

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda - September 23, 1975

4:00 PM - Ag. 241

I. Introductions

II. Minutes - July 1, 1975, Executive Committee Meeting

III. Reports

A. Statewide Academic Senate (Olsen, Wenzl, Murphy) - what Bert said

B. Grievance Procedure - Assembly Bill 804-Berman Bill (Olsen)

IV. Old Business

A. Senate Committee Membership (Labhard)(Attachment IV-A)

V. New Business

A. Foundation Manual and Presentation at the Senate Meeting (Labhard)

B. Student Community Services - Disabled Students (Jennings)
(Attachment V-B)

VI. Discussion

A. Student Evaluation of Faculty (Krupp)

B. Student Evaluation of Faculty - Ad Hoc Committee Update (Ellerbrock)

VII. Announcements

→ External Degree Programs (Dr. Jones)

A. President's Council (Labhard)

B. Foundation Board (Labhard)

C. Senate Membership and Preamble (Labhard)

D. "Response - Draft Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty" (Labhard)
(Attachment VII-D) - was attached to agenda

E. External Degree Program - (Jones)

→ Program Proposal

SAC State - Adm. detail

Poly - cooperating institution
(Criminal Justice)

need resolution
about this
by Oct. 8

→ Paul Wolff
Poll Exec.
Comm.
members
passed

→ Attach scoresheets

send minutes to
Jerry Ellerbrock

pink copy
of grievance
business for
executive comm.

dist r. but
Mandel Keene's
ditty on Collective
Bargaining

+ Attachment

List changes

Brochure

INFORMAL AMARAL TO
FIRST FULL MEETING
OF SENATE.

Referred to SAC

M/S/P

response by next Exec. comm.
meeting

attached a questionnaire will be dist'd on Oct
sample in Sen. office.
get points objectives of that comm. from tape

copy of Ellerbrock's
survey in minutes
Return copy
to Burton

Faculty
Handbook
Out
Don Shalton's
Office

ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS

Engineering and Technology

CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS STUDY COMMITTEE - Richard Kombrink

INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE - Tom Chou

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - Doral Sandlin

GENERAL EDUCATION AND BREADTH REQUIREMENTS COMMITTEE - Randy Norton


Memorandum

: Ms. Lezlie Labhard
Chairperson, Academic Senate

Date : August 14, 1975

File No.:

Copies : Dr. Hazel Jones
Dean Everett Chandler
Dr. Dan Lawson

From :  Mr. Robert Bonds, Coordinator
Student Community Services

Subject: Disabled Student Affairs Meeting on July 30, 1975

The meeting had one specific and important recommendation for Cal Poly's Academic Senate, 1975-76. For early November, Academic Senate go on records as:

1. Written resolution that the Academic Senate support a Disabled Student Awareness Day.
2. That the Academic Senate recommend to each department that they designate one faculty member from each department to participate in the five hour exercise.
3. An evaluation of that involvement by each faculty member be sent to: the coordinator of Disabled Student Affairs, president of Disabled Student Services, and the president of the Academic Senate.
4. Hopefully, a presentation by Disabled Student Services to the Academic Senate: "The Dilemma Facing Disabled Students," can be scheduled for mid-October, 1975.

As you may know, some 30 administrators (including President Kennedy and Dr. Andrews) and a few (5) faculty members participated in a Disabled Person Awareness Day during September, 1974. We need to bring into balance our entire campus population on the situation facing disabled students.

It has only been during the past two years that society has discovered disabled...four years ago it was women...15 years ago it was Asians, Blacks, Chicanos, and Native Americans. The disabled students at Cal Poly need assistance and support from every possible concerned organization... especially the Academic Senate.

If there are any questions to the above, please feel free to give me a ring.


Memorandum

To : Mr. Donald Shelton

Date : September 4, 1975

File No.:

Copies : Dale Andrews
Joe Weatherby
Chuck Jennings

From : Lezlie Labhard, Chair 
Academic Senate

Subject: Response - Draft Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft report of the ad hoc committee on the procurement and retention of a quality faculty. Although the document did not go before the whole senate because of time constraints, it is of major importance and impact particularly in light of steady state staffing and enrollment. The responses below reflect the consensus of review by Joe Weatherby, past chair, Chuck Jennings, secretary, and myself.

Generally we support most of the recommendations in the draft report but present some specific comments:

Recommendation # 3, Some General Considerations; Findings/Conclusions, p. 27.

"Special note" will need to be taken of collective bargaining, if introduced, particularly in defining the status of department chairs as faculty or administration.

Recommendation #4, "Evaluative Criteria" Defined; Findings/Conclusions, p. 10.

Research should be redefined to also include applied research leading to faculty development. This would permit the faculty member a better opportunity to justify development (research, applied research, creative activity) to colleagues and supervisors.

Recommendation #4, "Evaluative Criteria" Defined; Findings/Conclusions, p. 15.

The phrases "appropriate terminal degree" and "uniquely qualified" must be defined by respective disciplines.

Recommendations # 5 and 6, Relative Weights of the Evaluative Criteria and The Criterion of Teaching Effectiveness; Findings/Conclusions, pp. 14, 16, 19.

We strongly endorse the statement that the primary emphasis in the evaluation process should be teaching ability! Clarification of the terms "highest weight" or "primary emphasis" is essential. Do these mean the greatest of each of the other criteria considered individually or as a total? In addition, relative weights of criteria should reflect differences in program emphases; thus faculty should have input in the determination of relative weights of criteria.

Recommendation #8, Standardized Evaluation Forms and Documents; Findings/Conclusions, p. 11.

We strongly endorse flexibility in evaluation forms or documents to reflect program characteristics or emphases.

Recommendation #9c, Evidence for Evaluation; Findings/Conclusions, p. 12.

Detailed resumes should be acceptable as an alternate form to the narrative description statement by the faculty. Also the use of the adjective "professional" in the reference to "professional activities" is limiting; other activities could increase recognition to the institution and provide faculty development. In light of this consideration, we recommend substituting the phrase "faculty development" for "professional activities".

Recommendation #10, Probationary Period; Findings/Conclusions, p. 26.

We endorse the conclusion recommending no change in the regulations pertaining to the probationary period of four years.

Recommendation #13, Written Campus Standards and Procedures

See above Recommendation #4.

Recommendation #14, Withholding of a Merit Salary Increase; Findings/Conclusions, p. 10.

We support this recommendation for the "exceptions", e.g., those who have been granted a terminal year or those subjected to disciplinary action. We do not support rigorous evaluation of faculty for merit salary increases within rank.

Recommendation #17, Campus Statement on the Authority and Responsibility of Recommending Agencies; Findings/Conclusions, p. 14.

We strongly endorse the concept and the addition into the recommendations of the 1971 conclusion that the basic evaluation will be made by the colleagues in the respective field and the immediate supervisor, the department chair.

Recommendation #18, Restrictions on Tenure Track Appointments; Findings/Conclusions, p. 27.

We endorse the concept of campus and department flexibility in tenure track appointments rather than systemwide or campus wide restrictions.

Recommendation #23, Availability of All Personnel Policy Documents To Prospective Faculty; Findings/Conclusions, p. 18.

We strongly endorse the recommendation of appraising faculty of provisions related to the personnel process prior to appointment.

Recommendation #25, Additional Salary Steps for the Rank of Full Professor; Findings/Conclusions, p. 13.

We support the recommendation of periodic evaluation of faculty after tenure. However, other means of "tangible recognition of merit and excellence" to full professors should be studied and evaluated. Should the recommendation for additional steps for full professors be approved and budgeted, we support striking the sentence, "Any professor requesting consideration who is not awarded an additional step would be ineligible to request consideration again for two consecutive academic years". Funds for additional salary steps for full professors should not be at the expense of any salary increases to faculty in other ranks and steps. (In light of budget constraints, this whole idea seems like "spinning wheels".)

Recommendation #26, Improving the Operation of the Academic Department; Findings/Conclusions, pp. 21-24.

The twelve-month appointments of most department chairs can have serious implications of establishing permanent heads rather than chairs. If this idea should be adopted and funded, we strongly endorse the statement that the assignment is for the position - not the person. Funding of twelve-month appointments for all department chairs seems improbable and also impractical with the limited summer programs now offered. Obviously the concept of year round operation must be considered when evaluating the advantages of twelve-month appointments.

Any additional secretarial help which could be budgeted should be assigned to departments, not to department chairs, so that faculty would benefit.

We do not support the proposed increases for department chairs either in terms of salary differentials or sabbatical leaves! Chairs receive release time for their services and are eligible to apply for leaves as are faculty who meet the criteria.

In conclusion, recommendations on the Procurement and Retention of a Quality Faculty should address such issues as decreasing faculty loads, increasing student assistant and secretarial time, increasing numbers of sabbatical leaves, increasing opportunities for professional development and involvement through additional travel funds, etc.

Should you desire additional input or clarification of comments, please contact the senate office (ext. 2070).