CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

ACADEMIC SENATE

MEETING OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE
TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 1999
UU220, 3:00-5:00PM

I. Minutes: Approval of Academic Senate minutes for the meetings of February 9, February 23, March 2, March 9, and April 1, 1999 (pp. 2-11).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
Academic Senate election results for 1999-2001 (pp. 12-13).

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: Harold Goldwhite, Faculty Trustee for the CSU, will be attending today's meeting to report on activities occurring campuswide and statewide and to answer questions.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution Asking Chancellor Charles B. Reed not to Attend Cal Poly's 1999 Spring Commencement: first reading, Gooden, statewide academic senator (p. 14).
B. Resolution on Faculty Merit Increase Policy: second reading, (pp. 15-23).
C. Resolution to Modify the Definition (Membership) of the General Faculty in the Constitution of the Faculty: second reading, Harris, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 24-27).
D. Resolution on Program Review and Improvement Committee Bylaws Change: second reading, Stanton, chair of the Program Review and Improvement Committee (pp. 28-29).
E. Resolution on Credit by Examination Policy: first reading, Freberg, chair of the Instruction Committee (p. 30).
F. Resolution on Development of a Research Infrastructure at Cal Poly: first reading, Clay, chair of the Research and Professional Development Committee (pp. 31-35).
G. Resolution on Dependent Care: first reading, Harris, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 36-37).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
ACADEMIC SENATE MEMBERSHIP for 1999-2000

(Highlighted names indicate newly elected members)

**COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE (7 representatives)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahern, Jim</td>
<td>Agribusiness</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingus, Del</td>
<td>Soil Science</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, John</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel, Jay</td>
<td>Agribusiness</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Keefe, Tim</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes, Cliff</td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (6 representatives)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borland, Jim</td>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botwin, Mike</td>
<td>Agricultural Engineering</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay, Gary</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epstein, Bill</td>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas, Mike</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLEGE OF BUSINESS (5 representatives)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, Mary Beth</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertozzi, Dan</td>
<td>Global Strategy and Law</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqbal, Zafar</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labhard, Lezlie</td>
<td>Industrial Technology</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartz, Terri</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING (7 representatives)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beug, James</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeTurris, Dianne</td>
<td>Aeronautical Engineering</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goel, Rakesh</td>
<td>Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, James</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoCascio, James</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS (9 representatives)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coleman, Jim</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway, Jim</td>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evnine, Simon</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laver, Gary</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; HD</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubba, Johanna</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scriven, Tal</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang, Phil</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS (8 representatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colvin, Mike</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwald, Harvey</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood, Myron</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobson, Ralph</td>
<td>Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walters, Dirk</td>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES (4 representatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breitenbach, Stacey</td>
<td>CENG Advising Center</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimmitt, Laura</td>
<td>Financial Aid Office</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingues, Tony</td>
<td>Admissions Offices</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlan, Sallie</td>
<td>Reference Dept., Library</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (1 representative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheftic, Carol</td>
<td>UCTE</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STATEWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE (3 representatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gooden, Reg</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>1999-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood, Myron</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>1999-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kersten, Tim</td>
<td>CBUS</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-___-99/
RESOLUTION ASKING CHANCELLOR CHARLES B. REED
NOT TO ATTEND CAL POLY’S 1999 SPRING COMMENCEMENT

WHEREAS, Cal Poly is honored to host the ceremony which would bestow an honorary doctorate degree on former student, colleague, and trustee Jim Considine, and

WHEREAS, This ceremony is scheduled to coincide with the Spring, 1999 commencement exercise, and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Charles B. Reed has been invited to confer the award, and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Reed has on numerous occasions and in various places disparaged the faculty of The California State University by indicating faculty are opposed to considerations of merit and they do not work hard, and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Reed has acted in a manner inconsistent with the principles of collegiality and mutual respect as agreed to in Collegiality in the California State University System approved by the CSU Academic Senate March 7-8, 1985 and adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees on September 18, 1985, and

WHEREAS, Many Cal Poly faculty members attend commencement to honor the graduating students, and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly faculty could not in good conscience participate in an event attended by Chancellor Reed; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate urge Chancellor Reed not to attend the Spring, 1999 commencement ceremony at Cal Poly, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate so inform Chancellor Reed, the Board of Trustees, and the other campuses of The California State University, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly faculty support the Academic Senate in this regard.

Proposed by: Reginald Gooden
Date: March 30, 1999
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the attached Faculty Merit Increase Policy.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate
Date: April 6, 1999
PERFORMANCE-SALARY-STEP FACULTY MERIT INCREASE POLICY

1.0 Performance-Salary-Step Faculty Merit Increases - General Provisions

1.1 Performance Salary-Step Increases (PSSI) recognize outstanding or meritorious performance in each of the following areas: teaching and other professional performance, professional growth and achievement, and service to the University community, students, and community. Faculty unit employees whose performance does not include assignments in all of the above areas shall nonetheless be eligible for a PSSI on the basis of their performance in the individual areas of their assignment (MOU—see Article 31.14).

1.1.1 The following working definitions shall apply:

- **Outstanding**: exceptional performance; distinguished; acknowledged as a model of performance.
- **Meritorious**: commendable performance; worthy of praise, cooperative and productive work with colleagues.

1.2 The recognition of outstanding or meritorious performance by a Unit 3 employee shall normally 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 year (MOU—see Article 31.15), or shall be in the form of a bonus (not a permanent increase in the base salary) of no more than 2.4% of the candidate’s annual salary base in those cases where the faculty unit employee has reached the top step of his/her rank. (Employees in the full professor rank for any instructional faculty classification may be paid at a salary rate above the performance maximum for their classification.)

1.2.1 No candidate shall receive an FMI that results in more than a twelve and one-half percent (12.5%) in any year.

1.2.2 FMI may be in the form of a bonus (not a permanent increase in the base salary of the individual) of no more than the equivalent of an annual salary increase of two and four-tenths percent (2.4%) in the case of faculty unit members whose outstanding or meritorious performance was part of an activity or project conducted by a team, department or group of employees.

1.3 For the purposes of PSSI FMI review and funding targets, counselors, librarians, athletic coaches, and UCTE Unit 3 employees shall be considered separate units. (MOU—see Article 31.23).

1.4 The effective date of all PSSI FMI awards shall be July 1st of each year that there are negotiated Performance Salary Step Faculty Merit Increases (MOU—see Article 31.25).

1.5 There is no requirement to expend all funds dedicated to the PSSI FMI program in any given fiscal year. Any portion of the funds not expended in any fiscal year shall automatically carry forward to the PSSI FMI pool in the next fiscal year. In the event that the PSSI FMI 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 MOU.

1.6 Each year that the PSSI FMI program is funded, the President shall allot 95% of the campus funding to the colleges/units based on the pro rata share of total salary filled full-time equivalent faculty positions for Unit 3 employees (department chairs/heads not included in these calculations) in each college/unit (MOU—see Article 31.29) and shall reserve 5% of the campus funding to provide a pool for applicants who are subsequently awarded a PSSI pursuant to an appeal (MOU—see Article 31.39), for discretionary use. A separate allocation of FMI funds designated for department chairs/heads shall be based on the FTETF pro rata portion of chairs/heads in each college or 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.

College Deans shall distribute the PSSI FMI allocation pools to departments/equivalent units after factoring out a pro rata amount (based on total salaries filled full-time equivalent faculty positions (department chair/heads not included) for awarding PSSIs to department chairs/heads or equivalent supervisors) and retaining 10% for their discretionary use for FMI of faculty positions (excluding department chairs/heads). College deans shall inform all Unit 3 employees within their College as to the total funding for the College and the distribution of those funds.
1.7 At each level of evaluation, applicants/candidates shall be informed of their standing, including the reasons thereof, and be provided with a summary of the basis of their recommendation whether an FMI is recommended, and if so, the amount of the salary increase recommended.

1.8 Those involved in reviewing Faculty Activity Reports may access Personnel Action Files to verify or substantiate information.

1.9 A copy of the Faculty Activity Report will be filed in the candidate’s Personnel Action File. Recommendations pertaining to FMI will not become a part of the candidate’s Personnel Action File. A copy of the correspondence awarding FMI will be filed in the incumbent’s Personnel Action File.

2.0 Eligibility, Applications, and Nominations

2.1 All Unit 3 employees are eligible to who submit an annual completed Faculty Activity Report report of his/her activities to the Department Chair/Head by the established deadline shall be considered for an FMI application for a PSSI award or to be nominated by other faculty or academic administrators each year that the PSSI FMI program is funded (MOU see Article 31.16).

2.1.1 Applications/nominations Faculty Activity Reports of Department Chairs/Heads, and other equivalent supervisors of Unit 3 employees, who are contractually eligible to apply or be nominated, will be evaluated and FMI determined recommended by their Dean, or appropriate administrator.

2.1.2 Unit 3 employees shall not review his/her own annual report for an Faculty Merit Increase who are being evaluated for a PSSI, either through application or nomination, cannot serve on any PSSI related evaluation committee which may evaluate said employee. However, no faculty unit employee shall become ineligible for service on a faculty campus committee because he/she is a candidate for an increase.

2.2 All applications/nominations must be submitted to the Department Chair/Head or equivalent supervisor prior to the application closure date, with a copy to the President or his/her designee, and must follow the approved PSSI Application format (MOU—see Article 31.16; see page 6). The application is limited to 3 pages, however, applicants/nominators To facilitate the application process, Unit 3 employees may download the sample PSSI application form Faculty Activity Report from the OpenMail Bulletin Area-Forms, or from Academic Personnel website (http://www.Academic-Personnel.calpoly.edu) under forms. The Faculty Active Report is limited to no more than four (4)-typewritten pages using 12-point type and one-inch margins. Candidates may, without disrupting the order of the information presented, alter the amount of space dedicated to a specific section.

2.3 For FMI’s retroactive to July 1, 1998, evidence submitted in support of an applicant/nominee candidate should emphasize the period since the employee’s last PSSI award. For those who had not received a PSSI, the candidate should emphasize the 5 year period prior to the current PSSI FMI evaluation; or the interval since their initial appointment at Cal Poly if less than 5 years.

For FMI’s to become effective July 1, 1998 through December 31, 1998.

2.4 All applications/nominations Faculty Activity Reports and supporting documentation must only be submitted in writing. All forms of electronic, photographic, and other media will be returned to the applicant and will not be considered, unless authorized by Dean or appropriate administrator. Upon receipt, Department Chairs/Heads will provide copy of each FAR to Dean (or appropriate administrator) and to the Provost, and forward the FAR to the department faculty FMI committee or Review Board (see Section 3.2).

3.0 Department Criteria and Procedures and Criteria

3.1 Criteria and procedures, including the application form (as limited by Section 2.2 above), used in evaluating for PSSI awards to be established by each department/unit and approved by the Dean (or appropriate administrator). Criteria to be used in evaluating applicants/nominees are to be consistent with approved guidelines applied in RPT evaluations (MOU—see Article 31.18). The criteria for the award of Faculty Merit increases shall be as follows. Faculty shall be eligible for Faculty Merit Increases for demonstrated performance, commensurate with rank, work assignment, and years of service, 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.

3.4 3.2 Academic departments/units shall constitute the highest level faculty review committee with regard to PSSI FMI recommendations, applications/nominations unless replaced by a Review Board. Members of a departmental FMI committees or Review Board must hold tenure.

Departments/units may elect to utilize a College Review Board. In such cases, the department/unit would request that the Dean convene an elected Review Board. The composition of the Review Board should be similar to the College Peer Review. Committee used in promotion considerations, but could include representation from departments/units outside of the College when requested by the department/unit being evaluated.

The counselor, librarian, athletic coach, Writing Skills Program, and UCTE units may elect to request that the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs appoint a Review Board consisting of tenured faculty.

3.2 3.3 Following completion of the evaluation procedure used by the faculty review committee, all applications/nominations Faculty Activity Reports shall be forwarded to the appropriate department chair/head Dean of the College (or appropriate administrator). Departmental PSSI FMI recommendations, including the number of salary steps increase recommended, shall be forwarded to both the department chair/head and the Dean of the College (or appropriate administrator) and the President of the University (MOU—see Article 31.21).

3.3 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 (MOU—see Article 31.14).

3.4 Applicants/nominees shall be informed by their department/unit PSSI committee/Review Board of its recommendation and number of steps for which they were recommended.

3.4.2 Applicants/nominees may forward a one-page rebuttal, to the departmental or Review Board recommendation, to the Dean or appropriate administrator (with a copy to the President) within 7 calendar days of their notification. Statements submitted by applicants/nominees shall be included with their original PSSI application.

3.4 The total cost of all departmental recommendations shall not exceed the targeted allocation for the department/unit.

3.5 3.5.1 Applicants/nominees Candidates who receive positive recommendations, but for whom there is insufficient funding within the targeted departmental/unit allocation shall have their recommendation forwarded on a separate list so noted for consideration by the department chair/head and Dean.

3.6 The department chair/head shall receive the Faculty Activity Reports and recommendations from the departmental FMI committee or College Review Board, as appropriate. After review of the Faculty Activity Reports and the recommendations provided by the departmental FMI committee (or College Review Board), the department chair/head shall provide the Dean (or appropriate administrator) with his/her recommendations and the amount of any salary increase being recommended. The department chair/head shall inform each candidate of the FMI recommendations being forwarded to the Dean. Recommendations are not to be placed into the candidate's Personnel Action File.

4.0 Administrative Review

4.1 The Dean or appropriate administrator of each College/unit shall receive all PSSI FMI applications and recommendations annual reports from each department/unit within the College. After review of the applications/nominations Faculty Activity Reports, the recommendations of the departmental FMI committee and department chair/heads, and consultation with the Department Chairs/Heads, the Dean or appropriate administrator shall award PSSI FMI's, which at a minimum shall include at least 50% of Unit 3 members recommended for PSSI FMI awards by the respective department/unit/ review board. Once the 50% awards criterion is met from the 85% allocation, deans/appropriate administrators may treat the remaining dollar allocation as discretionary funds (in addition to the initial 10% discretionary allocation). The total cost of all steps recommended by the Dean shall not exceed the target allocation for the College/unit.
4.2 After conferring with the President and Provost, the Dean or appropriate administrator shall notify each applicant candidate of the decision to grant or deny a PSSI FMI award for outstanding or meritorious performance. The President may increase the allocation of a college/unit from his/her discretionary reserve. Applicants Candidates awarded a PSSI FMI shall also be informed of the number of steps salary increase to be granted and the effective date of the award.

4.3 Administrative review of counselors shall be the responsibility of the Vice President for Student Affairs or his/her designee; for librarians the Dean of Library Services or his/her designee; for athletic coaches the Athletic Director or his/her designee; and for UCTE the Director of UCTE or his/her designee.

5.0 President’s Review

5.1 The President or designee shall review the applications/nominations Faculty Activity Reports, recommendations from the academic departments/units and the decisions of College Deans, or appropriate administrator.

6.0 PSSI FMI calendar and timeline

6.1 The specific timeline covering notification, application submission, evaluation, and PSSI FMI award announcements shall be established by the President or designee in consultation with the Academic Senate. Faculty members who do want their name published should so indicate on their Faculty Activity Report at the time it is submitted.

7.0 Peer Review of PSSI denials

7.1 Applicants/nominees who fail to receive a PSSI award shall be eligible to have their application reviewed by the University Peer Review Panel. The appeal letter may be up to six pages in length, double spaced, and must be received by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs within ten academic working days of receipt of the notification of denial (MOU—see Article 31.40).

7.2 University Peer Review Panels, consisting of 3 members and 1 alternate, will be appointed by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in consultation with California Faculty Association. Members shall be selected by lot from among all full-time, tenured faculty who did not serve on a PSSI committee, and who were not applicants/nominees for a PSSI award (MOU—see Articles 31.41; 31.42).

7.3 The University Peer Review Panel shall begin to review the specific Performance Salary Step denial within 14 days of its selection. The Panel’s review shall be limited to a reconsideration of the increase denial of the applicant/nominee, and the appropriate administrator’s written response to any allegations made by the affected employee. Except for presentations of the complainant and the administrator, if the administrator chooses, the peer review will be made from the documents set forth in Section 31.43 of the MOU.

7.4 The University Peer Review Panel proceeding will not be open to the public and shall not constitute a hearing (MOU—see Article 31.44).

7.5 No later than thirty (30) days after its selection, the University Peer Review Panel shall submit to the President and complainant a written report of its findings and recommendations. All written materials considered by the University Peer Review panel shall be forwarded to the President. When the panel has complied with this section, it shall be discharged of its duties for any individual case (MOU—see Article 31.45).

7.6 The President shall consider the University Peer Review Panel’s recommendations and all forwarded materials. No later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of the University Peer Review Panel’s report, the President shall notify the applicant/nominee and the University Peer Review Panel of his/her final decision, including the reasons therefor. Notification of the President’s decision concludes the peer review procedure and his/her decision shall not be subject to review in any forum.
CAL POLY 1999 FACULTY MERIT INCREASE CALENDAR

July 1, 1998 FMI
&
July 1, 1999 FMI

April 1-May 2

- All faculty unit employees complete Faculty Activity Reports that detail in separate sections the following:
  a) all appropriate activities for the period from last review (see Section 2.3 of Campus Policy) to July 1, 1998, for fiscal year 1998/99 Faculty Merit Increases retroactive to July 1, 1998, and
  b) all appropriate activities between July 1, 1998, through December 31, 1998 for fiscal year 1999/2000 Faculty Merit Increases to become effective July 1, 1999.

April 13
- Academic Senate finalizes FMI Policy resolution.

April 16
- Departments determine whether to utilize a Departmental FMI Committee composed of tenured faculty unit employees, or a College Review Board, and advise Dean (or appropriate administrator) accordingly.

May 3 (Monday)
- 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 College Review Board; Department Chair/Head provides Dean (or appropriate administrator) and Provide with a copy of each FAR.
- Faculty Activity Reports of Department Chair/Head (or equivalent supervisors) are submitted to Dean, or appropriate administrator.

May 13
- Departmental FMI Committee (or College Review Board) review Faculty Activity Reports and provide recommendations to Department Chairs/Heads with a copy to Dean (or appropriate administrator).

May 20
- Department Chair/Head reviews Faculty Activity Reports and provides FMI recommendations to the Dean.

May 21-June 7
- Dean or appropriate administrator reviews Faculty Activity Reports and confers with Provost and President.

June 8
- Dean or appropriate administrator (as the President’s designee) notifies candidates of final FMI decision retroactive to July 1, 1998.

June 15
- Deans provide list of 1998 FMIs to Academic Personnel and Payroll Office by June 15

14 days after final budget allocation to campus
- Dean or appropriate administrator (as the President’s designee) notifies candidates of final FMI decision effective July 1, 1999
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 December 31, 1998

Please check the area of evaluation you wish to have emphasized during this review period (check only one):
☐ Teaching only (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 attest that the information provided in this report is accurate and true to the best of my knowledge.

Faculty Member’s Signature __________________________ Date __________________________

Faculty Activity Reports (FAD) for past five years will be accessible to FMI reviewers at department and college levels. FAD summarizes data of courses taught and enrollments by term for each faculty member. Faculty members are not expected to provide this information. The following Fall 1998 data will be provided by Academic Personnel to each Department: Rank/Classification; Tenured or Probationary or Temporary; If tenured or probationary, date of initial tenure-track appointment; If temporary, date of first appointment; years in present rank/classification; Time Base; and September 1998 monthly salary.
CAL POLY

FACULTY MERIT INCREASE RECOMMENDATIONS RETROACTIVE TO JULY 1, 1998

Candidate: ___________________ Department: ___________________

Recommendation of Faculty Committee

Check appropriate boxes: The quality of the unit member's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching alone:</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and scholarship;</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and service to the University and community; or</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Faculty Merit Increase retroactive to July 1, 1998 is (check ONLY ONE):

☐ highly recommended within target allocation for annual increase of $___________

☐ recommended within target allocation for annual increase of $___________

☐ recommended, however, insufficient funds within target allocation to cover costs

☐ not recommended

Signature, Chair of Faculty Committee: ___________________ Print Name: ___________________ Date: ____________

Recommendation of Department Chair/Head

Check appropriate boxes: The quality of the unit member's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching alone:</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and scholarship;</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching and service to the University and community; or</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Faculty Merit Increase retroactive to July 1, 1998 is (check ONLY ONE):

☐ highly recommended within target allocation for annual increase of $___________

☐ recommended within target allocation for annual increase of $___________

☐ recommended, however, insufficient funds within target allocation to cover costs

☐ not recommended

Signature, Department Chair/Head: ___________________ Print Name: ___________________ Date: ____________
CAL POLY

FACULTY MERIT INCREASE RECOMMENDATIONS
EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1999

Candidate: ____________________________ Department: ____________________________

Recommendation of Faculty Committee

Check appropriate boxes: The quality of the unit member's Outstanding Meritorious N/A

☐ Teaching alone: ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ Teaching and scholarship: ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ Teaching and service to the University and community; or ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ Teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community ☐ ☐ ☐

A Faculty Merit Increase effective July 1, 1999 is (check ONLY ONE):

☐ highly recommended within target allocation for annual increase of $___________

☐ recommended within target allocation for annual increase of $___________

☐ recommended, however, insufficient funds within target allocation to cover costs

☐ not recommended

Signature, Chair of Faculty Committee Print Name Date

Recommendation of Department Chair/Head

Check appropriate boxes: The quality of the unit member's Outstanding Meritorious N/A

☐ Teaching alone: ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ Teaching and scholarship: ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ Teaching and service to the University and community; or ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ Teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community ☐ ☐ ☐

A Faculty Merit Increase effective July 1, 1999 is (check ONLY ONE):

☐ highly recommended within target allocation for annual increase of $___________

☐ recommended within target allocation for annual increase of $___________

☐ recommended, however, insufficient funds within target allocation to cover costs

☐ not recommended

Signature, Department Chair/Head Print Name Date
WHEREAS, Changes in the Collective Bargaining Agreement Between The Board of Trustees of The California State University and The California Faculty Association, Unit 3 – Faculty since the last publication of the Constitution of the Faculty have expanded CFA’s representation of general faculty to include faculty in the Pre-retirement Reduction in Time Base Program, full-time coaches holding faculty appointments of one year or more, and full-time probationary and permanent employees in Professional Consultative Services; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Article I, Membership of the General Faculty, as defined in the Constitution of the Faculty be modified as follows:

Article I. Membership of the General Faculty

Voting members of the General Faculty shall consist solely of those persons who are full-time academic employees holding faculty rank and occupying a position in an academic department, according to their appointment, within the university and faculty in the Pre-retirement Reduction in Time Base Program regardless of time base. Department chairs, department heads, center directors, officers of the faculty and representatives to The California State University Academic Senate will not cease to be members of the General Faculty because of any reassigned time allotted to them by virtue of their offices. Full-time coaches holding faculty appointment of one year or more in an academic department or equivalent unit, Personnel full-time probationary and permanent employees in Professional Consultative Services, as defined in Article III.1.b of the Constitution, and full-time lecturers holding appointments of one year or more in academic departments are members of the General Faculty. Faculty whose appointments are full time for an academic quarter are considered members of the General Faculty during each quarter of their full-time appointment. Voting membership of the General Faculty shall lapse during a leave of absence if the leave is one year or longer. Nonvoting membership in the General Faculty shall include all temporary,
part time academic personnel not included in the voting membership.

Voting members of the General Faculty of Cal Poly shall consist of those persons who are employed at Cal Poly and belong to at least one of the following entities:

1. Full time academic employees holding faculty rank whose principal duty is within an academic department, unit, or program;
2. Faculty members in the Pre-retirement Reduction in Time Base Program;
3. Full time probationary and/or permanent employees in Professional Consultative Services, as defined in Article III.1.b of this Constitution;
4. Full time coaches holding a current faculty appointment of at least one year;
5. Lecturers holding full time appointments of at least one year in an one or more academic departments, units, or programs; and or
6. Lecturers with a current assignment of 15 WTUs for at least three consecutive quarters.

Members of the General Faculty, including department chairs/heads, shall not cease to be members because of any assigned time allotted to them for the carrying out of duties consistent with their employment at Cal Poly. "Visiting Personnel" shall not be members of the General Faculty. Members of the General Faculty who are on leave for at least one year shall not be voting members during their leave.

Nonvoting membership in the General Faculty shall consist of all academic personnel not included in the voting membership.

and, be it further

RESOLVED:

That upon Academic Senate approval of this modification, and in accordance with Article IV, Amendments, of the Constitution of the Faculty, said modification be submitted to the General Faculty for its adoption by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: January 5, 1999
Revised February 1, 1999
Revised March 9, 1999
CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY

Preamble
We, the faculty of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, in order to meet our academic responsibilities, hereby establish this Constitution for our governance. The responsibilities of the faculty, the powers necessary to fulfill those responsibilities and the collegial form of governance are based on historic academic traditions, which have been recognized by the people of the State of California through their Legislature.

Article I. Membership of the General Faculty

Voting members of the General Faculty shall consist solely of those persons who are full-time academic employees holding faculty rank and occupying a position in an academic department according to their appointment, within the university. Department chairs/heads, center directors, officers of the faculty and representatives to The California State University Academic Senate will not cease to be members of the General Faculty because of any reassigned time allotted to them by virtue of their offices. Personnel in Professional Consultative Services, as defined in Article III.1.b. of this Constitution, and full-time lecturers holding appointments of one year or more in academic departments are members of the General Faculty. Faculty whose appointments are full-time for an academic quarter are considered members of the General Faculty during each quarter of their full-time appointment. Voting membership of the General Faculty shall lapse during a leave of absence if the leave is one year or longer. Nonvoting membership in the General Faculty shall include all temporary, part-time academic personnel not included in the voting membership.

Article II. Rights, Responsibilities, and Powers of the General Faculty

Section 1. Rights of the General Faculty

The right of academic freedom is necessary for the pursuit and dissemination of truth and the maintenance of a free society. It is the obligation of the General Faculty to insure the preservation of an academic community with full freedom of inquiry and expression, and insulation from political influence.

Voting members of the General Faculty have the right to nominate, elect, and recall members of the Academic Senate and the right to call for, participate in, and vote at meetings of the General Faculty.

Section 2. Responsibilities of the General Faculty

The primary responsibility of members of the General Faculty is to seek truth and to encourage the free pursuit of learning in their peers and students. To this end, they devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluation of students and peers reflects true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation of students for their private advantage, acknowledge significant assistance from them, and protect their freedom of inquiry.
Background information for Resolution to Modify the Definition (Membership) of the General Faculty in the *Constitution of the Faculty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Fall '98 FT</th>
<th>Fall '98 PT</th>
<th># of Senate reps if only FT faculty counted</th>
<th># of Senate reps if FT and PT faculty counted</th>
<th># of additional senators if PT faculty counted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAGR</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBUS</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCTE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adopted:

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

AS-____-99/PRAIC
RESOLUTION ON
PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE
BYLAWS CHANGE

Background: The Program Review and Improvement Committee was created during the time at which the decision to eliminate two programs at Cal Poly was made. It was envisioned that the recommendations of the Program Review and Improvement Committee could be used as evidence to support the elimination of programs in the future. As a result the membership (no ASI representation) and the voting privileges (no ex officio members were permitted to vote) of the committee were severely limited. In addition, only tenured full professors were permitted membership on the committee.

However, the recommendations of the committee have been deliberately structured to prevent the use of the recommendations as a justification for the elimination of programs. The recommendations have been intended as a device for the improvement of programs. In fact, the title of the committee was changed to include reference to improvement. The recommendations below would bring the makeup and the voting privileges into compliance with most Academic Senate committees. The original arguments for the current structure and voting privileges of the committee are no longer valid.

WHEREAS, The Bylaws of the Academic Senate, Section VIII.B, reads: “Ex officio members shall be voting members unless otherwise specified in the individual committee description;” and

WHEREAS, Ex officio members are voting members of nearly every Academic Senate committee; and

WHEREAS, Students can provide an important perspective in the program review process; and

WHEREAS, Students are ex officio voting members of nearly every Academic Senate committee; and

WHEREAS, Faculty members who are not tenured full professors are eligible to be members of nearly every other Academic Senate committee; and
WHEREAS, Faculty members who are not tenured full professors can and do make important contributions to Academic Senate committees; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the *Bylaws of the Academic Senate* pertaining to the membership of the Program Review and Improvement Committee (Section VIII.K.5) be amended to read:

5. **Program Review and Improvement [Committee]**
   a. **Membership**

   The Program Review and Improvement Committee shall consist of six (6) tenured full professors or tenure track faculty members, one from each of the six colleges, and one (1) member from Professional Consultative Services. Nonvoting ex officio members shall include the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs or designee, and a representative appointed by the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, and an ASI representative. The ASI representative will have at least junior standing, and will have completed at least three consecutive quarters and 36 quarter units with at least a 3.0 grade point average at Cal Poly. The University Center for Teacher Education shall be included with a college of its choice for the selection of the representative from that unit.

   Members of the committee shall be elected by the Academic Senate Executive Committee in accordance with the Academic Program Review and Improvement Guidelines.

   Proposed by the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee

February 16, 1999
WHEREAS, Current Cal Poly policy allows a regularly enrolled student to petition for credit by examination in courses in which he or she is qualified through previous education or experience and for which credit has not otherwise been given; and

WHEREAS, Under current Cal Poly policy, it is possible for a student to complete entire minors through credit by examination; and

WHEREAS, Letter grades for credit by examination appear to be somewhat inflated in comparison to regularly administered courses; be it therefore

RESOLVED: That the number of units a student may take through credit by examination be limited to 16 units; and be it further

RESOLVED: That grading of credit by examination units be on a CR/NC basis only.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Instruction Committee
February 22, 1999
Background Statement: In 1996, the Academic Senate reconfigured its subcommittees. From this process, the Research and Professional Development Committee was formed and given the charge to assist in the development of research policies for the campus. Faculty on this committee, over the past two years, began identifying barriers to research on campus through a campus wide survey, and have prepared recommendations for creating an environment which supports faculty efforts in their scholarly work.

WHEREAS, Cal Poly is an institution known for its high quality of undergraduate education, where graduate programs have traditionally played a small role and faculty teaching of undergraduates has been the highest priority; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Strategic Plan outlines a greater emphasis on research and other scholarly activities by faculty in the future; and

WHEREAS, The Research and Professional Development Committee was formed by the Academic Senate and given the charge to assist in the development of research and professional development policies for the campus; and

WHEREAS, The success of research on campus requires an investment of time by faculty and students, allocation of space, and commitment of fiscal resources by the university administration; and

WHEREAS, The processes of teaching, discovery, integration, and application through research and creative activities is crucial for the continued growth and development of a community of faculty and student scholars; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That research and other scholarly activities be a factor in assigning faculty work loads; and be it further

RESOLVED, That research and other scholarly activities be a factor in assigning faculty work space, facilities, and equipment; and be it further

RESOLVED, That campus resource allocations include considerations of research and other scholarly activities; and be it further
RESOLVED, That research programs and proposed development efforts be encouraged and supported; and be it further

RESOLVED, That scholarly activities be given consistent recognition in retention, tenure, and promotional decisions at all levels of review; and be it further

RESOLVED, That graduate curricula be encouraged and developed, including funding for recruitment of graduate students and for graduate assistants; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate approve the attached recommendations for research and professional development at Cal Poly, and that these recommendations be forwarded to the President and Provost of Cal Poly.

Proposed by: Research and Professional Development Committee
Date February 22, 1999

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AT CAL POLY

CAL POLY MISSION STATEMENT

As a predominantly undergraduate, comprehensive, polytechnic university serving California, the mission of Cal Poly is to discover, integrate, articulate, and apply knowledge. This it does by emphasizing teaching; engaging in research; participating in the various communities, local, state, national, and international, with which it pursues common interests; and where appropriate, providing students with the unique experience of direct involvement with the actual challenges of their disciplines, in the United States and abroad.

IMPORTANCE OF FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP

In Scholarship Reconsidered (citation), Ernest Boyer emphasized that teaching and research are both important scholarly activities of the professorate. In its strategic plan, Cal Poly has encouraged the four scholarships as defined by Boyer;

"Cal Poly endorses the broad definitions of the four types of scholarship set forth in the Carnegie report. The following thoughts extracted from the Carnegie report summarize the mission of teaching and scholarship at Cal Poly."

THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING: As a scholarly enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows. Those who teach must be well-informed and steeped in the knowledge of their fields. Teaching is a dynamic endeavor which must bring students actively into the educational process. Further, teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, by transforming and extending it as well. In the end, inspiring teaching keeps scholarship alive and inspired scholarship keeps teaching alive. Without the teaching function, the continuity of knowledge will be broken and the store of human knowledge diminished.
The scholarship of Discovery: comes closest to what is meant when academics speak of “research”. This scholarship contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge, but also to the intellectual climate of the University. Not just the outcomes, but the process, and especially the passion, giving meaning to the effort. The probing mind of the researcher is a vital asset to Cal Poly, the state, and the world. Scholarly investigations and/or creative activity, in all the disciplines, is at the very heart of academic life, and the pursuit of knowledge must be assiduously cultivated and defended. Disciplined, investigative efforts within the University should be strengthened, not diminished. Those engaged in the Scholarship of Discovery shall ask: What is known and what is yet to be discovered?

The scholarship of Integration: involves the serious, disciplined work of interpreting, drawing together, and bringing new insight to bear on original research. This scholarship can involve doing research at the boundaries where fields of study converge, or it can involve the interpretation and fitting of one’s own research -- or the research of others -- into larger intellectual patterns. Integration means making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating non-specialists, too. Those engaged in The scholarship of Integration shall ask: What do the research findings mean and is it possible to interpret what has been discovered in ways that provide a larger, more comprehensive understanding?

The scholarship of application: involves using knowledge to solve problems. This scholarship is a dynamic process where new research discoveries are applied and where the applications themselves give rise to new intellectual understandings. This scholarly activity, which both applies and contributes to human knowledge, is particularly needed in a world in which huge, almost intractable problems call for the skills and insights of university faculties. Those engaged in the scholarship of application shall ask: How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems, and how can social, economic, and other problems define an agenda for scholarly investigation?

Cal Poly continually seeks ways to integrate the four types of scholarship, for the purpose of maintaining high quality academic programs. The benefits of faculty scholarship are many. Some examples are:

- Scholarship enables faculty to maintain currency in their disciplines
- Scholarship keeps teaching relevant and lively
- Scholarship can be revenue generating
- Scholarship provides opportunities for undergraduates to engage in sustained work on demanding, multifaceted problems in which they learn to define and communicate their own solutions, and to develop critical thinking and analytical skills.
- Scholarship provides opportunities for students to acquire core competencies that are valued by employers.
- Scholarship enhances the reputation of the individual and the University
- Scholarship provides an avenue for creativity and self expression
- Scholarship provides a means for faculty to reflect on the learning process
- Scholarship provides opportunities for interaction with working professionals and with scholars at other Universities
- Scholarship provides for extended individual interaction between faculty and students

The National Science Foundation recently undertook an extensive review of science, mathematics, engineering and technology education. Its report; Shaping the Future: New Expectations for
Undergraduate Education in Science, Mathematics, Engineering and Technology, stated that; “all students have access to supportive, excellent undergraduate education in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology, and all students learn these subjects by direct experience with the method and process of inquiry. Every student should be presented an opportunity to understand what science is and is not, and to be involved in some way in scientific inquiry, not just a ‘hands-on’ experience.”

Need for Policy

To operationalize this commitment to scholarship, Cal Poly needs to develop new policies and revise existing policies to support scholarly activities. A recent survey conducted by this committee of the Cal Poly faculty revealed that although there is some level of support for the research activities of its faculty, Cal Poly does not provide the necessary support to meet the professional development needs of faculty and students in the area of research. The following barriers to professional development were identified by the faculty survey:

1. Unavailability of funds to maintain a professional development program;
2. Lack of policy for research/creative activity space allocation;
3. Inequitable teaching loads;
4. Inadequacy of “seed” funds to develop or expand creative/investigative activities;
5. Insufficient support for graduate courses and programs;
6. Lack of standardized RPT criteria and acknowledgment of research as a valued activity;
7. Unavailability of functional, “supportive” intellectual environment;
8. Ambiguous policy regarding intellectual property of inventors.

Recommendations of the Research and Professional Development Committee

1.0 Make funds available to maintain a professional development program:

It should be the responsibility of each college to allocate and administer resources to maintain a professional development program. It is recommended that such resources be allocated to faculty based on professional progress and productivity.

2.0 Provide space for creative/investigative activities:

It is recommended that each college ensure that adequate space is provided to support creative and scholarly activities, and develop criteria for allocating such space to its faculty and students.

3.0 Equitable teaching loads:

Use flexibility in assigning faculty work loads to support scholarship. Scholarship and creative activities represent significant and valuable contributions to the University, and should be recognized in assigning faculty work loads. Efforts should be made in the assignment of work loads (e.g., numbers of courses requiring preparation, contact hours, class size, committee assignments) to ensure that all faculty, and particularly junior faculty, have quality time to devote to the pursuit of their scholarship. In addition, junior faculty should be offered a reduced teaching load in their first year of employment.

4.0 Make available creative/investigative “seed” funds:

Cal Poly should establish a campus wide research fund to support the initiation of research programs by faculty, and in particular, junior faculty. These funds would supplement funds
currently available through programs such as the State Faculty Support Grants Program. In addition, start up funds should be made available for new or junior faculty, and should be offered as part of the recruitment package.

5.0 Promote graduate curricula:

Graduate programs are an important complement to faculty scholarship. Resources should be dedicated to strengthening, expanding and initiating new graduate programs, particularly in disciplines relevant to the polytechnic emphasis of the campus. Since graduate level courses require a greater in-depth coverage of the subject matter and a greater student-teacher interaction, they should be given an additional weight factor when calculating WTU’s.
WHEREAS, Countless organizations have recognized the importance of provision of dependent care in the lives of their employees; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly currently provides childcare services via the Children’s Center. However, the Children’s Center currently has a waiting list of more than 200 children from parents who are either students, staff, or faculty, and an additional 116 children on the waiting list from members of the community; and

WHEREAS, The influx of older students and younger faculty and staff due to retirements in the next 10 years will only exacerbate the current waiting list situation; and

WHEREAS, A number of Cal Poly faculty and staff currently have had the difficult task of placing their parents in a care institution and the number is likely to increase greatly;

WHEREAS, The provision of dependent care on campus may be a significant factor in the successful recruitment of students, staff, and faculty; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That a new children’s center pre-design/design/preoperations task force be formed in a timely manner; and be it further

RESOLVED: That a task force be established by the President to examine the feasibility of the construction and management of dependent care facilities for (1) children of faculty, staff, and students, and (2) the parents of faculty or their spouses and the parents of staff or their spouses; and be it further
RESOLVED: That the membership of the task force has adequate representation (a minimum of two faculty, staff, and student representatives).

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: March 30, 1999
Adopted:

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

AS-___-99/

RESOLUTION ON
PARTICIPATION IN THE FMI (FACULTY MERIT INCREASE) PROCESS

WHEREAS, The Imposed Working Conditions require that every faculty member submit a FAR (Faculty Activity Report) form in order to qualify for a FMI (Faculty Merit Increase) award, and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly has recommended that merit money be "distributed broadly and equitably among all eligible faculty members," and

WHEREAS, Money for FMIs at Cal Poly is approximately $950,000 and has already been designated as a salary allocation, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly urge and encourage all eligible faculty to submit the required FAR forms and apply for both FMIs, and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly inform the University's administration, the CSU administration, and the Board of Trustees that faculty applications for FMIs are not to be considered as either an endorsement or acceptance of the merit pay system contained in the Imposed Working Conditions but the only available means to obtain the salary due to the faculty.

Proposed by: Myron Hood
Date: April 9, 1999
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA
AS-___-99/

RESOLUTION ON
PARTICIPATION/NONPARTICIPATION IN
IMPOSED MERIT PAY PROCESS

WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees has imposed working conditions on the faculty of the CSU, and

WHEREAS, The Statewide Academic Senate suggests that under such an imposition of working conditions, "campus senates refrain from developing criteria and standards, procedures or structure related to the implementation of any imposed terms and conditions of employment," and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly has already recommended that the merit money be "distributed broadly and equitably among all eligible faculty members," and

WHEREAS, The imposed working conditions call for faculty and department chair participation in the review process for merit pay, and

WHEREAS, Such faculty participation in the process will be divisive and further erode the morale of the faculty; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly not participate further in the developing or approving of criteria, standards or process for merit pay under the imposed working conditions, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly strongly urge that all faculty and department chairs protest this imposition of working conditions by refusing to participate in any level of the review process for the merit pay, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly urge and encourage every eligible faculty member to submit the required FAR forms and apply for both FMI's so that the intentions of the third Whereas may be carried out, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly inform the University's administration, the CSU administration, and the Board of Trustees that faculty applications for FMI's are not to be considered as either an endorsement or acceptance of the merit pay system contained in the imposed working conditions, but the only available means to obtain the salary due to the faculty.
WHEREAS, CFA (California Faculty Association), the legally constituted bargaining agent for the faculty of the CSU, rejected the Tentative Agreement proposed by the CSU; and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Reed recommended that the CSU Board of Trustees impose working conditions on the faculty; and

WHEREAS, The imposed working conditions call for faculty to participate in a system of merit pay similar to the one that was rejected by CFA in the Tentative Agreement; and

WHEREAS, The CSU Academic Senate has recommended that faculty refuse to participate in the administration of this system of merit pay; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate at Cal Poly strongly urge all faculty to refuse to administer this system by not participating in any of the functions necessary to its operation.

Proposed by: Simon Evnine
Date: April 7, 1999
Business Item B: Resolution on Faculty Merit Increase Policy

Changes made to draft #4 Faculty Merit Increase Policy pp. 15-23 in April 13 Senate agenda:

1.2.1 No candidate shall receive an FMI that results in more than a twelve and one-half percent (12.5%) salary increase in any year.

1.5 There is no requirement to expend all funds dedicated to the PSSI-FMI program in any given fiscal year. Any portion of the funds not expended in any fiscal year will carry forward to the PSSI FMI pool in the next fiscal year. In the event that the PSSI FMI program is eliminated, any funds that have been carried forward shall be used for the professional development opportunities identified in Provision 25. of the MOU.

2.3 For FMIs retroactive to July 1, 1998, evidence submitted in support of an applicant/nominee candidate should emphasize the period since the application deadline of the employee's last PSSI award. (The deadline for 1997-98 PSSIs was January 30, 1998; 1996-97 PSSI deadline was November 7, 1996; and 1995-96 deadline was January 25, 1996). For those who have not received a PSSI, the candidate should emphasize the 5 year period prior to the current PSSI-FMI evaluation; or the interval since their initial appointment at Cal Poly if less than 5 years.

3.4 3.2 (3.2 and 3.3 reordered) Academic departments/units shall constitute the highest level faculty review committee with regard to PSSI-FMI recommendations, applications/nominations unless replaced by a Review Board. Members of a departmental FMI committee or Review Board must be full-time and hold tenure. All faculty unit employees on campus during Spring Quarter 1998 are eligible to vote for members of a departmental FMI committee or Review Board. Votes are weighted in proportion to the incumbent's time-base (i.e., the vote of a lecturer with a half-time assignment would count as 50%; a FERP with a one-third assignment would count as 33%).

4.1 [last sentence of paragraph]. . . The total cost of all steps salary increases recommended by the Dean shall not exceed the target allocation for the college/unit.

[On agenda page 21 entitled California State University Faculty Activity Report replace paragraph at bottom of page with the following paragraph: The following information will be accessible to departments and faculty members NOT REQUIRED to include it on their FAR. Faculty Assignment by Department (FAD) reports for the past five years 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 tenured or probationary, date of initial tenure-track appointment; if temporary, date of first appointment; years in present rank/classification; time base; and monthly salary.]