

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

San Luis Obispo, CA 93407  
ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of the  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MEETING

Tuesday, September 22, 1992  
FOB (47)-24B, 3:00-4:30pm

Executive Committee members in attendance: Charles Andrews, Barbara Andre, Michael Botwin, Ronald Brown, Charles Dana, Lynne Gamble, Reg Gooden, Timothy Kersten, Robert Koob, Barbara Mori, Wesley Mueller, David Peach, James Vilkitis, Jack Wilson.

Guest in attendance: Michael Suess.

Executive Committee members absent: Craig Russell

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:10pm.

I. Minutes: none

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none

III. Reports:

- A. Academic Senate Chair: none
- B. President's Office: none
- C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: none
- D. Statewide Senators: none

IV. Consent Agenda: none

V. Business Item(s):

This meeting was called to discuss "promotion eligibility" for the 1992-1993 academic year.

Suess reviewed the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) requirements which state that a person must receive four Merit Salary Adjustments (MSA's) before being eligible to apply for the "normal promotion" process. However, it appears at this time that MSA's will not be funded for 1992-1993, and faculty members who were recommended for a fourth MSA will be unable to meet the above criteria. Suess distributed a "Resolution on Promotion Eligibility, 1992-1993" (see attached) outlining an alternative to consider five academic years in rank prior to the effective date of the promotion in lieu of four merit salary adjustments. Suess noted that the CFA campus representative, James Conway, was in agreement with the provisions of the resolution; however, he wanted the committee to be informed that MSA's have not yet been denied but were still "up in the air" for this year. Due to the October 1, 1992 time line for distributing RTP information to departments, Suess requested Executive Committee endorsement of the resolution prior to its deliberation before the full Academic Senate (on October 13, 1992).

Gooden asked if an individual can receive a step increase without the accompanying salary compensation. Suess explained that step increases denote a promotion to the next "salary" step. Andrews inquired whether a change could be made to indicate "step increases" without this being necessarily tied to a "salary adjustment." Suess replied that this was not possible according to the provisions of the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM). Brown suggested that the matter of separating promotion recommendations from the actual funding of same be addressed at some point in the future.

Peach made a motion to move this recommendation to the full Senate at its first meeting (October 13) with the understanding that the resolution applied only to the 1992-1993 academic year and a

charge would be made to the Personnel Policies Committee to draft a statement which would deal with this situation in the future.

Andrews asked Koob if promotion funds were being allocated to the colleges in their budgets. Koob replied that a certain dollar amount is made to the colleges, but each college is responsible to budget the amount anticipated for promotions. The decision as to whether money is available in a college for promotions is determined at the dean's level. The Vice President for Academic Affairs is not in control of this. Brown asked if a recommendation not to promote could be made based on lack of funds. Koob stated there would be no support from the administration for this position. A person would be held culpable if this occurred. The deans have been instructed to consider promotions as separate from funding.

The wording in the resolution of the fourth WHEREAS was discussed and the following change was made for clarity:

It is not the intent of Academic Senate to ~~expect faculty to undergo a more rigorous review for "early promotion"~~ disqualify faculty from "normal promotion" because of lack of funding for merit salary adjustments,

In addition, the wording in the resolution of the RESOLVED clause was discussed and the following change was made for clarity:

~~That for the 1992-93 academic year, the eligibility criteria for "normal promotion" be based on whether the applicant has reached the maximum salary for a particular rank, or will complete five academic years in his/her current academic rank prior to the effective date of the promotion.~~

Academic rank faculty members and librarians who were recommended for their fourth merit salary adjustment for the 1992-93 academic year are eligible to apply for "normal promotion" as if the merit salary adjustment had been funded.

Suess will verify with the colleges that the list of faculty who would have been recommended for a step increase is accurate before being distributed.

The Executive Committee endorsed the "Resolution for Promotion Eligibility, 1992-93" with the two changes noted above, and moved that it be agendized for the October 13, 1992 Academic Senate meeting.

#### VI. Discussion:

The Chair asked Vice President Koob to discuss his plans to invite faculty to meet with him during Fall Quarter. These discussion groups of 50 or less, will be held to talk about the three challenges President Baker addressed in his Fall Conference speech. These three challenges are:

1. maintaining instructional quality;
2. maintaining faculty members awareness of their discipline and the need for professional development; and
3. maintaining and promoting an understanding of a multicultural society and the changes occurring in student composition.

During these informal discussions, faculty will be asked what they think of these challenges and what they think should be done to meet the challenges. A task force will then be formed to carry out the recommendations which will then be turned over to the administration for implementation. The first meeting is scheduled for September 30, 1992. A personalized letter will be sent to all faculty members and the meetings will be organized around their availability. Vice President Koob noted that this was a grassroots attempt to build faculty development and to have faculty suggest ways of implementing the challenges stated above. This is a direct response to the Strategic Plan.

Koob stated he is asking for opinions regarding the Strategic Plan before the Plan is approved by the faculty. If it is approved, he will then be in a position to implement it as soon as possible

thereafter. Botwin felt this was interfering with the faculty process for review/input to the Strategic Plan. Andrews disagreed and felt these three issues were not necessarily coupled to the Strategic Plan. Koob stated he did not want this to be perceived as interference and he would be willing to postpone the meetings until Winter Quarter if that were the case. Brown stated if these meetings were an attempt to sell something, he would see this as interference. Gooden did not perceive this as interference; however, he was concerned that many faculty may feel they are too busy to devote time to this and the strongest responses may come from articulate, opinionated individuals. This may not give the issues the full debate it might receive otherwise. Mueller stated he would prefer to see an implementation document that was based on the discussion of several faculty rather than special interest, high-level groups. Koob responded that the document would be brought into the normal governance process, and the recommendations would come to the Academic Senate before implementation.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:25pm.

Recorded by:



---

Margaret Camuso  
Academic Senate

## PROMOTION ELIGIBILITY 1992-93

Background Statement: The 1992-93 budget does not contain funds for merit salary adjustments (step increases) for faculty unit employees. Current eligibility criteria for "normal promotion" include four merit salary adjustments. Since some faculty are unable to secure a fourth step increase for 1992-93, they would not meet the criteria to be considered for "normal promotion." An alternative is to consider the period of five academic years in rank prior to the effective date of the promotion, in lieu of four merit salary adjustments.

WHEREAS, Section 342.2B.7 of the Campus Administrative Manual defines the eligibility criteria for "normal promotion" to associate professor or associate librarian when both of the following conditions hold:

(1) the applicant is tenured or the applicant is also applying for tenure.

(2) the applicant has received four Merit Salary Adjustments (MSA's) (while an assistant professor or senior assistant librarian) or the applicant has reached the maximum salary for assistant professor or senior assistant librarian.

WHEREAS, Section 342.2B.7b of the Campus Administrative Manual defines the eligibility criteria for "normal promotion" to professor or librarian as:

...the applicant has received four MSA's (while an associate professor or associate librarian) or the applicant has reached the maximum salary for associate professor or associate librarian.

WHEREAS, Merit salary adjustments are not funded for faculty unit employees for the 1992-93 fiscal year,

WHEREAS, It is not the intent of Academic Senate to disqualify faculty from "normal promotion" because of lack of funding for merit salary adjustments,

WHEREAS, Faculty promotion eligibility lists must be established by October 1, 1992, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: Academic rank faculty members and librarians who were recommended for their fourth merit salary adjustment for the 1992-93 academic year are eligible to apply for "normal promotion" as if the merit salary adjustment had been funded.

Endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate  
Date: September 22, 1992

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jack Wilson".

---

Jack Wilson, Chair  
Academic Senate