Preparatory: The meeting was opened at 3:10 p.m.


I. Minutes: none

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: no report
B. President’s Office: no report
C. Provost’s Office: no report
D. Statewide Senators: Kersten mentioned the General Salary Increase and the fact that we lag approximately 10.5% behind average comparable institutions. The Trustees are supposed to be looking at the salary gap, with a report coming out soon. When Morrobel-Sosa asked if the report will be made public, Kersten responded that he didn’t know. Gooden commented that the Chancellor indicated that the gap is in the upper ranks, and Gooden wondered who actually did the analysis.
E. CFA Campus President: Zetzsche reported that the CFA is involved in contract negotiations. Counselors and Librarians will receive 2.2 GSI and 1.0 SSI. PSSI’s will be here for at least another year. Of the new CSU budget increase, half will go to salaries and half to technology upgrade. Still not sure what the budget total will be.
F. Staff Council representative: no report
G. ASI representative: no report
H. IACC representative: no report
I. Athletics Governing Board representative: no report
J. Other: Presentation of resolution commending Glenn Irvin of service to the university. M/S/P to enter resolution into Senate records.

IV. Consent Agenda:
V. Business Item(s): CONTINUED AGENDA FROM MEETING OF MAY 20, 1997.

E. Resolution on Faculty Performance Salary Step Increase Policy: M/S resolution into second reading. Harris gave introduction and information on additions and deletions from first reading. Zingg made comments (with the support of the President) acknowledging that the policy is borne of an industrial environment, has little value in industry, and is an insult to academia. The policy comes with little rationale and few principles. There is recognition by the administration that good work is done by all faculty. Administration encourages the Academic Senate to incorporate a policy that reflects the will of the campus.

Greenwald pleaded for civility and professionalism in the discussions, emphasizing that we can all agree to disagree. Three options were presented for discussion: (1) end the discussion today, (2) table the issue until Fall, or (3) if the group is close to finishing discussion, a continuation meeting can be held on 6/5 or 6/10. Greenwald gave clarification of various methods of discussion and voting.

M/S/P to move discussions to committee of the whole. M/S (Hood/P. Wheatley) to move Alternative Report #1 to committee of the whole. M/S (Bowker/Johnston) to move Alternative Report #2 to committee of the whole. M/S (Bowker/Johnston) to move Alternative Report #3 to committee of the whole.

Kersten questioned requirement of submission of an annual report by each faculty member. P. Wheatley echoed concern and liked elimination of college committee in Hood’s document. Morrobelsosa spoke to importance of teaching, against limit of number of times a person can receive an award, and questioned if we will now be rewarding mediocre teaching. Johnston spoke in favor of Hood’s proposal. Bowker suggested that limiting the number of PSSI awards makes sense. Kersten spoke to having department review only. Gooden was concerned that department-only approvals might be rewarding mediocre departments, and indicated a desire to see more than one level of review. Coleman voiced concern that recommendations and denials just at the department level would be very divisive. O’Keefe felt that department-only review would show favoritism. Valencia-Laver questioned what would happen if the department did not get along well. J. Wheatley spoke to departmental review on the basis that it would keep power in the department (as in RPT). Hood stated that no matter what we do, PSSI’s will always be divisive. Hood also raised the question of whether the decisions should be made by people with knowledge or people without. Miller voiced that this is an administrative function, and if it is not handled by equal distribution, then administration should make the decision.

Straw Vote: 23 for college-level review versus 20 for department-only review.

Hood made additional comments, indicating how it differed from the original document. Brown made comments on Alternative Report #3, and how it differed from the original resolution. Brown doesn’t feel that a person should have to submit a letter to the President if they don’t want to be considered for PSSI, and would like to see language to allow information to be submitted since the last PSSI, and not limiting it to two PSSI’s. Bowker yielded the floor to Jaime Colome, who proposed Alternative Report #2.
Colome spoke to the issue of teaching faculty versus administrative faculty (who have extensive release time, committee work, research, etc.).

Bowker requested that the group focus on one alternative report, and then modify it. **Vote was 26/8 to come back next week to continue discussion.**

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment: **M/S/P to adjourn at 4:50 p.m.**

Submitted by:

Leslie Cooper
Academic Senate
SAMPLE PSSI APPLICATION

Name of Applicant ________________________________

Department ________________________________

Date of Last PSSI Award ________________________________

TEACHING PERFORMANCE: (limited to one page)

Applicants are encouraged to include discussion of their teaching philosophy and methods, contributions to curricular development, and efforts to implement innovative instruction.

(actual space used, up to the one page limit, to be determined by the applicant)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: (limited to one page)

Please list your 3 most important accomplishments in the area of professional development. Applicants should include discussion of how their professional activities relate to their teaching function and the mission of the university.

(actual space used, up to the one page limit, to be determined by the applicant)

SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY: (limited to one page)

Please list your 3 most important accomplishments in the area of service to the university community. Applicants should address how their service enhances and promotes the mission of the university.

(actual space used, up to the one page limit, to be determined by the applicant)
 Significant changes proposed for the PSSI policy:

- PSSI funding to be allotted to departments/units based on the number of Full-time equivalent Unit 3 employees allocated in the department/unit.
- University and College PSSI committees to be eliminated from the review and recommendation process.
- Departments/units would be required to develop PSSI procedures and criteria consistent with current promotion, retention, and tenure (RPT) considerations and with the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).
- Departmental review of applicants/nominees to constitute the highest level of faculty review.
- Applicants to be informed as to the basis of their recommendation by the departmental PSSI review committee.
- Elimination of the "Highly Recommended" category.

Submitted by Les Bowker, Biological Sciences Dept, CSAM

June 3, 1997
CAL POLY
PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY

1.0 Performance Salary Step Increases - General Provisions

1.1 Performance Salary Step Increases (PSSI) recognize outstanding or meritorious performance in the areas of teaching and other professional performance, professional growth and achievement, and service to the University, students, and community by Unit 3 employees. (CBA Unit 3 -- Article 31.18)

1.1.1 The following working definitions shall apply:

Outstanding: exceptional performance; distinguished; readily acknowledged as a model of performance.

Meritorious: commendable performance; worthy of praise.

1.2 The recognition of outstanding or meritorious performance by a Unit 3 employee shall be in the form of a permanent increase in the base salary of the individual. PSSI awards shall consist of from one to five steps on the salary schedule in any single review period. (CBA -- Article 31.18)

1.3 For the purposes of PSSI review and funding allocation, athletic coaches, counselors, librarians, and UCTE Unit 3 employees shall be combined into a single "unit". The Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs shall appoint a review committee consisting of one administrative supervisor from each of the represented areas. (CBA -- Article 31.26)

1.4 The effective date of all PSSI awarded shall be of each year that there are negotiated Performance Salary Step Increases. (CBA -- Article 31.26)

1.5 There is no requirement to expend all funds dedicated to the PSSI program in any given fiscal year. Any portion of the funds not expended in any fiscal year shall automatically carry forward to the PSSI pool in the next fiscal year. In the event that the PSSI program is eliminated, any funds that have been carried forward shall be used for the professional development opportunities identified in Provision 25.1 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA, Unit 3, 1995-1998).

1.6 Each year that the PSSI program is funded, the President shall allot 85% of the campus funding to the colleges/units based on the number of Full-time Equivalent Unit 3 employees in each college(CBA -- Article 31.32). College Deans shall inform all Unit 3 employees within their College as to the total funding available to the College and the specific dollar allocations to each department. College Deans shall not retain funding for discretionary use. Funds retained by the President shall be utilized, at the discretion of the President, to ensure that Unit 3 employees have the opportunity to receive PSSI awards based on their outstanding performance, rather than the number of Unit 3 employees within their
department/unit. The Chair of the Academic Senate shall be notified of the allocation model by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in a timely fashion.

2.0 Eligibility, Applications, and Nominations

2.1 All Unit 3 employees are eligible to submit an application for a PSSI award (see Appendix A - Application Form) or to be nominated by other faculty or academic administrators each year that the PSSI program is funded. (CBA --Article 31.19)

2.1.1 Applications/nominations for Department Chairs/Heads, and other supervisors of Unit 3 employees, who are contractually eligible to apply or be nominated, will be evaluated and recommended by their Dean.

2.2.2 Unit 3 employees who are being evaluated for a PSSI, either through nomination or application, cannot serve on any PSSI related evaluation committee which may evaluate said employee. However, any Unit 3 employee may serve on a review committee, if their service is requested by another department/unit outside of their College/unit.

2.3 All applications/nominations must be submitted using the approved PSSI Application format (CBA -- Article 31.19; see Appendix A). The application is limited to 3 pages, however applicants/nominators may, without disrupting the order of the information presented, alter the space provided for any specific section. To facilitate the application process, Unit 3 employees may download the PSSI application form from _____________ or obtain an electronic file from ________

2.4 Evidence submitted in support of an application or nomination is to be limited to the period since the employee’s last PSSI award or for the 5 year period prior to the current application/nomination.

2.5 All applications/nominations and supporting documentation must be submitted in writing (all forms of electronic, photographic, and other media will be returned to the applicant and will not be considered).

3.0 Procedure and Criteria

3.1 Procedures used in evaluating applicants for PSSI awards are to be established by each department/unit and approved by the Dean, prior to submission of departmental/unit PSSI recommendations. Procedures used in evaluating applicants/nominees are to be consistent with approved promotion and retention procedures applied in RPT evaluations. (CBA -- Article 31.21)

3.2 Applicants/nominees are to be evaluated in the following areas: teaching-performance and/or other professional performance; professional growth and achievement; and service to the university, students, and community (CBA -- Article 31.17). Specific criteria to be used in evaluating applicants are to be
established by each department/unit, approved by the Dean (prior to submission of PSSI recommendations for 1997-98), and must be consistent with promotion and retention standards presently applied in RPT evaluations. (CBA -- Article 31.21)

3.3 Academic departments/units shall constitute the "highest level faculty review committee" with regard to PSSI applications/nominations and shall submit their recommendations to both the Dean of the College and the President of the University. (CBA --Article 31.31)

3.3.1 Applicants/nominees shall be informed by their department PSSI committee as to their recommendation and the number of steps for which they were recommended. The specific ranking methodology and/or point systems, including appeals to the departmental PSSI committee, shall be determined by the department as part of the overall PSSI procedure and criteria to be developed by each department.

3.3.2 Departmental recommendations shall not exceed the anticipated funding level for the department. Applicants who, based on departmental ranking, receive positive recommendations, but for whom there is insufficient funding shall have their application/nomination submitted to the President on a separate list for further consideration.

3.4 The Dean of each College shall receive PSSI recommendations from each department/unit within the College. After review of the recommendations and applications/nominations, and following consultation with the Department Chairs/Heads, each Dean will submit the their PSSI recommendations to the President.

3.4.1 The specific evaluation system, including appeal of the Dean's recommendation, shall be determined by the Dean, in consultation with department Chairs/Heads and the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, and must be approved by the President prior to submission of the Dean's recommendations for the 1997-98 PSSI review period. The Dean shall notify all Unit 3 employees within their College of the specific nature of the approved evaluation system. This notification must include any College specific criteria not applied during the departmental review.

3.4.2 The total cost of all steps recommended by the Dean shall be less than the anticipated dollar allocation to the College. Any applicants/nominees who are recommended by the Dean, but for whom there is insufficient funding shall have their recommendation forwarded to the President on a separate list for further consideration.

3.4.3 Applicants/nominees shall be informed of the Dean's recommendation and the number of steps for which the applicant/nominee was recommended. Furthermore, applicants/nominees shall receive a summary of the Dean's evaluation of their application/nomination.
4.0 PSSI calendar and program timeline

4.1 The specific timeline covering notification, application, evaluation, and Presidential awards shall be established by the Academic Senate each year that the PSSI program funded by the CSU system.

4.1.1 Notification of all Unit 3 employees should occur within 30 days of the campus receiving notification of the funding approval.

4.1.2 Application/nomination closure date shall be the end of the 4th week of the quarter in which the departmental review will take place.

4.1.3 Department evaluations shall conclude and all recommendations shall be forwarded to the applicants, Dean, and President by the end of the 8th week of the quarter in which the departmental evaluation takes place. While the notification of the applicants must contain their specific recommendation, including number of steps for which they were recommended, each department/unit shall determine the extent of the information contained within the notification to the applicant (see section 3.1 above)

4.1.4 The recommendations of the Dean shall be submitted to the President within 15 academic working days of the notification of the departmental recommendations.

4.1.5 The President or designee shall review the applications/nominations, recommendations from the academic departments/units and College Deans which have been submitted for consideration. The President shall notify all applicants of the, within 30 academic working days, of the decision to grant or deny a PSSI award for outstanding or meritorious performance. Applicants granted a PSSI shall also be informed of the number of steps to be granted and the effective date of the award.

5.0 Special provisions (see Faculty Affairs recommendations Section 10.0, May 27, 1997).

Exceptions: delete all references to University and/or College PSSI committees and substitute Departmental PSSI Committee.

6.0 Relationship to RPR Deliberations (see Faculty Affairs recommendations Section 11.0, May 27, 1997).

Exceptions: delete all references to University and/or College PSSI committees and substitute Departmental PSSI Committee.

7.0 Peer Review of PSSI denials (see Faculty Affairs recommendations Section 12.0, May 27, 1997).
Exceptions: Exceptions: delete all references to University and/or College PSSI committees and substitute Departmental PSSI Committee.

8.0 Reporting of PSSI awards (see Faculty Affairs recommendations Section 13.0, May 27, 1997).

9.0 Final Disposition of All Documents pertaining to PSSI awards (see Faculty Affairs recommendations Section 14.0, May 27, 1997).

Changes: add to section (1) ... Applicants Personnel file for inclusion.

Submitted by Les Bowker
The document that the Academic Senate is proposing to facilitate PSSI awards is flawed because it will not correct the injustices and damage to the University that past PSSI awards have created. Major problems caused by the PSSI awards are considered and a procedure for correcting these problems is presented.

Past PSSI awards, have for the most part, been given to persons who have significantly reduced teaching loads. See the attached figure. The highest awards have gone to persons that usually teach less than 10 units (10 hours a week) and in some cases have gone to persons who are known to be doing a very average job of teaching in their remaining courses because of other activities. Part-time teaching loads give faculty extra time to become highly visible. Those that have full-time teaching loads, advanced classes, and attempt to remain up-to-date are expected to compete with those that have part-time loads often requiring little preparation. This is unfair and unacceptable.

Because past PSSI awards have not gone to persons who teach full time (36 units/year) but to persons who have extra time to become highly visible, teaching is seen as something to escape. The limited number of PSSI awards are extremely destructive to faculty moral because most of the faculty will never receive more than one or two awards during the rest of their careers. This situation suggests to the faculty that they should “stop wasting their time teaching and get involved in other activities that will make them highly visible or at least happy.” The PSSI awards have divided the faculty into the “administrative faculty” (who do all the really important jobs in each department & sit on important Departmental, School, and University Committees) and the “teaching faculty” (who mostly teach and prepare for courses).

To counter the destructive effects of past and future PSSI awards, they should not go to persons that teach fewer than 36 units/year. Units for senior projects and special projects should not count toward the 36 units/year. Some faculty have these special courses accounting for most of their units. These restrictions on who would be eligible for a PSSI award would force the supposed “meritorious and outstanding teachers” back into teaching.

Since College and University Committees, Department Heads/Chairs, Deans, and other Administrators barely know how well many of their faculty teach or even how significant their professional development is, they should not be allowed to judge teaching nor arbitrarily give or take away PSSI awards. Awards should all be based on quantitative measurements, as much as possible, not on subjective judgements. A University Oversight Committee of representative faculty and administrators should only be involved in tabulating information submitted by PSSI candidates and in making sure that there is a “fair” distribution of PSSI awards. A procedure follows that hopefully will correct the damage done by past PSSI awards.
PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING AND DISTRIBUTING PSSI AWARDS

I. Requirements for applying.
1. A faculty member is not eligible for a PSSI award if they have taught less than 36 units/year in the preceding two years. Senior projects and special projects will not count as part of the 36 units/year.
2. A faculty member is not eligible for a PSSI award if they have received one the previous year.
3. A faculty member must submit a current evaluation (1-15 points) by the Department’s Personnel Committee/College Unit Committee (see section V) as to their relative teaching ability in their Department/College Unit. In addition, information should be provided by the candidate, which will enable a University Oversight Committee to credit the candidate for criteria in sections II, III, and IV.

II. The following is one way that teaching might be evaluated (50 points maximum):
1. Credit will be given for senior projects, special projects, & master’s degree committees. The more you do, the more credit you get (1-10 points).
2. Credit will be given for teaching large numbers of students. Each 300 SCUs taught per quarter is worth two points. Fractional points should be counted (1-15 points).
3. Credit will be given for teaching graduate courses. You receive one point for every unit (1-5 points).
4. Credit will be given by a Personnel Committee as to the faculty’s relative teaching ability in a Department or College Unit (see below). Student evaluations can play a role in this score. No ties are allowed (1-15 points).
5. Credit will be given for other teaching related activities not covered above (1-5 points).

III. The following is one way that professional development might be evaluated (15 points maximum):
1. Credit will be given for each professional meeting attended (1-5 points).
2. Credit will be given for each abstract published or other work presented. Multiple authored abstracts will receive partial credit unless they the other authors are your students (1-5 points).
3. Credit will be given for each talk or workshop given at a professional meeting (1-5 points).
4. Credit will be given for each paper or chapter published in a professional journal or book. Multiple authored papers will receive partial credit unless the coauthors are your students (1-5 points).
5. Credit will be given for each grant received. Multiple authored grants will receive partial credit (1-5 points).
6. Credit will be given for other professional development not considered above (1-5 points).

IV. The following is one way that service might be evaluated (15 points maximum):
1. Credit will be given for each committee (1-5 points).
2. Credit will be given for each chairperson position (1-5 points).
3. Credit will be given for each talk (associated with your profession) given to schools, clubs, etc. (1-5 points).
4. Credit will be given for each professional consultation with businesses, schools, governments, etc. Credit should not be given to consultants who receive pay for their services (1-5 points).
5. Credit will be given for other services not mentioned above (1-5 points).

V. The following is one way that awards might be given.
1. A University Oversight Committee will group related small Departments in the University into nearly equal “College Units” (25–35 individuals) and tabulate the points (maximum 80 points: 50 for teaching, 15 for professional development, 15 for service). The #1 candidates from each Department/College Unit will be considered equal, the #2 candidates from each College Unit will be considered equal, etc.
2. A single PSSI award will be given to each of the candidates beginning with all the #1s, then all the #2s, etc., until the money runs out. If there is not enough money to complete a group, the remaining candidates will be funded first (without having to reapply) the next year and will be eligible to apply again without an intervening year to make up for their wait.
3. The candidates will be informed by the University’s Oversight Committee what their final score was and why they did not receive a PSSI award.
4. Candidates turned down will have the right to appeal.
Enclosed is an alternative PSSI Policy proposed by Myron Hood. Listed below are the most substantive changes between this policy at the Faculty Affairs policy:

1. The evaluation and recommendation is done by the applicant’s department, dean, the Provost and the President. There are no college or university review committees.

2. To be eligible, one must have received less than two PSSI steps (one or none) the previous year or cycle.

3. All Unit 3 employees are required to submit an Annual Performance Review Statement. This Statement also serves as an application for those who are eligible. This procedure is quite different from what has been done previously. Because of this, I have included an alternative application procedure at the end. I think that either one of these procedures is preferable to what we now have before us.

PSSI Policy Alternative

1 PSSI’s and the MOU; determination of a PSSI calendar

1.1 - 1.5 As in the original document

1.6 During the Spring of each year, the President, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, will determine a time table for the application and review process for PSSI awards for the following year.

2 Initial distribution of PSSI funds, determination of applicants and application procedure

2.1 The President shall apportion 85% of the University PSSI allocation among the colleges/units in proportion to the number of eligible Unit 3 employees in those groups. The remaining 15% will be distributed by the President and Provost to take care of special merit cases and/or oversights. The Chair of the Academic Senate will be informed of these allocations in a timely manner.

2.2 All Unit 3 employees will submit an Annual Performance Review Statement (APRS), consisting of two or less pages. This Statement will become part of that employee’s personnel file, and it will constitute a PSSI application for all eligible employees.

2.3 Those eligible for a PSSI will be all Unit 3 employees who received less than 2 PSSI steps in the preceding fiscal year and have not received the maximum number of PSSI steps.

2.4 Eligible employees who do not wish to be considered for a PSSI in this cycle should attach a note to their APRS stating so. Those eligible employees who have not included such a note on their APRS will be considered applicants for the PSSI.

2.5 Department chairs/heads or other Unit 3 supervisory employees who are eligible and wish to be considered for a PSSI award, should submit their APRS to their dean or the Provost, as appropriate.

2.6 Applicants are to be evaluated in the following areas: teaching performance and/or other professional performance; professional growth and achievement; and service to the university, students and/or community.
3 Evaluation process of applicants and awarding of PSSI's

3.1 Each department will evaluate the applicants in their department. The evaluations will be based on the criteria listed in 2.6. The process for doing this is left up to the department, but it is suggested that procedures similar to PRT or Post Tenure Review be used. A committee made up of nonapplicants should be used, if possible.

3.2 The Dean of each College, after learning of the College's allotment of PSSI funds from the President, will tell each department what their approximate expected number of PSSI steps will be. The Dean will not withhold any funding for discretionary use.

3.3 After evaluation of its applicants, each department will prepare a list of applicants together with the suggested number of PSSI steps that should be awarded. The number of steps for each applicant will be between 0 and 5. The total number of steps submitted should equal the department's allotment. This list will be sent to the Dean.

3.4 Each department should inform every applicant of her/his evaluation and recommended number of PSSI steps. Any dissatisfied applicant could appeal her/his decision to the Dean.

3.5 Upon receiving the recommendation lists from all the Departments, the Dean will review the departmental recommendations, interleaf all the lists and send one list onto the Provost for consideration. The Dean may change the number of steps recommended for individual applicants on this list. The total number of steps recommended by the Dean shall equal that College's allocation. The Dean will also submit a list of additional names and recommended steps of those who could be funded with part of the President's 15%.

3.6 The Dean should inform each applicant of her/his status. Any dissatisfied applicant could appeal her/his case to the Provost.

3.7 For members of unit 3 that are not members of a department in some college, the Provost is responsible for establishing an evaluation process using the procedures in 3.1-3.6 as a guideline.

3.8 The Provost will collect the lists from the all the colleges and the other applicants. These will be combined into a single list and sent to the President. The Provost may change the number of steps recommended for an individual applicant.

3.9 The President will review the list and decide the final list of PSSI awards. This list shall be published.
Suggested datelines for Fall 1997 (PSSI retroactive to July 1, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President issues statement concerning PSSI’s and apportions PSSI to the Colleges, with copy to Chair of Academic Senate</td>
<td>Sep 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments/units collect Annual Performance Review Statements from Unit 3 members.</td>
<td>Sep 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans inform departments of approximate expected PSSI steps</td>
<td>Sep 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments review applicants, prepare and send list to Dean and inform applicants of status</td>
<td>Oct 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants can appeal to Dean</td>
<td>Oct 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean combines departmental lists into a College, sends it to Provost and informs applicants of status</td>
<td>Nov 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants can appeal to Provost</td>
<td>Dec 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost combines all lists into a single list for the President</td>
<td>Dec 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President makes awards</td>
<td>Jan 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Similar calendar for PSSI’s effective July 1, 1998 starting when sufficient budget data is known. Details to be worked out with Academic Senate Executive Committee)

Alternative application procedures for those seeking a PSSI award.

2.2’ All Unit 3 employees are eligible for PSSI awards. Applications/nomination will submit a PSSI Application form and up to three pages of support material.

2.3’ Evidence submitted in support of a an application/nomination should emphasize only the period since the employee’s last PSSI or the prior 5 year period if no award has been received during that time.

2.4’ Department chairs/heads or other Unit 3 supervisory employees should submit their applications or have their nominations sent to the appropriate dean or to the Provost for evaluation and recommendation.

2.5’ All applications/nominations and supporting documentation is limited to three pages and must be submitted in writing (i.e. electronic or other such media will not be considered).
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate acknowledges receipt of the Performance Salary Step Increase Policy; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate receive the Performance Salary Step Increase Policy; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the Performance Salary Step Increase Policy as modified; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Performance Salary Step Increase Policy be submitted to the President and Provost for implementation.

Proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee
May 1, 1997
Revised June 3, 1997
CAL POLY
PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY

1.0 Performance Salary Step Increases

1.1 Performance Salary Step Increases (PSSIs) recognize outstanding or meritorious performance in the areas of teaching performance and/or other professional performance, professional growth and achievement, and service to the university, students, and community. (MOU 31.17 -- see Appendix 5)

1.2 The recognition of outstanding or meritorious performance by a Unit 3 employee shall be in the form of a permanent increase in the base salary of the individual, in one or more steps on the salary schedule. (MOU 31.18 -- see Appendix 5)

1.3 No applicant/nominee shall receive more than five (5) PSSIs. (MOU 31.18 -- see Appendix 5)

1.4 The effective date of all PSSIs shall be in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement. (MOU 21.11)

1.5 There is no requirement to expend all funds dedicated to the PSSI program in any given fiscal year. Any portion of the funds not expended in any fiscal year shall automatically carry forward to the PSSI pool in the next fiscal year. In the event that the PSSI program is eliminated in the future, all accumulated funds in the PSSI pool shall be used for professional development opportunities identified in Provision 25.1 of the MOU.

2.0 Apportionment of PSSI Allocation

As soon as the campus dollar allocation is known, the President shall apportion 85 percent among the colleges/units in proportion to the number of Full-Time Equivalent Faculty in the colleges/units. Fifteen percent of the dollar allocation is withheld for the likelihood of unequal distribution of merit and for possible oversights. Ten percent of the dollar allocation is withheld for the likelihood of unequal distribution of merit and for possible oversights. Five percent or less of total PSSI funds shall be apportioned for the evaluation of department chairs/heads. The Chair of the Academic Senate shall be informed of the allocations by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in a timely fashion.

2.1 All Unit 3 employees are eligible each year to submit an application or to be nominated by other faculty or academic administrators for PSSIs.

2.2 Applicants/nominees are to be evaluated in the following areas: teaching performance and/or other professional performance, professional growth and achievement, and service to the university, students, and community.

2.3 The performance of applicants/nominees is expected to be at least meritorious in all areas. Applicants will identify which areas they consider their performance to be outstanding and/or meritorious. Teaching performance will be given greater weight than the other areas.
2.4 For the purposes of this document, the following working definitions shall apply:

Outstanding: exceptional performance, superior to others of its kind, distinguished, excellent, readily acknowledged as a model for other faculty to follow.

Meritorious: deserving of reward or praise, cooperative and productive work with colleagues.

3.0 Annual Announcement for PSSI

3.1 As soon as possible after the provisions of Section 2.0 have been accomplished, the President shall announce the apportionment of the campus PSSI allocations.

3.2 By "X" date, the President shall issue a statement concerning PSSIs and briefly outline the procedures to be followed.

4.0 Eligibility and Criteria

4.1 All faculty are eligible by submission of a one- to three-page annual summary of their performance based on the topics categories of teaching, professional growth and development, and service to the university, students, and community. All faculty are eligible by the submission of a six-page (maximum) document, no appendix, as stated in section 5.1. In the course of time, a transition to a one- to three-page annual summary of their performance based on the topic categories of teaching, professional growth and development, and service to the university, students, and community, is to be submitted in September and will be sufficient for eligibility.

The applicant/nominee may remove her/his name from PSSI consideration by means of a letter to the President indicating this desire.

4.2 The following areas are examples of the kinds of information applicants/nominees may submit, appropriately validated, as evidence of their performance in each area. Applicants/nominees shall not be limited to the following types of evidence:

AREA 1: TEACHING PERFORMANCE and/or OTHER PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

(when addressing teaching performance, applicants/nominees may, but are not required to, include examples of course syllabi; samples of examinations; description of innovative pedagogy and/or traditional modes of instruction; a summary of quantitative student evaluations for past two years along with grade distribution for classes that were evaluated and the basis used for grading students).

- teaching effectiveness recognized by peers and/or students by outstanding student evaluations; outstanding peer evaluations; successful meeting of behavioral objectives for courses taught; evidence of outstanding course preparation including syllabi, course notes/handouts; successful interaction with students;
- curriculum development and application of innovative and effective teaching methods and materials including such activities as development of new courses, programs, majors, or degrees;
- nurturing a commitment to learn as a serious lifelong endeavor;
- involving students in the research and creative processes;
- scholarship of teaching (see Appendix 3--Cal Poly Strategic Plan, Section 2)
- performance of professional responsibilities by librarians, counselors, or coaches;
- techniques that show excellence in teaching;
- evidence of significant professional development as it relates to teaching excellence;
- evidence of significant scholarly activity as it relates to the subject taught.

AREA II: PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT
For a full description of the following kinds of activities, see “Cal Poly Strategic Plan,”
Section 2 (Appendix 3), and Administrative Bulletin 85-2, “Role and Definition of
Professional Growth and Development” (Appendix 4).

- activities in the scholarships of teaching, discovery, integration, and application (see
  Strategic Plan -- Appendix 3);
- activities in professional growth and development as defined in AB 85-2 (see
  Appendix 4).

AREA III: SERVICE TO UNIVERSITY, STUDENTS AND COMMUNITY
- participation in university governance at the department, college/unit, university, or
  CSU levels;
- participation, as an advisor or mentor, in student organizations;
- mentoring colleagues;
- involvement in diversity-related activities;
- fostering collegiality;
- recruitment and retention of students and faculty;
- organizing events and activities for the sharing of ideas and knowledge;
- involvement; e.g. by presenting talks, organizing colloquia, or service as an officer,
  in the work of community groups related to one’s teaching/professional area;
- establishing interdisciplinary, collaborative partnerships between university and the
  community that enhances teaching, scholarship, and service to the university;
- involvement with the K-12 community provided that these activities go beyond those
  required in the faculty unit employee’s normal instructional program and are related to
  one’s teaching/professional area;
- community-related service projects provided that these activities go beyond those
  required in the faculty unit employee’s normal instructional program and are related to
  one’s teaching/professional area;
- participation in governance and committees of the exclusive bargaining agent (CFA).

5.0 Application

5.1 The period emphasized for outstanding or meritorious performance is five academic years
immediately preceding the academic year in which submission of the application/nomination is
made. It is the responsibility of the applicant/nominee to make a persuasive case for the
recognition of these achievements. Applicants/nominees should describe in six (6) or fewer
pages (additional pages will be discarded) their vita, achievements and the significance of
these activities, and examples of appropriate evidence. All documentation must be in writing
(videos and communications requiring electronic access will not be considered).
5.2 Applicants/nominees shall provide the college/unit PSSI committee with relevant documentation regarding outstanding or meritorious performance.

5.3 Department chair/head will verify the accuracy of the applicant/nominee’s record. Any concerns regarding information presented will be amicably settled by the department chair/head before being provided to evaluators.

6.0 Review by College

6.1 Each department shall form a Departmental Review Committee consisting of three elected tenured faculty members and the department chair/head. The review committee will be elected by all the full-time faculty of the department. If there are not enough tenured faculty in a department to comprise the three-member committee, tenured faculty from another department within the college/unit will be selected to sit on the review committee. The department chair/head will call the first meeting of the committee and the three elected, tenured faculty members will determine the chair of the committee.

In the case of librarians, counselors, and coaches where a department review may not be possible, the first level of review is at the college/unit level.

6.2 Factors listed in 7.2 will be utilized in the evaluation of the applicant’s teaching, professional growth and development, and service efforts.

6.3 Departmental review committees shall review and categorize all applicants. Each member of the committee will evaluate applicants/nominees other than their own.

The applicant/nominee will be provided point total recording scores for teaching, professional growth and development, and service.

6.4 Applicants/nominees have seven calendar days after the department review committee recommendation to provide a written rebuttal statement not to exceed three pages, double-spaced to the respective committee chair with a copy to the President. Any rebuttal letter will be reviewed by further review committees as part of the applicant/nominee’s package.

Applications, recommendations, and rebuttals will be forwarded to the college/unit committee.

7.0 Review by College

67.1 Each department shall have the opportunity to select a tenured faculty member to serve on the college/unit PSSI committee. The college/unit committee shall consist of at least nine members. If multiple members of a single department are necessary, their selection shall be by lot. For the purpose of considering PSSIs, coaches will be merged with the faculty of Physical Education and Kinesiology; and faculty unit employees from the Library, university Center for Teacher Education, and counselors shall be combined into a single unit. Each college and the UCTE/Library/Counselor Unit shall select a tenured faculty member to serve on the University PSSI Committee.
The college/unit committee shall elect their chairperson at the first meeting called by the dean of the college. The college/unit committee will form three-member subcommittees in charge of the exclusive evaluation of the following three performance areas: teaching, professional development, and service (rating in each area should be made independently). Each member will evaluate all applicants/nominees except their own.

The information to be considered in evaluating an applicant/nominee’s teaching proficiency includes, but is not necessarily limited to the following:

- quantitative and qualitative student evaluations of teaching;
- recognition of teaching proficiency by peers (e.g., teaching awards and peer evaluations based on classroom observations and review of course materials);
- development of new teaching methods and materials;
- use of innovative instructional techniques;
- involvement of students in conducting research or other scholarly activities;
- incorporation of diversity issues into the curriculum;
- development of new courses and degree programs and significant revisions of existing courses and degrees;
- participation in workshops and courses on teaching; and
- professional development activity indicating that the applicant/nominee stays current in the field (e.g., conference attendance, publications in scholarly journals).

1 to 7 points will be allotted to an applicant/nominee’s level of teaching proficiency using the following scale:

1. Clearly Inadequate (e.g., consistently low student evaluations and unfavorable peer evaluations, very little or no curriculum development or teaching-related scholarly activity);
2. Somewhat Inadequate (e.g., a mixture of low and adequate student and peer evaluations, relatively little curriculum development or teaching-related scholarly activity);
3. Adequate (e.g., relatively consistent moderate student and peer evaluations, some curriculum development or teaching-related scholarly activity);
4. Fair Moderate (e.g., consistently moderate student and peer evaluations, moderate levels of curriculum development or teaching-related scholarly activity);
5. Good Satisfactory (e.g., moderate to high student and peer evaluations, clear evidence of some curriculum development or teaching-related scholarly activity);
6. Very Good Very Satisfactory (e.g., primarily attains very high ratings from students and peers, significant accomplishments in curriculum development or teaching-related scholarly activity);
7. Excellent Outstanding (e.g., consistently receives among the highest ratings of students and peers, substantial contributions to curriculum development or teaching-related scholarly activity).

A score of at least 4 (four) on the teaching scale is necessary before any step award may be considered.

Evaluations of professional growth and development should consider an applicant/nominee’s scholarly achievements, such as publications, conference presentations, music compositions,
and performances and showing of artistic works. In addition, other professional growth activities should also be regarded, such as an applicant/nominee's obtaining an additional advanced degree, certification or license, training or consulting with a recognized expert in one's field to advance one's skill levels, and active participation in meetings and leadership of a recognized professional organization in one's field.

Given the variety of types of professional development that pertain to the diverse fields represented in the university, each department should develop more specific definitions of the individual ratings on the scale of 1-5 points allotted to applicant/nominee's level of professional development that follows:

Level of professional development:
1  Very Low
2  Somewhat Low
3  Moderate
4  Somewhat High
5  Very High

The scoring criteria for professional development should be completed to initiate the PSSI process in the Fall of 1997.

Evaluations of service should consider an applicant/nominee's involvement in departmental, college, university, and pertinent community activities. Service activities include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:
- administrative responsibilities (such as chairing a department, coordinating a program, scheduling departmental courses);
- membership in departmental, college, and university committees;
- committee leadership roles;
- consulting, public speaking, and other involvement with community entities (agencies, boards, schools, governmental bodies, businesses, etc. that are pertinent to the applicant/nominee's field of specialization);
- advising student clubs and groups;
- involvement in diversity-related service activities;
- working with departmental advisory boards and fundraising sources;
- mentoring students and junior faculty.

Greater weight should be given to activities involving leadership and large commitments of time and effort. It should not be assumed that an individual must have engaged in all of the above types of service in order to receive the highest rating for service.

1-5 points will be allotted to the applicant/nominee’s level of service using the following scale:
1  Very Low (e.g., minimal or no clear involvement in campus committees or community activities);
2  Somewhat Low (e.g., relatively low degree of participation in small number of campus or community activities);
3  Moderate (e.g., average level of involvement in campus committee work, assumption of minimal if any leadership responsibilities, slightly active participation in community...
4 Somewhat High (e.g., actively involved in multiple committee and some leadership positions, clearly pursues participation in significant community activities);
5 Very High (e.g., very actively and effectively serves both the campus and the community through participation in multiple committees and roles requiring significant leadership, responsibility, and commitment of time and effort).

Scores for applicant/nominee are totalled and divided by the number of subcommittee members to score an applicant/nominee for each category (e.g., Teaching, Professional Growth and Development, Service). Each subcommittee member rates each applicant/nominee and the average score is used. Discussion among subcommittee members may take place if significant variation in scores exists. Applicant/nominee’s total score = scores for Teaching + Professional Growth and Development + Service. The PSSI Committee as a whole, when totalling up the scores, has the option to award a maximum of 2 additional bonus points if they find that a particular applicant/nominee has been outstanding or exceptional in ways which are not adequately reflected in the total score. Such bonus points would have to be agreed upon by the majority of the college PSSI committee members.

Recommended steps based on total score: 5 steps = a total score of 16-17 points; 4 steps = a total score of 14-16 points; 3 steps = a total score of 12-14 points; 2 steps = a total score of 10-12 points; 1 step = a score of 8-10 points; and 0 steps = a total score of 3-8 points.

Applications and nominations shall be forwarded to college/unit PSSI committees consisting of tenured Unit 3 employees. Each member of the college PSSI committee will receive a minimum of one three units of assigned time for their service.

The College/unit and University PSSI committee shall review and categorize all applications. Three categories shall be used: highly recommended; recommended; not recommended. For those applicants/nominees recommended favorably, the college/unit and University PSSI committee shall recommend the number of steps to be awarded. Applicants/nominees have seven calendar days after the college/unit or University PSSI committee recommendation to provide a written rebuttal statement, not to exceed three pages (supplemental documentation is not permitted), to the respective committee chair with a copy to the President.

College/unit and University PSSI committees shall inform all applicants/nominees of their recommendations at the time that they are forwarded. Point total recording scores for Teaching, Professional Growth and Development, and Service shall be provided to each applicant/nominee for use in the improvement of performance. The applicant/nominee will be informed of reasons for/against recommendation of the PSSI award and the appropriate steps for improvement, if applicable. Applications, scores, recommendations, and rebuttals will be forwarded to the dean.

Dean’s Review

The dean shall evaluate each applicant/nominee utilizing the factors listed in section 7.2 concerning their teaching, professional growth, and development, and service efforts. The applicant/nominee will be provided point total recording scores for teaching, professional growth and development, and service. The applicant/nominee will be informed of reasons
Review by the President

All recommendations are forwarded to the President or her/his designee no later than ________ of each year in which PSSIs are awarded.

Failure to meet these deadlines for recommendations shall automatically result in the forwarding of all applications/nominations to the President for her/his award of PSSIs. (See MOU 31.27 -- Appendix 5)

The President or designee shall review all of the applications/nominations which have been submitted, and select the recipients of the increases from among this applicant/nominee pool by ________ of each year in which PSSIs are awarded. S/he shall also determine the appropriate number of steps to be granted. (See MOU 31.28 -- Appendix 5)

The decision to grant or deny an increase for meritorious performance, and the number of steps to be granted, shall not be subject to the grievance procedure. (See MOU 31.28 and Section 8, below). Only correspondence which documents information that a faculty member was granted PSSI(s) will be placed in a faculty member’s Personnel Action File.

Special Provisions (see MOU 31.29--31.31 -- Appendix 5)

At least fifty percent (50%) of the applicants/nominees receiving a PSSI must have received a positive recommendation from the College/unit PSSI Committee provided that:

- The College/unit PSSI Committee makes a positive recommendation for enough applicants/nominees to fully expend the campus pool for PSSIs in that fiscal year, and

- The College PSSI Committee/unit meets the time requirement for the review and recommendations of all applicants/nominees to the President as specified above.

If the College/unit PSSI Committee submits fewer than the minimum number of positive recommendations needed to expend fully the pool for PSSIs in any fiscal year, then the percentage of applicants/nominees receiving a PSSI that must also have received a positive recommendation from the College/unit PSSI Committee shall be reduced proportionately from fifty percent (50%).

Relationship to RPT Deliberations

The decision to grant or deny a PSSI shall not be considered during deliberations regarding the granting of reappointment, promotion or tenure. This shall not preclude the consideration
of any facts during RPT deliberations which are also considered during PSSI deliberations. (See MOU 31.35 -- Appendix 5)

4012.0 Peer Review of Performance Salary Step Denials (see MOU 31.36-31.42 -- Appendix 5)

4012.1 Applicants/nominees who have received a favorable recommendation from the University College/unit PSSI Committee and who subsequently fail to receive a PSSI shall be eligible to have the increase denial reviewed by a University Peer Review Panel. The rebuttal letter will be a maximum of six pages, double-spaced, and received by the appropriate date.

4012.2 University peer panels will be constituted by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Senate and selected by lot from among all full-time tenured faculty who did not serve on that year's University or college/unit PSSI committees, and were not applicants/nominees for PSSI.

4012.3 The University Peer Panel shall begin to review the specific Performance Salary Step denial within 14 days of its selection by lot. The Panel’s review shall be limited to a reconsideration of the increase denial of the nominee, and the employer’s written response to any allegations made by the affected employee. Except for presentations of the complainant and the administrator, the peer review will be made from the documents set forth in Section 32.39 of the MOU.

The proceeding above will not be open to the public and shall not be a hearing MOU 31.40.

No later than thirty (30) days after its selection, the University Peer Panel shall submit to the President and the complainant a written report of its findings and recommendations. All written materials considered by the University Peer Panel shall be forwarded to the President. When the Panel has complied with Section 31.41 of the MOU, it shall be discharged of its duties for any individual case.

4012.4 The President shall consider the University Peer Review Panel’s recommendations and all forwarded materials and, no later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of the University Peer Review Panel’s report, notify the affected employee and the University Peer Review Panel of her/his final decision, including the reasons therefor. Notification to the employee of the President’s decision concludes the peer review procedure and such decision shall not be reviewable in any forum.

4012.5 All requests for peer review must be submitted in writing to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs no later than ______ of each year in which PSSIIs are awarded.

413.0 Reporting of Awards

413.1 The university shall report to the Academic Senate annually by college/unit the appropriate aggregate statistics regarding the number of applicants/nominees in each category, the number of recipients, and the number of steps granted.

4214.0 Final Disposition of All Documents Pertaining to PSSI Applications
At the conclusion of a PSSI cycle, all documents pertaining to an individual's PSSI applications shall be: (1) for those applicants/nominees awarded a PSSI, forwarded to the administrative custodian of the applicant's Permanent Personnel File, (2) for those applicants/nominees not awarded a PSSI, returned to the applicant/nominee.
PSSI CALENDAR FOR WINTER/SPRING 1998  
(PSSI decisions effective July 1, 1998 or final budget)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost apportions PSSI budget allocation to colleges/units, with copy to Chair, Academic Senate</td>
<td>Jan 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President issues statement concerning PSSI and outlines procedures</td>
<td>Jan 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges/units distribute criteria to faculty</td>
<td>Jan 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications/nominations provided directly to department chair/head with copy to President. Departmental review begins.</td>
<td>Feb 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/unit PSSI committee selected (minimum 9 members)</td>
<td>Feb 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 member teaching/other professional performance subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 member professional growth and achievement subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 member service subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day for department chair/head to verify accuracy of applicant’s record and to forward recommendations from Departmental Review Committee</td>
<td>Mar 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College committee forwards scores per category, total score, and recommendations to President with copy to dean and applicant</td>
<td>May 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s rebuttal statement, if any</td>
<td>May 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President makes award decisions after conferring with deans and Provost</td>
<td>May 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for peer review with written complaint due in Provost’s office</td>
<td>June 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appeal process**

| Peer review panel(s) forward findings and recommendations to President | 30 days after selection |
| President notifies affected employees and peer review panel(s) of final decision | 14 days after report |
PSSI CALENDAR FOR FALL 1997
(PSSI decisions retroactive to July 1, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost apportions PSSI budget allocation to colleges/units, with</td>
<td>Sept 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copy to Chair, Academic Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President issues statement concerning PSSI and outlines procedures</td>
<td>Sept 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges/units distribute criteria to faculty</td>
<td>Sept 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications/nominations provided directly to department chair/head</td>
<td>Sept 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with copy to President. Departmental review begins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/unit PSSI committee selected (minimum 9 members)</td>
<td>Oct 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 member teaching/other professional performance subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 member professional growth and achievement subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 member service subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day for department chair/head to verify accuracy of applicant’s</td>
<td>Oct 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>record and to forward recommendations from Departmental Review Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College committee forwards scores per category, total score, and</td>
<td>Dec 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations to President with copy to dean and applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s rebuttal statement, if any</td>
<td>Dec 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President makes award decisions after conferring with deans and</td>
<td>Jan 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for peer review with written complaint due in Provost’s office</td>
<td>Jan 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appeal process**

Request review forward findings and recommendations to President         | 30 days after selection |
President notifies affected employees and peer review panel(s) of final decision | 14 days after report |