

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

AGENDA - February 25, 1975

- I. Minutes - February 4, 1975 (Attachment I)
- II. Reports
 - A. Budget as a line item (Nielsen)
- III. Old Business
 - A. Steady State Staffing Report and Recommendation (Weber)
(Attachment III-A)
- IV. New Business
 - A. Restoration of International Education Program of the
CSUC in the Governor's Budget (Eatough)(To be distributed)
- V. Announcements
 - A. Kennedy's Meeting with the Senate (Weatherby)

SEE ATTACHED QUESTIONNAIRE ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING - ANDREINI

Memorandum**To :** Academic Senate Executive Committee**Date :** February 19, 1975**File No.:****Copies :****From :** Barbara Weber, Chair
Personnel Policies Committee**Subject:** Steady State Staffing Report and Recommendations

In response to President Kennedy's request that the guidelines proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Steady State Enrollment and Staffing be referred to "all the appropriate consultative bodies for input and/or concurrence prior to university-wide utilization," the Personnel Policies Committee of the Academic Senate was assigned the task of analyzing and making recommendations on this critical matter. The committee recognizes that faculty resentment is clearly evident over the fact that the ad hoc committee of twelve was composed of nine non-faculty members, yet the thrust of the report is aimed at teaching faculty with little if any reference to resource faculty, administrators or staff. Further concern based upon action of the Academic Council is that the ad hoc report may well be a fait accompli, in spite of the request for faculty input which has been developed with care after a considerable amount of time and energy expended. In the interest of equity, any plans for faculty reduction also should be balanced with specific plans calling for reducing the number of administrators and comparable replacement of administrators on a regular basis. Because the complexity of Steady State Staffing precludes superficial prognostication and hasty, ill-defined methods of implementation, the Academic Senate must, therefore, seek significant faculty input in all future studies that might effect staffing changes as well as Senate participation on budgetary matters which affect the faculty directly.

Admittedly, the ad hoc committee chose to omit the following: 1) promotion policies and procedures; 2) layoff policies and procedures; 3) tenure and permanent status policies and procedures; and 4) the affirmative action program. The Personnel Policies Committee believes that any recommendation on Steady State Staffing must include these areas and in addition should also include an analysis of the status and rights of part-time faculty and lecturers. Additionally the ad hoc report should be questioned because of:

- 1) Excess emphasis on the declining number of 18-24 year olds, with little regard for the apparent increase in numbers of non-traditional students whose needs could only be met by flexible programs and sufficient faculty to meet those needs. Non-traditional students are those unemployed or unemployable due to lack of skills, older returning students seeking a second career, older women seeking to acquire new skills, etc. Providing programs for such students could offset declines in the traditional "college-age" population.

- 2) The use of Winter Quarter 1974 as a base upon which to plan. To do so presupposes continuation of teaching conditions which were an outgrowth of a period of rapid growth but which are highly questionable, i.e.:
 - a) faculty overloads;
 - b) increased faculty/student ratio;
 - c) more advisees per advisor;
 - d) an extended teaching day without reasonable schedule adjustments for some who are expected to teach both late night and early morning classes; lack of released time for new course development or major committee assignments, etc.

- 3) The assumption according to Part III A of the ad hoc committee report "that there will be no substantial changes in existing state standards for budgeting and support of CSUC campuses." The PPC would urge that Part III A be revised to read:

The committee assumes that appropriate individuals and organizations will work to undo the budgetary damage done to student/faculty ratios in recent years. However, since the timing of success is unpredictable, it is assumed that there will be no immediate substantial change in existing state standards for budgeting and support of CSUC campuses.

- 4) The suggestion that "departments and schools when hiring new full-time faculty should consider the balance and recency of education and experience." (VI.E-ad hoc report) This is questionable and implies age discrimination.
- 5) Emphasis on a pre-established number of lecturers (10%). The use of the lecturer classification as a means of maintaining flexibility is a practical approach, and could ultimately be a means of reduction of faculty without terminating those who are tenured. The PPC, however, feels that a quota would introduce weaknesses into the instructional program. Lecturers are not likely to bring stability to a department. Their loyalties, desires to work toward long-term departmental goals and willingness to assume departmental responsibilities are likely to be influenced negatively by the tenuous nature of their appointments. The recruitment of new faculty is bound to be affected adversely by such a system. Additionally a further danger exists in the likelihood that departments and/or schools will over-react by appointing lecturers exclusively (See VI.G.3 of ad hoc report), "where projected enrollment makes uncertain the future staffing needs of that program or department." If the hiring of lecturers seems to be the most expedient solution to the problem, then we must consider revisions to existing restrictions as to number of years one can hold a full-time lectureship, number of years creditable toward tenure if placed on rank and class, grievance rights, etc. Clear cut guidelines must be developed and utilized. Some concern has been expressed that current probationary faculty might be affected adversely by an over-enthusiastic application of a lectureship quota which could be extended to a denial of tenure for these individuals. We might well ask, "What commitments (moral or legal) have been made to current faculty members? Have they been told that 'satisfactory performance' will lead to tenure and promotion?" (Furniss p. 3)

The Personnel Policies Committee therefore recommends that the Academic Senate advise the President:

- 1) That Section 6.F. of the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Steady State Enrollment and Staffing which recommends the hiring of a set quota of lecturers is inconsistent with sound academic planning. It should be specifically noted that the recommendation of the Academic Council that the quota be applied school-wide transforms an idea supposedly justified on academic flexibility into one of administrative flexibility and, by the terms of the ad hoc committee report, cannot conceivably be justified.
- 2) That the hiring of lecturers be considered as one means of maintaining programmatic flexibility but that such hiring be based on needs defined by specific departments.
- 3) That clear-cut guidelines be developed regarding the status and rights of lecturers, whether full or part-time.
- 4) That the faculty be apprised of how Steady State Enrollment and Staffing will affect administrative and staff personnel.
- 5) That the remainder of the ad hoc committee's proposed guidelines, with the exception of J.3, which should be deleted, be considered as basic to maintaining sound personnel policies and procedures without specific reference to steady state enrollment.
- 6) That a new ad hoc committee be appointed with an appropriate number of faculty members; and
- 7) That the original report be returned to the new ad hoc committee with instructions to:
 - a) review basic assumptions;
 - b) review age distributions of faculty to determine whether regular replacement in departments or divisions is a real rather than a theoretical problem;
 - c) include areas previously omitted, i.e., policies and procedures regarding tenure, promotion and layoff and the affirmative action program, as these are liable to be affected by a steady state.

Personnel Policies Committee Vote - 5/0/3