SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE
SAN JOSE 14, CALIFORNIA

October 31, 1966

ACADEMIC COUNCIL POLICY RECOMMENDATION #F66-5

At its meeting of October 24, 1966, the Academic Council adopted the following resolution on promotional procedures which was presented by the Faculty and Staff Affairs Committee:

"In order that promotion deliberations may be expedited this year, it is recommended that the following changes in procedures be adopted for a one-year trial period:

1. The School Promotion Committees be eliminated.

2. The Departments shall forward to the College Promotion Committee, as soon as possible but not later than December 1, 1966, the priority ordered Promotion Recommendation Forms and complete dossiers. Duplicate copies of the Promotion Recommendation Form shall be sent to the School Dean.

3. School Deans shall have access to the dossiers, and will submit their individual and independent recommendations to the College Promotion Committee on or before December 16 so this committee may use them as additional data in their deliberations.

4. The College Promotion Committee will forward its recommendations to the President by February 1, 1966, to enable him to announce promotions by March 1, 1967."

ACTION BY COLLEGE PRESIDENT:
11-4-66 Approved, Item #1-3, inclusive
Filed back to Council, Item #4. See attached concurrence.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL NOTIFIED: November 4, 1966

Filed Under:
ACADEMIC COUNCIL POLICY RECOMMENDATION #F66-5,
dated October 31, 1966, APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING COMMENT:
I have approved the recommendation of the Council for the one year
experimental change in promotional procedures but do so with some
doubt that we have established an effective procedure for handling this
very critical problem. Perhaps the important factor in the development
of satisfactory promotional procedures for this college is to provide the
all campus committee with independent judgments of the professional
peers of those who are being considered for promotion or tenure. Our
present procedure is deficient because the form abstracts the concrete
opinions and renders the composite judgment of the departmental
committee. The all campus committee is thus deprived of specific
opinions of peers who agree with the general judgment but who may
dissent at critical points. We not only need to secure independent
judgment of faculty members but to take steps to protect the confidence
of those who give their opinions.

Is it not possible that the Council, on further reflection, would
courage the schools to exercise the option of establishing or not
establishing an all-school committee. I express this opinion for two
reasons: 1) We ought so far as possible, within broad standards, to
decentralize procedures and allow differences among the several schools;
2) in this particular issue some of the professional schools have very
small departments closely related in function to the entire school, a
fact that might argue for an all-school committee.

I regret that the Council did not have before it a careful summary
report of practices of other institutions as a background against which
to make judgments respecting changes in our own procedure. The
committee, of course, is not to blame for failing to provide a background
statement. It was appointed at the end of the spring term and had only
the summer months (when some members were gone and none was
obligated to committee service) and the early fall to prepare its report.
Action was needed at once. We have made some improvements and
with an adjustment of the calendar can proceed with our deliberations.
I recommend, however, that the Council continue the committee and
ask it to develop a full report which will be useful to us in establishing
procedures for another year.

Robert D. Clark
November 4, 1966