

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
SAN LUIS OBISPO  
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA

May 7, 1974, 3:00 p.m., MSD 125\*

- I. Minutes
- II. Business Items
  - A. Sabbatical Leave Policies and Procedures - Coyes  
(Attachment II-A)
  - B. General Education Committee Report - Scheffer  
(Attachment II-B)
  - C. Non-Classroom Activities Survey - Fierstine  
(Attachment II-C)
- III. Discussion Items
  - A. Senate Officer Elections
- IV. Announcements and Reports
  - A. Academic Council - Burton
  - B. Annual Reports - Burton

\*NOTE ROOM CHANGE

# Memorandum

## ACADEMIC SENATE

APR 26 1974


CAL POLY-SLO

To : Clyde P. Fisher  
Robert Alberti

Date : April 24, 1974

File No.:

Copies : Frank Coyes  
Tom Johnston

From :  Donald L. Shelton

Subject: Proposed Changes of Sabbatical Leave  
Policies and Procedures

On October 10, 1973, the Academic Senate proposed certain changes to the Campus Administrative Manual with regard to sabbatical leaves. This was subsequently considered by the Academic Council, and as a result of that meeting, President Kennedy asked me to take the lead in working with designees from the Academic Senate in resolving the wording problem as it relates to the implementation of intent. Attached is a copy of President Kennedy's November 26, 1973 memorandum. Frank Coyes and I have reviewed this matter in considerable detail and believe that the attached sections of CAM present a workable document which are consistent with the intent of the Academic Senate's resolution and the support extended by the Academic Council. Would you please review the attached and provide me with any comments which you might have so that I can finalize this matter for recommendation to President Kennedy with regard to publication in CAM.

Attachments

# Memorandum


To : Bob Alberti

Date : November 26, 1973

File No.:

Andrews,

Copies : Cummins, Ericson, Fisher,  
Gibson, Hasslein, Servatius  
Valpey, Don Shelton,  
Tom Johnston, Frank Coyes

From : Robert E. Kennedy 

Subject: Proposed Changes in Sabbatical Leave Policies & Procedures

On October 10, 1973 you forwarded a copy of the Academic Senate's proposed changes in those sections of the Campus Administrative Manual pertaining to sabbatical leaves.

As you know, I requested Vice President Andrews to schedule this matter as an agenda item for review at a meeting of the Academic Council and to forward the council's recommendations to me. Dr. Andrews reported that after lengthy discussion of this item which included participation from you and Bob Burton, the council supported the concepts relative to faculty involvement in the development of the criteria to be utilized and in reviewing and making recommendations on sabbatical leave applications. However, concerns were raised about the wording and implementation of the proposed changes. Objection also was raised about the provision that requires an applicant be placed in low priority whose employment is not expected to extend beyond three years after a sabbatical. I am in agreement with this objection.

In light of the additional staff work which is required on these proposed changes and since the review procedure is currently underway, I am approving the intent of the senate's proposal and requesting that it be implemented to the extent the means find it possible to implement for this year.

Meanwhile, I am asking Don Shelton to take the lead in working with you or your designee, and Dr. Andrews' office in resolving the wording problem as it relates to the implementation of intent and in removing any inconsistencies between sections of the procedure.

## 385.2 General Criteria

- A. There must be demonstrable benefits to the university program.
- B. The number of concurrent leaves with or without pay per department is limited as follows:

<u>FTE Staff in Department</u>	<u>Number of Leaves</u>
2 - 10	1
11 - 20	2
21 - 30	3
31 - 40	4
41 - 50	5
51 - 60	6

~~C. Consideration also is given to:~~

~~1. Time limitations for benefit to the individual~~

~~2. Length of service at the University~~

## 386 Leaves with Pay

Leaves with pay may be granted to faculty members after completion of six consecutive academic years of full-time service for (1) one or more quarters not to exceed three quarters, with compensation equal to the difference in salary between that received by the faculty member on leave and the minimum salary of the junior instructor rank; (2) one quarter at full pay; (3) two quarters at three-fourths of full pay; or (4) three quarters at one-half of full pay.

### 386.1 Limitation of Leaves with Pay

None of the four types of leave with pay can be granted to applicants whose purpose is to accept full-time employment. There may be rare instances where up to half-time employment may actually contribute directly to the goal of the faculty member's leave. However, the burden of proof is on the faculty member in any such exceptional circumstances to demonstrate the worth of such employment. A faculty member is not precluded from accepting any employment, but such employment must be minimal and purely incidental. This limitation applies to employment with any company, firm, college, public school system or agency or other organization, including positions in a foreign country under a foreign aid program.

## 386.2 General Principles

### A. Purpose

Leaves of absence with pay may be granted faculty members for purposes of study, research, or travel which will so improve and update their capabilities that during future employment in the University such experience will substantially enhance their value to the University and the students thereof.

### B. Retirement

The percentage of time for which a faculty member receives compensation during a leave of absence with pay determines the amount of service credited toward retirement. In no event shall the period of a leave with pay be construed as a break in the continuity of service required toward retirement, or toward any salary adjustment.

### C. Continuity of Service

A leave without pay does not constitute a break in the continuity of service required to qualify for leave with pay. Under certain circumstances, the dean of a school may determine that the actual time while on a leave without pay (not more than one year) will count toward eligibility for leave with pay.

### D. Reinstatement

At the expiration of his leave, a faculty member will be reinstated in the position held by him at the time of the granting of the leave of absence, unless he otherwise agrees.

### E. General Eligibility

To be eligible to apply for and receive a leave of absence with pay, the faculty member must have served full time for six consecutive academic years. Not more than one such leave may be granted in each seven-year period.

**F. Number on Leave**

The dean of each school is responsible for assuring and certifying that the number of leaves granted in any one quarter or year is not so great in any one department or the school as to disrupt the continued and regular course offerings or to affect the quality of education offered to the students. The granting of leaves of absence shall not exceed existing appropriations available for such leaves.

**G. Duration of Leaves**

Leaves with pay may be granted for periods not to exceed three quarters to faculty members who meet the criteria established by law and by State University and Colleges regulations.

**H. Compensation**

Compensation to faculty members on leave of absence with pay will be paid in the same manner as if they were not on leave of absence.

**I. Filing of Bond**

Except as provided in "J" below, final approval of a leave of absence with pay will not be granted until the applicant has filed with the University a suitable bond indemnifying the State of California against loss in the event the faculty member fails to render one quarter of service for each quarter of leave in the State University and Colleges following his leave of absence. The bond shall be in the amount of the total salary computed to become due the faculty member during his leave of absence. The bond will be exonerated if the failure of the faculty member to return and render the requisite service is caused by his death, his physical or mental disability, or dismissal for cause.

**J. Waiver of Bond**

The obligation to file a bond may be waived by the President if he finds that the interests of the State will be protected by a written agreement of the faculty member to return to the service of the State University and Colleges as required above. Such agreement must be accompanied by a statement of attachable assets showing, to the satisfaction of the President, the faculty member's capacity to indemnify the State against loss in the event he fails, through fault of his own, to fulfill the agreement.

**K. Extension of Leave of Absence**

The President may grant a faculty member one leave of absence without pay, not to exceed one year, at any time following completion of a leave of absence with pay. Time spent on such leave of absence without pay shall not be credited toward the requisite service required following a leave of absence with pay.

**L. Replacement**

The dean of the school will appoint a full-time replacement or the equivalent part-time replacement for a faculty member granted a leave of absence with pay unless the dean determines that the workload is such that the duties of the position vacated can be absorbed wholly or in part by existing faculty. Appointment of a replacement may be as a lecturer or as a regular academic appointment. The nature of such appointment will be determined by the dean of the school in light of whether or not it appears that there will be a continuing need for the services of the individual serving as the replacement.

**386.3 Leaves with Difference in Pay**

A faculty member who has completed at least six consecutive academic years of full-time service is eligible to be granted a leave of absence for one or more quarters not to exceed three quarters with compensation equal to the difference in salary between that received by him and the minimum salary of the junior instructor rank for the leave period.



386.4 Leaves with One-half Pay, Three-fourths Pay, or Full Pay

A faculty member who has completed at least six consecutive academic years of full-time service is eligible to be granted a leave of absence for one quarter at full pay, two quarters at three-fourths of full pay, or three quarters at one-half of full pay.

386.5 Application Procedure for Leaves with Pay

A. Deadline

Any faculty member desiring a leave of absence with pay shall submit an application to his department head by October 20 of the college year preceding that in which he wishes to take a leave. The department head will evaluate the application and submit his recommendation to the dean of the school by November 1. In arriving at his recommendation, the department head will consult with the tenured members of the department faculty and the results will be presented in writing to accompany his recommendation.

B. Form of Application

The first two pages of the application shall be prepared in seven copies and provide the following information:

1. Name of applicant
2. Academic rank and class
3. Current monthly salary equivalent and annual salary
4. Appointment date with the University--month, day, year
5. Dates of last leave of absence with pay--from and through
6. Type of leave requested:
  - a. One quarter at full pay
  - b. Two quarters at three-fourths pay
  - c. Three quarters at one-half pay
  - d. One or more quarters not exceeding one year with compensation equal to the difference in pay between that to be received by the applicant while on leave and the minimum salary of the junior instructor rank
7. Effective dates of the proposed leave from--month, day, year; through--month, day, year
8. A detailed outline of the proposed plan of study, research, or travel and service to be performed during the period of the leave and a statement of the resulting benefits which will accrue to the University and its students
9. The applicant's background applicable to the proposed plan of study, research, or travel
10. Probability of completion of the proposed plan of study or research by the end of the leave period
11. Urgency of the proposed leave in terms of its contribution to the improvement of the institution and other direct benefits to the university's program
12. The nature, amount, and the source of anticipated supplemental support. Example: scholarship, fellowship, part-time teaching fellowship, research grant, employment

C. Interviews

~~The appropriate faculty committee of each school will interview all leave applicants of that school as soon as practicable after the application deadline. Each school dean shall determine for his school the composition of the committee in consultation with the school council.~~

C. Guidelines and Procedures

Each school shall elect a sabbatical leave committee composed of teaching faculty, who in consultation with the Dean, shall prepare guidelines that shall be concerned with but not limited to the following:

1. The relative weighting to be assigned to the following categories of sabbatical leave applications:

- a. When the purpose is for meeting minimum standards established by the department for retention, tenure or promotion;
- b. When the purpose of leave is for (1) study, (2) research, (3) travel, or any combination of these;
- c. From faculty members who have had a previous sabbatical leave as compared to those applying for their first.

2. The priority to be given to the following factors:

- a. the length of service in the University of the applicant;
- b. the recency of other leaves, such as fellowships and grants through non-state funding or other leaves with pay;
- c. the recency of previous unsuccessful applications;
- d. a purpose which is more innovative than traditional;
- e. a leave more beneficial to the University at large than to an individual school or department;
- f. the length of service remaining prior to mandatory retirement.

Guidelines developed as outlined above shall be submitted to the faculty of the school for approval. The sabbatical leave committee will interview all leave applicants of that school as soon as practicable after the application deadline (October 20), and evaluate the applications based upon merits of their proposals and the school guidelines.

D. Distribution of Sabbatical Leave Positions Within the University

The number of sabbatical leaves allocated to the University will be distributed on an equitable basis among the schools. Guidelines for distributing sabbatical leaves include an initial distribution of one sabbatical leave to each school, with the balance of the allocation to be distributed according to the ratio of eligible faculty members in the respective schools to the total eligible faculty in the University. Not later than October 1, the Director of Personnel Relations will determine, in consultation with the Director of Business Affairs, the projected number of sabbatical leaves for the following year which would be allocated to the respective schools under the guidelines, reporting the projection to the school deans, Academic Vice President, and Chairman of the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate. He shall also publicize the projection in Cal Poly Report and through the Academic Senate. The school deans shall then provide those eligible members of their schools with the projection figures and copies of the

procedures and guidelines utilized in establishing priority lists of candidates and alternates. In the event sufficient applications are not received by any school, the Personnel Review Committee will recommend a redistribution of the unfilled leaves to the other schools after considering an equitable distribution in accordance with CAM 386.5E3.(e). If unfilled sabbatical leave slots are still available, the committee will recommend candidate(s) after considering the guidelines of the schools and the applications of the highest alternate on the priority lists submitted by the schools.

E. Recommendations

1. Following completion of all interviews, but not later than December 1, the committees which interviewed the candidates will forward their recommendations, via the respective school deans, to the Academic Vice President. The recommendations will list in priority all applicants from the school who are recommended for leave for (a) one quarter at full pay; (b) two quarters at three-fourths of full pay; (c) three quarters at one-half of full pay; and (d) one or more quarters not to exceed three quarters with compensation equal to the difference in salary between that received by the faculty member on leave at the minimum salary of the junior instructor rank.
2. Concurrent with transmission of the recommendations to the Academic Vice President, the school deans will forward a copy of the recommendations, and in addition a detailed report of the procedures and guidelines followed in the recommendation process, to the Chairman of the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate. The report of procedures followed in the recommendation process at school level will include, but not be limited to:
  - (a) the number and distribution by department of faculty eligible to apply for sabbatical leave;
  - (b) the number of applications received, including distribution of the applications among the departments;
  - (c) if any, a list of applicants not recommended;
  - (d) the composition and method of selection of the school committee which interviewed the applicants;
  - (e) a copy of each application.
3. By December 10, the Chairman of the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate will forward its report of the review of the recommendation process to the University President and a copy to the Senate Chairman. The report should not be concerned with particular priority rankings, recommendations for or against particular applicants, or recommendations of alternative rankings; rather it should determine whether (a) established procedures were followed; (b) sufficient information was included in applications to warrant recommendations; (c) all relevant information was



considered in the formulation of recommendations; (d) recommendations by the several school committees were internally consistent; and (e) an annual review of the rounding off of fractions of leaves allocated to the various schools has been jointly accomplished with the Director of Personnel Relations so that an equitable allocation pattern is established over a period of years.

F. Calendar for Processing Sabbatical Leave Applications

1. October 1 - Projection by the Director of Personnel Relations of sabbatical leave positions to be allocated to the respective schools to the school deans, Academic Vice President, Chairman of the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate, and to the Cal Poly Report.
2. October 20 - Applications submitted to department head.
3. November 1 - Applications submitted to the appropriate school dean with the department head's recommendation following consultation with tenured members of the department.
4. November 6 - Applications submitted to appropriate school committee by the school dean with his recommendation; concurrently the Personnel Review Committee will be provided a list of names of all applicants and the dates their applications were received by their respective department heads from the school dean.
5. November 6-30 - School committees interview applicants.
6. December 1 - Priority lists established by the school committees forwarded via the school deans to the Academic Vice President; concurrently, a copy of the priority lists and reports of the procedures followed in the recommendation process forwarded by the school deans to the Chairman of the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate.
7. December 10 - Report on procedural review of the recommendation process by the Personnel Review Committee of the Academic Senate to the University President and to the Chairman of the Academic Senate.
8. January 5 - Academic Vice President notifies applicants of the President's action on their applications, such action subject to fiscal appropriations which are proposed for inclusion in the budget.

G. Applicant's Further Action

As soon as an applicant for a leave with pay has been notified that his application has been approved, he shall complete and submit items 10 and 11 on pages 3 and 4 of the "Application for Leave of Absence with Pay" to the Academic Vice President. (See Appendix VI.)

# Memorandum

To : Executive Committee of Academic Senate

Date : May 1, 1974

File No.:

Copies :

From : General Education and Breadth Committee

Subject: Proposed Revision of the General Education Breadth Requirement

- A. The General Education and Breadth Committee proposes the following revisions for the 1977-79 catalog be considered an agenda item for the Academic Senate:

Reduce the minimum required quarter units from 63 to 60. This is to be done without changing the minimum or maximum required units by sub-heading. The reasons are to accept certification of completion of the General Education Requirements by junior college transfers. This should result in attracting as many students as possible by eliminating the present hurdle of three additional units and to reduce the department and evaluation office paper-work in determining which three units the student must take or deviate.

Secondly, under Humanities change the wording "No more than 3 units each in Art, Dr, Mu" to "No more than one course each in Art, Dr, Mu." The reason is many courses are being changed to 4 units, and this would allow the student to receive full credit. (One or two unit "skills" or "activity" courses are not ordinarily acceptable for Humanities general education credit.)

It was recommended that Note 2 be included in the wording under Humanities. The above phrase in parenthesis was added as a proposed note.

The last is to change under Basic Subjects to "written communication (Engl) (one course), oral (Sp) communication (one course)." This would require a student to take at least one course in written communication and one course in oral communication rather than the present requirement of one course in written communication, and would give the student or department a choice between a second course in either written or oral communication. The Committee felt both types of communication are needed.

- B. The Committee also recommends to the Executive Committee that they send to the appropriate committee the proposal for use of multiple prefixes. A number of departments have similar courses to those offered in departments listed under General Education Requirements. They have requested, in some cases, their course also be counted for General Education. The use of common prefixes, used in a number of other universities, would help solve the problem.

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
SAN LUIS OBISPO

General Education Breadth Requirement  
(Effective for 1975-77)

To be eligible for graduation with a Bachelor's degree from California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, the candidate must complete a minimum of ~~88~~ 60 quarter units of general education as specified below.

No course shall be used for this purpose if it has a prerequisite unless such prerequisite is also counted as general education. Only degree credit courses in the 100, 200, and 300 series may be counted as general education. No more than six units in the major academic discipline of the student may be counted as fulfilling the general education requirement.

Natural Sciences

At least 15 units chosen from courses in the natural sciences, with at least one course in life science (Bact, Bio, Bot, Cons, Ent, Zoo), and at least one course in physical science (Astr, Chem, Geol, PSc, Phys). Up to six units of "broadly-based" course work in the Schools of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Architecture and Environmental Design, or Engineering and Technology may be counted in this category, provided that these units are taken outside the School in which the student is enrolled. No more than three courses having the same prefix may be counted to satisfy the natural science requirement. Maximum 24 units.

Social Sciences

At least 9 units chosen from courses in Ant, Ec, Geog, Pol Sc, Pay, Soc Sc, Soc. All students must take Pol Sc 201.<sup>(1)</sup> No more than two courses having the same prefix may be counted in this category. Maximum 16 units.

Humanities

At least 15 units chosen from courses in Art, Dr, Hum, literature (in English or in a foreign language), Mu, Phil. All students must include two courses in literature ~~and/or philosophy~~, or two courses in philosophy, or one each. All students must take Hist 204 and 205,<sup>(1)</sup> or equivalent. No more than ~~8~~ one course (excluding skill courses) each in Art, Dr, Mu, nor 6 units in Hist, may be counted in this category. Maximum 21 units.

Basic Subjects

Mathematical sciences (CSc, Math, Stat) (at least a 3-unit course), written communication (Engl) (one course), oral (Sp) ~~or written~~ communication (~~or~~ one course). Minimum 12 units, maximum 16 units.

Other Subjects

Physical Education Activity or Health Education (3 to 5 units, at the option of individual Schools).<sup>(2)</sup> Any 6 to 4 units (depending upon P. E. requirements of individual Schools), provided that these additional units are taken outside the department in which the student is enrolled. Minimum 3 units, maximum 9 units.

(1) These courses are required to satisfy Section 40404 of the Administrative Code, but the units may also be counted as general education (Section 40405). Transfer students, certified as having completed the general education requirement, will have to complete this requirement separately if they have not already done so. (Social Sciences and history majors will take an equivalent sequence.)

(2) Exemption from the course in Health Education may be granted by the Director of Admissions, Evaluations, and Records upon receipt of a statement of contrary religious belief. Exemption from required Physical Education Activity may be authorized by the Director of Admissions, Evaluations, and Records based on recommendation of medical authority, or attainment of age 18 at the time of initial enrollment. Any veteran may claim appropriate military service as a substitute for the physical education requirements.

Note 1. In the Humanities category all students are required to take Hist 204 and Hist 205. Also, no more than 6 units in history may be counted in the Humanities category. It is intended that history courses which may count here are limited to the two named courses or their equivalent. Students may, of course, elect to take additional history courses for other purposes.

Note 2: ~~Under no circumstances shall any of the following courses be counted toward the Humanities general education credit:~~ One or two unit "skills" or "activity" courses are not ordinarily acceptable for Humanities general education credit.

Note 3: In some cases, the total units in courses designated to satisfy a category may exceed the maximum units for that category. However, the excess units over the maximum may not be used to satisfy any part of the minimum of ~~88~~ 60 total units in general education.

Note 4: The title of the 5th category, "Other Subjects," is intended to exclude natural sciences, social sciences, humanities (as listed), and courses in mathematical sciences and in oral or written communication. The intent here is to encourage breadth in keeping with the Trustees' designation: General Education Breadth Requirement. Specifically, the "Other Subjects" category should not be used to circumvent the limitations in the first four categories.

SURVEY OF NON-CLASSROOM  
ACTIVITIES (RELATED DUTIES) AT  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
SAN LUIS OBISPO

prepared by

David Brodie  
Harry L. Fierstine  
John Rogalla

for

Instruction Committee,  
Academic Senate  
Harry L. Fierstine, Chairman

May, 1974

ATTACHMENT II-C



### Background and Purpose

The Instruction Committee was interested in learning if non-classroom activities (i.e. committee work, student advising, club advisor, professional growth, etc.) were interfering with assigned teaching duties. In early February, 1974, a questionnaire was distributed to the faculty of the University. It was assumed that all participants taught an annual average of 36 equated units.

At first the Committee planned to survey a random sample of the faculty; however, upon second thought it was decided to give all faculty an opportunity to participate. Unfortunately, the covering letter was duplicated before its final editing and before the wording had been changed to describe that the questionnaire was sent to all faculty. However, this minor error should not have significantly affected the results of the survey, except that more faculty probably participated because each thought he or she was randomly picked by the computer. The following is the result of the survey, followed by a discussion, conclusions, and recommendations.

### Questionnaire

The questionnaire and its unedited covering letter is attached. At the outset, the questionnaire was designed to be tallied by hand, not by the computer. In addition the questions were all placed on one page for ease of answering by the participants.

### Results

Four hundred and seventeen (417) questionnaires were returned to us by the deadline date. Thirty-nine (39) questionnaires were disqualified because the respondents commented that they taught less than 36 equated units (annual average). Of the remaining 378 completed questionnaires, 191 (50.5%) indicated that their non-classroom activities did not interfere with their teaching assignments, whereas 187 (49.5%) indicated that their teaching was adversely affected.

### Negative Responses

Table 1 gives the distribution of the negative responses by school, and Table 2 gives the results of the negative responses by academic rank.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF 191 NEGATIVE RESPONSES BY SCHOOL

School	%
Agriculture and Natural Resources	24.6
Architecture and Environmental Design	6.8
Business and Social Sciences	9.4
Communicative Arts and Humanities	13.1
Engineering and Technology	11.0
Human Development and Education	8.4
Science and Mathematics	26.7

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF 191 NEGATIVE RESPONSES BY ACADEMIC RANK

Rank	%
Lecturer	12.1
Assistant Professor	36.6
Associate Professor	30.9
Full Professor	20.4

The exact number of questionnaires distributed by school or academic rank was not determined; thus, this information is primarily useful when compared with the affirmative responses (See discussion below.).

Thirty-one percent (i.e. 60 out of 191) of the negative respondents offered written comments, and Table 3 summarizes their comments into 7 categories.

TABLE 3

COMMENTS OF 60 NEGATIVE RESPONDENTS, SEPARATED INTO 7 CATEGORIES

Comments	Frequency of Reply
1. "I avoid or can control my non-teaching duties; it is a question of balance."	19
2. Respondents who tabulated their hours, but made no other written comments	12
3. "I am a first-year faculty member..."	9
4. "Part of job; non-teaching activities enhance teaching."	7
5. "Non-teaching duties interfere with professional growth, not teaching."	6
6. Comments not understood or unable to categorize	4
7. "Too much time spend in tenured meetings."	3
	<hr/> 60

The most common written comment (32%) declared that the respondents were able to avoid or control their non-teaching duties and that they had struck a balance between teaching and non-teaching activities. Fifteen percent stated that they were first-year or new faculty and had few non-teaching duties. Others offered



comments that indicated that they misunderstood the survey or were in some way hard to analyze.

#### Affirmative Responses

Table 4 gives the results of the survey by school, and Table 5 gives the distribution of the affirmative responses by academic rank. For the same reasons given in the section above, this information will be most useful when compared with the negative responses (See discussion.).

TABLE 4

#### PERCENTAGE OF 187 AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSES BY SCHOOL

School	%
Agriculture and Natural Resources	10.7
Architecture and Environmental Design	4.8
Business and Social Sciences	8.6
Communicative Arts and Humanities	19.3
Engineering and Technology	17.6
Human Development and Education	13.9
Science and Mathematics	25.1

TABLE 5

#### PERCENTAGE OF 187 AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSES BY ACADEMIC RANK

Academic Rank	%
Lecturer	4.3
Assistant Professor	32.8
Associate Professor	36.6
Full Professor	26.3

Table 6 shows the amount of interference by academic rank. More than sixty percent of the respondents indicated that non-teaching duties moderately interfered with their classroom assignments. In the higher two ranks, at least twice as many reported great interference as reported little interference. In the lecturer category, twice as many reported little interference as reported great interference.

TABLE 6

#### PERCENT OF EACH ACADEMIC RANK THAT RESPONDED WITH DIFFERENT AMOUNTS OF INTERFERENCE

Academic Rank	Interference		
	little	moderate	great
Lecturer	25.0	62.5	12.5
Assistant Professor	9.8	80.4	9.8
Associate Professor	11.8	60.3	27.9
Full Professor	6.3	65.3	28.6

The number of hours per week (annual average) actually spend on non-classroom activities were tabulated by rank (Table 7). In the event that the respondents reported their hours in ranges, then the median value was used.

TABLE 7

#### THE AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK ACTUALLY SPENT ON FIVE CATEGORIES OF NON-CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES BY 187 CAL POLY FACULTY

Academic Rank	Category					Total Number of Respondents
	1*	2*	3*	4*	5*	
Lecturer	4.75	8.50	0.88	3.25	0.00	8
Assistant Professor	5.56	7.11	1.64	4.19	0.41	61
Associate Professor	7.03	7.09	0.82	3.70	1.09	68
Full Professor	7.55	6.30	0.97	4.18	0.42	49
Average	6.61	6.98	1.15	4.00	0.64	187

- \*1. Committee, consultative, or other administrative work
2. Student advisement (advises as well as students from class)
3. Co-curricular (club advisor, A.S.I.)
4. Professional growth (research, consulting, attending professional societies)
5. Other

Table 8 gives the average number of hours per week that the respondents felt should be spent on the various categories of non-teaching duties.

TABLE 8  
THE AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK THAT 168 RESPONDENTS  
FELT SHOULD BE SPENT ON FIVE CATEGORIES  
OF NON-CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

Academic Rank	Category*					Total Number of Respondents
	1	2	3	4	5	
Lecturer	2.12	4.31	1.33	5.38	0.00	8
Assistant Professor	2.35	4.54	1.39	7.31	0.13	54
Associate Professor	2.35	4.99	.91	7.41	0.42	62
Full Professor	3.16	4.66	.77	5.62	0.20	45
Average	2.57	4.75	.97	6.85	0.25	168

\*Categories identical to Table 7

Category 5 in both Tables 7 and 8 represents the "other" activities that the respondents felt interfered with their teaching duties. The following types of duties seemed to be of consequence (no priority intended): community relations; coordination of conferences; curator of animal or plant collections; faculty organization and activities; governmental commissions; shop facility maintenance.

#### Discussion

The value of the survey is limited because the questionnaire was not sent to a random sample of the faculty. This makes it difficult to draw inferences upon the entire population of Cal Poly faculty. In addition, the survey should have asked those that responded negatively to the question of interference to indicate the number of hours they spent in the five categories. This additional data would have allowed comparison of hours spent with those who responded affirmatively. Even with these limitations, however, this survey provides valuable data about the Cal Poly faculty upon which conclusions and recommendations can be made.

It is interesting that approximately fifty percent of the respondents felt that their non-teaching duties interfere with their classroom related activities. This is too large a number to ignore and to not have concern for their problem. Those respondents that indicated that they were first-year or new faculty in essence stated that they have not been here long enough to receive many non-teaching assignments. A few indicated that if they had any more non-teaching assignments, their classroom activities would definitely receive interference.

Possibly of greatest interest is that approximately 10 percent of all the negative respondents declared that they had been able to say "no" and control their non-teaching duties. Just about all of these respondents were in the higher two academic ranks.

When the "yes" and "no" responses are compared by academic school (Tables 1 and 4), it becomes obvious that only the respondents from the School of Agriculture and Natural Resources overwhelmingly indicated that non-teaching duties did not interfere with their classroom activities. This may be due to the fact that many of the agriculture faculty have 12 month appointments and spend considerable time at the units. They possibly have no time for other involvements. The Schools of Engineering and Technology, Communicative Arts and Humanities, and Human Development and Education indicated a moderate amount of classroom interference. The percentage of faculty from the other three schools were equally divided between the "yes" and "no" responses. Unfortunately, those who responded negatively were not asked to indicate how many hours they spend on the five categories of related duties or what the nature of each duty was. If they had, the responses from the School of Agriculture and Natural Resources might have shown how to be successful in distributing the workload between the classroom and non-classroom activities.

When the "yes" and "no" responses are compared by academic rank (Tables 2 and 5), only the lowest two ranks gave more negative responses than affirmative ones. This indicates that the Associate and Full Professor ranks carry most of the non-teaching workload. This could be alleviated, in part, by giving more non-teaching responsibilities to those in the lower two academic ranks.

When the distribution of the time actually spent in non-classroom activities is studied (Table 7), then the cause of the problem becomes obvious. Categories 1 through 3 and possibly some answers to 5 are generally considered by most administrators to be the related duties of highest priority to be included in the faculty's 3 unit non-teaching workload. This 3 unit workload is normally considered equivalent to 9 or more hours per week. The average faculty member responded that he or she worked approximately 15 hours per week in these activities. However, when one adds to this workload an afternoon of professional growth per week (4 hours), then non-classroom activities (related duties) are overloaded by approximately 100 percent.

Table 9 gives the percent change between the average hours per week that respondents actually spent on non-classroom activities and the average hours per week that they felt should be spent on non-classroom activities. The greatest decrease in time to be spent was in the committee work category and the greatest increase in the time to be spent was in professional growth.

TABLE 9  
COMPARISON OF THE AVERAGE HOURS ACTUALLY SPENT IN NON-TEACHING  
ACTIVITIES TO THE AVERAGE HOURS DESIRED BY 168 RESPONDENTS

Non-Teaching Category	Average Hours Spent	Average Hours Desired	Percent Change
1. Committee Work	6.61	2.57	-61
2. Student Advisement	6.98	4.75	-32
3. Co-curricular	1.15	0.97	-16
4. Professional Growth	4.00	6.85	+71
5. Other	0.64	0.25	-61

In actual number of hours, the change is not great; however, the courses for these changes must be examined.

Cal Poly over the last five years has increased its number of graduate programs. Tacetly assumed with most of these programs is a need for up-to-date faculty with an off campus recognition in the various fields of speciality. In order to remain a recognized expert, the faculty member must engage in some type of professional growth. There must be a block of time set aside during a normal work week for the faculty member to work in this activity.

As if to compound the problem, the hiring practices at Cal Poly have recently favored the Ph.D. degree. This degree, by its nature, is research orientated. In most instances those faculty expect upon graduation to continue to engage in professional growth, particularly research and publication. In most instances, the administrative climate at Cal Poly has been to participate in research, but do not expect space or time during the normal work week. This climate must change and possibly will in light of the recent memo from the Chancellor's office that recognizes professional development as one of four criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure.

Over the last five years the administration has begun to consult with the faculty at nearly all administrative levels. Faculty organizations and the faculty themselves have been responsible for this necessary activity. However, approximately 50 percent of the faculty would like to see it reduced by about 60 percent; they feel it is the major related duty to be decreased in order to make room for time to pursue professional growth.

In no way should the administration take this as a mandate to reduce consultation to a trace amount. If committee work was given a workload value (e.g. a committee meeting two hours per week, and with one hour preparation time would equal one unit of related duties), then committee work could be more equitably distributed among the faculty. The argument that not having workload values allows more flexibility in assignments is fallacious. It hides the fact that some faculty are over-committed (admittedly often by choice) whereas others are under-committed (often by choice).

There is no reason that professional growth could not be similarly measured. Each faculty member could easily determine the time necessary to attend seminars on or off campus, to prepare original research or projects, etc. Four hours per week (one afternoon) of professional growth (a number much less than the average value desired by many faculty; see Tables 8 and 9) could equal one unit of related duties.

So far two categories of related duties have been discussed, and there is no reason that student advising (advisees or special advising duties) could not also be measured. For example, 15-20 advisees could easily equal one unit of related duties.

The three units of related duties discussed above are not unreasonable workloads and should not over-commit the teacher so that there is interference with teaching assignments. One important committee assignment, 15 to 20 advisees, and four hours of professional growth would easily adhere to the officially recognized non-teaching workload. If a professor's department lacks advisees, then the faculty member could increase the committee assignments or professional growth activity.

The above workload suggestions do not give the faculty member time to radically revise curricula or innovate instructional approaches. The only way that the faculty member can currently achieve these latter goals is at the expense of instruction, related duties, professional growth, and family. The administration should release a faculty member from some teaching or related duties when that person desires to undertake a time consuming innovation. This would not leave the faculty member torn between trying something radically new at the expense of other activities.

#### Conclusions

1. Fifty percent of the faculty responding feel that their assigned non-teaching duties interfere with their teaching duties. The administration, academic senate, and faculty organizations should be concerned and should try to remedy the problem.
2. Non-teaching assignments should be equitably distributed among the faculty. New faculty with few or no assignments should be responsible for more activities.
3. Committee and other administrative work should be assigned on the basis of real need and should be productive. Both faculty and administrators should be concerned about the time spent in consultation and avoid meaningless consultation and committee work.

4. All non-teaching assignments should be given a workload value and the total workload should not exceed nine hours per week (annual average). This value should be used to balance the workload for all faculty. Workloads beyond the nine hour maximum should only be undertaken voluntarily by each faculty member in any category he or she so chooses. There should be no pressure from the administration to accept more than the nine hour workload and the faculty should be evaluated for retention, tenure and promotion only on the quality of performance within the nine hour workload.
5. Fifty percent of the faculty desire at least 4 hours per week to be devoted to professional growth. Where possible this time should be available in a solid 4 hour block.

Recommendation

The Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University recommends to the President that all non-teaching assignments should be given a workload value and that the total workload should not exceed nine hours per week (annual average). This value should be used to balance the workload for all faculty. At least 4 hours of the nine hour workload should be devoted to professional development and the time should be available in a 4 hour block. Workloads beyond the nine hour maximums should only be undertaken voluntarily by each faculty member in any category he or she so chooses. There should be no pressure from the administration to accept more than the nine hour workload and the faculty should be evaluated for retention, tenure and promotion only on the quality of performance within the nine hour workload.

# Memorandum

To : Faculty Member

Date :

File No.:

Copies :

From : Perry Fiershine, Chairman  
Instruction Committee  
Academic Senate

Subject: Faculty Survey - Non-Classroom Activities

The Instruction Committee of your Academic Senate thinks instruction may be suffering because the faculty ~~spends~~ spends too much time on non-classroom activities (committee work, student advisement, administrative work, club advisor, professional growth, etc.). As a first step in our study, we want to survey the faculty to determine if you agree that a problem exists and, if you do, what activities interfere the most and are the most important. We will tabulate the survey and if a problem exists, we will suggest solutions to the Academic Senate. If the senators agree with our solutions, then they will forward them to the administration.

You have been selected as part of a randomized sample of full-time Cal Poly faculty members. Please take the time to complete the survey.

This survey assumes that you are teaching an annual average of 36 equated units.

Return the completed survey no later than February 15, 1974.



FACULTY SURVEY  
NON-CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

Please indicate your academic rank:

Please indicate your instructional school:

Lecturer \_\_\_\_\_

Agriculture and Natural Resources \_\_\_\_\_

Assistant Professor  
(Assistant Voc. Prof.) \_\_\_\_\_

Arch. and Environmental Design \_\_\_\_\_

Associate Professor  
(Associate Voc. Prof.) \_\_\_\_\_

Business and Social Sciences \_\_\_\_\_

Communicative Arts and Humanities \_\_\_\_\_

Full Professor  
(Voc. Prof.) \_\_\_\_\_

Engineering and Technology \_\_\_\_\_

Human Development and Education \_\_\_\_\_

Science and Mathematics \_\_\_\_\_

Do you think your non-classroom activities (committee work, student advisement, administrative work, club advisor, professional growth) interfere with your assigned teaching duties? (By interfere we mean keep you from doing your best job in the classroom.)

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

If you answered no, please return the survey to the address at the bottom of the survey. If you answered yes, please continue answering the survey.

How much do your non-classroom activities interfere?

Little \_\_\_\_\_

Moderately \_\_\_\_\_

Greatly \_\_\_\_\_

How many hours per week (annual average) do you spend on the following non-classroom activities?

- |   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| 1. Committee, consultative or other administrative work                         | _____ hours/week |
| 2. Student advisement (advisees as well as students from class)                 | _____ hours/week |
| 3. Co-curricular (club advisor, A.S.I.)   | _____ hours/week |
| 4. Professional growth (research, consulting, attending professional societies) | _____ hours/week |
| 5. _____ (other)  | _____ hours/week |

How many hours per week do you think you should spend on the following activities at Cal Poly:

- |   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| 1. Committee, consultative or other administrative work | _____ hours/week |
| 2. Student advisement                                   | _____ hours/week |
| 3. Co-curricular  | _____ hours/week |
| 4. Professional growth                                  | _____ hours/week |
| 5. _____ (other)  | _____ hours/week |

Please return the survey to:

Harry L. Fierstine  
Biological Sciences Department