

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93401
ACADEMIC SENATE

Executive Committee Agenda
February 18, 1986
FOB 24B, 1500-1700

MEMBER:

Ahern, James
Bonds, Robert
Botwin, Michael
Cooper, Alan F.
Fort, Tomlinson Jr.
Gamble, Lynne E.
Gooden, Reg H. Jr.
Hallman, Barbara

DEPT:

Ag Mgmt
LAC
Arch Engr
Biology
Adm
Library
Political Sci
History

MEMBER:

Kersten, Timothy
Labhard, Lezlie*
Lamouria, Lloyd H.
Olsen, Barton
Riener, Kenneth
Tandon, Shyama
Terry, Raymond

DEPT:

Economics
Home Econ
Ag Engr
History
Bus Admin
EL/EE
Mathematics

*for Larry Gay on leave Winter '86

Copies: Baker, Warren J.,
Irvin, Glenn W.

I. Minutes: Approval of the February 4 and February 7, 1986 Executive Committee Minutes
(attached pp. 2-7)

II. Announcements:

III. Reports

- A. President/Provost
- B. Statewide Senators

IV. Business Items:

- A. Formation of Ad Hoc Committee on Foundation Board Selection Procedures - Lamouria (attached pp. 8-11)
- B. Upcoming Academic Senate Elections - Kellogg (Chair, Elections Committee) (attached pp. 12-14)
- C. Modification of MPPP Rules & Regulations - Andrews (Chair, Personnel Policies Committee) (attached pp. 15-17)
- D. Internationalizing General Education - Stan Dundon (attached pp. 18-20)
- E. Resolution on Adequate Time for Consultation - Kersten (attached p. 21)
- F. Resolution on "Accuracy in Academia" - Kersten (attached p. 22)
- G. Resolution on Academic Senate Assigned Time- Lamouria (attached pp. 23-24)

V. Discussion Items:

- A. Review of Collegiality - Kersten (attached pp. 25-40))
- B. Long Range Planning Committee Status Report - French (Chair)
- C. Faculty Library Committee Status Report - Havandjian (Chair)

VI. Adjournment:

Memorandum

RECEIVED

FEB 3 1986

: Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
Academic Senate

Academic Senate

Date : January 31, 1986

File No.:

Copies: Richard Kranzdorf
Lezlie Labhard
Gail Wilson

From : Harvey Greenwald *HG*
Mathematics

Subject: Foundation Board of Directors

I have a concern about the process by which the Foundation Board of Directors are elected. I have enclosed the appropriate portion of the Foundation Bylaws concerning this process. My concern involves the fact that nominees are elected by the Board of Directors. This could result in a lack of broad representation on the Foundation Board of Directors.

I would like to request of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate that an ad hoc committee consisting of Richard Kranzdorf, Gail Wilson, and myself be formed to examine the election process of the Foundation Board of Directors and recommend possible changes in this process.

P.S. Lloyd, I asked Lezlie to be a member of the committee. She agreed to work with our committee but preferred to not be a member of the committee.

(c) Community Directors. At least one but no more than three Directors from the general population residing in the area served by said University, shall be selected and designated by the President of the University to serve one year terms on the Board of Directors. The University President shall disclose such selections and designations at the annual meeting of the Board of Directors or within a reasonable period of time thereafter. If the University President fails to disclose at least one such selection and designation within a reasonable period of time following the annual meeting of the Board of Directors, then the Board of Directors shall make a selection and designation of one such Director.

(d) Student Director. One Director from the student body of said University shall be selected and designated by the President of the University to serve a one year term on the Board of Directors. The University President shall disclose such selection and designation

Memorandum

FEB 11 1986

: School Caucus Chairs of Academic Senate

Date : February 10, 1986

Academic Senate

File No.:

Copies : Lloyd Lamouria, Chair
Academic SenateFrom : Bill Kellogg, Elections Committee Chairman
Agricultural Education Department

Subject: Upcoming Academic Senate Elections

In accordance with the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, please be informed of the need to elect senators to represent your school. The following list will inform you whose term will expire. Notice that your school may not necessarily be electing the exact number to serve as those positions who will expire. Should you notice a discrepancy after reviewing your school's list, you have until March 14th at 5:00 pm to bring this to my attention.

During the week of March 17, the Elections Committee will solicit nominations for the vacancies to be filled. Accepted nominations shall include a signed statement of intent (available from the Academic Senate Office) to serve from the candidate. You may desire to start encouraging your colleagues to consider serving on academic senate in preparation for the upcoming announcement. In addition to the election of senators, the School of Engineering will need to elect a representative to serve a one year term on the University Professional Leave Committee (UPLC), while the schools of Architecture & Environmental Design, Communicative Arts & Humanities, and Science & Mathematics will need to elect a representative for a two year term to the UPLC. The librarians will also need to elect their representative to serve a two year term as well.

Our campus will also need to elect two representatives to the Statewide Academic Senate. The procedures and timetable for election of CSU Academic Senate members will be the same as that for the Senate and University Personal Leave Committee, except that nomination shall be by petition of not less than ten (10) members of the faculty and shall include a consent to serve statement signed by the nominee. Statements are available from the Academic Senate Office. We will need to elect a one year replacement for Barton Olson to complete his term through 1987 and elect a three year appointment (1987-90) replacing Timothy Kersten. All newly elected senators and UPLC members will serve a two year term.

Terms expiring May 27, 1986

School of Agriculture - Elect 4

	<u>Dept.</u>
James Ahern	AM
John Phillips	CrSc
Kenneth Scotto	ASci/VS
Mary Wang	Food Sci

(Remaining senators: Lamouria, AE; Rice, SS; Vilkitis, NRM)

School of Architecture & Environmental Design - Elect 2

William Howard	CRP
Charles Quinlan	Arch

(Remaining senators: Bartels, LA; Botwin, ARCE; French, CRP; Rodger, CM)

School of Business - Elect 3

Dan Bertozzi, Sr.	Bus
Kenneth Riener	Bus
Artemis Papakyriazis	Econ

(Remaining senators: Andrews, Actg; Stebbins, Mgmt)

School of Communicative Arts & Humanities - Elect 3

Susan Currier	Eng
Nishan Havandjian	Journ
Clarissa Hewitt	Art
John McKinstry	SocS

(Remaining senators: Hallman, Hist; McKinstry, SocS; Michelfelder, Phil; Miller, Speech; Weatherby, Pols)

School of Engineering - Elect 5

Charles Dana	CSc
Eugene Fabricius	EL/EE
William Forgeng	Met Engr
Shyama Tandon	EL/EE

(Remaining senators: Hanes, ET; Kolhailah, Aero; Yong, ME)

School of Professional Studies & Education - Elect 5

Mary Lud Baldwin	Educ
Gary Field	GRC
Larry Gay	IT
Lynn Jamieson	PE
Mary Linda Wheeler	PE

(Remaining senators: Blum, GRC; Labhard, HE)

School of Science & Mathematics - Elect 4

Leslie Bowker	BioSci
Alan Cooper	BioSci
John Poling	Phys
Thomas Schumann	Phy

(Remaining senators: Rogers, Stat; Saenz, Phy; Terry, Math; Wright, Chem)

Professional Consultative Services - Elect 3

Robert Bonds	LAC
Nancy Loe	Lib
Robin Lofters	Fin Aids

(Remaining senators: Axelroth, CS/TEST; Gamble, Lib)

(Please note that article II.C 3 of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate state:
"There shall be no more than one Senator per department elected by any school
where applicable, until all departments within that school are represented. Any
department shall waive its right to representation by failure to nominate.")

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

ACADEMIC SENATE
805/546-1258

Date: February 12, 1986 **Attachment:** Procedures for MPPP Awards
To: Executive Committee
From: Charles Andrews, Chair
Personnel Policies Committee
Subject: MPPP Awards Procedural Discrepancies

The Personnel Policies Committee has determined there is a problem with the implementation of the current MPPP Awards procedures which needs to be brought to the attention of the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

It has been brought to the attention of the committee that a change in the established timelines occurred when the number of applications/nominations were known at the school level. The events appear to be as follows:

A school dean asked the department heads the number of applications/nominations they had received. The dean, upon ascertaining that fewer were filed than the school was allocated, proceeded to extend the timeline for the school MPPP Awards Committee to receive the nominations/applications from the departments.

Further, some department heads extended the timelines for receiving applications/nominations after having knowledge of the number of persons filing. Other department heads extended the filing timeline before it was known how many faculty were applying or being nominated.

When this issue first came before the PPC, there was substantial discussion without a formal position being taken. The discussion, at that time, did not identify a significant problem since the timelines for RTP actions have been flexible in many schools over the years. This is the position which I presented to the Executive Committee on January 14. The communication of the substance of the PPC discussion led at least one dean to extend the timelines in his school.

It is possible that the changes in the timelines may cause inequities in that a different timeline criteria is applied between faculty in a given department, in a school, and within the university. A person making a timely filing may be denied because a late application/nomination was selected to receive an award, is an example of the potential problem.

The issue which the Personnel Policies Committee brings to the Executive Committee is whether timelines for the MPPP Awards should be firm or flexible. This issue should be addressed in the context of the recommended changes which we are proposing in a separate communication for revising the procedures for the MPPP Awards (attached).

PROCEDURES FOR MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSIONAL PROMISE AWARDS

I. PREAMBLE

This policy is designed to implement Articles 31.11 through 31.19 of the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three (faculty), agreed to in December, 1984.

Equal Opportunity guidelines govern the granting of MPPP Awards just as they do all other significant personnel actions at Cal Poly -- neither nominating faculty nor subsequent review bodies may discriminate on the basis of race, religion, or gender.

II. ELIGIBILITY

All persons covered by the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three are eligible to apply for or be nominated for Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards.

No MPPP Awards shall be made except under criteria mutually developed and approved by the campus President and the body of the Academic Senate.

No MPPP Awards shall be granted without a positive recommendation from the particular school or appropriate administrative unit MPPP Committee.

III. CRITERIA

Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards shall be given: (1) retrospectively, to recognize excellence in one or more of the following areas -- teaching, professional activity, service and/or (2) prospectively, to promote excellence in one or more of the same areas.

Individual schools may choose whether to develop more specific criteria statements appropriate to their disciplines as long as they do not contradict the general university statement. They are also free to determine whether variable criteria are appropriate for different ranks. If school committees elect to elaborate their own criteria, they are urged to remain consistent with established school criteria for other personnel decisions. School statements of criteria should be distributed to faculty and forwarded to the Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee well in advance of any selection cycle.

IV. APPLICATIONS/NOMINATIONS

Applications and nominations for MPPP Awards must document a candidate's excellent performance in teaching, professional activity, and/or service. Or,

Applications and nominations for MPPP Awards must document proposed projects which would enhance a faculty member's performance in teaching, professional activity, and/or service. (Examples of some appropriate uses are: travel, research support, technical/clerical support, released time, etc.) Or,

Applications and nominations for MPPP Awards may combine the above.

V. SELECTION PROCESS

All members of Unit Three may submit applications or nominations to appropriate department heads by January 10. Past recipients are as eligible as all other unit members.

Every school or appropriate administrative unit shall elect a committee by January 15 to review applications/nominations for MPPP Awards. (Each department or other appropriate

unit elects one representative from faculty who have neither applied for nor been nominated for an award.)

Department heads shall forward all applications/nominations to school committees by January 20 . No rankings occur before nominations/applications reach school committees.

School committees will review nominations/applications without prejudice in favor of nominations as opposed to applications or vice versa, and by February 15 , forward to the dean or appropriate administrator no more than the same number of applicants/nominees as MPPP Awards allocated to the school/appropriate administrative unit. Only positive recommendations shall be forwarded. School committees need to complete and return data sheets furnished by the Academic Senate before they disband.

If the dean or appropriate administrator concurs with the recommendations, the awards shall be granted as recommended no later than March 1 .

If the dean/appropriate administrator disagrees with the recommendations forwarded by the faculty, both the recommendations of the dean or appropriate administrator and those of the faculty shall be forwarded to the President by March 1 .

By March 5 , the President shall transmit both sets of recommendations for review by the University Professional Leave Committee, which shall forward its positive recommendations by March 20 to the President for his/her consideration in making a final determination by April 1 .

If the UPLC makes a negative determination, the committee shall state their reason and shall return the denied application to the originating school committee with the request to forward a substitute recommendation to the dean/appropriate administrator, repeating the original process. Each level of review shall complete and forward its recommendations within five (5) working days.

If the President disagrees with the UPLC, he/she shall state their reasons and shall return the denied application to the originating school committee with the request to forward a substitute recommendation to the dean/appropriate administrator, repeating the original process. Each level of review shall complete and forward its recommendations within five (5) working days.

This process shall be repeated until all the awards are granted or until the nominee/applicant pool is exhausted.

Awards shall be granted no later than June 30.

IV. GENERAL PROVISIONS

- A. Recipients as well as the Personnel and Payroll Offices shall be notified in writing within five (5) days of concurrence.
- B. Awards shall be paid within 30 days of having been granted.
- C. When there is question as to the definition of the appropriate administrative unit for a particular application/nomination, said question shall be referred to the Personnel Policies Committee for resolution.
- D. All other questions about procedures and dates should also be referred to the Personnel Policies Committee.

State of California

California Polytechnic State Univ.
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

MEMORANDUM

To : Executive Committee,
Academic Senate

Date : 2/11/86
File No.:

Copies :

From : Stan Dundon *SB*

Subject : Senate Status for Committee on Internationalizing the
General Education

The attached memo, which you should already have received in a general mail distribution, describes a Department of Education funded project on which some thirty faculty are now working. Members of the committee have asked me to discuss with you whether there is some appropriate way for our committee to become a committee or subcommittee of the Senate.

It is our intention to continue this activity after the exhaustion of the grant support. Moreover there will be a need for continued faculty oversight of the proposed cluster of courses so that its coherence will be maintained without needless overlap and so that new modules and/or faculty can be considered as faculty and their interests change.

Since this activity explicitly excludes seeking new courses in general education and is intended to draw together courses from all appropriate general education areas without seeking any changes in the definition of those areas, it will not impinge on the authority or plans of the General Education Committee, except to carry out the spirit of its plans in several ways.

Location of our activity as an ad hoc subcommittee of the General Education Committee would be acceptable. If our work becomes as permanent as we hope and faculty become more familiar with it, we might consider permanent status. We will be grateful for any consideration you can offer this endeavor.

Stan - This information sheet is OK. What is needed is a cover memo outlining what is -19- and what is being requested of the Executive Committee. Let's go for it! Feb 2-6-86

State of California
California Polytechnic State Univ.
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

MEMORANDUM

Date : 2/5/86

To : Department Heads and All University Faculty

Copies : Provost Fort

From : Stan Dundon (for the Committee on Internationalizing the General Education)

Subject : INTERNATIONALIZING GENERAL EDUCATION

Project Description

In September 1985, a group of faculty began doing curriculum development work aimed at implementing one of the Faculty Senate approved goals of General Education: the provision of a broad education in international issues. Supported by President Baker and Provost Fort, this project obtained \$40,000 from the Department of Education with a likely addition \$40,000 for our second year. The overall director of this project is Dianne Long (Political Science).

The project has two principal parts: 1) development of three full length courses in international issues which had been newly required or function as options for a requirement in General Education; 2) development of a cluster of general education courses in every conceivable field by modifying existing general education courses in those fields to include treatment of an international issue appropriate to the course. The modification is to be in the form of a module of one to four class sessions. It may, and will often most likely be, an interdisciplinary module whose development may require the assistance of a faculty member from another department or school. But the intent is both to help students get a truly comprehensive general education in international issues and demonstrate the relevance of the specific discipline to important human issues of international dimensions.

Help Needed to Form Faculty Consensus on Topics:

The committee working on the cluster aspect of this project has reached the point of listing what topics constitute an adequate coverage of international issues in general education.

In this effort we need your help. We intend to hold informal meetings, open to all, every Wednesday, 3 P.M. & Friday, Noon, in the Staff Dining Room during February (and the first week of March if necessary.) We will attempt to reach a consensus on a framework which can determine adequate coverage of international issues, and do a preliminary listing of individual topics. After March 1st we hope to publish guidelines and criteria for submitting proposals for the development of modules which treat of one or more of those topics. We will allow a month for submission of proposals. After an early April deadline for submissions we will select about 20 modules for development. A deadline for full development of the modules will be set so that

the cluster can be initiated in Fall of 1986. The fully developed modules will be reviewed by the committee prior to awarding the \$325 awards. These awards are meant to be in the nature of "Certificates of Appreciation."

Rewards:

For those faculty who do the final module development and whose section of the given general education course thereby becomes part of the international issues cluster, we feel that the real reward will be to have a classroom of general education students who are already acquiring a comprehensive knowledge of international issues and who have selected your section for motives more profound than the hour the class is offered. At some later date we may be able to offer a minor in international studies as a further incentive to students to take their general education courses in the cluster.

For the many faculty who do not anticipate actually teaching the cluster courses but have been on our committee or wish to join it, we hope your reward will be what motivated you to join us, namely your concern that our graduates have a better grasp of the world beyond our borders and of the critical global issues that confront mankind.

How to Participate:

For the purpose of casting our nets as widely as possible and to gain a real sense of faculty consensus on what constitutes adequate coverage of international issues, we are asking you to share your ideas with us at the informal meetings. Stan Dundon will record the progress at the meetings and maintain communication among those who cannot attend regularly.

But since we have a deadline for reaching a consensus, if you wish to suggest a comprehensive taxonomy of international issues please try to attend the meetings in the first weeks of February. The taxonomies submitted so far would group issues on the basis of their relationship (either hindering or assisting) to the satisfaction of basic human needs. Fuad Tellew suggested that those needs can be divided first into the need for life (subsistence needs), self esteem and freedom. Dundon, working with submissions of about fifteen other faculty, divided the needs into physical needs and psycho-social needs and then a second division of these into subdivisions too numerous to mention here. Neither of these divisions should be read as containing a bias toward applied science or policy science topics since everyone who has communicated with us to date is well aware of the extreme importance of history, art, literature, religion and philosophy in understanding the people of the world and in seeking solutions to even their most pragmatic problems.

Please feel free to attend sporadically, to call Stan Dundon (MWF, 10:10 -11, Tues 3-4 ext. 2811, 2041 for messages) or submit written comments. Membership in the committee is not closed, although we are exploring faculty senate recognition of the committee which may entail a formal list of committee members.

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

AS-____-86

RESOLUTION ON
THE NEED FOR ADEQUATE TIME FOR CONSULTATION

- WHEREAS, Effective collegial governance of the university requires extensive consultation between administration and faculty and students; and
- WHEREAS, Effective consultation between the administration and faculty is often a time-consuming process; and
- WHEREAS, The Statement on Collegiality adopted by the Academic Senate of the California State University urges that adequate time be provided for full consultation between the administration and faculty on matters of importance to the university; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, Cal Poly State University, urge the President, the Chancellor of the California State University, and the Board of Trustees, to ensure that adequate time be provided for full and meaningful consultation between administration and faculty on all matters of importance to the university in accordance with the spirit of the Board of Trustees' Statement on Collegiality.

Proposed by:
The Executive Committee
on January 21, 1986

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-____-86

**RESOLUTION ON
"ACCURACY IN ACADEMIA"**

- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University consistently has defended academic freedom and responsibility within The California State University system; and
- WHEREAS, A new obstacle to academic freedom is an organization entitled "Accuracy in Academia" which has emerged in California and in the rest of the nation; and
- WHEREAS, This organization intends to monitor faculty classroom statements "for liberal bias"; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University oppose the efforts of "Accuracy in Academia" because it endangers academic freedom and responsibility within California Polytechnic State University; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University also urge the President of the University to oppose the efforts of "Accuracy in Academia".

Proposed by:
The Executive Committee on
February 7, 1986

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

Background:

The historical level of assigned time support for the Academic Senate has and continues to be 0.4 FTEF. Exceptions have occurred. There is a long and unbroken record of requests from former Senate chairs to administration explaining the need for recognition and the essentiality of increasing the FTEF for both the Senate chair and other functions. In June, November and again in December 1985, attempts (including a Senate Executive Committee resolution to the President) were all unsuccessful in an attempt to increase assistance for the current year.

Your present Senate Chair worked half time this past summer without recompense. Since September 1, 1985, he has, and continues to devote full time to the Senate on an allocation of 0.4 FTEF. The contribution of several of the standing committee chairs is also excessive and with no assigned time.

The need of Academic Senates is recognized state wide. The CSU Academic Senate per Resolution AS-1634-86/FA has urged the Chancellor to adequately support local academic senates.

For comparison purposes, data supplied by Dr. Joan G. Schroeder*, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU, Fresno, are as follows:

	<u>FRESNO</u>	<u>CAL POLY</u>
Staff Support	OA II, 12 mo	
Staff Support	CA III, 10 mo.	CA II, 12 mo.
Senate Chair	0.75 FTEF	0.4 FTEF
Senate Other	1.25 FTEF	

*Reconfirmed February 6, 1986

AS-____-86

**RESOLUTION ON
ACADEMIC SENATE ASSIGN**

*Should not
have been
included*

- WHEREAS, The charge by the Board of Trustees to both Administration is shared decision making at achievement; and
- WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees in their Statement on Collegiality assigned prime collegial governance responsibilities to faculty; and
- WHEREAS, Implementation of faculty prime collegial governance responsibilities requires significant staff and FTEF support; and
- WHEREAS, Included in the document, Administration of General Education and Breadth, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, and approved by President Baker on April 4, 1984, is the statement that the Chair of the General Education and Breadth Committee shall receive appropriate assigned time; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That President Warren J. Baker be urged to support the following requests for assigned time to better facilitate Academic contributions to campus governance:
1. Effective Summer Quarter 1986
- 0.25 FTEF for Senate Chair
 2. Effective for Fall, Winter, Spring 1986-87
- 0.75 FTEF for Senate Chair
- 1.25 FTEF for other Senate needs (assignments based upon recommendation of Academic Senate Executive Committee to the Provost)

Proposed by:
Lloyd H. Lamouria
February 6, 1986

ATTACHMENT TO: AS-1529-84/FA

REVISED 3/14/85

COLLEGIALLY IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

COLLEGIALITY IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

The smooth and effective operation of a complex multipurpose university system requires a spirit of collegiality that both reflects and fosters mutual respect among all groups within the system. Collegiality consists of a shared decision-making process and a set of attitudes which cause individuals to regard the members of the various constituencies of the university as responsible for the success of the academic enterprise.

Fundamental to this concept is the understanding that a university is a community of scholars who, out of mutual respect for the expertise and contributions of their colleagues, agree that shared decision making in areas of recognized primary responsibility constitutes the means whereby a university best preserves its academic integrity and most effectively attains its educational mission.

During the past two and one half decades, The California State University evolved from what had been a collection of teachers' colleges operated by the State Department of Education into one of the largest university systems in the world. This development brought profound changes in the organization, size, and mission of the nineteen institutions. The California State University has emerged as a complex institution with multiple, and sometimes conflicting, goals. These goals include providing an outstanding education for its students, assuring equal access for all qualified students, maintaining maximum opportunities for faculty professional development, protecting freedom of inquiry, advancing the cause of equal opportunity and affirmative action, and planning effectively for changing social, economic, and demographic realities. Achieving and reconciling these goals constitute a considerable challenge.

In The California State University, governance must reconcile two, often conflicting, types of authority. The faculty, by virtue of its expertise, has a responsibility for resolving a wide range of academic issues, including curriculum planning, peer evaluation, and academic policy. The Board of Trustees, and administrators acting on its behalf, has a responsibility to oversee the university in accord with law and administrative code. The exercise of these legitimate responsibilities sometimes has led to conflict in university governance.

The state of mind of participants in collegial decision making is an important determinant of the success of the process. Participants should consider one another as colleagues and should respect each other's individual expertise and contributions. The adversarial implications of collective bargaining terminology must be left at the bargaining table and the grievance hearing and must not enter into the collegial decision-making process. Academic administrators should consider themselves "management" only in the context of collective bargaining.

Critics sometimes compare the functioning of a university to that of private enterprise, but such analogies are misleading. The basic objectives of a

business are to maximize profits, to produce a measureable commodity at a minimal cost, and to increase its share of the market; a university strives for alternative and often conflicting achievements. Because of these differences, and because of the special role of faculty and students, decision making in a university is a more diverse process than that of private industry. A collegial approach to decision making is the means whereby the fundamental values of the university can be preserved, its conflicting objectives balanced, and its legal obligations to the state met.

Collegiality in the modern public university recognizes that the faculty, the board of trustees, and the administration are not the only entities which should participate in university decision making. Student views are particularly important on questions of curricular activities, university recreational events, and student facilities planning. Obviously, students should participate when decisions are being made regarding curriculum development, program initiation or discontinuance, grading standards and practices, academic disciplinary policies, and student conduct codes.

Alumni, whose interest in and closeness to the university are recognized, also must have the opportunity to communicate their concerns and ideas to the university. The university community recognizes the vital help alumni give to it by fund raising, political action, suggestions for educational improvement, and support for community activities sponsored by the university (concerts, dramatic events, athletic events).

Collegial decision making encourages the constituencies within the university to participate in ways appropriate to their knowledge and responsibility. As the process proceeds, the parties should be sensitive to the concerns of others and should avoid acting unilaterally.

This document is part of the continuing efforts by the Academic Senate to develop appropriate governance procedures. Its formulation was precipitated by: (1) the concern of faculty, administrators, and students about how best to meet the primary function of The California State University--excellence in classroom instruction--within the context of providing increased access to all segments of society in the state; (2) the widely-held belief by the faculty that some of its prerogatives and professional responsibilities have been abrogated; (3) the emergence of collective bargaining as an operational reality in The California State University; (4) the significant changes in the administration's view of its function as illustrated in the adoption of the Management Personnel Plan in 1983; and (5) a continued sense of frustration among faculty, and perhaps administrators and students, over the inability to develop a coherent, shared view of the university and its governance.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF COLLEGIAL PATTERNS OF DECISION MAKING

Shared decision making in universities is unique among the administrative systems of large, modern organizations. Universities are complex, pluralistic institutions. Their structures, including their power structures, are loose, ambiguous, and constantly changing. In the evolution of modern universities, greater authority and responsibility have been granted to faculty than most employees in private industry or government service enjoy. The historical origins of faculty authority and responsibility can be found in the universities of the late medieval period.

EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE PATTERNS

The often cited ideal of the university as a free, independent community of scholars has seldom existed in reality. From their inception in medieval Europe, universities have contained four competing authorities: faculty, internal administration, students, and external lay governing bodies. There is no consistent historical precedent from the medieval period favoring the exclusive authority of one over the others.

The universities of northern Italy and of Paris, dating from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, created the pattern for subsequent universities. In the case of Paris, especially, the masters or faculty of these institutions generally came to control the curriculum. By the fourteenth century, however, ultimate authority resided with external bodies created to protect the interests of those--whether papal, monarchical, or municipal--who authorized the existence of the university and who, in many cases, paid the faculty. Protestant universities created after the Reformation did not significantly depart from this pattern. The Calvinist founders of universities such as Geneva, Leyden, and Edinburgh subscribed to the Calvinist belief that all social institutions, including universities, should be overseen by laymen. They therefore created governing boards with final responsibility. However, they also made specific provision for initial faculty authority in academic matters.

The English universities of Oxford and of Cambridge followed the continental pattern. While their charters provided for external boards ("visitors"), they also dramatically extended the authority of the faculty who elected the heads of the colleges and were constituted as a formal governing body exercising internal legislative powers. For some two hundred years, beginning about 1650, the faculty ran the colleges of these universities almost entirely free of external interference. In 1850, however, the English government stepped in and began to change the organization of Oxford and Cambridge; by 1870 the faculty had lost much of its power to rectors and lay boards. The charters for every other English university founded in the preceding two centuries already had permitted strong external control through governing boards, though most included provision for faculty responsibility in educational matters.

The German universities of the nineteenth century broke from the tradition of external governing boards. Prior to that time, German universities had been subject to strong control by civil authorities. The University of Berlin, founded in 1810, set a new standard for the governance of German Universities; the University's founders deliberately granted complete authority for academic matters to the faculty, hoping thereby to create a true community of scholars, free to study and teach without external control. The University of Berlin and subsequent German universities were governed by faculty boards composed of full professors who elected the rectors and deans. Civil authorities retained powers of faculty appointment and salaries, but the faculty had complete control over internal matters. Greatly admired by academics in other countries, these German universities provided a model for the transformation of American universities in the late nineteenth century. They also form the historical basis for the modern view that a university is a community of scholars and that the faculty should properly have primary responsibility for academic matters.

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE PATTERNS IN THE UNITED STATES

Prior to the Civil War, university governance in the United States drew upon European and English patterns. The charter of Harvard College (founded in 1636) provided for a "Board of Overseers," and the charters of all subsequent American universities contained similar provisions. Those who founded universities retained control over them and exercised that authority through rectors. At the same time, the Calvinist pattern of faculty control of academic matters and the model of Oxford and Cambridge resulted in significant delegation of responsibility to the faculty. Both Harvard and the College of William and Mary (founded in 1693) originally had dual boards, faculty and trustee, an arrangement that ensured significant faculty involvement in governance. Over time, however, the growth of the power of the external boards resulted in a decline in faculty authority.

The tradition of strong trustee authority continued into the nineteenth century. There were some exceptions: Yale University (founded in 1701) provided for extensive faculty control, and Thomas Jefferson made specific provisions for faculty control of the curriculum when he founded the University of Virginia (1819). Throughout the nineteenth century, patterns of governance varied from university to university depending upon individual traditions and the style of trustee boards, rectors or presidents. Universities were simple organizations, faculties were small, and the curriculum was standard. The faculty constituted nearly the entire university staff and was generally conceded to have some responsibility for curriculum. Trustee authority, however, was supreme. No American university resembled the Oxford-Cambridge model of a corporation of research and teaching fellows; none emulated the German model of near-complete control by faculty.

These conditions changed dramatically after 1860. Over the next four decades, a revolution in American higher education accompanied the emergence of industrial, urban, multi-ethnic America, so that the universities of 1900 bore little resemblance to those of 1860. Universities grew larger and structurally more complex, reflecting changes in the curriculum, especially the emergence of majors and electives.

The increasing size of universities and the need of university presidents and trustees to make informed decisions regarding increasingly diverse and specialized activities, prompted the creation of middle-level administrative units and officers in a fashion analogous to the simultaneous appearance of "middle management" in the concurrently emerging industrial corporations. At the same time, the appearance of academic departments, each organized around an increasingly specialized discipline, brought a decentralization of authority over academic matters; the downward shift of such authority increased the power of the faculty, particularly in the older, elite, liberal arts institutions. Simultaneously, there came an even greater increase in the power of university presidents, who began to exercise many responsibilities formerly wielded by external boards. Trustees retained legal authority but, due to the growing size and complexity of universities, they found themselves increasingly dependent upon the university president to summarize information and to present policy proposals, and the trustees thereby became more and more remote from the details of administration.

By the end of the century, it was generally recognized that the faculty had primary responsibility for academic matters. William Rainey Harper, president

of the University of Chicago from 1891 to 1906, stated that it was the "firmly established policy of the Trustees that the responsibility for the settlement of educational questions rests with the Faculties." This authority found organizational expression in the creation of academic senates during the 1890s. Cornell University established the first senate, composed of the president and full professors, in 1889.

By 1900 American universities were organized much as they are today. Changes since then have been largely the result of an increase in size, structure, and complexity. The rapid growth of universities served to reinforce the patterns of the second half of the nineteenth century. Faculty tended to lose responsibility in administrative areas to presidents and to a rapidly increasing number of middle-level administrators. At the same time, the growing size and complexity of universities necessitated greater delegation of authority over educational matters to faculty and academic departments where expertise would facilitate decision making and maximize the academic integrity of the university.

While the tradition of faculty authority over educational policy has been characteristic of elite, private institutions since the late nineteenth century, the past half century also has seen a significant movement toward collegial governance in publicly supported colleges and universities. In 1980, the Association of California State University Professors published a list of a hundred colleges and universities in the United States in which the faculty had been granted authority in academic, educational, and professional matters. Among the many state-supported institutions on the list are the University of California, the University of Illinois, the University of Michigan, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Texas, and the University of Washington.

The growth of faculty influence in university governance accelerated after World War II. Faculty increasingly have come to regard themselves as "professionals" with expertise which, along with tradition, justified a major role in educational policy, research, personnel decisions, athletics, libraries, and auxiliary organizations. They see their authority as "functional," i.e., based upon competence, and, as professionals, they believe their standards, integrity, and dedication are sufficient to justify their primary control of academic policy.

This professionalism, combined with the tradition of faculty governance, produced by the 1960s a general acceptance of the ideal of a "collegial" university administrative structure based upon meaningful consultation within a formal governance structure on all matters of educational policy. The extent of demonstrated collegiality, however, varied among universities. If the influence of the faculty had generally grown, so also had the size of university administrations. Thus, there developed two bureaucracies within most large universities: the administration (president, vice-presidents, provosts, and deans) and the faculty governance structure (senates, councils, and committees). The potential for conflict is inherent in such a bifurcated organization, but the spirit and reality of collegiality between administrative professionals and academic professionals, despite their correspondingly different values based on varied responsibilities, can lead to satisfactory resolution of these conflicts.

GOVERNANCE PATTERNS IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Preserving shared governance (collegiality) in The California State University is possible despite the existence of a bifurcated decision-making structure. This structure is established in law and administrative code. The sub-chapter of Title 5 which considers "Educational Programs" defines "Appropriate Campus Authority" as "the president of the campus acting upon the recommendation of the faculty of the campus." Similarly, state legislators noted in Section 3561-b of the Higher Education Employee Relations Act that:

the Legislature recognizes that joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of such institutions . . .

Most recently the concept of joint decision making was expressed in the statement by the Academic Senate of The California State University on "Responsibilities of the Academic Senate Within a Collective Bargaining Context" which received the endorsement of the Chancellor and some campus senates and presidents.

RECENT CHANGES IN GOVERNANCE PATTERNS

When, in 1960, through the Donahoe Higher Education Act, the State of California transformed what had started as a few small-sized and medium-sized teachers' colleges into the multi-purpose California State University system (now one of the largest systems of higher education in the nation), the institutions began receiving closer legislative scrutiny of both budget and program. An increased centralization of administration brought a greater need for information and a greater emphasis on reporting responsibilities.

Ironically, some university officials have adopted a hierarchical managerial approach to the administration of universities at the very time when such management increasingly is seen as outmoded in private industry. This managerial approach is prone to regard collegiality in the Weberian sense as inefficient and imprecise. Administrators who see themselves as "managers" of the university, emphasize "resource management" and "efficiency" and feel frustrated by collegiality because it does not allow them to do their job unfettered by the faculty. In many cases, such administrators lose touch, or are perceived by the faculty as having lost touch, with the unique character of university governance and with the very purpose of the university.

Faculty are frustrated and ultimately alienated by demonstrations of hierarchical management. Like all professionals, faculty do not comfortably accept managerial control. The hallmark of a professional is self-direction; such an individual is not susceptible to being "managed." Nor are faculty inclined to regard managers as colleagues, thus further reducing the level of mutual respect necessary for collegiality.

When hierarchical management occurs, a line is drawn between the faculty, who see themselves as defending the traditional values of higher education and the academic integrity of the institution, and the administrative managers, who see themselves as fostering the welfare of a large, complex "business." This split has occurred on many campuses in the United States, and examples can be found in The California State University system.

This erosion of the spirit of collegiality has helped introduce, and on occasion has been exacerbated by, collective bargaining in higher education. Collective bargaining in higher education is the direct product of (1) the remarkable increase in the size of universities in the United States and the appearance of "multiversities" (over 200,000 full-time faculty positions were created in the 1960s alone), (2) the shift to professional management techniques, and (3) fiscal retrenchments made necessary by reduced budgets. Because of these developments, some faculty across the nation, including those in The California State University, embraced unionization as a means to supplement - and occasionally supplant - patterns of academic governance and collegiality. As a result, the traditional division between faculty and administrators recently has grown wider on some campuses. Presidents, instead of being first among their academic peers, too frequently appear to be managers and chief executive officers. Faculty who once took pride in the professorial ideal of unselfish and underpaid dedication to the university and to teaching and research increasingly are now inclined to regard the same issues as "working conditions." The institutions and the students of The California State University are the losers.

MAINTAINING AND IMPROVING SHARED DECISION-MAKING IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The Academic Senate of The California State University does not believe that the shared decision making of the collegial model and the shared decision making of the collective bargaining mode are inherently incompatible. They represent different approaches to different types of decisions. By outlining the types of decisions appropriate to the collegial process and the usual steps involved in the collegial process for these decisions, the Academic Senate hopes that this statement will help to keep separate the two approaches to decision making and simultaneously will help to maintain and to improve the collegial process of shared decision making. The three major types of decisions to be discussed below are those involving the curriculum, those involving other aspects of academic policy, and those involving the faculty itself.

COLLEGIALITY IN CURRICULAR DECISIONS

The University's curriculum is central to the operation of the institution, and is the principal concern of the faculty. The curriculum is determined within the framework of established educational goals. Although there is great diversity in The California State University system, all campuses must conform to general policies established by law and by The California State University Board of Trustees. But within those limits each campus develops its own mission statement which is the product of faculty and administrators engaging in a collegial process.

The faculty have a professional responsibility to define and offer a curriculum of the highest academic quality. In some fields, this professional responsibility is exercised within accrediting guidelines developed and enforced by professional associations. This professional responsibility cannot, by its very nature, be delegated. The faculty therefore have primary responsibility for curricular recommendations to the president. Normally, the president will take the advice and recommendations of the faculty on

curriculum matters. Faculty appropriately have this responsibility because they possess the expertise to judge best whether courses, majors, and programs are worthy of scholarly standards of learning.

Among curricular decisions for which faculty should have primary responsibility are:

1. The initiation of new academic courses and programs, and the discontinuance of academic courses and programs.
2. Course content, including choice of texts, syllabus design, assignments, course organization, and methods of evaluating students.
3. The designation of courses as non-degree applicable, lower or upper division, or graduate level.
4. The content of the general education program, within systemwide guidelines. Faculty should designate appropriate courses and establish the requirements for completion of the program. Faculty should be responsible for review and revision of the program.
5. The adoption, deletion, or modification of requirements for degree major programs, minor programs, formal concentrations within programs, credential programs, and certificate programs.
6. The establishment of minimum conditions for the award of certificates and degrees to students, and the approval of degree candidates.
7. Recruitment decisions affecting curriculum.

Since any curricular decision affects the primary mission of the university, the education of students, the decision-making process demands student involvement in developing the curriculum.

Although practices on the various campuses will differ, in general, decisions affecting curriculum will proceed through a process of (1) initiation by a faculty member or academic administrator, (2) approval by a department committee, (3) approval by curriculum committees at one or more levels, (4) approval by other relevant committees (general education, graduate programs, interdisciplinary), and (5) approval or review by the campus senates. The recommendation is then forwarded to the president.

The major limitations on faculty autonomy in curricular decision making include constraints related to the campus mission, budgets, staffing limitations, and the general policies of The California State University system. Consultation among faculty and administrators should ensure that faculty are well aware of both the constraints on, and the possibilities for, program development and innovation. Faculty can be expected to make responsible judgments if they are in close consultation with administrators and thus kept knowledgeable of developments affecting curricular matters.

COLLEGIALITY IN ACADEMIC POLICY DECISIONS

Because the university's curriculum is of central concern to the faculty, and because faculty have the primary responsibility in curricular decisions, it follows that faculty should have the major voice in decisions which closely affect the curriculum, access to the curriculum, or the quality of the curriculum. "Academic policy" in this context refers to University policies and procedures which affect the curriculum. All of the following are examples of academic policy:

1. Criteria, standards, and procedures for adoption, deletion, or modification of degree major programs, minor programs, formal concentrations within programs, credential programs, and certificate programs.
2. Grading practices and standards.
3. Criteria, standards, and procedures for earning credit or satisfying requirements outside the classroom, e.g., competency examinations for English composition and in U.S. history and government, credit by examination, or credit for experiential learning.
4. Both short-run and long-range planning, including definition or modification of the campus mission statement, determination of the general scope and relative size or priority of campus programs, modifications of the campus academic master plan, annual campus allocation of faculty positions to schools or other units, and annual campus budget allocations.
5. Criteria, standards, and procedures for evaluating programs, the quality of instruction, faculty currency, and all other evaluations of the quality of the curriculum or of instruction.
6. Campus policies which govern resources which support or supplement the curriculum, especially the library and research facilities.
7. Campus policies which govern auxiliary institutions which support or supplement the curriculum, especially the campus foundation and the campus bookstore.
8. Student affairs policies, especially those governing financial aid, advisement, learning services, Equal Opportunity Programs, and related services which determine the extent to which students can avail themselves of the curriculum.
9. Campus and system policies governing withdrawal, probation, reinstatement, and disqualification which affect access to the curriculum and which can affect program quality.

10. Co-curricular activities, especially those which increase the likelihood that students will benefit fully from the curriculum or those which distract students from the curriculum, including intercollegiate athletic programs and the relationship of those programs to the academic program and mission of the campus.
11. The academic calendar, including the first and last days of instruction and the scheduling of final examinations.

Faculty and administrators recognize that such policy decisions dramatically affect the quality of education afforded to students and agree that these decisions will involve students.

The process of academic policy-making will vary from one campus to another, and may vary from one type of decision to another on the same campus. Collegial patterns of decision making, however, should be followed in all instances. On every California State University campus, the full faculty and the faculty's representative body, the campus senate/council, are the agencies for collegial decision making. Some types of decisions may be made directly by the campus senate/council. In other instances, the faculty or campus senate/council may create a special body to develop academic policy in some area; if so, that body should include at least a majority of faculty representatives, chosen either by direct election or by the campus senate/council.

In the case of curricular decisions, the faculty should usually be the initiator of policy, within the constraints of budget, law, and system policy. By contrast, in the case of academic policy, proposals for changes in policy or for new policy may arise from academic administrators. The Chancellor or Board of Trustees may designate campus administrators as responsible for implementation of systemwide policies. In every instance, collegiality requires that the academic administrator work closely with the appropriate faculty representatives. When a change in policy or a new policy is needed, the faculty should be invited to participate fully in framing the policy. When an academic administrator presents a policy question to the faculty, the faculty should give it full consideration and the academic administrator should participate as a colleague in order to arrive at agreement. Where there are differences of opinion, compromise should be sought. All academic administrators should be constantly alert to the policy implications of their decisions. If a decision has policy dimensions or implications, or if it may have policy dimensions or implications, the academic administrator should bring the matter to the attention of the appropriate faculty representatives.

COLLEGIALITY IN FACULTY AFFAIRS

The faculty's professional competencies (derived from academic training, pedagogic experience, and continuing professional development) must play a significant and often decisive role in decisions regarding curriculum and academic policy. It is also the faculty who implement academic plans, programs, and curricula. Policies and procedures used in building, maintaining, and renewing the university faculty are vital determinants of the quality of the education the university provides to its students and to society.

The professional competencies that are central to curricular and academic policy decisions should be comparably decisive and significant in the implementation and genesis of faculty personnel policies, procedures, and criteria. Recommendations regarding hiring, retention or nonretention, awarding of tenure, promotion in rank, and disciplinary actions are best left to faculty who are technically competent in their disciplines and in pedagogy, and who are in the best position to observe and make judgments on such matters as faculty performance and the specific staffing needs of academic programs.

Academic administrators may propose changes in faculty affairs policies. Proposals from administrators should be forwarded to the appropriate faculty committee for review and action in accordance with normal policy development procedures. The administrator should be invited to meet with the committee to discuss the proposal.

"Faculty affairs," in this context, refers to those decisions regarding personnel policies, procedures, and criteria which have a potential impact on the quality of the curriculum. The following are examples of such faculty affairs decisions:

1. The establishment of criteria and standards for hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion.
2. The hiring of new faculty members, including the establishment of qualifications, development of procedures for implementing university policies such as affirmative action, evaluation of candidates, and the recommendation to the appropriate administrator.
3. The granting of tenure to faculty members, including the establishment of criteria and standards, the evaluation of candidates for tenure, and the recommendation to the appropriate administrator.
4. The development of appropriate criteria and standards for layoff and retrenchment.
5. The promotion of faculty members, including establishment of criteria and standards, the evaluation of candidates for promotion, and the recommendation to the appropriate administrator.
6. The selection of department chairs, including establishment of the election process and of criteria and standards, and the recommendation to the appropriate administrator.
7. The selection, evaluation, and retention of all academic-administrators (i.e., those administrators who also hold an academic appointment and who have the potential for exercising retreat rights to a faculty position), including establishment of qualifications, composition of the search committee (which should always include a majority of faculty representatives), evaluation of candidates for appointment, and recommendation to the appropriate administrator.

8. Recommendations regarding the selection, evaluation, and retention of non-academic administrators whose duties involve substantial influence on the curriculum.

Obviously, while evaluating faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure, committees must take into account student perceptions.

The process of collegial decision making in faculty affairs decisions will vary somewhat, depending on the type of decision. In decisions involving hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion, the criteria and standards shall normally be determined through the campus senate/council and implemented through departmental committees and other appropriate faculty committees at levels above the department. Faculty committees must abide by all California State University and campus policies, such as affirmative action requirements. Administrators should assume that faculty committees are best qualified to judge the teaching effectiveness and other merits of the candidates; administrators should decide contrary to faculty recommendations only if there is clear indication of violation of system or campus policies or clear indication that the faculty committee failed to consider relevant information, in which instance, the administrator should provide the faculty committee with written reasons for the decision and should refer the matter back to the faculty committee for reconsideration.

Department chairs have a substantial impact on the quality of the curriculum as well as on the quality of professional life. Because of their key role in implementing a range of decisions, department chairs should be acceptable to both the faculty of the department and to the university's administration. The Senate should develop campus policy defining the minimum guidelines to follow in the selection of department chairs. When faculty act within those guidelines to recommend a candidate for appointment, administrators should assume that the faculty are best able to judge the effectiveness and merits of the candidates; administrators should deny a faculty choice only for cause and should explain fully any such decision to the faculty in question. Administrators should not impose a chair upon a faculty against its wishes except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be clearly stated in writing.

Because most academic administrators hold both academic positions and administrative positions, they have the option of exercising "retreat rights" and thereby becoming members of the instructional faculty. Academic administrators also have an impact on the curriculum. To maintain the quality of the instruction, faculty members should be closely involved in the evaluation and recommendation of candidates for academic administrative positions, both to evaluate the qualifications of the candidates should they ever exercise retreat rights and to evaluate the fitness of the candidates to make crucial decisions affecting the curriculum.

CONCLUSION

Authority in the modern public university derives from two quite different sources: (a) from the knowledge of the subject matter and from the pedagogic expertise of the faculty and (b) from the power vested by law and administrative code in governing boards and administrators. The collegial decision-making process evolved nearly a century ago as a means of reconciling these two types of authority. Collegial governance must resolve conflict within the university, while preserving respect and understanding among the faculty, trustees, administrators, students, and alumni.

Central to collegiality and shared decision making is tolerance, which might be defined as a civil regard for differing opinions and points of view. Tolerance welcomes diversity and actively sponsors its opinions. The collegium must be the last public bastion of respect for individuals, whether they are members of the faculty, student body, staff, alumni, administration, or board of trustees.

The faculty must exercise its authority responsibly and recognize the legitimacy of administrative authority. If faculty members fail to act responsibly, academic administrators have an obligation to intervene. If an academic administrator fails to act responsibly, the faculty is professionally obligated to seek rectification of the problem. At all times, the various entities should try to reach an accommodation which is sensitive to the concerns of the university's constituencies.

Academic administrators and faculty representatives may not always be able to achieve consensus, even when they approach a problem in a properly collegial state of mind and when they exert their best efforts to achieving consensus through rational dialogue. In such circumstances, the appropriate administrator should meet with faculty representatives to discuss their differences. The more closely a decision affects the curriculum, the more the administrator should defer to the views of the faculty. Administrators should reject faculty proposals if the proposals are contrary to system policy or law or if they cannot be implemented due to budgetary constraints, but administrators should not reject faculty proposals merely out of differences of opinion. When there is disagreement on an issue, all parties should undertake a serious reconsideration of their positions.

The California State University's system administration is also important in encouraging collegial decision making. The California State University directives requiring campus implementation should always include sufficient time to allow for full consideration through the collegial decision-making process. Shared decision making is time consuming, especially when the issue is complex. When The California State University administrators direct campus administrators to develop campus policy and specify short time lines, they place the campus administrator in an untenable position. Time constraints are an unacceptable reason for by-passing full and collegial consideration.

The California State University administration should encourage collegial patterns of thought and behavior in other ways as well. It should itself be a model of collegiality, limiting its managerial mode to the bargaining table and to the working conditions specified in the contracts. It should specifically encourage all campus presidents to do the same and should

incorporate appropriate references to the key role of the faculty and to the process of collegial decision making into all memoranda and directives which address curricular, academic, or faculty matters. Ability to sustain good collegial relations through shared decision making should be one of the most important criteria in evaluating campus presidents and candidates for appointment as campus presidents.

In fostering collegial, shared governance, all members of the university community must realize that conflict within the university is inevitable. The challenge is to resolve conflict, or at least bring it to closure, while maintaining due regard for the prerogatives, expertise, and responsibilities of those involved. Disagreements must be vigorously and openly debated, then resolved through procedures of shared decision making. Differing perspectives must be tolerated and respected. The university suffers seriously when faculty-administrative relations erode to "us versus them." All members of the university community must treat one another with respect and honesty.

Mechanisms for shared decision making exist on each campus and in the system. What is needed now is the commitment of students, faculty, administrators, and the Board of Trustees to use these institutions in accordance with the principles discussed in this document. By so doing, they will accomplish the sensitive, thoughtful resolution of the inevitable conflicts that arise in the university, and they will thereby create a better university.

Memorandum

To : Academic Senate
Executive Committee

Date : February 18, 1986

File No.:

Copies :

From : Nishan Havandjian
Chair, Faculty Library Committee

Subject: Status Report

MEETINGS

The committee has met on a monthly basis since October.

MAIN ITEMS OF BUSINESS

UCSB Shuttle

The shuttle continues for another quarter with encouraging results. One shuttle (March 1) is scheduled for Saturday in order to accommodate those faculty who can't make it on Fridays. If results are encouraging, up to one third of next quarter's schedule can include Saturdays. For the first time this quarter, graduate students will be allowed to ride on the shuttle. The library committee felt that it was not necessary at this point to have the students obtain prior permission from their faculty or advisers.

Finding drivers still remains a problem. Employing a work study student may be one solution.

The committee briefly discussed the possibility of starting an overnight shuttle to Berkeley or UCLA. Such a shuttle would be desirable because of UC's and UCLA's extensive research facilities. Further discussion is pending on the outcome of the UCSB shuttle.

Faculty carrels at the Kennedy Library

The library started an open carrel system for faculty in the Fall Quarter. The transition has been smooth and there was no discernable faculty objection to the new assignment method.

Data retrieval workshop for faculty

Reference Head Paul Adalian has agreed to schedule an extra faculty data retrieval workshop next quarter. The library usually has one workshop in the Fall.

Library holdings

The committee asked Angelina Martinez, assistant director for collection development, to gather reports from faculty library contacts their assessment of the library's holdings. The library is in the process of meeting with all the faculty library contacts on an individual basis.

The committee hopes that some of the lottery money will be funneled to bolster the library's periodical holdings. The English version of Pravda was mentioned as an example of needed subsidy. The daily costs about \$600 per year.

Video

The committee briefly discussed the development of a full-fledged video library. The development of an instructional video library which does not rely on industry supplied tapes may be worth exploring.

BACKGROUND

When faculty FTEF allocations are made to each school, the dean is provided the authority for intra school distribution. Historically, the Office of the President has not accorded even this minor recognition to the Academic Senate which by any interpretation of collegiality is a partner in the shared decision making process.

RESOLUTION ON DISTRIBUTION OF ASSIGNED TIME

(This is a resolution of the Executive Committee)

- Whereas, For Spring 1986, President Baker has asked the Provost to consider a 0.4 FTEF increase in assigned time for the Academic Senate; and
- Whereas, For Summer 1986 a second reading Academic Senate resolution requests 0.25 FTEF for the Senate chair position, and
- Whereas, For Fall, Winter and Spring 1986-1987, a second reading Academic Senate resolution requests 2.0 FTEF total Senate assigned time;
- Whereas, Historically, the distribution of FTEF within the Academic Senate has been determined by administration rather than by the Academic Senate Executive Committee; therefore
- Resolved,* That the Academic Senate Executive Committee urge President Baker to accord to the Academic Senate a working relationship consistent with partnership status; therefore
- Resolved,* That pending implementation of the preceeding resolved clause, the Academic Senate Executive Committee recommends to President Baker, the following division of Senate assigned time for Spring 1986 and for fiscal year 1986-1987:

Executive Committee Assigned Time Resolution

February 18, 1986

Page 2

<u>OFFICE</u>	<u>SPRING '86</u>	<u>SUMMER '86</u>	<u>F.W.SP '86-'87</u>
Chair	0.6 FTEF	0.25 FTEF	0.75 FTEF
Vice Chair			0.15*
Secretary			0.15
Budget			0.20
Curriculum			0.20
GE&B	0.2		0.20
Long Range Plng			0.15
Personnel Plcy			0.20
UPLC			0.15 W only
Student Affairs			0.10
		TOTAL 2.00 FTEF	

*Currently included with Budget, Long Range Planning and Personnel Policy since the current Vice Chair is with Professional Consultative Services.

A.S. Executive Committee
February 18, 1986