

SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE  
SAN JOSE 14, CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

October 31, 1966

ACADEMIC COUNCIL POLICY RECOMMENDATION #F66-5

At its meeting of October 24, 1966, the Academic Council adopted a 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, items # 1-3, inclusive  
Referred back to Council, item # 4. See attached memo.  
R. W. Clark


ACADEMIC COUNCIL NOTIFIED: November 4, 1966  
(date)

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  
encourage 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  
delegate 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