

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

FILE COPY

Executive Committee
Academic Senate Agenda
Tuesday, February 6, 1990
UU 220, 3:00-5:00 p.m.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>
Andrews, Charles	Acctg	Murphy, James (C)	IndTech
Bailey, Philip	Int VPAA	Murphy, Paul	Math
Borland, James	ConstMgt	Smith, Terry	SoilSci
Boynton, William	Acctg	Vilkitis, James (Secty)	NRM
Dobb, Linda	Library	Weatherby, Joseph	PoliSci
Freberg, Laura	Psy/HD	Zeuschner, Raymond	SpcCom
Gooden, Reg	PoliSci		
Kersten, Timothy	Economics		
Lutrin, Sam (VC)	StLf&Actvs		
Moustafa, Safwat	MechEngr		

Copies: Warren Baker
William Rife
Howard West

1.16.90
minutes
removed

- I. Minutes: Approval of the January 16, 1990 Executive Committee Minutes (pp. 2-5).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. President's Office
 - B. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
 - C. Statewide Senators
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. Resolution on Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Unit Employees-P Murphy, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee (pp. 6-13).
 - B. Resolution on Departmental Support for International Education at Cal Poly-Weatherby/Floyd (pp. 14-15).
 - C. Nomination of faculty to the Academic Planning Committee.
 - D. Nomination of faculty to the Multi-criteria Admissions Committee.
 - E. Nomination of faculty to the Selection Committee for Director of Admissions.
 - F. Vacancies:
 1. University Union Executive Committee (UEC) vacancy (replacement for Lynne Gamble)
 2. Academic Senate Committee vacancies:
SBUS Student Affairs
SSM Status of Women
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
Trustees' Resolution on "Development of Joint Doctoral Programs in Education" (pp. 16-20).
- VII. Adjournment:

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS- -89/
RESOLUTION ON
PERIODIC EVALUATION OF FACULTY UNIT EMPLOYEES

- WHEREAS, The Campus Administrative Manual (CAM) contains no procedures for Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Unit Employees; and
- WHEREAS, Such Periodic Evaluation is mandated in the Memorandum of Understanding between the CSU and Unit 3-Faculty; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the attached CAM 345 be added; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the current CAM 345 be renumbered to CAM 346.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Personnel
Policies Committee
Date: February 6, 1990

C.A.M. 345 PERIODIC EVALUATION OF FACULTY UNIT EMPLOYEES

A. Definition of Periodic Evaluation

A periodic evaluation of a faculty unit employee shall normally be required for the following purposes:

1. Evaluation of temporary faculty unit employees.
2. Evaluation of probationary faculty unit employees who are not subject to a performance review for retention. For example, a probationary faculty member who receives an initial two-year appointment will undergo a periodic evaluation during his/her first year.
3. Evaluation of tenured faculty unit employees who are not subject to a performance review for promotion.

B. Evaluation Procedures - see C.A.M. 341

C.A.M. 345.1 PERIODIC EVALUATION OF TEMPORARY FACULTY UNIT EMPLOYEES

A. Procedures (also see C.A.M. 341.1.A)

1. Full-time temporary faculty unit employees (e.g., full-time coaches and lecturers) appointed for the entire academic year must be evaluated during that year by a peer committee of the department or equivalent unit, the department head/chair and dean. Members of the peer committee chosen for the evaluation of full-time temporary faculty unit employees must be full-time, tenured faculty unit employees.
2. Part-time temporary faculty unit employees appointed for the entire academic year must be evaluated by the department head/chair. A peer committee evaluation is not required. However, full-time tenured faculty should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements and such statements shall be written and signed.
3. Any temporary faculty unit employee (full-time or part-time) appointed for one or two quarters are to be evaluated at the discretion of the department head/chair, the dean, or the department or equivalent unit. such an employee may request that an evaluation be performed. The request must be in writing and must be accompanied by an updated resume. The request must be submitted to the department head/chair by the established

deadline.

4. A written record of a periodic evaluation shall be placed in the temporary faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File. The temporary faculty unit employee shall be provided a copy of the written record of the evaluation.

B. Criteria (also see C.A.M. 341.1.B)

1. For temporary faculty unit employees with teaching duties, student evaluations of teaching performance shall be considered.

C.A.M. 345.2 PERIODIC EVALUATION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

A. Procedures (also see C.A.M. 341.1.A and C.A.M. 343.1.A)

1. Periodic evaluation of probationary faculty shall be conducted by the department Peer Review Committee, the department head/chair and the dean in any year in which the probationary faculty unit member is not subject to a performance review for retention.
2. A written record of a periodic evaluation shall be placed in the probationary faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File. A probationary faculty unit employee shall be provided a copy of the written record of the periodic evaluation.

B. Criteria (see C.A.M. 341.1.B and C.A.M. 343.1.A)

C.A.M. 345.3 ANNUAL EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY UNIT EMPLOYEES

A. Procedures

1. Tenured faculty unit employees who are eligible for a Merit Salary Adjustment and who are below Step 19 (or Step 11 for those on the designated market discipline salary schedule) and who are not applying for promotion shall be evaluated by the department head/chair and the dean.
2. A written record of this annual evaluation shall be placed in the tenured faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File, with a copy of this written record provided to the employee.

B. Criteria (see C.A.M. 341.1.B)

C.A.M. 345.4 PERIODIC EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY UNIT EMPLOYEES

A. Procedures

1. Tenured Professors (Librarians)

- (a) During the year in which a tenured professor (librarian) reaches Step 19 (or Step 11 for those on the designated market discipline salary schedule), s/he shall be subject to a periodic evaluation.

2. Tenured Assistant or Associate Professors (Senior Assistant or Associate Librarian)

- (a) During the year in which a tenured assistant or associate professor (senior assistant or associate librarian) has received a fourth Merit Salary Adjustment and/or has reached the maximum salary for a given rank, s/he shall be subject to a periodic evaluation if s/he does not apply for promotion.

3. Periodic evaluation of tenured faculty unit employees at any rank shall occur at least once every five years after the initial periodic evaluation. Performance reviews for promotion can serve as periodic reviews for the purposes of this section. More frequent periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty unit member may be requested by the employee, department head/chair or dean. After such a request, a periodic evaluation shall be conducted as soon as possible.

4. Periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty unit employee shall be conducted by an elected peer committee of the department or equivalent unit, and the dean. The peer committee members shall be tenured professors when evaluating professors and associate professors (librarians and associate librarians); and shall be tenured professors and/or associate professors (librarians and/or associate librarians) when evaluating assistant professors (senior assistant librarians).

5. A tenured faculty unit employee shall be provided a copy of the peer committee report of his/her periodic evaluation. The peer committee chair and the dean shall meet with the tenured faculty unit employee to discuss his/her strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for his/her improvement.

6. Copies of the periodic evaluation report shall be placed in the tenured faculty unit employee's

Personnel Action File, and shall be provided to the employee.

B. Criteria

1. The purpose of periodic evaluation of tenured faculty is to maintain and improve a tenured faculty unit employee's effectiveness.
2. See C.A.M. 341.1.B.

CAM 341.1. C. Post Tenure Peer Review

Schools and departments, with student participation, should develop procedures for peer evaluation of tenured faculty instructional performance including currency in the field, appropriate to university education. The procedures shall be compatible with the following University guidelines:

1. Annually, department heads and deans will be required to evaluate tenured Assistant Professors, steps 1 - 4; tenured Associate Professors, steps 1 - 4; and tenured Professors, steps 1 - 3, for merit salary adjustment purposes only. This will be accomplished by using pages 4 and 5, Form 109 (Faculty Evaluation Form).

Assistant Professors, step 5; Associate Professors, step 5; and Professors, steps 4 and 5, shall undergo post-tenure peer review at least once every five years. In addition, if a department head or dean has reason to believe that a faculty member is performing unsatisfactorily, a post-tenure peer review by the departmental full Professors shall be conducted as soon as possible.

2. Post-Tenure review of Professors
 - a. All Professors at Step 4 shall undergo a post-tenure peer review by the departmental tenured full Professors prior to June 1 of the academic year they reach that rank/step.
 - b. Peer review of tenured Professors, Step 5, shall occur at least once every five years after initial evaluation.
 - (1) Only departmental tenured full Professors are eligible to participate at the first level of peer review.

Revised November, 1980 |

Added November, 1980 |*

- (2) If the department has no tenured Professors, the evaluation shall be conducted only by the department head and dean. Consideration shall be given to student evaluations.
- (3) The criteria for post-tenure review of full Professors will be the same as for promotion to the Professor level, unless supplemental department or school criteria are approved.

3. Post-tenure peer review of Associate Professors

- a. During the academic year that a tenured Associate Professor reaches Step 5, one of the following two courses of action shall be taken:
 - (1) If the professor requests promotion consideration, the evaluation shall be conducted under established promotion procedures and criteria. Such evaluation will be considered as satisfying the requirements for post-tenure peer review.
 - (2) If promotion consideration is not requested, a peer review by the departmental professors shall be made in accordance with Board of Trustee policy.
 - (a) The criteria for post-tenure review shall be the same as for promotion to Associate Professor, unless supplemental department or school criteria are approved.
 - (b) If the department has no tenured Professors, the evaluation shall be conducted by the department head and dean. Consideration shall be given to student evaluation.
 - (c) Peer review of tenured Associate Professors, Step 5, shall occur at least once every five years.
- b. Although post-tenure peer review of Associate Professors below Step 5 is not required, such faculty shall arrange for periodic conferences with the department head and senior faculty for advice and assistance regarding progress toward promotion during the year they are at Step 3.

4. Post-tenure Review Assistant Professors

- a. During the academic year that a tenured Assistant Professor reaches Step 5, one of the following two courses of action shall be taken:
 - (1) If the professor requests promotion consideration, evaluation shall be under established promotion procedures and criteria. Such evaluation will be considered as satisfying the requirements for post-tenure review.
 - (2) If promotion consideration is not requested, peer review by the department Professors shall be made in accordance with Board of Trustee policy.
 - (a) The criteria for evaluation shall be the same as for the award of tenure, unless supplemental department or school criteria are approved.
 - (b) If the department has no tenured Professors, the evaluation shall be conducted by the department head and dean. Consideration shall be given to student evaluations.
- b. Post-tenure review of tenured Assistant Professors, step 5, shall occur at least once every five years.

5. The Faculty Evaluation Form 109 can be used in its present form or modified as appropriate to meet specific departmental or school needs. The peer evaluation may be in a written narrative form signed by the committee chairman or by individuals who reviewed the professor. The evaluation shall include the process used, the reasons for recommendations, and evidence in sufficient detail to validate the findings. In those instances where the consultative evaluations represent a consensus opinion signed by the committee chairperson, the filing of a minority report by committee member(s) whose opinions differ from the views expressed in the majority report should accompany the majority report at the time it is forwarded to the department head.
6. Post-tenure peer evaluations shall be forwarded to the department head no later than May 1. Department heads' and deans' evaluations should be completed prior to June 1, using Faculty Evaluation Form 109. The department head shall meet with each faculty member evaluated to discuss the results of the evaluations. If areas for improvement are identified, the department head shall advise the faculty member of avenues for assistance available within the department or university. The written evaluations shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file which is maintained in the school dean's office.

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS- -89/
RESOLUTION ON
DEPARTMENTAL SUPPORT FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AT CAL POLY

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of The California State University has urged that interested campus departments include reference to CSU International Program opportunities in the catalog (AS-1862-89/ACSP&AA); and

WHEREAS, A subcommittee of the Academic Council for International Programs has urged that the following language be included in campus catalog offerings by interested departments:

The department of (name) supports the concept of international education and encourages students to investigate opportunities for overseas study. Certain courses taken at CSU International Programs Study Centers in foreign countries are equivalent to courses in the department of (name) and may be used to fulfill some of the requirements for degree options offered by the department and/or certain general education requirements. Students should consult the International Programs Bulletin, available at (location), a departmental advisor, or the campus International Programs advisor for more information; and

WHEREAS, Students need to know which departments encourage an international education experience as part of the curriculum offerings; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University urge each interested department to include the suggested statement, or an appropriate statement, supporting international education in the departmental curriculum section of the catalog.

Joseph Weatherby and
Donald Floyd
Date: February 6, 1990

15-
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

(Item 13)

AS-1862-89/ACSP & AA
May 4-5, 1989

INCLUSION OF CSU INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS IN CAMPUS CATALOGS

- WHEREAS, The Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education has issued its report, "The Master Plan Renewed"; and
- WHEREAS, The Commission on the Pacific Rim has issued its report, "The Future of the Pacific Rim is Now"; and
- WHEREAS, Both of these reports stress the importance of "internationalizing" the California State University curriculum [Master Plan Renewed Report: Recommendation 13, item (3); and California Faces ... California's Future, Recommendation 38 "expanding international and multicultural education programs to enhance opportunities for developing understanding in these areas"; and Pacific Rim Report: Recommendations to internationalize the CSU curriculum from a Pacific Rim perspective (page 8)]; and
- WHEREAS, Students in the CSU have an excellent opportunity to study abroad in the International Programs and in numerous campus-based study-abroad semesters; there, however, appears to be a general lack of awareness of these programs; and
- WHEREAS, Although some students in the CSU might be aware of the study-abroad programs, they are often unaware of how the courses taken during these experiences can be applied to their General Education program, University Electives, and/or Major; and
- WHEREAS, The University Catalog is a valuable planning guide for both students and their parents; and
- WHEREAS, The University Catalog is an illustration of what is important in our curriculum; and
- WHEREAS, Department faculty have the responsibility for determining which courses satisfy their Major and General Education requirements within their discipline; and
- WHEREAS, We wish to indicate our support for the concept of our students having an international and multicultural perspective while at our Universities; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the campus Academic Senates to include CSU International Program courses in their campus catalogs in General Education and the Major for each department where the department or the appropriate program faculty or faculty committee approves.

APPROVED May 5, 1989



-16-

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

400 Golden Shore, Suite 134, Long Beach, California 90802-4275 • (213) 590-5578 or 5550, ATSS: 635-5578 or 5550

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Members, Academic Senate CSU
Chairs, Campus Academic Senates

DATE: January 18, 1990

FROM: Ray Geigle, Chair
Academic Senate CSU

SUBJECT: Trustee Resolution on "Development of Joint Doctoral
Programs in Education"

Attached is a resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees at its January meeting. You will note that the title refers to "Joint Doctorates" but that the resolution speaks to the "Independent Doctorate in Education." The report to the Board as included in the Trustee agenda, was on the CSU experience with Joint Doctorates. At the conclusion of the report by Vice Chancellor Kerschner, the Trustees focused their discussion not on joint doctorates, but on an independent doctorate in education. A motion was made by one of the Trustees that, if adopted, would have committed the CSU to "SEEK" an independent doctorate in education. In response to requests from the Executive Committee, the language of the resolution was changed to commit the CSU to "EVALUATE" an independent doctorate in education and directs CSU staff, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, to prepare an item for adoption in March that delineates the process for "ACHIEVING THAT GOAL."

The Executive Committee will work with Vice Chancellor Kerschner to draft an item that speaks only to the process by which the CSU could gain approval to offer the Independent Doctorate in Education for the March Board of Trustees' meeting. We will also work to prevent a vote until the May Board of Trustees' meeting on the substantive question of whether the CSU should legislatively seek to gain the right to offer the independent doctorate in education. Your advice on the substantive question is hereby requested.

The Statewide Academic Senate has considered this policy question previously as language was being developed for the Master Plan for Higher Education. Two resolutions, considered by the Senate in November, 1985 are attached to serve as background information for your discussion of the issue. Please note that item AS-1612 INDEPENDENT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN THE CSU failed but AS-1617 THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT passed.

The Academic Affairs Committee, through its Chair, Professor Hal Charnofsky, will be responsible for Statewide Academic Senate review of the proposal and welcomes advice from the Campus Academic Senates. In order to meet the Trustee timetable, we will have a first reading item on the issue at the Senate's March 1-2 plenary, and a final reading item at the May 3-4 plenary.

Thank you for your review of this item. Since we do not have a systemwide committee report on which to focus our discussion, the Executive Committee suggests that you begin with a consideration of the previous Statewide Academic Senate position that recommends the independent doctorate only under a set of specific conditions.

This item will be on the agenda of the February 8 meeting of the Campus Academic Senate Chairs. We look forward to hearing your preliminary advice at that time.

CSU Board of Trustees Meeting
January 9-10, 1990
Agenda Item 4

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
DEVELOPMENT OF JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the California State University evaluate an independent Doctorate in Education and to that end directs staff, in consultation with the Academic Senate Executive Committee, to prepare an action item for the March meeting to delineate the process to achieve that goal.

THE ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-1617-85/AA
October 31 - November 1, 1985

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT

- WHEREAS, The Chancellor's staff has prepared an "Outline of a California State University Mission Statement--Working Draft" which was presented as an information item to the CSU Board of Trustees in September, 1985; and
- WHEREAS, Committees of the Academic Senate of The California State University have participated in the development of the draft outline of the CSU Mission Statement and have continued to be involved in its revision; and
- WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees will consider in November, 1985 adoption of a resolution and accompanying new CSU Mission statement entitled, "The Mission of The California State University"; and
- WHEREAS, The California State University administration has agreed in a letter dated October 31, 1985, that should independent doctorates be offered in the CSU, they would be created and continued only with (1) separate and adequate funding for the program and (2) the approval of the faculty on the campus involved through the normal curricular development and review process; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University recommend that the CSU Board of Trustees adopt the resolution and accompanying CSU Mission statement entitled, "The Mission of The California State University," as contained in its November agenda, with these recommended changes:
- (1) Deletion, in the final paragraph of the Mission statement, of the words "in the field of education"; and replacement of the word "demand" with the word "need";
 - (2) Inclusion of an additional resolved clause in the Board of Trustees resolution which would declare the Board's intent that authorized independent doctoral programs be supported by separate budget line items; and
 - (3) Restoration, as paragraph 5 of Section II, the following:
"Requires of its advanced degree and credential recipients a depth of knowledge, completeness of understanding, and appreciation of excellence that enables them to contribute continuously to the advancement of their fields and professions."

APPROVED

October 31 - November 1, 1985

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-1612-85/FA
September 12-13, 1985

INDEPENDENT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN THE CSU

WHEREAS, The California State University occupies a distinct position in California higher education as a system of four-year institutions emphasizing excellence in undergraduate education; and

WHEREAS, The University of California has long been recognized as the research-oriented segment of California higher education which is best equipped to offer doctoral programs; and

WHEREAS, The offering of doctoral programs is known to require financial and other resources which are not currently provided the CSU; and

WHEREAS, The establishment and maintenance of any doctoral program necessitates teaching loads substantially lower than those existing in the CSU; and

WHEREAS, Historically there is no precedent to indicate that adjustment in resources and teaching load would be made to allow the development and maintenance of quality independent doctoral programs; therefore be it

(OVER)

ACADEMIC SENATE CSU
Page Two

AS-1612-85/FA
September 12-13, 1985

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of The California State University
oppose the creation of independent doctoral programs in the CSU;
and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly urge that all references
to independent doctoral programs in the CSU be omitted from the
CSU system's Mission Statement.

FAILED

10/31-11/1/85