

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO
ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - AGENDA
August 5, 1980

3:00 PM

Chair, Tim Kersten
Vice Chair, Rod Keif
Secretary, John Harris

- I. Minutes
- II. Announcements
- III. Business Items
 - A. Policy on Student Teachers During Strikes and Other Emergencies
(Kersten) (Attachment)
 - B. Ad Hoc Committee on Interim General Education and Breadth Guidelines
(Kersten) (Attachment)
- IV. Discussion Items
 - A. Discontinuance of an Academic Program (Brown) (Attachment)
 - B. Fall Conference (Kersten)
 - C. Senate Reaction to the Trustees' New Policy on Post-Tenure Review
(Weatherby) (Attachment)
 - D. Senate Reaction to Presidential Selection Process (Weatherby) (Attachment)
 - E. Other

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-112-81/IC & EC
August 5, 1980

RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY POLICY ON STUDENT TEACHING
AND FIELD EXPERIENCES DURING STRIKES AND OTHER EMERGENCIES

Background: This item was discussed by the Instruction Committee during the 1979-1980 academic year. The committee voted unanimously to endorse the proposal as written by the administration. The Executive Committee discussed the proposal during its July 8, 1980 meeting and was briefed on the issues by Ron Brown, Chair of the Instruction Committee. Vice President Hazel Jones indicated the value of having a policy in place prior to the academic year 1980-1981 (so as to be prepared). The Executive Committee asked the Chair to draft a resolution in support of the proposal.

WHEREAS, The Instruction Committee of the Academic Senate, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo has unanimously endorsed the Draft Proposal on University Policy on Student Teaching and Field Experiences During Strikes and Other Emergencies; and

WHEREAS, A policy in this regard is timely inasmuch as the new academic year is fast approaching; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo endorse the Draft Proposal on University Policy on Student Teaching and Field Experiences During Strikes and Other Emergencies.


APPROVED

August 5, 1980

Memorandum

o : Ad Hoc Committee on Interim Guidelines for General Education and Breadth Requirements: Ron Brown, Mike Wenzl, Linden Nelson, Rod Keif, and John Harris Date : July 28, 1980
File No.:

Copies : Malcolm Wilson

From :  Tim Kersten, Chair
Academic Senate

Subject: Development of an Interim General Education and Breadth Policy

As you may know, the Trustees have adopted a new set of General Education and Breadth requirements for the CSUC system. These are to be implemented beginning in the Fall Quarter 1981. Cal Poly needs to change its curricula in order to comply, and administrative deadlines necessitate new curricula being ready by about Christmas-time 1980. The Academic Senate General Education and Breadth Committee is continuing its complete assessment of General Education and Breadth requirements at Cal Poly. It cannot finish this important job in time to meet these deadlines (nor should it try to). Therefore, this Ad Hoc Committee needs to develop a short-term, interim policy to meet the legal mandate of the Trustees' policy while minimizing the need for large alterations in current curricula at Cal Poly.

At first glance, it appears that many of the courses and/or categories of courses being utilized to fulfill the present GE & B distribution areas will quite comfortably transfer over to the new distribution areas. In addition, there may be existing courses which have not previously been utilized which can now be used--particularly since the new regulations mandate nine semester units of upper division. Associate Vice President Malcolm Wilson has prepared some examples of how Cal Poly might realign its current curricula to achieve these goals. These are included for your consideration. They may provide a point of departure for your deliberations, but you need not feel bound to follow this approach. Associate Vice President Wilson will serve as the administrative linking-pin with the committee. Your work needs to be completed by the beginning of the Fall Quarter 1980, so that it can be submitted to the Senate for its consideration at the first Senate meeting in the Fall.

Your first meeting is scheduled for August 5 at 1:00 PM in Fisher Science 292. This meeting will serve to further acquaint you with the background information you need and will permit the development of the committee work schedule.

TWK:sh

Memorandum

: Max Riedlsperger, Chair
Academic Senate

Date : May 15, 1980

File No.:

Copies :

From : Ron Brown, Co-Chair
Instruction Committee

Subject: Proposed Discontinuance of an Academic Program

The memoranda from Chancellor Dumke and Vice President Hazel Jones regarding the Proposed Discontinuance of an Academic Program were discussed at the April 3 meeting of the Instruction Committee. Several questions were raised during the discussion:

1. Who calls for the review of academic programs?
2. Who appoints the review committees? Are they (it) ad hoc or regular?
How is the composition of the review committee established?
3. Who determines which programs should be the subject of such a review?
4. Is the same procedure to be used for internal reviews of programs (Masters degree programs, degree option changes, etc.)?

The committee did not make any recommendations regarding these questions, but felt that the proposed procedures should make answers to these kinds of questions clear.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-97-80/PPC
June 3, 1980

RESOLUTION REGARDING PERSONNEL EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

Background: The Legislature has requested that the CSUC system consider the advisability and actuality of implementing a process for regular evaluations of all tenured faculty.

The Statewide Academic Senate passed a resolution (AS-1119-79/FA) last November stating that evaluations should be used for faculty development. The Statewide Academic Senate provided another resolution (AS-1130-80/FA) objecting to the Faculty and Staff Affairs proposal, which was drafted without faculty input.

At the local level, the Personnel Policies Committee studied review and evaluation processes for tenured faculty. Their conclusions result in the following resolution:

- WHEREAS, Cal Poly is currently engaged in post tenure evaluations. These procedures have been implemented by CAM sections 341.1.B, 341.1.C, AB 74-1 and Form 109. Additional sections which provide for suspension, dismissal, etc., are included in CAM section 345.5; and
- WHEREAS, The implementation of regular evaluation of tenured faculty has failed to demonstrate its advisability; and
- WHEREAS, There is evidence that merit increases are not automatic, nor are promotions; and
- WHEREAS, The intrusion by the Legislature represents a serious threat to tenure, which the 1966 AAUP statement on institutional governance ties inextricably to academic freedom; and
- WHEREAS, It is the judgement of the Academic Senate, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, that this university is currently evaluating all faculty adequately; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Legislature adhere to the spirit of the 1966 AAUP statement on institutional governance.

APPROVED

June 3, 1980



ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

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

Office of the Chair

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: MEMBERS,
ACADEMIC SENATE CSUC
CHAIRS,
CAMPUS SENATES/COUNCILS

DATE: July 21, 1980

FROM: Robert D. Kully, Chair
ACADEMIC SENATE CSUC

SUBJECT: Report on Board of Trustees' Meeting

The Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges met on July 8-9, 1980, at the Trustees' Conference Center in Long Beach. You should have received a general report of all the actions taken by the Board at the meeting. In this memorandum I will summarize those items of most interest to the faculty.

1. The Board of Trustees approved a resolution authorizing salary increases of approximately 9.75%, effective July 1, 1980, for all classes in the Academic Salary Group, subject to the certification by the Department of Finance of the availability of funds. For the nonacademic salary group (Administrative, Support Staff, and Other Classes), the Trustees authorized the 9.75% increase plus further salary increases which may be needed "to remedy future salary inequities and to maintain proper alignment of positions, and the Chancellor is authorized herewith to make such equity adjustments as shall seem appropriate to him, to the extent that funds are available." The Chancellor was asked if there was a possibility that he would use this authorization to seek an "equity adjustment" for Deans and Vice Presidents similar to the additional increase he requested for these administrators last summer. The Chancellor responded that he would not use any funds for that purpose this year.

2. The Board approved the "Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Employment." The policy statement does not include the sections on procedures that are in the current Trustees' Policy Statement. A procedural document will be issued by the Chancellor sometime this summer. The Academic Senate endorsed the policy, but did recommend that the procedures for implementing the Affirmative Action policy require presidential consultation with the faculty whenever faculty personnel matters are concerned. I believe the Office of Faculty and Staff Affairs has assured us that such consultation will be required.

3. The Board approved the procedures for implementing the policy on "Evaluation of Tenured Faculty and Administrators." (You will recall that at its meeting in May the Board approved an amendment to Title 5 of the California Administrative Code to provide for evaluation of tenured faculty and Academic Administrators.) Most of the recommendations in the Academic Senate's resolution (Evaluation of Tenured Faculty, AS-1143-80/FA) approved at its May 9, 1980, meeting are in the approved procedures, except for one very important item (see "f" below). The major features of the procedures are as follows:

- a. Each department, or the first level of review, with student participation, is required to develop procedures for the evaluation of tenured faculty. I believe this statement should be taken literally. Each department should design its own procedures. The President is responsible for ensuring that procedures are developed and that these procedures conform with the policy and procedures approved by the Board. But, the authority for developing the procedures, as stated in the resolution approved by the Board, rests with the department.
- b. The procedures shall provide for peer evaluation of faculty in instructional performance. We assume that each department shall define what it means by "instructional performance," although the procedures make specific reference to "currency in the field" and instructional performance "appropriate to university education." These procedures shall include, but not be limited to, consideration of student evaluations of instructional performance.

- c. The procedures apply to all tenured faculty except those scheduled for "promotion review."
- d. The Academic Senate recommended that the faculty be evaluated at intervals of "not less than 3 years." Chancellor's staff recommended that they be evaluated at intervals of "no greater than 3 years." The approved statement requires evaluations at "no greater than 5 years."
- e. The Academic Senate recommended that the "department chair or designee" meet with each faculty member evaluated to discuss the result of the evaluation. There was opposition to the use of the term "department chair" by some presidents. The Board approved the phrase "department chair or the appropriate administrator at the first level of review." I think the intent is obvious! Each faculty member evaluated should discuss the results of the evaluation with a person close to the discipline, which in almost all cases will be the department chair. If areas for improvement are identified the "aforementioned administrator shall advise the faculty member of avenues for assistance available within the department or campus."
- f. Over the objections of the Academic Senate and in spite of the recommendations of a majority of the Chancellor's working party, the Board approved the Chancellor's recommendation that a written summary of the evaluation be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The Senate believed that the best way to enhance instructional performance was to make the evaluation a positive process and feared that placing the evaluation in the file would create a negative, threatening, and possibly punitive atmosphere, thereby precluding improvement in teaching. Some Trustees and Presidents and the Chancellor seemed to be concerned with finding faculty who "are not performing competently or who are neglecting their duties." However, this evaluation procedure was not designed for that purpose. The Senate's concern is that the main objective of the process, which is to provide assistance to faculty if areas for improvement are identified, will be lost because of the negative tone of the procedures and because of the prospect that the evaluation documents could be misused. The departments and campus Senates/Councils will need to ensure that the evaluation process neither jeopardizes (or is perceived to jeopardize) nor in any way generates a real or imagined threat to academic freedom or tenure.

July 21, 1980

4. The Board approved the revised procedures for the selection of presidents. Although the procedures are considerably better than the original proposal submitted by the Trustees' ad hoc committee, they still relegate the faculty and other constituencies to a less than full participatory role in the process. Following are the important features of the procedures:

- a. The composition of the committee is the same as in the current procedures. The one change is that the Chair of the Board of Trustees shall designate a Trustee as Chair of the Selection Committee; the Chancellor serves as Chair under the current procedures.
- b. After the Chancellor's staff screens the resumes for minimum qualifications, the committee will review the resumes and will decide on a list of candidates for interview. One change: "There shall be no voting. The list shall be determined by consensus."
- c. After the interviews by the committee, the Trustee members will narrow the list to five or six candidates for background checks.
- d. The results of the background checks will be reviewed and commented on by the members of the committee. However, the Trustee members will then reduce the number of candidates to a minimum of three or four (the finalists).
- e. There is only one other minor change in the procedures. The ad hoc committee recommended that the Vice Chancellor accompany each candidate on the campus visit; the new procedures require that the Chancellor perform that duty.

Because prospective presidents will have no way of knowing if they have the support of the campus representatives, we are concerned that many of the best qualified persons may not wish to become candidates. Obviously, this is not a concern which is shared by the majority of the Trustees or by the Chancellor.

If you have any questions about any of these items, please call me at the Statewide Academic Senate Office.

RDK/jsm

cc: Dr. Claudia Hampton
Dr. Glenn Dumke
Mr. Harry Harmon
Dr. Robert Tyndall

in continuing education and other self-support programs; and to all personnel procedures and practices including but not limited to recruitment, appointment, evaluation, promotion, demotion, classification, transfer, termination, compensation, training, leaves with and without pay, fringe benefits, layoff and return from layoff, grievance procedures and disciplinary actions.

Auxiliary organizations which are required to comply with the policies of the Board of Trustees are obliged to adopt similar employment procedures consistent with this policy and systemwide operational guidelines established by the Chancellor.

Affirmative action and equal employment opportunities shall be viewed as an integral part of the mission and management of the CSUC and shall be reflected in all relevant procedures and practices which contribute to the educational experiences of students and the employment conditions and opportunities of faculty, staff, and members of the administration. Demonstrated good faith efforts as well as progress in achieving goals and objectives shall be considered in the evaluation of performance of managers, supervisors and others involved in personnel processes, recommendations and decisions.

III. Policy Implementation

The authority and responsibility for assuring compliance with this policy shall rest with the Chancellor and the Presidents of the nineteen campuses. They shall exercise effective personal and professional leadership in promoting equal opportunity in every aspect of personnel policy and practice as well as in establishing, maintaining, and improving a continuing affirmative action program. Members of the faculty, staff and administration of The California State University and Colleges in carrying out their responsibilities shall adhere to the intent and letter of this policy statement.

Each campus and the Office of the Chancellor shall establish affirmative action plans and programs consistent with this policy statement as well as with relevant systemwide guidelines developed by the Chancellor. Each plan and any subsequent revisions shall be approved by the Chancellor. In addition, the Chancellor shall monitor affirmative action programs and progress, for program effectiveness and compliance with legal and policy requirements, and shall initiate with the Presidents corrective measures where necessary.

EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS — PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION (RFSA 7-80-15)

RESOLVED, That the Trustees adopt as policy the following minimum standards for the evaluation of tenured faculty:

1. The President shall be responsible for assuring that each department, or the first level of review, with student participation, shall develop procedures for peer evaluation of faculty instructional performance including currency in the field, appropriate to university education.
 - a. These procedures shall apply to all tenured faculty except those scheduled for promotion review.
 - b. These procedures shall include, but not be limited to, consideration of student evaluations of instructional performance currently required of all faculty in at

least two courses annually. Courses selected for evaluation shall be representative of the faculty member's teaching responsibilities during the evaluation cycle.

- c. These procedures shall provide that tenured faculty be evaluated at intervals of no greater than 5 years.
2. Following the evaluation, a written summary of the evaluation shall be given to the faculty member. Normally the department chair or the appropriate administrator at the first level of review shall meet with each faculty member evaluated to discuss the results of the evaluation.

If areas for improvement are identified the aforementioned administrator shall advise the faculty member of avenues for assistance available within the department or campus.

3. The written summary of the evaluation shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file, and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Trustees adopt the following minimum standards for the evaluation of academic administrators:

Academic administrators serve at the pleasure of the President. It is the policy of the CSUC that all academic administrators be evaluated at regular intervals. It is necessary that the evaluator be aware of the perceptions of those who work with the administrator. The President shall develop procedures for the systematic acquisition of information and comments from appropriate administrators, faculty, staff, and students, on the work of the administrator to be evaluated.

PROCEDURES FOR THE SELECTION OF PRESIDENTS (RFSA 7-80-16)

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges, that the following Procedures for the Selection of Presidents are hereby adopted:

PROCEDURES FOR THE SELECTION OF PRESIDENTS

Responsibility for Appointment of Presidents

The Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges has the final responsibility for the selection and appointment of each campus president. The Board is committed to the principle of consultation with campus and community representatives.

Establishment of the Presidential Selection Advisory Committee

The Chancellor will inform the Board when a presidential vacancy develops or when one is anticipated. The Chair of the Board of Trustees will, upon learning of a present or impending presidential vacancy, establish a Presidential Selection Advisory Committee (PSAC) for the particular institution.

The Committee shall be composed of the Chair of the Board of Trustees, three Trustees appointed by the Chair, and the Chancellor (designated henceforth as the Trustee members); three members of the faculty of the affected campus, selected by the faculty;

one member of the administrative and support staff of the affected campus, selected by the staff; one student from the affected campus, selected by the duly constituted representatives of the campus student body; one member of the campus Advisory Board, selected by the Advisory Board; one alumnus/alumna from the campus, selected by the campus Alumni Association; the president of another campus in the system, appointed by the Chancellor. The Chair of the Board of Trustees shall designate a Trustee as chair of the PSAC.

The five Trustee members of the committee, acting as any other Trustee committee, shall constitute the voting members of the committee:

The Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Affairs, will provide staff assistance to the Trustee Presidential Selection Advisory Committee.

Duties of the Presidential Selection Advisory Committee

1. Conduct the search, review and interview candidates.
2. Review the job description for the new president. The Trustee members will approve the job description.
3. Suggest candidates for the position.
4. Comment on a number of semi-finalists. The comments will particularly emphasize the candidate's administrative ability, academic qualities, and appropriateness for the campus. Trustee members will approve the list of semi-finalists.
5. Participate in PSAC interviews and comment prior to the Trustee members' decisions as to those candidates recommended for reference checks, and on finalists.

The Procedures for the PSAC

1. Confidentiality about every part of these procedures is essential for the protection of candidates and the integrity of the process.
2. All procedures will be in accordance with the Affirmative Action policy of the Board of Trustees.
3. The Chancellor's staff, in consultation with the campus, will develop a job description, description of the campus, an advertisement or advertisements, and a list of sources of nomination which will be referred to the PSAC for comment.
4. After review, the advertisements will be placed and letters requesting nominations will be sent by the Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Affairs. The letters will include position descriptions. The period for responses will normally be a month to six weeks with a specific deadline.
5. The Chancellor's staff will screen resumes for minimum qualifications and forward the remainder to PSAC for review.
6. The PSAC will establish criteria for review of the resumes and review the resumes. The PSAC will reduce the list of candidates to an appropriate number to interview (8-15). There shall be no voting, but a list shall be developed by consensus.

7. All proceedings of the PSAC will be held in strict confidence.
8. The PSAC will decide on a smaller list of candidates for interview. There shall be no voting, but a list shall be developed by consensus.
9. The Chancellor's staff will make arrangements for the interviews which will last about one hour each. The PSAC will decide on a core of questions and topics to be addressed with each candidate.
10. After the PSAC interviews, the Trustee members will narrow the list to five or six candidates for background checks. These background checks will be carried out by a member of the Chancellor's staff.
11. The results of the background checks will be reviewed and commented on by members of the PSAC. The Trustee members will then reduce the number of candidates to a minimum of three or four (the finalists).
12. The Chancellor's staff will make arrangements for the finalists to visit the particular campus, and the Chancellor will accompany each candidate on that visit. The purpose of the visit is to acquaint the candidate with the campus.
13. The Chancellor will report to the Trustee members any appropriate observations about the campus visits.
14. The final candidates will be presented by the Chancellor to the full Board of Trustees at a special meeting in executive session. At that meeting, the Board will appoint one of the candidates as president. After the meeting, a press conference including the Chair of the Board, the Chancellor, and the appointee will be held.

Deviations from Normal Procedures

It is expected that normal procedures will be followed. The Board of Trustees will normally confine itself to the names of the finalists presented by the Trustee members of the PSAC.

In rare instances and for compelling reasons, the Board reserves the right should, in its judgment, circumstances warrant, to depart from the list or from the normal procedures outlined above.

.....

*similar letters sent to
all Trustees of the CSUC.*

May 1, 1980

Dr. Glenn S. Dumke, Chancellor
The California State University & Colleges
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Dr. Dumke:

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed change in the Presidential Selection procedures to be considered at the May Board of Trustees meeting. Although the time has been inadequate for our own Academic Senate to consider a resolution on this specific proposal, I feel, on the basis of a resolution by the Academic Senate last year, a petition signed by over 250 faculty members and a referendum of the faculty on the present procedures which were used during our presidential search, that my expression of opposition is an accurate reflection of faculty opinion (Attachments).

In September of 1978, the Board of Trustees passed the current "Procedures for Selection of President," against the wishes of faculty as expressed by the CSUC Academic Senate. The Board of Trustees has always expressed its support for the principle of collegiality. A significant role for faculty in the selection of Presidents and indeed all academic administrators has traditionally been evidence of that collegiality and a part of the joint decision making and consultation recognized by AB 1091 as "... the long accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning." The fact that faculty may, in the future, choose an agent to bargain on matters of wages, hours and working conditions should not be used as a justification for limiting the faculty's traditional role in the governance of the university. In order to prevent the relationship between the faculty and the administration from needlessly deteriorating into an adversary relationship, it is important that the tradition of shared governance not be further eroded. Faculty accept the burden of responsibility in this process. The record established by our three representatives in our presidential search during the 1978-1979 academic year is evidence of their energy, commitment, leadership and responsibility. In that search the Cal Poly faculty reluctantly cooperated in a process that many felt was distinctly inferior to that used for the selection of President Kennedy on the grounds that the PSAC included so few members of the local faculty. Despite the feeling of the Academic Senate that faculty should have been more heavily represented on the PSAC, we recognized that the search was well conducted and successful.

Dr. Glenn S. Dumke, Chancellor
May 1, 1980
Page 2

If Trustee disappointment with the existing procedures is to be cited as the grounds for the proposed changes, this would have to be construed as a vote of a lack of confidence in the procedures by which they selected our President Baker. Furthermore, the selection of President Rosser of CSULA under these same procedures would seem to contradict the validity of the expressed Trustee disappointment with these procedures because of a lack of responsiveness in furthering the Trustee affirmative action policy.

I urge you to carefully consider the deleterious impact of a further attack on academic governance that would ensue in the wake of this new attempt to denigrate the role of faculty in the selection of Presidents, at a time when faculty morale is already at a nadir.

Sincerely,

Max E. Riedlsperger
Chair, Academic Senate

cc: Warren Baker
Robert Kully, Chair, CSUC Academic Senate