faculty member's personnel file? (Consideration should be given to the sheer bulk of the evaluation material which may be generated by certain evaluation systems or procedures.)

7. How often should evaluation criteria and procedures be reviewed and revised?

Members of the Student Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate are:

E. Chandler – Dean of Students
E. Cosma – Food Processing
A. Merriam – Architecture
H. Miles – Electrical Engineering
J. Rice – Graphic Communications
D. Thompson – Biological Science
J. Webb – Mens Physical Education
P. Banke – President ASI
R. Redmond – Student, 651 No. Chorro St.
W. Boyce – Business Administration (Chairman)
An Alternative Proposal on Tenure

In the promotion, retention and tenure procedures on each campus only tenured faculty members shall serve on the various committees or otherwise participate in the formal recommendations through the appropriate channels to the President. The final campus decision shall be made by the President.

Examples: Faculty making the formal recommendations to the President will be tenured, except that Department Chairmen, Deans or Academic Vice Presidents, or other academic-administrative officers need not be tenured. The sources of their information, upon which they may base their recommendations, may be other tenured faculty, nontenured faculty, students, alumni, academic administrators, or any other appropriate source.

2. There shall be notice of the granting or denial of reappointment or tenure by the appropriate dates. Failure to receive such notice shall not be construed as either granting or denying reappointment or tenure; such granting or denial of reappointment or tenure must be a positive act. (Subject to #9)

3. The normal probationary period prior to the granting of tenure shall be four full years, except that the President may at his discretion and after appropriate consultation with tenured faculty grant an additional (fifth) probationary year appointment. If at the end of that fifth year it is considered that more time for evaluation is still needed, he may grant a final (sixth) probationary year
4. Those faculty members currently in probationary status and who have not yet received notification that tenure would be granted as of September 1, 1971, would continue under the previous regulations. However, at the discretion of the President and with the consent of the faculty member concerned such "grandfather clause" might be waived and the faculty member placed under the new regulations. Faculty members transferring from an existing State College to a newly established State College shall transfer their tenure rights.

5. A faculty member who held the rank of Associate Professor or Professor at any State College where he had tenure, and who transfers from that State College to another may be appointed with tenure or with such credit towards tenure as the President of the State College to which he transfers shall determine.

6. Service as a full-time lecturer may be counted toward tenure if the individual is reappointed without a break in service to an academic position to which academic tenure is accorded. For the rank of associate professor, a maximum of two years of full-time service as a lecturer may be credited toward tenure. Appointment to the rank of associate professor or professor from lecturer status will not be made without tenure. However, when a two-year probationary period for professor is required, one year of service as a lecturer may be credited toward tenure.

7. The President, in special circumstances, may at his discretion and after appropriate consultation with tenured faculty,
grant tenure to any probationary faculty member when in the judgment of the President such early granting of tenure would be advantageous to the institution.

8. These standards of notification shall be utilized by the California State Colleges:

1) Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service.

2) Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service.

3) At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.

These standards of notice shall also apply to the present Title 5 regulations with respect to notice and appropriate changes shall be made.

9. A faculty member may not be promoted to the rank of associate professor or professor without the prior or simultaneous according of tenure.