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To: Executive Committee
From: Charles Andrews, Chair
Personnel Policies Committee

Subject: MPPP Awards Procedural Discrepancies

The Personnel Policies Committee has determined there is a problem with the implementation of the current MPPP Awards procedures which needs to be brought to the attention of the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

It has been brought to the attention of the committee that a change in the established timelines occurred when the number of applications/nominations were known at the school level. The events appear to be as follows:

A school dean asked the department heads the number of applications/nominations they had received. The dean, upon ascertaining that fewer were filed than the school was allocated, proceeded to extend the timeline for the school MPPP Awards Committee to receive the nominations/applications from the departments.

Further, some department heads extended the timelines for receiving applications/nominations after having knowledge of the number of persons filing. Other department heads extended the filing timeline before it was known how many faculty were applying or being nominated.

When this issue first came before the PPC, there was substantial discussion without a formal position being taken. The discussion, at that time, did not identify a significant problem since the timelines for RTP actions have been flexible in many schools over the years. This is the position which I presented to the Executive Committee on January 14. The communication of the substance of the PPC discussion led at least one dean to extend the timelines in his school.

It is possible that the changes in the timelines may cause inequities in that a different timeline criteria is applied between faculty in a given department, in a school, and within the university. A person making a timely filing may be denied because a late application/nomination was selected to receive an award, is an example of the potential problem.

The issue which the Personnel Policies Committee brings to the Executive Committee is whether timelines for the MPPP Awards should be firm or flexible. This issue should be addressed in the context of the recommended changes which we are proposing in a separate communication for revising the procedures for the MPPP Awards (attached).
PROCEDURES FOR
MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE AND PROFESSIONAL PROMISE AWARDS

I. PREAMBLE

This policy is designed to implement Articles 31.11 through 31.19 of the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three (faculty), agreed to in December, 1984.

Equal Opportunity guidelines govern the granting of MPPP Awards just as they do all other significant personnel actions at Cal Poly -- neither nominating faculty nor subsequent review bodies may discriminate on the basis of race, religion, or sex.

II. ELIGIBILITY

All persons covered by the Memorandum of Understanding for Unit Three are eligible to apply for or be nominated for Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards.

No MPPP Awards shall be made except under criteria mutually developed and approved by the campus President and the body of the Academic Senate.

No MPPP Awards shall be granted without a positive recommendation from the particular school or appropriate administrative unit MPPP Committee.

III. CRITERIA

Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards shall be given: (1) retrospectively, to recognize excellence in one or more of the following areas -- teaching, professional activity, service and/or (2) prospectively, to promote excellence in one or more of the same areas.

Individual schools may choose whether to develop more specific criteria statements appropriate to their disciplines as long as they do not contradict the general university statement. They are also free to determine whether variable criteria are appropriate for different ranks. If school committees elect to elaborate their own criteria, they are urged to remain consistent with established school criteria for other personnel decisions. School statements of criteria should be distributed to faculty and forwarded to the Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee well in advance of any selection cycle.

IV. APPLICATIONS/NOMINATIONS

Applications and nominations for MPPP Awards must document a candidate's excellent performance in teaching, professional activity, and/or service. Or,

Applications and nominations for MPPP Awards must document proposed projects which would enhance a faculty member's performance in teaching, professional activity, and/or service. (Examples of some appropriate uses are: travel, research support, technical/clerical support, released time, etc.) Or,

Applications and nominations for MPPP Awards may combine the above.

V. SELECTION PROCESS

All members of Unit Three may submit applications or nominations to appropriate department heads by January 10. Past recipients are as eligible as all other unit members.
Every school or appropriate administrative unit shall elect a committee by January 15 to review applications/nominations for MPPP Awards. (Each department or other appropriate unit elects one representative from faculty who have neither applied for nor been nominated for an award.)

Department heads shall forward all applications/nominations to school committees by January 20. No rankings occur before nominations/applications reach school committees.

School committees will review nominations/applications without prejudice in favor of nominations as opposed to applications or vice versa, and by February 15, forward to the dean or appropriate administrator no more than the same number of applicants/nominees as MPPP Awards allocated to the school/appropriate administrative unit. Only positive recommendations shall be forwarded. School committees need to complete and return data sheets furnished by the Academic Senate before they disband.

If the dean or appropriate administrator concurs with the recommendations, the awards shall be granted as recommended no later than March 1.

If the dean/appropriate administrator disagrees with the recommendations forwarded by the faculty, both the recommendations of the dean or appropriate administrator and those of the faculty shall be forwarded to the President by March 1.

By March 5, the President shall transmit both sets of recommendations for review by the University Professional Leave Committee, which shall forward its positive recommendations by March 20 to the President for his/her consideration in making a final determination by April 1.

If the UPLC makes a negative determination, the committee shall state their reason and shall return the denied application to the originating school committee with the request to forward a substitute recommendation to the dean/appropriate administrator, repeating the original process. Each level of review shall complete and forward its recommendations within five (5) working days.

If the President disagrees with the UPLC, he/she shall state their reasons and shall return the denied application to the originating school committee with the request to forward a substitute recommendation to the dean/appropriate administrator, repeating the original process. Each level of review shall complete and forward its recommendations within five (5) working days.

This process shall be repeated until all the awards are granted or until the nominee/applicant pool is exhausted.

Awards shall be granted no later than June 30.

IV. GENERAL PROVISIONS

A. Recipients as well as the Personnel and Payroll Offices shall be notified in writing within five (5) days of concurrence.

B. Awards shall be paid within 30 days of having been granted.

C. When there is question as to the definition of the appropriate administrative unit for a particular application/nomination, said question shall be referred to the Personnel Policies Committee for resolution.

D. All other questions about procedures and dates should also be referred to the Personnel Policies Committee.

Proposed By: Personnel Policies Committee
February 18, 1986
Revised April 8, 1986
To: Lloyd H. Lamouria, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Warren J. Baker  
President

Subject: Revised Procedures for Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards  
(AS-205-86/PPC)

The revisions adopted by the Senate on April 22, 1986 for the Procedures for Meritorious Performance and Professional Promise Awards are acceptable to me. I appreciate the improvements that the Personnel Policies Committee proposed and that the Academic Senate adopted.

Several complex procedural questions were referred to the PPC this year, and I am grateful for the committee's professional handling of these matters. As provided in the accepted procedures, questions and comments about procedures and dates will continue to be referred to the PPC for resolution.

Please convey to Charles Andrews, Chair, and the other members of the committee my thanks for their productive efforts during this academic year.