

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
SAN LUIS OBISPO

Executive Committee, Academic Senate

Minutes March 28, 1974

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Chairman Robert Alberti.
- II. The minutes of the February 26 meeting were approved as submitted.
- III. Those in attendance were:

MEMBERS:

Robert Alberti  
Robert Andreini  
Sara Behman

Robert Burton  
Marcus Gold  
Leslie Labhard

John Rogalla  
Arthur Rosen  
David Saveker

Harry Scales  
Paul Scheffer  
Larry Voss

GUESTS:

Ed Clerkin  
Frank Coyes

Harry Fierstine  
Thomas Johnston

IV. Business Items

A. Bylaws Amendment (See Item IV-D, Academic Senate Minutes, March 12, 1974.)

Executive Committee members discussed the proposed amendment to Section VII.B.1 of the Senate Bylaws which was presented as a first reading item at the March 12 Senate meeting. It was moved and seconded (Rosen/Scheffer) to recommend to the Senate that the following changes be made in the proposed amendment:

1. Section 1.a

Change second sentence to read: The senior member and junior member from each school must be from different departments, where applicable.

Change third sentence to read: The senior members and junior members shall serve two-year, staggered terms, with a maximum of two consecutive terms. The junior member becomes the senior member at the start of the second year of the term and the newly elected member from that school becomes the junior member.

Change the last sentence to read: A functional committee is dependent upon a quorum, which shall consist of a member from each school and Professional Consultative Services.

2. Section 1.b

Change the first sentence to read: A member shall not serve when review involves his/her own department, or at the request of the member.

3. Section 1.c

Change the sentence to read: Each school and Professional Consultative Services shall have one vote. The senior member shall cast that vote on all matters that are put to vote before the committee when present, except when disqualified.

4. Section 1.d

Change the last sentence to read: Only when a faculty member presents a written request for action, will the committee review his case.

5. Section 1.e

Delete the last sentence and include it in a separate section (1.f) to read: It may consult with the parties involved to ensure the effective review of cases brought before it.

6. Section 1.f

Change to Section 1.g.

The motion passed. This Bylaws Amendment will be a second reading item at the April 9 Senate meeting. The Executive Committee's recommendation will be presented separately at that time.

B. Final Examination Policy (See Attachment VI-A, Academic Senate Minutes, March 12, 1974.)

There was extended discussion of the pros and cons of the proposed final examination policy. Arthur Rosen read a statement from Robert Frost which expressed the opinion that this proposed change would involve a rather confusing and discretionary use of the last four days in terms of what both the students and instructors are supposed to do. In this statement, Dr. Frost proposed the following for the final examination period:

"Scheduled periods for evaluation will be provided by the Associate Dean of Educational Services for the last four days in the quarter. These will be scheduled instructional days, and instructors not using them for evaluation will use them for other class activity. Students shall not be required to attend classes or evaluation meetings outside the scheduled hours although alternate hours may be arranged by mutual consent of student and instructor. The Associate Dean of Educational Services shall cooperate in scheduling rooms to the extent that they are available for such alternate meetings. The room originally available shall remain available for students who have academic or personal conflicts with the rescheduled time."

It was moved and seconded (Burton/Scales) to place the report of the Instruction Committee concerning final examination policy on the Academic Senate agenda for the April 9 meeting. The motion carried.

C. Bookstore Policy on Faculty Nonpublished Materials (See Attachment II-C, Academic Senate Executive Committee Agenda, March 28, 1974.)

It was moved and seconded (Scales/Andreini) to put the "Bookstore Policy on Faculty Unpublished Materials" on the Academic Senate agenda for the April 9 meeting. The motion carried.

D. Class Scheduling

Harry Fierstine, Chairman of the Instruction Committee, reported that a subcommittee was handling this item and was not yet ready to report.

Executive Committee members discussed the class scheduling item and expressed concern that the Academic Council had passed the 11:00 class scheduling change, permitting classes to be scheduled at that time, and that, with the approval of Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs Fisher, the change had been implemented. It was felt that the Academic Senate should have a chance for review when such important matters of concern to the faculty were considered.

Committee members consolidated several ideas which they felt should be brought to the attention of President Kennedy relative to this consultation process. It was moved and seconded (Saveker/Burton) to notify the President concerning this process by incorporating the thoughts brought up at this meeting into a statement to be sent to the President. The motion passed unanimously. (A copy of the statement appears as Attachment IV-D.)

It was moved and seconded (Burton/Saveker) that this action be announced to the Senate at the April 9 meeting. The motion carried.

E. 60/40 Reports (See Attachment IV-E and IV-F.)

Ed Clerkin, Chairman of the Budget Committee, reported on developments in his Committee's efforts to obtain information on questions relative to 60/40. He will report at the April 9 Senate meeting.

F. Faculty Evaluation/CAM (See Attachment II-F, Academic Senate Executive Committee Agenda, March 28, 1974.)

It was moved and seconded (Coyes, Labhard) to put the Personnel Policies Committee's proposed revision of "Other Factors of Consideration" in Criteria for Promotion, Retention and Tenure, CAM 340, on the Academic Senate agenda for April 9, 1974. The motion carried.

G. Appointment of Instructional Department Heads/CAM (See Attachment II-G, Academic Senate Executive Committee Agenda, March 28, 1974.)

It was moved and seconded (Burton/Andreini) to put the Personnel Policies Committee's proposed revision of CAM 315.5, "Appointment of Instructional Department Heads" on the Academic Senate Agenda for the April 9, 1974, meeting. The motion carried.

It was moved and seconded (Saveker/Scheffer) to recommend to the Senate that the words "and the President" be added to the proposed revision in the revised paragraph two at the end of the second sentence. The motion carried.

H. Collective Bargaining Seminars

Chairman Alberti asked for a consensus of the Executive Committee regarding the time that the proposed seminars should be scheduled. Members agreed that Friday afternoons from 3:00 until 5:00 would be better than Saturday mornings. The proposed sessions will hopefully be as follows:

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Friday, May 3, 3 p.m.  | <u>Collective Bargaining: The Issue</u><br>Pro: "Mac" Larsen, Secretary, CSUC Academic Senate<br>Con: Clay Sommers, CSUC Dean, Faculty Affairs |
| Friday, May 10, 3 p.m. | <u>Collective Bargaining: The Membership Organizations</u><br>Representatives of AAUP, ACSUP, CCUFA, CSEA, UPC                                 |
| Friday, May 17, 3 p.m. | <u>Collective Bargaining: An Analysis</u><br>Sara Behman, Associate Professor of Economics<br>Homer Hoyt, Associate Professor of Education     |

V. Discussion Items

A. Curriculum Committee Procedures

This item was deferred since Dr. Weatherby was unable to be present.

VI. Announcements and Reports

A. President's Response to Senate Actions

Chairman Alberti announced that the President has shown concern about some items he has read in the minutes. Specifically, he was concerned about some items in the Senate Directions Committee report. President Kennedy did approve the proposal for the academic ranks in the catalog. His response was as follows:

"At the recommendation of the Academic Council, I am approving the Academic Senate's proposal to include faculty ranks in the faculty and staff directory of the University Catalog. The inclusion of faculty ranks will be implemented in the 1975-77 edition of the Catalog. One of the questions which will need to be addressed in the implementation of this recommendation is the listing of classifications or titles for student affairs officers, librarians, and other academically related classifications currently listed in the directory. Any suggestions the Senate wishes to make regarding the method of listing these individuals in the faculty and staff directory would be appreciated.

Following the Academic Council's recommendation of April 2, 1973, an addition to section 490 of CAM was approved with regard to listing faculty and staff in the University Catalog. Section 490.6, including the Academic Senate's proposed revision, as quoted below will be included in the next CAM Change:

## 490.6 Catalog Directory

The directory of faculty and staff is a listing of the tenured and probationary professional personnel of the university and its auxiliary organizations who are employed half time or more. Individuals on temporary or limited term appointments (i.e. substitutes, temporary leave replacements, lecturers, etc.) will not be listed in the Catalog Directory unless their appointments as future tenured or probationary employees have been documented by Catalog press proof time.

A brief biography citing academic degree, professional licenses granted by a governmental agency, certification by a professional association, and professional experience directly related to the appointment accompanies each faculty and staff listing.

Robert Andreini asked if a response had been received relative to Evaluation of Department Heads and said that several people had questioned him about it. Dr. Alberti reported that no decision has yet been made by the President. He will be asked again before the April 9 Senate meeting.

B. President's Council

Chairman Alberti reported that the major item of concern at the last meeting was steady state enrollment and staffing with respect to its implications for this campus. A university-wide committee has been appointed to study this situation, including Messrs. Warren Anderson, Barton Olsen, and Dominic Perello, representing the faculty.

C. Academic Council

Robert Burton reported that the Academic Council at its last meeting was concerned with the updating of the Academic Master Plan. Also under consideration was the scheduling of classes at Tuesday at 11:00 a.m., and the remote possibility of scheduling at 11:00 on Thursday mornings.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

## Consultative Process in Academic Policy Decisions

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, at its meeting of March 28, 1974, voted unanimously to present the following recommendations to the President:

1. A. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate recognizes the delegation of authority by the President to the Vice President for Academic Affairs as stated in the revised CAM Section 172, distributed January 21, 1974:  

(The Academic Council's) "actions on procedural matters become final when approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs; its actions on policy matters become final when approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the President."
  - B. The Executive Committee is appreciative of the President's willingness to consult with the Academic Senate in the past on matters of academic policy, and is hopeful of maintaining this tradition under the new organizational structure of the University.
  - C. In this spirit of consultation, the Executive Committee recommends to the President that, on matters pertinent to the faculty which pass the Academic Council and which may be implemented by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Academic Affairs be directed to defer final approval until counsel of the Academic Senate has been actively sought.
  - D. As a specific example, the Executive Committee notes with concern the recent action of the Acting Academic Vice President in handling the Academic Council agenda item II-B (March 4, 1974) wherein the tie vote of the quorum present was broken by the vote of the Acting Academic Vice President and the policy was implemented by the action of the Acting Academic Vice President without further specific Academic Senate counsel. Appearing as a discussion item on the agenda of the Academic Council for November 26, 1973, the issue was considered along with several other issues related to the broad problem of class scheduling. Following the November meeting, the issue was set aside and not discussed until it reappeared, without warning, over three months later as a single business item requiring immediate action. (The agenda for the March 4 Academic Council meeting was received on March 1.) The Instruction Committee of the Academic Senate had, in fact, been considering the matter of scheduling since November. It is the consensus of the Executive Committee that matters affecting changes in the scheduling policy for holding classes are of vital concern to the faculty, and procedural changes in this area should not be implemented without the separate review and consultation of the Academic Senate.
2. A. An ad hoc University-wide committee be established, with appropriate broad representation, to study the problem of class scheduling as noted in the Academic Council minutes of November 26, 1973:  

"...Vice President Andrews indicated that the Academic Council will continue to explore various alternatives for solving this problem at future meetings and urged all members of the Council to discuss the issue with their constituent groups so that there can be full understanding and communication of the problems to be solved and the various approaches which might be used."
  - B. Further policy decisions by the President, Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs, or Academic Council regarding class scheduling be delayed until such ad hoc committee has made its recommendations, and the Academic Senate has had opportunity for review.

## Memorandum

To : Ed Clerkin, Chairman  
Academic Senate Budget Committee

Date : March 5, 1974

File No.:

Copies : D. Andrews  
C. Fisher  
D. Shelton  
J. Surra

From : James R. Landreth  
Director of Business Affairs

Subject: Consideration of 60/40 Rule -- Budget Committee Questions

In answer to your questions presented in your February 4th memo to me, I asked Joseph Surra to work with Payroll and Personnel to accumulate the requested data.

In answer to Question No. 1, "How much money is requested for promotions at Cal Poly in the 1974-75 Budget and how was the figure calculated?", we interpret your request as promotions involving rank and class positions in Instruction in contrast to staff positions. There is \$51,460 budgeted for a total of 74 estimated promotions in 1974-75. This figure was calculated using Chancellor's Office promotion budget rates and Cal Poly's Personnel Office projections of promotions as shown in the table below. It should be noted that this calculation was done in August of 1973 and does not include salary increases.

|                        |                         |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Jr. to Intermediate    | 6 x \$550 = \$3,300     |
| Intermediate to Senior | 38 x \$515 = \$19,570   |
| Senior to Principal    | 30 x \$953 = \$28,590   |
|                        | <hr/> 74 <hr/> \$51,460 |

In answer to Question No. 2, "How much money was requested for promotions at Cal Poly in the 1972-73 and 1973-74 Budget, and how were these figures calculated?", we have prepared the following tables:

## 1972-73 Budget

|                        |                         |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Jr. to Intermediate    | 2 x \$383 = \$ 766      |
| Intermediate to Senior | 28 x \$406 = \$11,368   |
| Senior to Principal    | 31 x \$621 = \$19,251   |
|                        | <hr/> 61 <hr/> \$31,385 |



Ed Clerkin  
March 5, 1974  
Page 2

1973-74 Budget

|                        |                       |          |
|------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| Jr. to Intermediate    | 2 x \$414 = \$        | 824      |
| Intermediate to Senior | 40 x \$436 = \$17,440 |          |
| Senior to Principal    | 23 x \$668 = \$15,364 |          |
|                        | <hr/>                 | <hr/>    |
|                        | 65                    | \$33,628 |

NOTE: All the figures as shown do not include  
Salary Increase funds.

In answer to Question No. 3, "For the periods 1972-73 and 1973-74, how much money has been spent on promotion of Associate Professors (or equivalent) to Full Professors (or equivalent)?", our Personnel records show the following figures including exempt time:

1972-73 - 23 promoted to Full Professor

1973-74 - 31 promoted to Full Professor

In answer to Question No. 4, "In the 1974-75 Budget, how much money will be spent on promotion of Associate Professors (or equivalent) to Full Professors (or equivalent)?", please refer to the last line of the table in answer to Question No. 1. The Personnel Office's best estimate in August of 1973 was that 30 promotions would be made to Full Professor.

In answer to Question No. 5, "For the period 1972 to 1974 and 1974-75, how much 'promotion money' has been used to make up Salary Savings?", we can, for all intentional purposes, say "none". This is because the rates presently used by the Chancellor's Office in budgeting for promotions do not generally match the promotion costs actually experienced by the University. For example, using the current salary scale, a promotion from Intermediate Voc. to Senior Voc. AY, \$1,094 to \$1,206, effective 9/1 costs \$1,120 versus the \$515 included in the 1974-75 Budget. Therefore at this campus, traditionally we need more promotion money than is available in the Budget.

# Memorandum

To : Don Shelton  
Director, Personnel Relations

Date : March 21, 1974

File No.:

Copies :

From : Ed Clerkin *EC*  
Chairman, Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Consideration of 60/40 Limitations

Reference: (a) memo of Feb. 11, 1974 from Vice-President Fisher,  
same subject.

(b) memo of March 5, 1974 from Jim Landreth,  
same subject.

Reference (a) suggested I contact your office in the event the following information has been compiled to date or is in the process of compilation.

1. A record of departmental promotion recommendations which were not honored allegedly because of 60/40 limitations, for 1972-73 and 1973-74.
2. Departments, where promotional recommendations for 1974-75 will not be honored allegedly because of 60/40 limitations.

Reference (b) outlines the number of estimated promotions and budget figures for 1974-75, 1973-74 and 1972-73, but does not establish the criteria on which these promotion estimations were made.

Perhaps you can provide the above information in order to assist the Senate Budget Committee in the preparation of its report to the Academic Senate on the consideration of the 60/40 rule.