Meeting of the
Academic Senate
Tuesday, October 28, 1997
UU220, 3:00-5:00pm

Minutes: Approval of the October 7, 1997 minutes of the Academic Senate (pp. 2-3).

Communication(s) and announcement(s):
A. All electronic mail is being sent to your OpenMail account. If you do not have an OpenMail account, mail will be directed to your UNIX account. However, if you have a UNIX account and an OpenMail account, Academic Senate communications will automatically be sent to your OpenMail account.
B. The Academic Senate is now on the World Wide Web. Information regarding meetings, agenda, minutes, resolutions, etc. can be viewed at http://www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen.

Reports:
(Reports should be limited to 2-5 minutes. If a report is expected to exceed 5 minutes, please prepare the information in written form for distribution instead.)
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost’s Office:
D. Statewide senators:
E. CFA campus president:
F. Staff Council representative:
G. ASI representatives:
H. Other:

Consent agenda:

Business item(s):
A. Resolution on the Cal Poly Performance Salary Step Increase Policy: Bob Brown, second reading (pp. 4-9).
B. Resolution on the Search Process and Qualifications for the New CSU Chancellor: Executive Committee, first reading (pp. 10-11).
C. Resolution on Future Cal Poly Budgets: Hood, Chair of the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee, first reading (p. 12).
D. Resolution on Faculty Governance of Mode of Instruction: Laura Freberg, Chair of the Instruction Committee, first reading (p. 13).
E. Resolution on Cal Poly’s Response to the Cornerstones Report: Executive Committee, first/second readings (pp. 14-20).
F. Resolution on CSU Presidents’ Pay Raises: Lewis, caucus chair for CSM, first reading (p. 21).

Discussion item(s):

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


I. Minutes: none

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
A. All electronic mail is being sent to your OpenMail account. If you do not have an OpenMail account, mail will be directed to your UNIX account. However, if you have a UNIX account and an OpenMail account, Academic Senate communications will automatically be sent to your OpenMail account.
B. The Academic Senate is now on the World Wide Web. Information regarding meetings, agenda, minutes, etc. can be viewed at http://www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen.
C. DRAFT copy (6.19.97) of Office Space Allocation Policies and Priorities was provided.
D. Final Report of the Task Force on Distance Education was provided.
E. Merit Pay Task Force to Visit Cal Poly on October 9.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: no report
B. President's Office: no report
   Provost's Office: Zingg reported that the Supreme Court will be taking on Proposition 209. Admissions for Cal Poly has been as expected - both on growth and reduction in some areas. Discussion of MCA - Kersten questioned who was on the MCA revision committee. Discussion ensued on basis for rulings. Question was asked regarding when the Senate would have input on the proposed formula. Zingg indicated that they are trying to establish criteria to be used for Fall 1998 admissions. Federal fellowships and scholarships will follow federal guidelines - Proposition 209 does not change them.
C. Statewide Senators: Gooden reported on the CETI initiative. Hale and Gooden will review and report on it next meeting. The new Chancellor has been named. Hale reported change in entry requirements - increasing laboratory science requirement to 2 years and making social science requirement changes. This will bring entry requirements close to the UC system with the exception of visual and performing arts. Kersten gave a list of which committees he will be serving on, which includes one committee that will be looking at entrance requirements.
D. CFA Campus President: Zetzschke reported on good news/bad news issue of new chancellor. The union will not bargain this year after May 1, 1998.
F. Staff Council representative: Cooper reported that the Campus Mixer held during Fall Conference Week was a success. The next meeting of the Staff Council will be held on October 8th.

G. ASI representative: Bingham indicated that interviewing for ASI representatives on the Academic Senate committees will take place by Friday.

H. IACC representative: Johnston reported on CIP status.

I. Athletics Governing Board representative: no report.

J. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):

A. Resolution on Cal Poly Performance Salary Step Increase Policy: Morrobel-Sosa explained some of the reasons for the changes. Suess elaborated that some of the changes were a direct result of the Collective Bargaining agreement. Discussion ensued on changes between previously approved document and revised version. **M/S/F (Jacobson/Martinez)** to suspend the rules and move to second reading. Discussion continued on clarifications, suggestions, etc. Bingham voiced concern that students have no input into PSSI. Suess explained that the Collective Bargaining agreement precludes direct dialogue and input from students. However, student evaluations are in the faculty personnel files, which are accessible to the PSSI committee. **M/withdrawn (Hood/XXX)** for the chair of the Academic Senate to communicate with the department heads/chairs immediately. Suess informed the group that the document has already been provided to department heads/chairs.

B. Resolution on the Search Process and Qualifications for the New CSU Chancellor: Issue is now over. Discussion not necessary.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

A. Hanley presented information on the status of the CETI/CTI (Technology Infrastructure Initiative. For approximately $25 million, the program would increase the speed and connectivity of all faculty, staff and students. There will be a chatroom on Thursday, October 9, from 4:00-6:00. Hanley indicated that the Chancellor has requested that Cal Poly name a person to be the interface between the Chancellor’s office and the campus. Gooden questioned if the document can be put on the web. Hanley indicated that it would not be done this way because of competitors.

VII. Adjournment: **M/S/P (Lewis/Martinez)** to adjourn at 5:03 p.m.

Submitted by:

[Signature]

Leslie F. Cooper
Academic Senate
1.0 Performance Salary Step 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 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) in those cases where the faculty unit employee has reached the top step of his/her rank and shall not exceed 2.4% of the incumbent's annual salary base.

1.3 For the purposes of PSSI review and funding targets, counselors, librarians, and UCTE Unit 3 employees shall be considered separate units. Athletic coaches shall be merged with PSSI applicants/nominees of the Physical Education and Kinesiology Department (MOU -- see Article 31.23).

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

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

1.6 Each year that the PSSI program is funded, the President shall allot 80% of the campus funding to the colleges/units based on the number of Full-time Equivalent Unit 3 employees in each college/unit (MOU -- see Article 31.29); 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); shall retain 15% of the campus funding to be utilized, at the discretion of the President, to ensure that Unit 3 employees have equal opportunity to receive PSSI awards based on their outstanding performance. The Chair of the Academic Senate shall be notified of the allocation model by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs in a timely fashion.

College Deans shall inform all Unit 3 employees within their College as to the total funding for the College and the amount targeted to each department. College Deans shall not retain funding for discretionary use.

1.7 At each level of evaluation, applicants shall be informed of their standing and be provided with a summary of the basis of their recommendation.
2.0 Eligibility, Applications, and Nominations

2.1 All Unit 3 employees are eligible to submit an application for a PSSI award or to be nominated by other faculty or academic administrators each year that the PSSI program is funded (MOU --see Article 31.16).

2.1.1 Applications/nominations 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 recommended by their Dean.

2.1.2 Unit 3 employees 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.

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 may, without disrupting the order of the information presented, alter the amount of space dedicated to a specific section. To facilitate the application process, Unit 3 employees may download the PSSI application form from the OpenMail Bulletin Area-Forms.

2.3 Evidence submitted in support of an applicant/nominee should emphasize the period since the employee's last PSSI award; the 5 year period prior to the current PSSI evaluation; or the interval since their initial appointment at Cal Poly if less than 5 years.

2.4 All applications/nominations 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.

3.0 Department Procedures and Criteria

3.1 Criteria and procedures used in evaluating applicants for PSSI awards are 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).

3.2 Departments/units may elect to utilize a College level 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, and UCTE units may elect to request that the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs appoint a Review Board consisting of tenured faculty.

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 Academic departments/units shall constitute the highest level faculty review committee with regard to PSSI applications/nominations unless replaced by a Review Board. Following completion of the evaluation procedure used by the faculty review committee, all applications/nominations shall be forwarded to the Dean of the College (or appropriate administrator). Departmental PSSI recommendations, including the number of salary steps recommended, shall be forwarded to both the Dean of the College (or appropriate administrator) and the President of the University (MOU --See Article 31.21).
3.4.1 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 within 7 calendar days of their notification. Statements submitted by applicants/nominees shall be included with their original PSSI application.

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

3.5.1 Applicants/nominees 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 for consideration by the Dean.

4.0 Administrative Review

4.1 The Dean or appropriate administrator of each College/unit shall receive all PSSI applications and recommendations from each department/unit within the College. After review of the applications/nominations, departmental recommendations, and consultation with the Department Chairs/Heads, the Dean or appropriate administrator will submit his/her PSSI recommendations to the President. The total cost of all steps recommended by the Dean shall not exceed the target allocation for the College/unit.

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

4.3 Applicants/nominees shall be informed by their Dean or appropriate administrator as to his/her recommendation and number of steps for which they were recommended.

4.3.1 Applicants/nominees who receive positive recommendations, but for whom there is insufficient funding within the targeted allocation for the College (or equivalent unit) shall have their recommendation forwarded on a separate list for consideration by the President.

4.3.2 Applicants/nominees may forward a one page response, regarding the recommendation of the Dean (or appropriate administrator), to the President within 7 calendar days of their notification. Statements submitted by applicants/nominees shall be included with their original PSSI application.

5.0 President’s Review

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

5.2 Applicants who are denied a PSSI award shall have the right to request a review of their application by the Peer Review Panel (see Section 7.1 below).

6.0 PSSI calendar and timeline

6.1 The specific timeline covering notification, application, evaluation, and PSSI award announcements shall be established by the President in consultation with the Academic Senate.
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 of 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 of 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.
1997-98 PSSI Schedule

September 15 to October 31 (~7 weeks)
- Departments develop criteria and procedures to be used in evaluating PSSI applicants.
- Departmental PSSI criteria to be submitted to the Dean for approval by Oct 31, 1997

Oct 31 - November 21 (3 weeks)
- Dean/appropriate administrator review and approval of department PSSI criteria.

Nov 21 - January 9 (6 weeks)
- PSSI applications due to the Department Chair/Head

Jan 9 - February 6 (4 weeks)
- Department review of applicants.
- Department recommendations submitted to the President, Dean, and applicants by Feb. 6th.

Feb 6 - Feb 27 (3 weeks)
- Review of PSSI materials by the Dean
- Dean/appropriate administrator recommendations submitted to the President and applicants by Feb 27.

Feb 27 - April 3 (5 weeks)
- Review of PSSI materials and recommendations by the President or his designee
- President notifies applicants of PSSI decision by April 3rd.

April 3 - April 17 (2 weeks)
- Peer Review requests due to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs by April 17th.

April 24 (1 week)
- Review Panel formed.

April 24 - June 5 (6 weeks)
- Review Panel report submitted to the President by June 5th.

June 19 (2 weeks)
- Applicants notified of the President's decision.
SAMPLE PSSI APPLICATION

Instructions: Please complete your application for a PSSI award and submit the completed application and a current resume to your department Chair/Head or equivalent Supervisor prior to January 9, 1998. Your application is limited to 3 pages. Applicants should determine the amount of space dedicated to each of the three areas (Teaching Performance, Professional Growth, and Service to the University), but should not alter the order of these sections. Your current resume and student evaluation summaries are not included within the 3 page limit.

Name of Applicant: _______________________________________

Department/Unit: _______________________________________

Date of Last PSSI: ____________________________ Steps _______

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

(Actual length used to be determined by the applicant)

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

(Actual space used to be determined by the applicant)

SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, STUDENTS, AND COMMUNITY: Please list your 3 most important accomplishments in the area of service to the University, students, and community. Applicants should include discussion of how their service activities relate to their teaching function and the mission of the university.

(Actual space used to be determined by the applicant)
Adopted:

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

AS-__-97/
RESOLUTION ON
SEARCH PROCESS AND QUALIFICATIONS
FOR NEW CSU CHANCELLOR

WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees has determined that the current CSU Chancellor Search Committee will not include a faculty member except the Faculty Trustee; and

WHEREAS, The elimination of faculty representative on the search committee is contrary to prior practice and breaches the CSU Statement of Collegiality which acknowledges and respects the faculty's role in the shared governance of the University; and

WHEREAS, The Chancellor of the CSU is the academic leader of this institution, and faculty are significantly affected by this leadership; and

WHEREAS, Faculty have the professional responsibility to execute the CSU's primary mission of education and should therefore participate directly in the search for its academic leader; and

WHEREAS, Direct faculty participation in the search process will enhance the credibility of the new Chancellor selection both within and outside the CSU system; and

WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees has recognized the importance of its search for a new Chancellor and has requested written input on the qualifications for the position; and

WHEREAS, The chief academic and chief executive officer of the CSU system should demonstrate experience in the academy through teaching and scholarship as well as administrative experience in complex organizations; and

WHEREAS, The position description for the new Chancellor no longer emphasizes these academic qualifications but refers only to the candidate’s “commitment to higher education and the values of an academic community” and “demonstrated commitment to quality education”; and

WHEREAS, This recent change in the job description for the next Chancellor has given the impression that this leader need not be well acquainted with the culture of higher education;

WHEREAS, These developments may have the unfortunate effect of undermining the cooperation and trust between faculty and CSU administration and could also undermine the confidence of the faculty in its next academic leader; therefore, be it
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly State University urge the CSU Board of Trustees to permit CSU faculty to participate directly and meaningfully in the Chancellor search process through faculty representation on the search committee; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly State University urge in the strongest possible terms that the CSU Board of Trustees revise its job description for CSU Chancellor to include the requirement that the candidate have a record in teaching, scholarship, and academic administration; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That pursuant to the CSU Board of Trustees request for written input from faculty on the qualifications for the next Chancellor, that copies of this resolution be distributed to each member of the Board and to the Academic Senate CSU.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: September 23, 1997
WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Mission Statement, Cal Poly’s Strategic Plan and the Cal Poly Plan all emphasize the education of its students and the pursuit of academic excellence; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly maintains its national and statewide reputation by virtue of the teaching and academic achievements of its faculty and the success of its graduates; and

WHEREAS, The projected availability of state funds for the CSU system in the coming years will require that budget allocations for Cal Poly be very judiciously scrutinized in to order to meet the academic demands of the students enrolled here; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That support for academic programs should be given the highest priority in future Cal Poly budgets.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee
Date: September 23, 1997
Revised: October 7, 1997
WHEREAS, Curriculum development and oversight are among the most important responsibilities of the faculty; and

WHEREAS, The curriculum process is best served when a climate of full disclosure and consultation is encouraged; and

WHEREAS, The use of distributed and distance learning techniques is becoming much more frequent; and

WHEREAS, The use of distributed and distance learning techniques represents a significant and relatively experimental change in instructional mode; and

WHEREAS, There is currently no mechanism of university-wide faculty review for the use of distributed and distance learning; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That new course proposals should specify whether or not distance and distributed learning techniques will be used, to what degree they will be used, and a rationale for how these techniques will contribute to positive student outcomes; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That existing courses undergoing a change in mode of instruction from traditional to 50 percent or more SCU’s via distributed or distance learning be reviewed under current policies and procedures for new courses; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Instruction and Curriculum Committees provide an annual report to the full Senate regarding the use of distributed and distance learning on campus.

Proposed by: The Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: September 23, 1997
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly receive the following report entitled *Cal Poly's Response to "The Cornerstones Report."*

Proposed by: Cornerstones Task Forces
Date: October 16, 1997
CAL POLY'S RESPONSE TO "THE CORNERSTONES REPORT"
14-Oct-97

Background:
The reports from the Cornerstones Task Forces and the Review of the Baccalaureate were publicly revealed for discussion at the CSU Academic Conference in Monterey held February 1997. A delegation of faculty and administrators from Cal Poly attended that meeting. A steering committee was formed to organize the campus-wide discussion of Cornerstones. In March 1997, a revised draft of Cornerstones was sent to all campuses and made available on the web (http://www.co.calstate.edu/aa/cornerstones). Committees were then organized to coordinate responses to each of the Cornerstones Task Force reports and the Review of the Baccalaureate, and a local web site (http://www.fmde.calpolu.edu/cornerstones) was established to help with this effort. A preliminary report on the Cornerstones March draft was compiled from the issues/concerns identified by the committees and submitted to the Cornerstones group on 16 May 1997. In addition, every college held an open forum on Cornerstones in advance of a campus visit (29 May 1997) from members of the Executive Committee of Statewide Academic Senate to discuss Cornerstones. In August 1997, a final "draft" of "The Cornerstones Report" was released and campus responses to the document were solicited. This was written by members of the Cal Poly Cornerstones Steering Committee and the Cornerstones Task Force committees.

General Assessment:
The August 1997 version of "The Cornerstones Report" is much improved from the draft released last spring. It does a better job of distinguishing between broad principles for the whole system and the forms of their implementation on individual campuses. As now written, the document may actually allow for appropriate cohesion at the system level and appropriate heterogeneity across the different campuses. The new version of the document is better organized and better written with some of the contradictions embedded in the earlier draft either resolved or deleted. "The Cornerstones Report" asks some very good questions like: "How do we educate our students for this new world?" Yet, this paired-down version is overly simplistic and does not face the hard realism head-on.

There is still a fascination with the language of industry which for some translates into the University as factory. In particular, there is a recurring theme of the "delivery" of education as a product, rather than as a process: isn't the student the product (rather than client or customer), and doesn't the student bear responsibility for learning?

The vision for California's education as implied by this report is very shallow: to strengthen traditions and deal with the economic realities of our economy and the diversity of our population. The educational vision must be based upon excellence AND it must provide the types of skills and at the level required by our future and not merely continue to do what we have previously done well. We CANNOT afford to equip our graduates at the level of 1970's skill for the year 2000 and beyond.

While the new draft is also less adversarial in tone, over and over the document refers to the faculty, leaving out mention of staff. Staff should be included in most or all of those references, particularly since support systems in today's universities require sophisticated, professional staff to develop and maintain. For example, they should be included in the discussions of shared responsibility for excellence, of renewal and reinvestment (currently limited to faculty), and of
competitive salaries. But over all, the tone of the language in the document is good because the faculty, staff and administration will have to work together to best serve students and other constituents.

The report identifies four policy goals and ten guiding principles with several derivative recommendations following each principle. These goals and principles are cited in our response to ensure the proper context of our comments.

In addition to fiscal and access issues, a fundamental theme of the Cornerstones Project is the need to define empirical indicators of significant educational outcomes, primarily for the purpose of accounting for their attainment level. This theme provides a broad rubric within which the more specific issues of outcome specification/definition, assessment procedures, and accountability processes can be appropriately subsumed. At this broadly conceptual level, policy goals A and D could be combined, since Goal A (focusing ostensibly on learning outcomes), and Goal D (focusing ostensibly on accountability), both deal with this broad theme of specifying educational goals and their attainment. Reorganized thus, the combined set of principles and recommendations can be reevaluated for conceptual congruence with this general issue.

Of top importance is that the report implies that both quality and quantity of graduates must be attained. There is no evidence that both can be attained. If both cannot be achieved, then we must maintain quality in our graduates. It is felt that fundamental principles of teaching/learning should always be maintained.

Policy Goal A: The CSU Seeks to Ensure Educational Results

The document states the CSU commitment "to innovation in the use of its facilities." If courses are to be offered throughout the hours of every day throughout the entire year according to student demand, more services that just plant operations will need additional investment. For example, academic department offices will need additional support to handle the heavier workload of more students, and more student service units may need to be open more hours to accommodate the needs of students on campus on weekends and at night.

Another question is how does one account for learning over time: the kind that reinforces and builds a body of values and skills and understandings that any one course cannot give? The Cornerstones document does not resolve the teaching-centered versus learning-centered model of education. It says teaching-centered and then says accountable for what the students have learned. There appears to be several significant assumptions missed about these definitions.

Principle 1 - We will award the baccalaureate primarily on the basis of demonstrated learning. We will state explicitly what a graduate of the CSU is expected to know. We will assure that our graduates possess a certain breadth and depth of knowledge together with a certain level of skills and are exposed to experiences that encourage the development of sound personal values.

Remarks on Recommendations Supporting Principle 1:

"Demonstrated learning" is a troubling proposal. Is there some sort of acceptable "demonstration" or knowledge in lieu of class time, or learning equivalent to a college degree? Would engineers accept demonstrated learning in math if a student completed one advanced problem? And of course, the major value of a university education is to learn how to learn -- the true meaning of producing lifelong learners.

There is also consternation that the "forms of knowledge and ability expected from any graduate is ("Is" is grammatically incorrect)") unrealistic. For example, a freshman without significant knowledge of a second language will not be able to attain "the ability to speak, read, and write in a language other than English."
Our students need all the skills listed in Principle 1, PLUS

1. a capacity for innovation and at a level of creative problem solving unheard of in the present population,

2. the ability not only to work in groups and appreciate other cultures, but the ability to LEAD successful multi-disciplinary and multi-cultural teams and/or successfully take on different team roles,

3. the ability to observe and reflect upon one's own performance and to put in the corrections without waiting for approval from the "outside" as well as being able to act in a socially responsible manner, and

4. the ability to value excellence and be able to recognize it and to produce it.

As it stands, the section under this principle simply declares that educational outcomes will be identified, and that systems to assess the attainment of these (as yet unspecified) outcomes will be developed by allocating resources appropriately. If the preceding coarse-grained analysis holds, the existing policy substance proposed in support of the theme of accountability is thin.

The following are a few significant issues that are integral aspects of the accountability theme, and which might be addressed in this section to provide supporting guidelines in campus developments of assessment and accountability systems:

1. some rudiments of philosophic/theoretical bases for valuing particular types of educational outcomes (e.g., pragmatism, creativity, social utility, personal development, basic research, etc.)

2. definition of stakeholders/participants in outcome definition and accountability

3. a position regarding the level of commitment to developing more authentic, and usually more costly, outcome assessment instrumentation, especially in such areas as those mentioned on page 3, and described as "those things most difficult to test"

4. a balanced reliance on the various forms of validity, as well as on outcome attainment in articulating student success

5. purposes and processes for standard-setting and determination of outcome attainment level cut-off points.

6. the level of commitment to require that this endeavor be implemented according to an adequate plan (especially given this fundamental shift from content coverage and seat time to demonstrated knowledge), and be monitored, diagnosed, and evaluated with appropriate frequency.

Principle 2 - Students and their teaching and learning experience are the center of the academic enterprise. We will shape the provision of our academic programs and support services to meet the diverse needs of our students and our society.

Remarks on Recommendations Supporting Principle 2:

The redesign of current standards and processes of facilities utilization, so that the campuses can offer courses when appropriate throughout the year and throughout the hours of every day of every week, according to student demand. This, in turn, will require developing support for plant operation and other support services beyond the current schedules.

Principle 3 - CSU students will be expected to be active partners in the learning process, and the university will provide opportunities for active learning throughout the curriculum.

Principle 4 - The CSU will reinvest in its faculty to maintain its primary mission as a teaching-centered comprehensive university.

We believe that alternate plans must be in place in case those proposals fail. It is known on this campus that "faculty renewal and reinvestment" is not working, because many junior faculty are commanding a salary near that of senior faculty because of competition with industry. There is
no question that this is an important issue for the faculty and the pursuit of this objective is supported by all. However, this same issue is important to staff and administration. It should also be understood that the staff that is needed to support the campus is of a professional caliber. The support systems that are now common place at the universities require sophisticated, professional staff to maintain and/or develop. Support systems are no longer simple. Just as we should support redevelopment and learning in faculty, we should support training and retraining of administrators and staff.

Policy Goal B: The CSU Seeks to Ensure Access to Higher Education

We strongly endorse the statements concerning expansion of continuing and extended learning programs. This integration can also benefit the traditional student and provide alternatives to the standard curriculum. We wish to emphasize that this expansion can only be accomplished with better integration of continuing and extended education programs into the overall academic planning process. It also requires a commitment to provide additional financial resources for implementation and a commitment to provide financial aid and support services for students. Presently there is NO financial aid currently available for continuing/extended students at Cal Poly and student support services do not exist for students who only take evening classes.

Principle 5 - We will meet the need for undergraduate education in California through increasing outreach efforts and transfer, retention, and graduation rates, and providing students a variety of pathways that may reduce the time needed to complete degrees.

Principle 6 - Graduate education and continuing education are essential components of the mission of the CSU.

Remarks on Recommendations Supporting Principle 6:

6a The last sentence needs to be clarified. We agree that new programs cannot continue to be added, without phasing out or scaling down others and this should be done continuously as refreshment and renewal. Changes in programs must always be done cautiously and carefully. However, it does not necessarily follow that new GRAD/POST-BACC programs must replace other GRAD/POST-BACC programs. Weak/obsolete programs should be reduced regardless of level, to make way for new ones and that may actually cause a shift toward a higher percentage of graduate programs than we currently have, if that is indeed where the quality and demand lie.

6b We again endorse the idea of integration of programs.

6c This statement is ambiguous regarding "differences in professional fees."

6f We have reservations about the idea of a CSU Alumni passport. How would this be financed? We already have fee waivers for a number of different categories of students.

Policy Goal C: The CSU Seeks to Ensure Financial Stability

Principle 7 - The State of California must develop a new policy framework for higher education finance to assure that the goals of the Master Plan are met. The framework should be the basis for the subsequent development of periodic "compacts" between the State and the institutions of higher learning.

Remarks on Recommendations Supporting Principle 7:
7e The term "professional fee" is vague. Some Master's programs could be called "professional" programs and others not.

7f This is an important principle. Presently student fees are a barrier for many students in graduate, teacher preparation, or continuing education programs.

While there may be more efficiencies still to be found (no doubt there are), we are very concerned that the search for still more efficiency at Cal Poly, which has already achieved high ratings for current levels of efficiency (in western, comprehensive universities, it's ranked second or third for academic reputation and 57th for resources) and the search for still more efficiency throughout the other campuses, which are also probably already efficient, may produce wretched consequences rather than increased efficiencies. There are a lot of speeches about working smarter when, in fact, most faculty and staff are working harder. The rhetoric doesn't change the reality and frustrates, even insults, those who know the difference. For example, faculty and staff know that so little of the CSU budget is invested in faculty and staff development that many are driven to focus more on survival than on innovation. In the same way that raising money requires spending money, increasing quality and access and other desired changes require investing in people.

It is not clear that the CSU's commitment to Compact II will equal a commitment from the legislature. Although it may be assumed that this document is a plea for such, there is/will be no guarantee. There seems to be no strategic plan for pursuing other revenues than "the relentless search for more state funding," nor a mechanism for producing one other than to let each institution go out with a corps of development officers. The CSU needs a comprehensive plan that supports creativity, rewards innovation, produces results, and cultivates public support.

Principle 8 - The responsibility for maintaining educational excellence, access, diversity, and financial stability shall be shared by the State, the CSU system, the campuses, our faculty, and students.

The document calls for an increase in funding to go along with the anticipated increase in enrollment. We should have a plan for the case of no funding increase for the increased enrollments. Quality should be maintained.

Policy Goal D: The CSU Seeks to Ensure University Accountability

Our group is somewhat divided over the new draft's policy substance on accountability, in general, and demonstrated learning, in particular. Some find it thin; others are relieved that so much definition seems delegated to the individual campuses. At least one who wants further system-level elaboration of guidelines notes the following unaddressed but integral issues in accountability:

- Philosophical and theoretical bases for valuing particular types of results (e.g., pragmatism, creativity, social utility, personal development, basic/applied research, community service)
- Identification of constituents/interested parties/participants in definition of desired results and accountability processes
- A balanced reliance on various forms of validity and results in articulating student success
- Purposes and processes for setting standards
- Recognition that accountability itself consumes resources and that developing more authentic assessment especially of those "things most difficult to 'test'" -- reasoned judgment, rich imagination, personal integrity, and civic engagement -- are particularly costly.

Principle 9 - The CSU will account for its performance in facilitating the development of its students, in serving the communities in which they reside, and in the continued contribution to the
California economy and its society, through regular assessment of the learning outcomes of its students and through periodic reports to the public regarding our broader performance.

**Principle 10** - The CSU campuses shall have significant autonomy in developing their own missions, identities, and programs, with institutional flexibility in meeting clearly defined system policy goals.

Remarks on Recommendations Supporting Principle 10:

Decentralization of campus identities seems to be a good thing too, but there is not a way to forward the thinking about mutual accountability AND greater flexibility and different program design standards. WHO is going to develop a comprehensive performance assessment? Long Beach?
ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-___-97/
RESOLUTION ON
CSU PRESIDENTS' PAY RAISES

WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees has taken action to increase the salary of CSU presidents by 10 percent; and

WHEREAS, This comes in a year when the majority of CSU faculty will receive a pay increase of slightly more than 2 percent; and

WHEREAS, CSU faculty salaries lag those for comparable universities by about 10 percent; and;

WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees has taken no steps to address this shortfall; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly State University condemn the CSU Board of Trustees and the CSU administration for their action to increase the salaries of CSU presidents; and, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of Cal Poly State University strongly urge the CSU Board of Trustees to rescind their action until the issue of adequate pay raises for CSU faculty and staff is adequately addressed.

Proposed by: George Lewis, CSM
Date: October 14, 1997
Adopted:

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

AS-97/ RESOLUTION ON
SPORTS COMPLEX

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate recognizes the need for new sports facilities at Cal Poly, including playing and practice fields and a baseball stadium; and

WHEREAS, The plan for the Cal Poly Sports Complex in its present configuration fails to provide adequate buffers to protect wetlands that serve as habitats for 33 documented species of wild waterfowl; and

WHEREAS, The present configuration will cause unnecessary adverse impacts to critical Biological Sciences Department fish and wildlife teaching resources as specified in a letter to the administration signed by 27 out of 30 Biological Sciences Department faculty on March 7, 1997; and

WHEREAS, The Introduction to the “Campus Master Plan” document dated April 28, 1992 states that “At a fundamental level the primary function of the physical environment of the campus is the [sic] support and enhance the instructional and scholarly agendas of the university”; and

WHEREAS, The present configuration of the Cal Poly Sports Complex plan places a road, a parking lot, and a softball stadium within 40 feet of Smith Reservoir; and

WHEREAS, Coastal ordinances require at least 100 feet of buffer between any development and wetland borders and County ordinances require at least 50 feet of buffer between any development and a wetland; and

WHEREAS, The letter signed by faculty in the biological Sciences Department recommend 200 yards minimum from Shephard and 100 yards minimum from Smith as buffers; and

WHEREAS, The EIR for the Sports Complex plan in its present configuration notes these requirements and states that “The University is not subject to local ordinances”; and

WHEREAS, A university educating students in Natural Resources Management, City and Regional Planning, Landscape Architecture, and Biological Sciences should maintain a higher and not a lower standard of environmental responsibility than other developers; and

WHEREAS, Members of the university community have made know their concerns about adequate wetland buffers to the administration since the beginning of the EIR process; therefore, be it
RESOLVED: That Cal Poly adhere to Coastal and County ordinances that require an appropriate buffer between any development and a wetland; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That President Baker halt construction on the Sports Complex, in whatever its final scale, until all environmental and educational issues have been adequately addressed.

Proposed by: Richard Kranzdorf and Steven Marx
Date: October 27, 1997
DRAFT PSSI TARGET ALLOCATION BY DOLLARS (CAL POLY ALLOCATION: $467,000)

MOU requires 5% of PSSI funds for appeals. Column 4 shows allocation of remaining 95%. Column 5 results in 10% target reserve at Presidential level; Column 6 results in 15%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>College FTE</th>
<th>95% College Target Dollars</th>
<th>85% College Target Dollars</th>
<th>80% College Target Dollars</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Department FTE</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (95%)</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (85%)</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (80%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>119.23</td>
<td>$65,725</td>
<td>$58,807</td>
<td>$55,348</td>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>$3,859</td>
<td>$3,453</td>
<td>$3,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BioResource &amp; Ag Engineering</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>8,230</td>
<td>7,364</td>
<td>6,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agribusiness</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>11,025</td>
<td>9,884</td>
<td>9,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>6,784</td>
<td>6,052</td>
<td>5,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crop Science</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>7,498</td>
<td>6,696</td>
<td>8,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy Science</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4,961</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td>4,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food Science &amp; Nutrition</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>7,717</td>
<td>6,905</td>
<td>6,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Resources Management</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>6,808</td>
<td>6,091</td>
<td>5,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Horticulture Science</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>4,523</td>
<td>4,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil Science</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>3,418</td>
<td>3,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$119.23</td>
<td>$65,725</td>
<td>$58,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch &amp; ED</td>
<td>77.74</td>
<td>$42,054</td>
<td>$38,343</td>
<td>$36,088</td>
<td>Architectural Engineering</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>4,735</td>
<td>4,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>40.07</td>
<td>22,089</td>
<td>19,763</td>
<td>18,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City and Regional Planning</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>5,551</td>
<td>4,967</td>
<td>4,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>3,946</td>
<td>3,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5,512</td>
<td>4,932</td>
<td>4,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$77.74</td>
<td>$42,054</td>
<td>$38,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>68.74</td>
<td>$37,893</td>
<td>$33,904</td>
<td>$31,910</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>6,323</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>5,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>4,735</td>
<td>4,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>3,456</td>
<td>3,093</td>
<td>2,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global Strategy and Law</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>5,325</td>
<td>4,765</td>
<td>4,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Technology</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4,961</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td>4,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>7,866</td>
<td>7,038</td>
<td>6,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>4,699</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>3,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$68.74</td>
<td>$37,893</td>
<td>$33,904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DRAFT PSSI TARGET ALLOCATION BY DOLLARS (CAL POLY ALLOCATION: $467,000)

MOU requires 5% of PSSI funds for appeals. Column 4 shows allocation of remaining 95%. Column 5 results in 10% target reserve at Presidential level; Column 6 results in 15%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>College FTE</th>
<th>95% College Target Dollars</th>
<th>85% College Target Dollars</th>
<th>80% College Target Dollars</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Department FTE</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (95%)</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (85%)</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (80%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>121.59</td>
<td>67,026</td>
<td>59,971</td>
<td>56,443</td>
<td>Aeronautical Engineering</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil &amp; Environmental Engr/ARDFA</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>13,671</td>
<td>12,232</td>
<td>11,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>14,145</td>
<td>12,656</td>
<td>11,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td>12,188</td>
<td>10,905</td>
<td>10,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial and Manufacturing Engr</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>8,197</td>
<td>7,334</td>
<td>6,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Materials Engineering</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>2,756</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>2,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>12,828</td>
<td>11,477</td>
<td>10,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121.59</td>
<td>67,026</td>
<td>59,971</td>
<td></td>
<td>198.45</td>
<td>109,395</td>
<td>97,880</td>
<td>92,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>198.45</td>
<td>109,395</td>
<td>97,880</td>
<td>92,122</td>
<td>Art and Design</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>6,979</td>
<td>6,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>48.80</td>
<td>26,901</td>
<td>24,069</td>
<td>22,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Languages and Literatures</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>4,812</td>
<td>4,306</td>
<td>4,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>9,151</td>
<td>8,187</td>
<td>7,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>3,551</td>
<td>3,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>6,168</td>
<td>5,519</td>
<td>5,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>7,497</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td>6,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>6,946</td>
<td>6,215</td>
<td>5,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>7,717</td>
<td>6,905</td>
<td>6,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>7,497</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td>6,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre and Dance</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>3,346</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>2,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>1,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graphic Communication</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>3,841</td>
<td>3,527</td>
<td>3,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology and Human Dev</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>11,372</td>
<td>10,175</td>
<td>9,577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MOU requires 5% of PSSI funds for appeals. Column 4 shows allocation of remaining 95%. Column 5 results in 10% target reserve at Presidential level; Column 6 results in 15%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>College FTE</th>
<th>95% College Target Dollars</th>
<th>85% College Target Dollars</th>
<th>80% College Target Dollars</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Department FTE</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (95%)</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (85%)</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (80%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science and Math</td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>87,891 $</td>
<td>78,639 $</td>
<td>74,013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>33.39</td>
<td>17,822 $</td>
<td>15,946 $</td>
<td>15,008 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>22,083 $</td>
<td>19,758 $</td>
<td>18,596 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>40.06</td>
<td>15,396 $</td>
<td>13,776 $</td>
<td>12,065 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>27.93</td>
<td>8,670 $</td>
<td>5,968 $</td>
<td>5,517 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>7,514 $</td>
<td>6,723 $</td>
<td>6,327 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE and Kinesiology</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>87,891 $</td>
<td>78,639 $</td>
<td>74,013 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCTE</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>9,024 $</td>
<td>8,074 $</td>
<td>7,599</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>9,024 $</td>
<td>8,074 $</td>
<td>7,599 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8,158 $</td>
<td>7,300 $</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>8,158 $</td>
<td>7,300 $</td>
<td>6,870 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,756 $</td>
<td>2,466 $</td>
<td>2,321</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2,756 $</td>
<td>2,466 $</td>
<td>2,321 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>12,927 $</td>
<td>11,566 $</td>
<td>10,886</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>12,927 $</td>
<td>11,566 $</td>
<td>10,886 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>804.81</td>
<td>443,650 $</td>
<td>396,950 $</td>
<td>373,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>804.81</td>
<td>443,650 $</td>
<td>396,950 $</td>
<td>373,600 $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cal Poly PSSI allocation (100%) = $467,000
DRAFT PSSI TARGET ALLOCATION BY STEPS
(Cal Poly Estimated Step Allocation: 288)

Note: 288 steps based on 96-97 steps awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>College FTE</th>
<th>95% College Target Steps</th>
<th>85% College Target Steps</th>
<th>80% College Target Steps</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Department FTE</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (95%)</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (85%)</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (80%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>119.23</td>
<td>40.53</td>
<td>36.27</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BioResource &amp; Ag Engineering</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agribusiness</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crop Science</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dairy Science</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food Science &amp; Nutrition</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Resources Management</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Horticulture Science</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil Science</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119.23</td>
<td>40.53</td>
<td>36.27</td>
<td>34.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch &amp; ED</td>
<td>77.74</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>Architectural Engineering</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>40.07</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>11.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City and Regional Planning</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.74</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>22.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>68.74</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global Strategy and Law</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Technology</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68.74</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>19.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DRAFT PSSI TARGET ALLOCATION BY STEPS
(Cal Poly Estimated Step Allocation: 288)

Note: 288 steps based on 96-97 steps awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>College FTE</th>
<th>95% College Target Steps</th>
<th>85% College Target Steps</th>
<th>80% College Target Steps</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (95%)</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (85%)</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (80%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>121.59</td>
<td>41.34</td>
<td>36.98</td>
<td>34.81</td>
<td>Aeronautical Engineering</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil &amp; Environmental Engr/ARDFA</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial and Manufacturing Engr</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Materials Engineering</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>198.45</td>
<td>67.46</td>
<td>60.36</td>
<td>56.81</td>
<td>Art and Design</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>48.80</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>13.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Languages and Literatures</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speech Communication</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre and Dance</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graphic Communication</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology and Human Dev</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>198.45</td>
<td>67.46</td>
<td>60.36</td>
<td>56.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRAFT PSSI TARGET ALLOCATION BY STEPS
(Cal Poly Estimated Step Allocation: 288)

Note: 288 steps based on 95-97 steps awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>College FTE</th>
<th>95% College Target Steps</th>
<th>85% College Target Steps</th>
<th>80% College Target Steps</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (95%)</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (85%)</th>
<th>Department Target PSSI Steps (80%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science and Math</td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>54.20</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>45.64</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>33.39</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>10.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>40.06</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>12.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>27.93</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE and Kinesiology</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>54.20</td>
<td>48.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCTE</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>804.81</td>
<td>273.60</td>
<td>244.80</td>
<td>230.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>804.81</td>
<td>273.60</td>
<td>244.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cal Poly Target PSSI Steps = 288 (est)