Meeting of the
ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, May 23, 2000
UU220, 3:00-5:00pm

I. Minutes: Minutes of Academic Senate meetings for April 11, April 25, and May 2, 2000 (pp. 2-4).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost’s Office:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. ASI Representative:
G. Other: Master Plan, Linda Dalton, Vice Provost for Institutional Planning.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
A. Election of Senate officers for 2000-2001: Hannings, Vice Chair of the Academic Senate.
B. Resolution on Election of Academic Senate Representative for Part-time Lecturers and Part-time PCS Employees: Fetzer, President of Cal Poly Labor Council, second reading (to be distributed).
C. Resolution on Voting Status for the Academic Senate Representative of Part-time Lecturers and part-time PCS Employees: Fetzer, President of Cal Poly Labor Council, second reading (to be distributed).
D. Resolution on 1999-2000 FMI Procedures: Bethel, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, second reading (to be distributed).
E. Resolution on Code of Product Labor Principles and Business Standards, Greenwald, academic senator, first reading (p. 5).
F. Resolution to Establish a Campuswide Policy on Posthumous Degrees: O’Keefe, chair of the Instruction Committee, first reading (p. 6).
G. Resolution on Operational Methods to Monitor and Maintain Academic Quality in the Face of Potential Enrollment Growth: Kaminaka, chair of the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee, first reading (pp. 7-9).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
Background: The abuse of basic worker rights in the apparel industry has been a continuing problem. These abuses include child labor, women labor, as well as forced labor. Health and safety issues have all too frequently been ignored.

At the national level, the United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) was organized as an attempt to eliminate these abuses of basic worker rights in the apparel industry. Sit-ins and other confrontations between students and university officials have become increasingly common as students demand a change in university policies to end sweatshop manufacturing of university apparel.

The Cal Poly chapter of the USAS, Cal Poly Students Against Sweatshops, was organized with a similar intent to end sweatshop manufacturing of university apparel. Over the last several months the students in the Cal Poly Students Against Sweatshops have entered into a dialogue with the administration at Cal Poly with the goal of establishing a Code of Conduct concerning the manufacturing of university apparel.

The enclosed Code of Product Labor Principles and Business Standards is a joint effort of the Provost, the Cal Poly Students Against Sweatshops, and faculty members.

WHEREAS, The abuse of basic worker rights in the apparel industry throughout the world has been a continuing problem; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly can and must be a part of the solution to this problem; and

WHEREAS, There are fundamental rights that workers everywhere should possess; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly must ensure that the goods manufactured bearing its name and symbols be produced in a manner consistent with these fundamental rights; and

WHEREAS, The President, Warren Baker, and the Foundation Executive Director, Alfred Amaral, have signed the enclosed Code of Product Labor Principles and Business Standards; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly’s Academic Senate endorse the enclosed Code of Product Labor Principles and Business Standards.

Proposed by: Harvey Greenwald
Date: May 3, 2000
Revised: May 15, 2000
WHEREAS, Cal Poly has had a long history of compassionate interaction with families of deceased students; and; and

WHEREAS, This compassionate interaction is in the best interest of the families and the University; and

WHEREAS, There has in recent years been a concern about uniform University policy concerning awarding posthumous degrees; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the family of the deceased student may initiate a request for posthumous degree through the student’s department; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the faculty in the department of the student’s major may recommend to the President the award of a posthumous degree to the family of a deceased student when that student has satisfactorily completed at least two-thirds (2/3) of all coursework towards a degree; and be it further

RESOLVED: That when a deceased student lacks the two-thirds required coursework the faculty may recommend to the President and the President may present the family with a certificate.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: April 13, 2000
Background: The Academic Senate adopted Resolution AS-524-99/B&LRPC on May 25, 1999. That resolution, **RESOLUTION ON PRINCIPLES TO GOVERN ENROLLMENT GROWTH AT CAL POLY**, was intended to reinforce several principles that were felt to be important to the faculty at Cal Poly. These included: (1) that academic quality not be jeopardized, (2) that academic progress not be delayed, (3) that any enrollment growth should be fully funded, (4) that facilities must be in place before growth occurs, (5) that enrollment growth should occur in planned phases, (6) that Cal Poly continue to follow its role as a Polytechnic university and its adopted mission statement, and (7) that enrollment growth must be sensitive to its impact on surrounding communities and environment.

As we entered into the development of a new Master Plan for Cal Poly, it became evident that some operational definitions of the **Principles to Govern Enrollment Growth** were needed in order to assess whether or not the above principles were indeed being met. This concern has led to the introduction of this resolution. The substance of this resolution has been communicated to the Master Plan Development coordinators and to the Dean’s Enrollment Planning and Advisory Committee (DEPAC).

WHEREAS, Cal Poly is coming to closure on its Year 2000 update of its Campus Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, The previous **RESOLUTION ON PRINCIPLES TO GOVERN ENROLLMENT GROWTH AT CAL POLY (AS-524-99/B&LRPC)** was adopted by the Academic Senate on May 25, 1999; and

WHEREAS: Operational methods are needed by which the impacts of enrollment growth upon academic quality, facilities utilization, and resource allocation can be properly monitored, assessed, and dealt with as per the intent of that resolution; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the new Cal Poly Master Plan incorporate the following suggested strategies for operationalizing the **Principles to Govern Enrollment Growth** as embodied in Resolution AS-524-99/B&LRPC.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Budget and Long Range Planning Committee
Date: May 9, 2000
SUGGESTED STRATEGIES

PLAN FOR PHASED ASSESSMENT OF ENROLLMENT GROWTH IMPACTS
1. Planning for growth should be based upon a CONTINGENCY PLANNING concept which recognizes that additional capacity for enrollment will be built in discrete units.
2. Make use of key MILESTONES such as those points in time when FACILITIES (for classrooms & labs, etc.) become available.
3. Conduct an assessment at each PHASE OF GROWTH where PHASE ZERO (0) represents the point when we reach our current Master Plan Capacity (15,000 net AY FTE). PHASE is to be defined as "a point in time where we pause to think about where we're at".

SELECT MEASURES AND DEVELOP BENCHMARKS
1. Select a limited and manageable set of measures to be continuously monitored.
2. Establish current benchmarks for those measures to provide a reference point.
3. The faculty, students, staff, and administration of each college and program should engage in a collaborative process to select those measures which they would most prefer to use as benchmarks.
4. Recognize the need for two sets of measures: (1) those required by the CSU System, and (2) those which best correspond to your own program objectives.
5. Avoid value judgments, at this stage, as to the meaning of the selected measures. The meaning of the selected measures should be debated later in a different forum.
6. Each college or program could select those measures which they would most prefer to use as benchmarks.

QUALITY APPROACH
1. Use a Quality Control approach to monitor for excessive deviations from NORMAL benchmark values.
2. Use the results of your monitoring efforts to assess the impacts of any enrollment growth upon academic quality.

SOME POSSIBLE MEASURES THAT MIGHT BE CONSIDERED
NB. There is no value judgment implied by the listing of these measures. Whether or not these are indicators of higher or of lower quality is yet to be debated.

1 ACADEMIC QUALITY MEASURES?
   1. $/FTES
   2. Class size
   3. Size of applicant pool, quality of applicant pool
   4. Student / faculty ratios
   5. Group work versus individual work - Can new paradigms cause us to rethink student/faculty ratios?
   6. Number of SCANTRON exams given per student
   7. Faculty teaching loads
   8. Ratio of full-time to part-time faculty
   9. Quality of new faculty hires?
   10. Benchmarks- based upon current status?

2 ACADEMIC PROGRESS MEASURES?
   1. Time to graduation Need well-defined cohorts
   2. Retention
3. Surrogate = course loads (annual basis, summer loads)
4. Benchmark = students' perception of ability to capture classes?

(QUOTE)

3. GROWTH SHOULD BE FULLY FUNDED MEASURES?
   See Item 5

4. FACILITIES MUST BE IN PLACE BEFORE?
   See Item 5

5. GROWTH SHOULD OCCUR IN PLANNED PHASES?
   1. Contingency planning - based upon when facilities become available.
   2. Conduct assessment at each phase
   3. Phase 0 - when we reach our current Master Plan capacity (15,000).

6. ROLE AS A POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY AND ADOPTED MISSION STATEMENT?
   1. Mission statement states this goal in terms of percentages?
   2. Are absolute numbers an alternative?

7. ENROLLMENT GROWTH MUST BE SENSITIVE TO IMPACT ON SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES AND ENVIRONMENT?
   1. Evaluate negative and positive press coverage?
   2. Effects on housing and traffic.
   3. Effects on local economy.
   4. Environmental Impact Analysis

---

**FIGURE 1:** Alternative Strategies for Matching Enrollment Growth to Construction of New Built Capacity. Construction of New Facilities are assumed to be key milestones for planning purposes.
Number of Part-time Lecturers and Part-time PCS Employees
1999-2000

| College of Agriculture | 20 |
| College of Arch & Env Des | 7 |
| College of Business | 22 |
| College of Engineering | 26 |
| College of Liberal Arts | 61 |
| College of Science & Math | 14 |
| Professional Consult Servs | 21 |
| UCTE | 11 |

Provided by Human Resources
Fall Quarter 1999
WHEREAS, Part-time lecturers and part-time PCS (Professional Consultative Services) employees presently have a nonvoting, nonelected part-time representative on the Academic Senate; and

WHEREAS, Voting by secret ballot is the most democratic means of selecting representation by any organized group; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: Whereas, That this position be an elected position rather than an appointed position as is current procedure; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, conduct a General Faculty referendum to change Article III.1 (membership of the Academic Senate) of the Constitution of the Faculty as follows:

c. Those part-time lecturers of an academic department/teaching area and those part-time employees of Professional Consultative Services, other than those who are members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I, will be represented by one [voting] member in the Senate.

The Academic Senate representative of part-time lecturers and part-time PCS (Professional Consultative Services) employees shall be elected by a vote of all University part-time lecturers and part-time PCS employees during fall quarter of each academic year. Such representative must have an academic year appointment in order to serve in this position.
RESOLUTION ON THE GROWTH COMPONENT OF THE PROPOSED MASTER PLAN REVISION

Whereas, The CSU has reimbursed Cal Poly for increased enrollment at considerably less than the marginal cost of adding additional students; and

Whereas, The State of California has refused to increase the funding to Cal Poly to address the problems associated with inadequate support for high cost programs; and

Whereas, The proposed revised Master Plan includes a provision allowing for a substantial increase in enrollment headcount of 3000 students, and

Whereas, Each additional student at Cal Poly will result in a further deterioration of the financial health of Cal Poly; and

Whereas, This financial deterioration will result in increased class sizes, decreased availability of funds for equipment, and decreased throughput for students, and

Whereas, This financial deterioration will result in a decrease in the quality of education; and

Whereas, Once the Master Plan ceiling has been raised, Cal Poly will have lost its leverage; and

Whereas, The CSU has shown in the past its willingness to force Cal Poly to accept higher enrollment without adequate funding; therefore, be it

Resolved: That no enrollment growth should take place at Cal Poly until the State of California and the CSU provide a level of support for existing students and programs equal to the level of the 1991-1992 budget; and be it further

Resolved: That increased enrollment will occur only when the same or higher level of per student funding for the general Cal Poly budget is guaranteed by the State of California and the CSU; and be it further

Resolved: That unless such a firm guarantee for adequate support for current and additional students is received from both the State of California and the CSU, the growth component shall be removed from the proposed revised Master Plan

Proposed by: Budget and Long Range Planning Committee
Date: May 22, 2000
WHEREAS, Part-time lecturers and part-time PCS (Professional Consultative Services) employees presently have a part-time representative on the Academic Senate; and

WHEREAS, Such representation is currently a nonvoting position; and

WHEREAS, To fully represent her/his constituency, such representative should be a voting member of the Academic Senate; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, modify Articles I.B.4, I.B.5, II.A.3, and VII.B.8 of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate as follows:

I.B.4. [Definition of] Temporary Part-time lecturers and part-time PCS (Professional Consultative Services) academic employees: Faculty members Lecturers in academic departments/teaching areas in the University and personnel in Professional Consultative Services who are not full academic employees as defined above, who are not members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I of the Constitution of the Faculty; and personnel in PCS classifications (librarians, counselors, student service professionals I, II, III-academically related, student service professionals III and IV, Cooperative Education lecturers, physicians, and coaches) who are not members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I of the Constitution of the Faculty.

I.B.5. College Caucus: All of the senators from each college or Professional Consultative Services shall constitute the caucus of that college or Professional Consultative Services. Part-time lecturers and part-time PCS employees shall not be part of any college caucus.

II.A.3. Representative of Temporary Part-time lecturers and part-time PCS (Professional Consultative Services) Academic Employees: A nonvoting voting member of the Academic Senate representing temporary part-time lecturers and part-time PCS academic employees shall be appointed each quarter or for the academic year contingent upon the representative's continuing appointment elected by vote of all University part-time lecturers and part-time PCS employees during fall quarter of each academic year. Such representative must have an academic year appointment in order to serve in this position.
Whereas:

1. The faculty unit collective bargaining agreement (MOU 31.13) requires all faculty unit employees to provide annually a Faculty Activity Report (FAR) of their activities irrespective of whether he/she is applying for a Faculty Merit Increase (FMI); and

2. The FAR form is used for both FMI and SSI (Salary Service Increases); and;

3. In the two previous FMI cycles the FAR form was confusing because it was not clear that the faculty unit employee was to document all activities relevant to his/her job assignment for the applicable period; and

4. The FAR form was inconsistent with requirements of MOU 31.29 because the form allowed a faculty member to opt not to have his or her name and award published; and

5. The FAR form seemed to some faculty members to be demeaning by requiring them to state that yes, they wanted to be considered for an FAR FMI; and

6. It is helpful for clerical purposes that FMI awards be in whole dollar amounts each month, and

7. Some faculty who did not have full-time assignments were confused when their FMI awards were paid proportionally to their time bases; be it therefore

8. It is important for faculty to know what features of their performance determined that they did or did not receive an FMI award; therefore, be it

9. The Academic Senate in passing AS 518 99/EX and AS 519 99/AS have both recommended that the merit money be distributed broadly and equitably among all eligible faculty members; and

10. The FMI awards during the past FMI cycle were, in fact, distributed broadly; and

11. The campus experienced comparatively few appeals; and

12. The campus experienced far less anger and hostility toward the FMI process than in previous years; therefore, be it

Resolved:

13. That each department and each dean involved in the FMI review process publish, in advance, the criteria that will be used to determine FMI awards; and be it further

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-_____00/
RESOLUTION ON
1999-2000 FMI Procedures
Resolved: That each department and each dean involved in the FMI review process inform each faculty member in writing of the way in which the criteria were applied in his or her case; and be it further

Resolved: That the FAR form be revised as per the attached sample; and be it further

Resolved: That the attached FMI and SSI calendars be adopted; and be it further

Resolved: That deans and departments be urged to make FMI annual award recommendations in whole dollar amounts that are evenly divisible by twelve based on an equivalent time base of full-time; and be it further

Resolved: That deans be urged to inform their faculty that FMI awards are paid proportionally to the faculty member's time base; and be it further

Resolved: That deans and departments be urged to tell each faculty member in writing what criteria were used in making the decision to award him or her an FMI or not, and how those criteria were applied in his or her case; and be it further

Resolved: That the deans and departments involved in the FMI review process be encouraged to distribute the FMI awards as broadly and equitably as possible.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: May 2, 2000
Revised: May 15, 2000
Revised: May 18, 2000
CAL POLY FACULTY MERIT INCREASE CALENDAR: FAR
JULY 1, 1999 - JUNE 30, 2000

September 22, 2000
- Departments determine whether to utilize a Departmental FMI Committee composed of faculty unit employees, the department head/keyboard designee, or combination of the above at the discretion of the department.
- Department head/keyboard advises dean (or appropriate administrator) of department's decision.

September 22, 2000
- Faculty unit employees (faculty, librarians, coaches, counselors) submit completed Faculty Activity Reports to the department chair/keyboard who makes them available to the Departmental FMI Committee or designee, and provides dean (or appropriate administrator) and the President with a copy of each FAR.
- Faculty Activity Reports shall detail in separate sections all of the appropriate activities based on the employee’s work assignment for the period July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000. (The work assignment for most tenure track faculty consists of teaching, scholarship, and service; a lecturer’s typical work assignment consists of teaching, only. Faculty who are unsure of their assignment should check with their department chair/keyboard or dean.)

October 13, 2000
- Departmental FMI Committee (or designee) reviews all Faculty Activity Reports of Unit 3 employees from respective department/unit and provides recommendations to dean with a copy to candidate and to the President.

October 20, 2000
- Candidate may submit a written rebuttal to the dean.

November 3, 2000
- Dean (or appropriate administrator) reviews Faculty Activity Reports, department recommendations, and provides separate recommendation to President with copy to the candidate.

November 10, 2000
- Candidate may submit a written rebuttal to the President.

November 20, 2000
- President (or designee) notifies candidates of final FMI decisions retroactive to July 1, 2000.

December 4, 2000
- Appeal deadline. Faculty may appeal if they were favorably recommended by the department or the dean/appropriate administrator for an FMI, and the final FMI decision is less than the amount recommended at either level, or the FMI was denied.
SSI (Service Salary Increase) Criteria and Calendar for FY 2000-01

SSI Criteria: demonstrated satisfactory performance commensurate with rank, work assignment, and service during the period between July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000. Part-time lecturers are eligible for SSI after teaching 36 WTUs and thus, reports should include all appropriate activities for the period between their last SSI and June 30, 2000.

September 22, 2000

- All SSI-eligible faculty unit employees submit to department chair/head a Faculty Activity Report that details the following for an 2000/01 SSI:

  All appropriate activities between July 1, 1999, through June 30, 2000 will be considered for the SSI which will be effective on the incumbent's SSI eligibility date, normally the beginning of Fall Quarter.

  Note: This FAR will also be used for employees wishing to be considered for a 2000/01 FMI.

September 25, 2000

- Department chairs/heads provide a copy of FARs that have been submitted by SSI-eligible faculty to dean (or appropriate administrator) and to the President.

September 29, 2000

- Department chairs/heads provide recommendations for 2000/01 SSIs to dean (or appropriate administrator).

October 10, 2000

- Dean (or appropriate administrator) grants or denies Service Salary Increase and communicates decision to employee, department chair/head and President. An approved SSI shall result in a salary increase of 2.65% to be effective on appropriate SSI eligibility date of incumbent.

SSI Appeals

October 17, 2000

- Employee denied SSI may request meeting with dean (or appropriate administrator) to discuss review.

October 21, 2000

- Employee may appeal the decision to deny an SSI. An appeal committee of faculty shall hear the appeal.

Note: FMI review commencing September 22, 2000

- 2000/01 FMI: The FAR submitted for 2000/01 SSI on September 22, 2000 will also be used for 2000/01 FMI consideration for those employees wishing to be considered for an FMI. Such FARs will be forwarded by department chair/head to appropriate departmental FMI designee (dean and President were provided copies on September 25, 2000).

- See Cal Poly "Faculty Merit Increase Policy" for procedures and calendar.
California State University Faculty Activity Report  
JULY 1, 1999 through JUNE 30, 2000

The criteria for the award of a Faculty Merit Increase shall be for demonstrated performance commensurate with the rank and work assignment of the faculty unit employee (i.e., most tenure track faculty have a work assignment of teaching, scholarship, and service, whereas, a typical lecturer's work assignment consists of teaching only. If you are unsure of your assignment, please check with your department chair or dean.)

Name ____________________________________________ Dept. ____________________________

Highest Degree & Date _________________________________________________________________

☐ Check here if eligible for SSI (Service Salary Increase)
☐ Check here if you do NOT want to be considered for an FMI (note: a Faculty Activity Report is required even for those employees who elect not be considered for a faculty merit increase.)

In no more than four (4) typewritten pages using 12-point type and one-inch margins, provide information on your activities, contributions, and accomplishments in the areas applicable to your work assignment, for the period covered by this report. (Note, the sub-headings under each section are considered guidelines and not an obligatory request for information)

I. Teaching & Contributions to Student Development/Other Primary Work Assignment
   A. Summarize and comment on your student evaluations of teaching.
   B. Describe any changes in teaching approach or in responsibilities.
   C. Describe your responsibilities in advising, supervision, or similar activities.
   D. Course development or other curricular activities (i.e. redesign a major or minor)
   E. Other

II. Scholarly/Creative Activities and Professional Development/Practice
   A. List/describe work completed (books, journal articles, performances, editing, presentations, grant proposals, etc.).
   B. List/describe work in progress.
   C. Other

III. University & Community Service (list/describe your contribution to the following)
   A. Department Committees/Service
   B. College, University, Systemwide Committees/Service
   C. Professional Service Activities
   D. Community Service Activities
   E. Other

IV. Optional: List special accomplishments & other activities not included in any of the above

I attest that the information provided in this report is accurate and true to the best of my knowledge.

__________________________________________  ________________________________
Faculty Member's Signature           Date

The following information will be accessible to departments; faculty members are NOT REQUIRED to include it on their FAR. Faculty Assignment by Department (FAD) reports for the past year will be accessible to FMI reviewers at department and college levels. FAD summarizes data regarding courses taught and enrollments by term for each faculty member. Academic Personnel will send each Department a report to include: rank/classification; tenured or probationary or temporary; if probationary, date of initial tenure-track appointment; if temporary, date of first appointment in present range; time base; June 2000 monthly salary rate, and SSI counter.

http://academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/policies/html

Academic Personnel Office, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 4/10/00