Meeting of the ACADEMIC SENATE
Tuesday, May 30, 2000, UU220, 3:00-5:00pm

I. Minutes: none.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
   A. Please calendar Thursday, June 1, 3-5pm, UU220 for last Academic Senate meeting of the quarter.
   B. Introduction of new senators: Caucus chairs will introduce next year's senators.

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair:
   B. President's Office:
   C. Provost's Office:
   D. Statewide Senators:
   E. CFA Campus President:
   F. AS[ Representative:
   G. Other: Report from IALA (Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment), Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Special Assistant to the Provost.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
   A. Resolution to Establish a Campuswide Policy on Posthumous Degrees: O'Keefe, chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading (Revised resolution to be distributed at meeting).
   B. Resolution on Election of Academic Senate Representative for Part-time Lecturers and Part-time PCS Employees: Fetzer, CFA campus president, second reading (p. 2. Bring the following handouts distributed at the May 23 meeting: (1) Constitution of the Faculty and Bylaws of the Academic Senate, (2) Number of Part-time Lecturers and Part-time PCS Employees, 1999-2000).
   C. Resolution on Voting Status for the Academic Senate Representative of Part-time Lecturers and part-time PCS Employees: Fetzer, CFA campus president, second reading (pp. 3-4).
   D. Resolution on Article 31.7 of the MOU, first reading. Kersten, statewide academic senator (to be distributed at meeting).
   E. Resolution on 1999-2000 FMI Procedures: Bethel, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, second reading (pp. 5-9).
   F. Resolution on the Growth Component of the Proposed Master Plan Revision, Greenwald, for the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee, second reading (Revised resolution to be distributed at meeting).
   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, second reading (Revised resolution to be distributed at meeting).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS--__--00/CFA
RESOLUTION ON ELECTION OF ACADEMIC SENATE REPRESENTATIVE FOR PART-TIME LECTURERS AND PART-TIME PCS EMPLOYEES

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.

d. e.

e. d.

d. e.

Proposed by the California Faculty Association Executive Committee
Date: April 13, 2000
Revised: April 26, 2000
Revised: May 2, 2000
Revised: 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.
VII.B.8. **Executive Committee**: The Executive Committee shall appoint one representative of the temporary part-time academic employees to serve during that quarter or academic year in accordance with Article I.B.4 and II.A.3 of these Bylaws.

Proposed by: The California Faculty Association Executive Committee
Date: April 26, 2000
Revised: May 2, 2000
Revised: May 22, 2000
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-____-00/
RESOLUTION ON
1999-2000 FMI Procedures

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

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

3. **Whereas:** 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. **Whereas:** 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. **Whereas:** 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. **Whereas:** It is helpful for clerical purposes that FMI awards be in whole dollar amounts each month;

7. **Whereas:** 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. **Whereas:** 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. **Whereas:** 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. **Whereas:** The FMI awards during the past FMI cycle were, in fact, distributed broadly; and

11. **Whereas:** The campus experienced comparatively few appeals; and

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

13. **Resolved:** 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The faculty unit collective bargaining agreement (MOU 31.13) requires all faculty unit employees to provide annually a Faculty Activity Report (FAR) of his/her activities irrespective of whether he/she is applying for a Faculty Merit Increase (FMI); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The FAR form is used for both FMI and SSI (Salary Service Increases); and;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It is helpful for clerical purposes that FMI awards be in whole dollar amounts each month; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The FMI awards during the past FMI cycle were, in fact, distributed broadly; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The campus experienced comparatively few appeals; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The campus experienced far less anger and hostility toward the FMI process than in previous years; therefore, be it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
September 22, 2000
- Departments determine whether to utilize a Departmental FMI Committee composed of faculty unit employees, the department head/chair, designee, or combination of the above at the discretion of the department.
- Department head/chair 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/head 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/head or dean.)

October 23, 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 23, 2000
- Candidate may submit a written rebuttal to the dean.

November 13, 2000
- Dean (or appropriate administrator) reviews Faculty Activity Reports, department recommendations, and provides separate recommendation to President with copy to the candidate.

November 13, 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.
WHEREAS, Cal Poly has had a long history of compassionate interaction with families and friends of deceased students who died while enrolled at the University; and;

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

WHEREAS, The awarding of a posthumous degree has frequently brought closure to a tragic situation for the family and friends of the deceased student as well as the University; and

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

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

RESOLVED: That the majority of 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.

RESOLVED: That the President or designee may grant the awarding of a posthumous degree or certificate for a student who has completed less than two-thirds (2/3) of the degree coursework under special or unusual circumstances.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: April 13, 2000
Revised: May 24, 2000
California State University Faculty Activity Report

Check one applicable time period per FAR completed: For the period:
☐ 1. ______ (date of last review) through June 30, 1998
☐ 2. July 1, 1998 through June 30, 1999

Please check the area of evaluation you wish to have emphasized during this review period (check only one):
☐ Teaching (see Section I below)
☐ Teaching and scholarship (see Sections I and II below)
☐ Teaching and service to University and community (see Sections I and III below)
☐ Teaching, scholarship, and service to University and community (see Sections I, II and III below)

Name __ Dept.

Highest Degree & Date

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 following area(s) you have selected, 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

Are you willing to have your name published if awarded a Faculty Merit Increase? ☐ Yes ☐ No

I do / do not (check one) wish to be considered for a Faculty Merit Increase.

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, and faculty members are NOT REQUIRED to include it on their FAR:
Faculty Assignment by Department (FAD) reports for the past five years will be provided 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; date of initial Cal Poly appointment; years in present rank/classification; time base; September 1998 and July 1999 monthly base salary rate.
RESOLUTION REGARDING ARTICLE 31.7 OF THE CURRENT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)

Whereas: the California Faculty Association and The California State University, after long and difficult bargaining, reached agreement about the criteria for the award of Faculty Merit Initiative (FMI) program salary increases, and;

Whereas: the FMI criteria were built upon the recommendations of the California State University (Statewide) Academic Senate Resolution “Criteria and Standards for Faculty Merit Increases,” AS-2438-99, passed February 12, 1999, and;

Whereas: AS-2438-99 reads in part as follows:

“Teaching is at the center of any system of merit increases. Faculty Merit Increases may be granted for:

• the quality of the unit member's teaching alone;
• teaching and scholarship;
• teaching and service to the University and community; or
• teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community.

Faculty unit employees whose work assignments do not encompass all the criteria (e.g., lecturers, coaches, department chairs, librarians) shall be eligible for Faculty Merit Increases on the basis of their performance in their particular work assignments,” and:

Whereas: Article 31.7 of the Current Memorandum of Understanding reads:

“31.7 The criteria for the award of Faculty Merit Increases shall be as follows. Faculty shall be eligible for Faculty Merit Increases, pursuant to the provisions of this Article, for demonstrated performance commensurate with rank, work assignment, and years of service, for:

a. the quality of the unit member’s teaching alone;

b. the quality of the unit member’s teaching and scholarship;

c. the quality of the unit member’s teaching and service to the University and community; or

d. the quality of the unit member’s teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community.

Faculty unit employees whose performance does not include assignments in all of the above areas shall nonetheless be eligible for a Faculty Merit Increase on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment.” Therefore Be It:

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo affirms the Faculty’s commitment to excellence of teaching, and Be It Further:

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo recognizes the importance of Article 31.7 of the Current Memorandum of Understanding in preserving the primacy of the teaching function for purposes of determining rewards under the Faculty Merit Initiative.

Proposed by: Tim Kersten, May 30, 2000
Criteria and Standards for Faculty Merit Increases

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt and urge the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to adopt the following criteria and standards for Faculty Merit Increases (provided in Article 31 of the Unit 3 MOU) as applicable to the increases granted effective July 1, 1998, and July 1, 1999. The Academic Senate CSU shall reexamine the criteria and standards for Faculty Merit Increase cycles effective July 1, 2000, and thereafter following its evaluation of the effectiveness of the Spring 1999 campus processes.

Teaching is at the center of any system of merit increases. Faculty Merit Increases may be granted for:

- the quality of the unit member's teaching alone;
- teaching and scholarship;
- teaching and service to the University and community; or
- teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community.

Faculty unit employees whose work assignments do not encompass all the criteria (e.g., lecturers, coaches, department chairs, librarians) shall be eligible for Faculty Merit Increases on the basis of their performance in their particular work assignments.

Teaching is broad and inclusive. Teaching encompasses instruction and such activities as advising, mentoring, supervision (e.g., individual studies, thesis direction, field supervision), and a range of contributions to improving student learning (e.g., curriculum revision, course and program coordination, assessment of learning outcomes, and applications of technology).

Scholarship is also broad. Scholarship includes discovery (traditionally labeled research, especially published or presented to professional audiences), integration (e.g., inter- or cross-disciplinary efforts), application (e.g., used in teaching or solving social, community, or technical problems), and creative activity (e.g., works of art, performances).

Service to the University and community is likewise broad. Service to the University and community includes the activity necessary to the faculty role in shared governance of the institution (CSU and its campuses) and activity applying the unit employee's expertise to benefit the University and its
community in general. Examples of service include significant committee work; student outreach and retention; participation in university and community organizations, professional associations, California Faculty Association, and appropriate governmental boards and commissions; advancement of public support for the University; and lectures and seminars to community groups.

Campus Senates shall immediately develop, and report to the Academic Senate CSU, the standards of performance for implementing the criteria established above.

RATIONALE: The Academic Senate CSU was asked by the CSU Chancellor’s Office and the California Faculty Association to develop standards and criteria for the awarding of Faculty Merit Increases consistent with the Academic Senate’s responsibility under HEERA. The above standards and criteria are developed to implement Article 31, section 31.14 of the Unit 3 Tentative Agreement.

APPROVED – February 12, 1999
Dear Colleagues:

The Cal Poly SLO Academic Senate is considering changes in the policies governing the award of FMIIs for the coming year. Currently they allow for faculty to apply for an FMI on the basis of excellence in teaching, or teaching and any combination of professional development and/or community service. It is up to the faculty member to choose whether to apply and what areas in addition to teaching (if any) to use as evidence of merit. The department faculty then make the primary recommendation. These principles are consistent, I believe, with the Merit Pay Taskforce's recommendations which guided the development of the contract solution last year. I want to know whether your campus is similar to ours or much different in how it handles FMI policy. In the interests of brevity and consistent information would you please reply to the following questions with a yes or no. Then add any narrative of additional information.

1) Does your campus policy require that FMI applicants be evaluated for an award based on all aspects of performance? (i.e., teaching, professional development, and community service)

2) Does your campus allow the faculty member to choose which job aspects under which to choose to compete? (rather than having the department chair or dean make that decision)

3) Does your campus allocate FMI money to the department level (at least some of the money)?

4) Does your campus publish in a widely available and timely manner the results of the FMI process?

If you would just reply by answering yes or no to each numbered question and follow that with any additional comments you wish I would be grateful. Thank you for your help and have a wonderful summer. Tim

Here are the Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAKERSFIELD</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHICO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESNO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYWARD</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMBOLT</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITIME AC.</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHRIDGE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. BERNARDINO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. FRANCISCO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NOT SPECIFIED</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACRAMENTO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JOSE</td>
<td>NO(?)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN MARCOS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANISLAUS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

May 30, 2000