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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED: That the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee work with the Academic Programs Office, the Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment Task Force, the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the Program Review and Improvement Committee to develop a process and procedures for the development of suitable criteria to assess the impacts of enrollment growth upon academic quality; and, be
RESOLVED: That the reports derived from such assessment efforts before the start of and at the end of each growth phase be sent to the Academic Senate for review, comment, and recommendations.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Budget and Long Range Planning Committee
Date: May 9, 2000
Revised: June 1, 2000
SUGGESTED STRATEGIES

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

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

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

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

1. ACADEMIC QUALITY MEASURES?
  1. $/FTES
  2. Class size
  3. Size of applicant pool, quality of applicant pool
  4. Student / faculty ratios
  5. Group work versus individual work - Can new paradigms cause us to rethink student/faculty ratios?
  6. Number of SCANTRON exams given per student
  7. Faculty teaching loads
  8. Ratio of full-time to part-time faculty
  9. Quality of new faculty hires?
  10. Benchmarks - based upon current status?
  11. Faculty Quality and Academic Quality Measures should be coordinated with the efforts of the Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment Task Force.
2 ACADEMIC PROGRESS MEASURES?
1. Time to graduation Need well-defined cohorts
2. Retention
3. Surrogate = course loads (annual basis, summer loads)
4. Benchmark = students' perception of ability to capture classes?
   (CAPTURE)

3 GROWTH SHOULD BE FULLY FUNDED MEASURES?
See Item 5

4 FACILITIES MUST BE IN PLACE BEFORE?
See Item 5

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

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

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

FIGURE 1: Alternative Strategies for Matching Enrollment Growth to Construction of New Built Capacity. Construction of New Facilities are assumed to be key milestones for planning purposes.
Adopted:

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

AS-____-00/B&LRPC
RESOLUTION ON THE GROWTH COMPONENT
OF THE PROPOSED MASTER PLAN REVISION

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

Whereas, The State of California has refused to not increased the funding to Cal Poly to address the problems associated with inadequate support for high cost polytechnic programs; and

Whereas, The programs at Cal Poly contribute significantly to the workforce in vital areas of the economy of California; and

Whereas, The proposed revised Master Plan includes a provision allowing for a substantial increase in fall enrollment headcount of 3000 students to a maximum total fall enrollment of 20,900 students (17,500 net Full-Time Equivalent Students; and

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

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

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

Whereas, Once the Master Plan ceiling has been raised, Cal Poly will have lost its leverage to address these financial concerns; and

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

Whereas, The statewide Academic Senate has approved Resolution on Year Round Operation, AS-2444-99/FGA, which states that funding to support year round operations be sufficient to maintain high quality programs and that the funding to support year round operations be total cost funding; and

Whereas, Both the statewide Academic Senate (through the approved Resolution on Enrollment Management Policy in the CSU, AS-3482-00/AA) and the CSU (through the adopted Cornerstones Principle 1) have stated that attempts to increase capacity must not interfere with or reduce in any way demonstrable student learning outcomes, or the
Resolved: That no enrollment growth should take place at Cal Poly until the State of California and the CSU provide a level of support for existing students and programs equal to the level of the 1991-1992 budget; and be it further.

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

Resolved: That consistent with the position of the statewide Academic Senate regarding systemwide enrollment growth plans, any enrollment growth at Cal Poly should occur only when funding adequate to restore former support levels and sustain quality is provided; and be it further.

Resolved: That enrollment growth funding at Cal Poly recognize the true marginal costs associated with the curricular emphases and pedagogies that support the University’s polytechnic mission; and be it further.

Resolved: That failing such funding commitments and guarantees, Cal Poly should resist any enrollment growth scenarios that threaten the academic quality of the University or jeopardize its polytechnic mission; and be it further.

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

Proposed by: Budget and Long Range Planning Committee
Date: May 22, 2000
Revised: June 1, 2000
AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED TO
RESOLUTION ON 1999-2000 FMI PROCEDURES

#1
Submitted by Reg Gooden:
Insert the following phrase (IN CAPS) on line 17 of the resolution:

That each department and each dean involved in the FMI process COLLABORATE IN
THE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLICATION, in advance, OF the criteria
commensurate with each of the four areas of emphasis that will be used to determine FMI
awards; etc....

RATIONALE: What Senator Kersten, I, and other geezers who go back to the bad old
days before the Higher Education Employment Relations Act codified the faculty's
primary role in developing "criteria and standards," are obsessed with is the need to
protect the faculty's responsibility in the area of standards. There is also the related
concern that the peers are in the best position to evaluate the merits of their colleagues
with regard to the needs of the department. My amendment to that effect was hurried,
clumsy and was silent on an aspect the majority of the senate found troublesome—the
need to have the dean's criteria made public. I lacked the wit to correct my oversight on
the run but Dean Hellenbrand put his finger on the need for collaboration. In the
College of Liberal Arts that is exactly what happened. The dean and the departments
collaborated. That will not always be the case. It may not be the case now in some
colleges. As Harry mentioned, it will always be a source of acrimony unless both sides
agree to the rules. The present language does not expect cooperation. I think it is
important to set up such an understanding. The policy does not have to be uniform across
the College. It is necessary, however, that each department is in rapport with the dean
and that all are public with their expectations.

Therefore, I think it is important to incorporate the language of collaboration in the
document. That is the purpose for the amendment which, of course, would be available
for amicable improvements in the expression of the intent. I hope you agree.

----------

#2
Submitted by John Harris:
Add the following Resolved Clause after line 22:

RESOLVED: That the dean provide specific suggestions to each FMI applicant to
improve her/his performance.
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 her/his activities irrespective of whether s/he 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 her/his 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 her or his 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 FMI; and

6. Whereas: Some faculty members who did not have full-time assignments were confused when their FMI awards were paid proportionate to their time bases;

7. Whereas: It is important for faculty to know what features of their performance determined whether they did or did not receive an FMI award and what features of their performance determined the amount of the FMI award received; therefore, be it

8. Resolved: That each department and each dean involved in the FMI review process publish, in advance, the criteria commensurate with each of the four areas of emphasis that will be used to determine FMI awards; and be it further

9. 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

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

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

12. Resolved: That deans inform their faculty that FMI awards are paid proportionate to the faculty member’s time base; and be it further
Resolved: That the deans and departments involved in the FMI review process 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
Revised: June 1, 2000
CAL POLY

CAL POLY FACULTY MERIT INCREASE CALENDAR: FAR
JULY 1, 1999 - JUNE 30, 2000

September 22, 2000
- Departments determine whether to utilize a Departmental FMI Committee composed of faculty unit employees, the department head/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 22-30, 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 14-23, 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 20-30, 2000
- Candidate may submit a written rebuttal to the dean.

November 3-6, 2000
- Dean (or appropriate administrator) reviews Faculty Activity Reports, department recommendations, and provides separate recommendation to President with copy to the candidate.

November 10-13, 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 ___________________________

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)

☐ 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.
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.