I. Minutes: none

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Vice President for Academic Affairs:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. Staff Council representative:
G. ASI representatives:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on the Cal Poly Plan: first reading (To be distributed). (Attached as p. 2, for your information, is Academic Senate Survey on the "Cal Poly Plan" Executive Summary.)
B. Guidelines and Criteria for Performance Salary/Step Increases: first reading (To be distributed.)
D. Resolution on "U" Grades-Freberg, Chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading, (p. 4).
E. Resolution on Guidelines for Experiential Education-Williamson, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading, (p. 5).
F. Resolution on Proposal to Establish an Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute-Mark, Associate Dean of CAGR, first reading (pp. 6-22).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
Executive Summary

From the middle of October through November 6, 1995, the Academic Senate conducted a survey of faculty and professional consultative services staff. The Survey was designed to determine faculty priorities, should increased funds become available. Three-hundred fifty-nine faculty / PCS staff responded and the following are the highlights of the results of those responding:

**Equipment:** Forty-six percent said there should be a major increase in funding for new equipment.

Thirty-five percent said there should be a major increase in funding for the maintenance of existing laboratory equipment.

Thirty-three percent said there should be a major increase in funding for the maintenance of existing faculty equipment.

**Library:** Forty-eight percent said there should be a major increase in funding for library services and materials.

Forty-one percent said there should be a major increase in funding to provide for longer library hours.

**Staffing:** Forty-eight percent said there should be a major increase in funding to hire more tenure track faculty.

On a related issue, fifty percent said should be a major increase in funding toward offering more Summer courses.

**Overall Priorities:** Respondents were asked to rank their five highest priorities. Additional classes were the three top priorities, while hiring more tenure track faculty and more graders / student assistants was the second highest ranked area. Also ranked highly were reduced teaching load and class size, more time for research, maintenance of current equipment and increased library hours.
WHEREAS, The following nine departments/programs were reviewed during the 1994-1995 academic year:
- Architectural Engineering
- Civil and Environmental Engineering
- Foreign Languages and Literatures
- Forestry and Natural Resources
- Mathematics
- Mechanical Engineering
- Music
- Statistics
- Theatre and Dance

and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate acknowledges receipt of the Program Review and Improvement Committee's "Report on programs reviewed during 1994-1995"; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate receive the Program Review and Improvement Committee's "Report on programs reviewed during 1994-1995"; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Program Review and Improvement Committee's "Report on programs reviewed during 1994-1995" be submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Proposed by the Program Review and Improvement Committee
June 1, 1995
WHEREAS, Executive Order 268 specifies that the grade of "U" is used "when, in the opinion of the instructor, completed assignments or course activities or both were insufficient to make normal evaluation of academic performance possible. For purposes of grade point average and progress point computation this symbol is equivalent to an "F"; and

WHEREAS, It is recognized that registration is a student responsibility, and that students enrolling but failing to attend class are potentially preventing other students from utilizing campus resources; and

WHEREAS, In some cases, the "U" grade may represent an unduly harsh performance grade consequence for a procedural error; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That students may request a grade change from "U" to "W"; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That students may receive only one such grade change from "U" to "W" during their academic career at Cal Poly; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That such student-initiated grade changes will be governed by the policy set out in AS-384-92 (Resolution on Change of Grade) adopted April 14, 1992.
Background Statement: Efforts have been made over the past eight years to develop university guidelines for experiential courses. In 1986-1987, an Ad Hoc Committee on Experiential Education studied the issue and proposed guidelines which were framed in an Academic Senate resolution dated October 1989. The Senate Executive Committee referred the issue to the Curriculum Committee for further study and the committee made "tentative recommendations" in its "End of Year Overview, 1992-93." On October 3, 1994, Jack Wilson, Chair of the Academic Senate, requested the Curriculum Committee to "develop guidelines for 'coop' courses" as part of the committee's charge for 1994-95.

Following review of these previous efforts, the current Curriculum Committee concluded that the issues of major concern were: first, that experiential education should not constitute an inordinate component of a student's course of study; and, second, that grading of students' efforts in these classes is subjective and does not reflect uniform standards for what must be an individualized experience both in conception and execution.

The Curriculum Committee concluded that it was impractical and unwarranted to establish a university-wide limitation on student credit units earned in experiential courses. The committee also concluded that experiential courses should be graded C/NC across the university due to their individualized nature and the lack of university-wide standards of expectation. These recommendations were made in the committee's "Report on Curricular Reform," forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee.

WHEREAS, Experiential education is a complement to the formal curriculum and includes those courses with a significant component of out-of-classroom experience. Such courses may include but are not limited to coops, internships, enterprise projects, student teaching, service and club related activities; and

WHEREAS, Experiential education constitutes a valued part of Cal Poly's curriculum; and

WHEREAS, Such courses call for student design and implementation of course methods and goals; and

WHEREAS, Such courses represent a highly individualized educational experience for the student and raise difficulties in ensuring standardized expectations across the university; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That grading for experiential courses be on a C/NC basis only.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Curriculum Committee
May 8, 1995
RESOLVED: That an Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute be established at Cal Poly as proposed in the attached Proposal for the Formation of an Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute.

Proposed by the College of Agriculture
May 11, 1995
Enclosed is a request from Dean Joseph Jen, College of Agriculture, to establish an Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute at Cal Poly. The proposed Institute received conceptual approval by the Academic Deans’ Council last spring and was also subject to an administrative review process conducted by Susan Opava, Dean of Research and Graduate Programs.

I would appreciate the Academic Senate’s review and recommendation of this proposal. A response would be appreciated by the close of Fall Quarter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to either contact me or Dean Jen.

Enclosure
To: Robert Koob
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Date: May 11, 1995

Copies: S. Opava
W. Mark

Subject: Revised Proposal for the Formation of an Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute

Attached is the revised proposal for the establishment of the Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute at Cal Poly. Also attached are revised bylaws for the operation and structure of the institute and a budget plan for the first four years of operation. This institute appears to be a very viable institute, based on the past level of support received and the number of projects funded for the upcoming year.

The institute clearly reflects an area of excellence at Cal Poly, urban forestry. While many of the projects to date have not involved faculty from multiple disciplines on the campus, the nature of the field of urban forestry should provide such opportunities in the future.

The list of grants received and funding indicates that several faculty in the Natural Resources Management Department have been active doing projects in urban forestry in the past two years. These include Norm Pillsbury, Rich Thompson, Tim O'Keefe, Doug Piirto, and Wally Mark. These grants area an important source of professional development opportunities for the faculty, funding for extra compensation and assigned time, funding for graduate students, office support, and equipment. As such I have agreed to continue to support the effort by releasing my Associate Dean, Wally Mark, 10% of his time to direct the institute and to place a Macintosh computer in the UFEI Office.
The Academic Dean's Council reviewed the original proposal and passed that along for administrative review. My understanding is that this has been completed and that the revisions reflect the input from the administrative reviewers. I understand that the university is willing to provide startup funding for the institute, but that Academic Senate review and approval is required before the institute becomes official.

The establishment of the Urban Forest Ecosystem Institute will provide recognition of the area of excellence that exists at Cal Poly. I hope that you will support the College in this effort by expediting the required approvals.

Attachments
Background & Purpose

Throughout the State and across the nation, there is a growing demand for improved management of urban forest ecosystems. The definition of an urban forest is changing rapidly as population pressures increase the urbanization of historically rural/wildland areas—the urban interface forest. This is especially true in California where the value of forests from the High Sierras to the coast is being generated increasingly by recreational and vacation homesite uses and less by traditional commodity uses.

The Society of American Foresters has developed the following definition of urban forestry: "Urban forestry is a specialized branch of forestry that has as its objective the cultivation and management of trees for their present and potential contribution to the physiological, sociological, and economic well-being of urban society. Inherent in this function is a comprehensive program designed to educate the urban populace on the role of trees and related plants in the urban environment. In its broadest sense, urban forestry embraces a multi-managerial system that includes municipal watersheds, wildlife habitats, outdoor recreation opportunities, landscape design, recycling of municipal wastes, tree care in general, and the future production of wood fiber as raw material."

As California, and the nation, place greater demands on urban forests, improved management and awareness of these resources is needed. The Natural Resources Management Department, along with other disciplinary areas such as Biological Sciences, City and Regional Planning, Landscape Architecture, Ornamental Horticulture, Political Science, Recreation Administration, and Soil Science at Cal Poly-San Luis Obispo, is ideally suited to address these needs given the philosophy of an ecosystems approach to resource management, expanding interest in interdisciplinary efforts, and location within the highly urbanized areas of Central and Southern California. Cal Poly has curriculum, applied research and faculty competencies in urban forestry and wildland management.

In response to these needs the Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute (UFEI) is proposed for establishment at Cal Poly. The purpose of the proposed UFEI at Cal Poly is to provide a center for (1) applied research on urban forest topics, (2) extension and technology transfer for urban forest areas, (3) community service and outreach programs that will assist landowners and public agencies in improving the management of urban forests and (4) student involvement in research and education activities in urban forestry. The scope of UFEI will range across the full spectrum of forest settings—from the inner-city forests to semi-developed forests, using the broad definition of urban forestry.

Mission Statement

The Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute will conduct applied research on urban forest resources including planning, management, and utilization strategies for those resources. The UFEI will also develop and conduct technology transfer programs related to urban forestry. This will be done by members, associate members, and community liaisons.
Goals

- provide opportunities for faculty, staff and student cooperation and integration by participating in an interdisciplinary effort to develop programs to manage urban forest resources
- provide opportunities for professional, intellectual, and personal growth through applied research and development activities
- analyze, plan and implement activities in urban environments that benefit both human and natural systems
- review literature and state-of-the-art technologies that may be applied to urban forest ecosystems
- provide the opportunity for faculty to apply current research and learning to teaching and instructional programs
- invite the local, regional and national community to participate and promote the transfer of information and technologies through applied research
- conduct cross-disciplinary applied research that will inform the public and decision makers about mitigation, management, and implementation strategies that impact urban forest resources
- develop a computerized data base (including literature) and techniques for resources information distribution
- develop educational programs that will inform the public at large as well as decision makers about the major issues, concerns, and opportunities available to management in the urban forest
- allow interdisciplinary teams the opportunity to work toward a single goal that unifies their research energies
- create an institute of excellence which is widely recognized, self-sustaining, and is complementary to and enriches other programs, activities, and institutes at Cal Poly
- provide a vehicle (workshops, conferences and symposiums) for the exchange of ideas and skills from the physical, biological, social, and economic sciences, as well as engineering and technology, and the arts and humanities.

Objectives

In order to respond to the major urban forest resource management issues, UFEI will draw upon many disciplines present at Cal Poly. Project work will be accomplished through an interdisciplinary initiative of the Natural Resources Management Department at Cal Poly representing the core group of disciplines with others from programs such as Soil Science, Agricultural Engineering, Recreation Administration, Environmental Horticultural Science, City and Regional Planning, Landscape Architecture, Political Science, and Biological Sciences.
Applied research and educational efforts will be based on a philosophy of integrated ecosystems management of the urban environments and resources without adverse impact to the natural systems. Technology transfer will be accomplished through various types of education programs including: conferences, workshops, seminars, publications, and public service announcements.

Examples of more specific objectives for applied research and extension projects will focus on the following urban forest issues:

- Wildfire hazard prediction and fuel management
- Greenbelt/open space management
- Shade tree vigor analysis, selection, and stability prediction (including possible application of the "Specimen Tree Concept")
- Description of best management practices (BMP's) and sustainability of urban forests through improved modeling of urban forest and wildland ecosystems
- Economic analysis of benefits and costs associated with urban forests, wildlands and their management
- Inventory of urban forest resources
- Analysis and recommendation of policies and public opinions designed to achieve community forest goals.
- Riparian corridor inventory and best management practices
- Urban wildlife habitat management
- Utilization of urban trees requiring wood/biomass volume estimation and product market research
- Achievement of urban air and water quality goals through urban forest management
- Urban waste management

The technology transfer and community outreach function will include the following means:

- Special seminars and demonstrations
- Hosting and participating in conferences and workshops at all levels; local, state, and national
- Publication of a UFEI public information series
- Video and slide/tape programs
- On-site training programs
- News articles and public service announcements for mass media
- Development of an information database for access by urban forestry professionals
- Implementation and utilization of new technologies in urban forest inventory, planning, and management
The support of teaching and learning opportunities for Cal Poly faculty and students would be enhanced by:

- Increased availability of information from the UFEI information database
- Interaction with professionals through research and extension activities
- Direct involvement of faculty and students in a variety of research and extension activities which add to the learning experience and professional development
- Employment opportunities for students as student assistants and interns while attending college

Direction and priorities for applied research, extension, technology transfer and outreach activities will be provided by an advisory committee that will be comprised of representatives from various public and private sector organizations such as California Urban Forests Council, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, United States Forest Service, National Park Service, Soil Conservation Service, University of California Cooperative Extension, California Urban Forestry Advisory Council, International Society of Arboriculture, Society of American Foresters, East Bay Regional Park, California Oak Foundation, and other conservation organizations.

Organization

MEMBERSHIP: Membership will consist of faculty, staff, and graduate students of Cal Poly with an interest in studying, teaching, working, and researching in urban forest resource issues. In addition consultants, research associates, and others interested in UFEI projects may join as associate members of the UFEI. Cal Poly undergraduate and graduate students may be hired to work on projects.

ORGANIZATION: The Director of the UFEI reports to the Dean of the College of Agriculture. The Director is the overall administrator of the institute, providing support to the various projects undertaken by members. The Director would be responsible for implementation of the recommendations of the Executive Committee. The Director must be a regular Cal Poly faculty member or administrator.

The Associate Director reports to the Director and manages the UFEI Office and is responsible for personnel actions for the UFEI staff. The Associate Director also pursues leads for grants and contracts, organizes conferences, workshops, seminars, and short courses. The Associate Director could be a Cal Poly faculty member or administrator or an individual contracted with by the Institute. The Associate Director would only be hired if sufficient funds were available through the institute.

Each project would have a project director, who would be directly responsible for its implementation, completion, and required reporting and project accounting. Funds would be managed by the Cal Poly Foundation, which would also serve as the funding recipient on behalf of the UFEI. (See attached organization chart)
LOCATION: For the initiation of the UFEI, office space will be provided by the University. The institute will require office space for the Executive Director and administrative assistant/clerical support. Telephones and a computer and printer for the administrative assistant/clerical support will also be provided by the University.

FUNDING: Initial startup funds are requested from the Vice President for Academic Affairs. During the 1993-94 Fiscal Year funds for a one-half time clerical position were obtained from grant moneys. The Associate Vice President for Academic Resources agreed to match this funding during the 1994-95 Fiscal Year to provide for a one-half time support staff for the UFEI office. The institute requests similar funding from the University for the 1995-96 and 1996-97 FY's. It is anticipated that grant funds will provide support to match the one-half time support from the university. In addition, startup funding of 18 WTU's per year for 1994-95, 1995-96, and 1996-97 are requested for faculty assigned time for a director to work on the startup and direction of the UFEI. During this time other required equipment and operating expenses associated with the UFEI office will be provided from grant moneys. After the 1996-97 FY it is anticipated that funding for the clerical and director positions will be generated from grants.

Additional faculty assigned time will be funded on individual grants as they are received. Some faculty may also receive additional compensation from grants administered in the UFEI.
ACTIVITY: There has been considerable activity related to the types of projects that will be supported by the institute in 1993-94. The following is a list of the grants that have been received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1993-94:</th>
<th>Project Dollars:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Forestry Recycling</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Urban Tree Species for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume and Biomass Potential</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Forest Profiles for Sustainability</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning for Urban Forestry in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Communities</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Total:</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1994-95:</th>
<th>Project Dollars:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe Tree Values</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning for Urban Forestry in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Communities</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Forest Tree Utilization</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Volume Tables to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Street Tree Inventory Data</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Total:</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Activity 1995-96:</th>
<th>Project Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohost Oak Woodland/Urban Forestry Conference</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning for Urban Forestry in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Communities</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Volume Tables to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Street Tree Inventory Data</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Networking for Urban Forestry</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Coast Tree Finder Application</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Total:</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUDGET:

See attached budget proposal.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Assigned Time (12 wtu/y)</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>CAGR</td>
<td>UFEI</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Dean Time 10%</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salary (part time contractors)</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOA I (half time)</td>
<td>$7,209</td>
<td>$7,569</td>
<td>$7,930</td>
<td>$7,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Graduate Research Assistant</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Salaries</td>
<td>$14,109</td>
<td>$14,469</td>
<td>$14,830</td>
<td>$14,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (26% for AOA; 8% SA/GRA)</td>
<td>$2,091</td>
<td>$2,191</td>
<td>$2,292</td>
<td>$2,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Space for Staff &amp; AOA I</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers and printer</td>
<td>CAGR</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Furnishings</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
<td>Cal Poly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies/Operations</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
<td>$16,661</td>
<td>$17,122</td>
<td>$17,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$61,427</td>
<td>$62,350</td>
<td>$63,273</td>
<td>$63,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$16,200</td>
<td>$16,661</td>
<td>$17,122</td>
<td>$17,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$61,427</td>
<td>$62,350</td>
<td>$63,273</td>
<td>$63,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFEI Grants</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$9,689</td>
<td>$15,150</td>
<td>$15,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Tahoe Grant</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Symposium</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Finder</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bryant</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$37,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance =</td>
<td>$(772)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1. Organizational Chart for the Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute
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BYLAWS

URBAN FOREST ECOSYSTEMS INSTITUTE

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California

These bylaws are applicable within the authorization established by the Board of Trustees of the California State University (CSU) and the California Polytechnic State University (Cal Poly).

ARTICLE I - NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute, referred to in these Bylaws as the UFEI.

ARTICLE II - PURPOSE

Section 1 - Direction: The UFEI is a non-profit, non-partisan organization established for educational, research, and service purposes. The UFEI will promote the study and management of urban forest ecosystems and participate in education and the decision making processes through a combination of interrelated programs of an applied nature involving students, faculty, and community collaboration.

Section 2 - Policies: The policies of UFEI shall be in harmony with the policies of the California State University and the California Polytechnic State University.

Section 3 - Dissolution: In the event UFEI is dissolved, its assets remaining after payment of, or provision for payment of, all debts and liabilities shall be distributed to the Natural Resources Management Department of the College of Agriculture of the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.
ARTICLE III - MEMBERSHIP

Section 1 - Class of Membership: Members may be faculty, staff, and graduate students of the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, and Associate Members may be consultants, research associates, and others interested in the institute.

Section 2 - Admission to Membership:

a. Eligibility: All interested faculty, staff, and graduate students of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, can be Members of UFEI, if so requested by the individual. All Associate Members are required to have written agreements to serve UFEI and its programs.

b. Request for Membership: Any qualifying individual interested in an UFEI program may request membership (see class of membership for criteria for membership).

c. Acknowledgment of Membership: The Director/Executive Director of UFEI shall acknowledge members.

Section 3 - Terms: Terms of members shall be determined by the Executive Committee.

Section 4 - Fees and Dues: Fees or dues may be established upon recommendation of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE IV - UFEI ADMINISTRATION

Section 1 - Administrators: Administrators shall consist of the Director and Associate Director.

Section 2 - Staff: Staff members are those persons serving the University in an instructional or non-instructional program of UFEI. Staff members shall work under the direction of personnel listed in IV.1.
UFEI Bylaws  
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ARTICLE V - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Section 1 - Composition: There shall be an Executive Council composed of the Director and Associate Director of UFEI, the NRM Department Head, one Member actively involved in research during the past 12 months, one Member in good standing, one Associate Member in good standing, and one member of the Advisory Committee.

Section 2 - Membership: Membership is determined as follows:

a) The Director, Associate Director and the NRM Department Head shall be members of the Executive Council.

b) The Director shall call for nominations for the Active Research Member position on the Executive Council from those who are actively involved in Sponsored Programs, Cal Poly Foundation, research projects or have been involved during the past 12 months. The Executive Council makes the final selection.

c) The Director shall call for nominations for the Member position on the Executive Council from those who are Institute Members in good standing. The Executive Council makes the final selection.

d) The Director shall call for nominations for the Associate Member position on the Executive Council from those who are Institute Associate Members in good standing. The Executive Council makes the final selection.

e) The Advisory Committee shall recommend one Advisory Committee Member for appointment to the Executive Council by the Director.

Section 3 - Meetings: The Executive Council shall meet at a minimum, meet once per year. Minutes of the Executive Council shall be submitted to UFEI Members, Associate Members and the Advisory Committee.

Section 4 - Duties: The Executive Council shall provide the general guidance related to the business activities and affairs of UFEI. The Director shall implement those decisions.
Section 5 - Conduct of Meeting: Meetings shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order, as such rules may be revised from time to time, insofar as such rules are not inconsistent with or in conflict with policies of the CSU and/or Cal Poly.

ARTICLE VI - ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Section 1 - Composition: The Advisory Committee to UFEI shall consist of no more than 10 persons recommended by the UFEI Executive Council and approved by the Dean of Agriculture. Members shall not be regular employees of Cal Poly State University.

Section 2 - Purpose: The Advisory Committee shall provide advice and comment on UFEI programs and shall engage in public relations and fund raising for UFEI programs.

Section 3 - Meetings: The Advisory Committee shall meet at least once a year to review UFEI programs and to provide general direction to UFEI. The Committee may elect to meet for special purposes at any other time, upon agreement of a majority of Committee Members.

Section 4 - Number Constituting a Quorum: A majority of Committee members shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE VII - FISCAL POLICIES

Section 1 - Fiscal Year: The fiscal year shall be in accordance with the University.

Section 2 - Accounts and Audit: The books and accounts of the UFEI shall be kept by the Cal Poly Foundation in accordance with sound accounting practices, and shall be audited annually in accordance with University policies.
ARTICLE VIII - OPERATING GUIDELINES

The Executive Committee may develop operating guidelines to implement these Bylaws.

ARTICLE IX - AMENDMENTS

The Bylaws may be amended by a 2/3 vote of the members of the Executive Committee voting at any meeting of UFEI. Each member shall have two (2) weeks advance written notification of the proposed amendments.
RESOLUTION ON THE CAL POLY PLAN
ACADEMIC SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE
FALL, 1995

WHEREAS, Funding for higher education in the State of California is an unprotected category in the state budget; and

WHEREAS, Federal and State funding levels of financial aid for students are seriously threatened, and such action will make it increasingly difficult for many qualified students to attend Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, The current Cal Poly budget does not provide sufficient funds to maintain, replace or upgrade the equipment needed for instructional programs; and

WHEREAS, Reduced or even constant levels of funding threaten to diminish the quality of education at Cal Poly, and such funding levels would greatly inhibit Cal Poly's ability to meet the educational demands of the future; and

WHEREAS, Enrollment growth at Cal Poly is an expectation of the Governor and the State Legislature; and

WHEREAS, Increased enrollment at Cal Poly will cause significant stress on the infrastructure of the University; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Plan is an effort to address the above concerns, and it offers the flexibility for Cal Poly to respond to additional challenges; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Plan is being developed through a collaborative process involving all constituents of the University; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support the continued development of the Cal Poly Plan provided that revenues generated through this plan will not be used to reduce funds allocated to Cal Poly from CSU sources; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support the continued development of the Cal Poly Plan provided that the priorities of use of the additional revenues raised by this plan be determined through a collaborative process that involves all constituents of the University; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support the continued development of the Cal Poly Plan provided that a process be established to evaluate the effectiveness of the Plan and allow for adjustments of the Plan in order to maintain and enhance educational quality; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate encourage the Cal Poly community to work together to develop a Cal Poly Plan that meets the conditions of this Resolution.

TO ALL SENATORS: This is the attachment to Business Item V.A. on your November 14, 1995 agenda which was sent under separate cover.
RESOLUTION ON
PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY

WHEREAS, the faculty ("Unit 3") contract (the "Memorandum Of Understanding" or MOU) creates Performance Salary Step Increase ("PSSI")s, and

WHEREAS, the MOU delegates to the Academic Senate on each campus with the task of establishing standards, criteria, and procedures for granting such step increases, and

WHEREAS, if the senate does not act by December, 15, 1995, the MOU allows the campus President to institute standards, criteria, and procedures on his own, be it

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached policy on procedures, standards and criteria for the granting of PSSIs during the 1995-96 academic year, and be it further

RESOLVED: that this policy be reviewed this year and a more permanent policy be put into place by June 1, 1995 to apply for academic years 1996-97 and 1997-98.

Proposed by the ad hoc Academic Senate committee on Performance Salary Step Increases
### Emerging Enrollment Principles for Cal Poly Plan
- **15,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES) for the academic year (Cal Poly's Master Plan level)** over the next three to five years (about 17,000 students)
- Rebuild summer enrollment, beginning with Summer 1996
- Enrollment growth range for 1996-97 from 275 to 350 new Calendar Year FTES

**Key Enrollment Choices Remaining**
- Distribution of enrollment growth by level and program, applying the following:
  - Cal Poly's mission with respect to the program mix
  - Diversity/representation
  - Demand for graduates
  - Facilities & equipment -- quality & capacity
  - Staff/Service capacity

### Emerging Financial Principles for Cal Poly Plan
- Continued affordability (remain a "best buy" in higher education)
- Recognition of quality and costs associated with "learn by doing"
- Continuing state support for enrollment growth
- Differential campus-based fee to accommodate investments needed to restore and enhance quality associated with Cal Poly's mission and reputation

**Key Financial Choices Remaining**
- Level of campus-based fee
- Campus-based fee structure

### Emerging Investment Principles for Cal Poly Plan
- Revenues from differential fees to be invested in visible (identifiable) quality and productivity enhancements (including student progress toward degree completion)
- Financial aid sufficient to provide at least the same level of support as at present

**Key Investment Choices Remaining**
- Priorities (pending findings from surveys of students, faculty, staff, parents, and advisory groups and assessment of needs by divisions and colleges)

### Process for Defining and Building Quality, Productivity, and Accountability
- Involvement of campus constituents in defining and measuring quality and productivity
- Accountability at institutional and program levels
- Linkage between planning, resource allocation and performance
- Continuing investments in quality and productivity
  - Student productivity -- More effective student learning; progress toward degree goals; curricular flexibility
  - Faculty/Staff productivity -- Capitalization of faculty; restructuring workload
  - Institutional productivity -- More effective use of fixed resources

**Key Choices Remaining Regarding Process for Quality, Productivity and Accountability**
- Structure and schedule for continuing dialog to define quality and productivity, to develop accountability measures for both, and to create internal links between performance and resource allocation

### Continuation of Steering Committee and Involvement of Vice-Presidents and Deans to Monitor Progress Regarding Quality, Enrollment Growth, Funding, and Investments

November 6, 1995
A primary goal of the *Cal Poly Plan* is to transform the serious challenges facing California higher education into opportunities that allow us to create our own future. As we move toward the 21st Century, we will protect what we do well while formulating creative ways to meet demands for growth, for secure financing, for improved quality and efficiency, and for clear accountability to our students and the public.

**Fiscal Challenges and Opportunities**

Cal Poly is unique in the CSU System, set apart as much by our recognized excellence as by our polytechnic mission and learn-by-doing philosophy. However, these characteristics that contribute to a more effective education and help shape our national reputation involve higher costs than those faced by more traditional universities.

Until five years ago, the state recognized our special needs through differential funding that financed our programs and provided a margin for excellence. Over the past four years as the budget has diminished, however, we were forced to cut enrollment, reduce faculty and staff by a significant percentage, raise class sizes, lower equipment budgets, and defer campus maintenance. Only hard work by faculty and staff kept our quality of education from eroding. We cannot continue on this course any longer. Present and future students must be able to experience the same quality of education that established Cal Poly's reputation.

Obviously, we will continue working with others to convince the state to restore budget levels that meet the needs of higher education. Independently, however, we believe our reputation for superior quality and our popularity with the best students in California offer Cal Poly an opportunity to enhance its funding if we guarantee that the new revenues will be used to improve instruction and make our programs more effective.

The state should continue to provide a significant share of the average costs of public education. And since Cal Poly's fees are modest compared to costs of a public university education nationally, we believe students and their families are willing to consider additional fees in return for a commitment by the University to invest in specific, qualitative improvements. These improvements will include those clearly identified as essential by members of the Cal Poly community.

Equally important, we believe our alumni, our friends in industry, and our other supporters are prepared to increase their financial backing for Cal Poly, particularly in the context of a clear and ambitious plan for the future.

**Other Challenges and Opportunities**

Over the next decade, California faces unprecedented growth in the number and diversity of students seeking a university education; many thousands of these students will be asking to enroll in the CSU System alone. With an adequate funding plan in place, however, Cal Poly will be able to help meet this challenge. In fact, given the University's strong and diverse applicant pool and the existing Master Plan that allows us to expand the student body, we see this as an opportunity for growth that will have a positive effect on the campus.

In the meantime, the nation's universities are being challenged to be more responsible and productive. Cal Poly will use its widely recognized reputation for quality undergraduate education and for efficiency to expand our leadership role within the CSU as we explore new ways to improve quality, productivity, and accountability.
**Planning Process**

Campus-wide discussions last spring were followed by a conversation between Cal Poly officials and the Chancellor's Office to identify core themes of a *Cal Poly Plan*.

Over the summer a 14-member Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee was appointed to provide consultation and communication across campus to achieve the substantive consensus the University must reach. This group is chaired by President Baker and is composed of representatives from the Academic Senate (Harvey Greenwald, John Hampsey, Jack Wilson), Staff Council (Bonnie Krupp, Patricia Harris, Eric Doepel), ASI (Cristin Brady, Mike Rocca, Tony Torres), and the administration (Paul Zingg, Frank Lebens, Juan Gonzalez). A Labor Council representative, George Lewis, sits with the committee.

This fall the administration and deans are developing enrollment and funding scenarios for Steering Committee consideration. Surveys and forums are being conducted to discover and assess top priorities for the future as expressed by faculty, students, staff, parents, and advisory groups.

**Core Themes**

In the conversation between Cal Poly and the Chancellor's Office, these core themes emerged:

1. We will explore the idea of increasing enrollment during the regular academic year and also during summer term;
2. we will look at ways to improve and stabilize funding for the campus while also improving the management of our resources;
3. we will consider approaches to define, measure and strengthen the quality and productivity of the University's entire operations; and
4. we will evaluate changes in the University’s curriculum to enhance educational quality and opportunities for greater student success.

Other themes included continuing work in the review of employment issues unique to this campus, advancing efforts to assess and strengthen some of the ways the University does business, and planning for eventual growth beyond Cal Poly's present capacity.

**Immediate Questions**

If portions of the *Cal Poly Plan* are to be implemented next Fall Quarter, these questions need to be addressed immediately:

- How should Cal Poly grow?
- How should Cal Poly fund this enrollment growth and quality enhancement?
- What initial investments should we make?
- How do we begin to define and then link quality, productivity, and accountability?

**Call for Participation**

President Baker’s white paper, “Keeping Cal Poly’s Promise,” provides additional background on the *Cal Poly Plan*. It is available in the Kennedy Library Reserve Room and from the University Communications Division, Heron Hall. During Fall Quarter 1995 and beyond all members of the campus community are encouraged to share their views about the questions listed above through participating in surveys and forums, and by contacting members of the Steering Committee.

Comments and questions can be sent to the President or the Cal Poly Plan, c/o Office of the Academic Vice President. E-mail messages should go to polyplan@oboe. All comments will be forwarded to the Steering Committee, and all messages will be answered.
Background Statement: Efforts have been made over the past eight years to develop university guidelines for experiential courses. In 1986-1987, an Ad Hoc Committee on Experiential Education studied the issue and proposed guidelines which were framed in an Academic Senate resolution dated October 1989. The Senate Executive Committee referred the issue to the Curriculum Committee for further study and the committee made "tentative recommendations" in its "End of Year Overview, 1992-93." On October 3, 1994, Jack Wilson, Chair of the Academic Senate, requested the Curriculum Committee to "develop guidelines for 'coop' courses" as part of the committee's charge for 1994-95.

Following review of these previous efforts, the current Curriculum Committee concluded that the issues of major concern were: first, that experiential education should not constitute an inordinate component of a student's course of study; and, second, that grading of students' efforts in these classes is subjective and does not reflect uniform standards for what must be an individualized experience both in conception and execution.

The Curriculum Committee concluded that it was impractical and unwarranted to establish a university-wide limitation on student credit units earned in experiential courses. The committee also concluded that experiential courses should be graded C/NC across the university due to their individualized nature and the lack of university-wide standards of expectation. These recommendations were made in the committee's "Report on Curricular Reform," forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee.

WHEREAS, Experiential education is a complement to the formal curriculum and includes those courses with a significant component of out-of-classroom experience. Such courses may include but are not limited to coops, internships, enterprise projects, student teaching, service and club-related activities For purposes of this resolution, such courses are defined as coops, internships, practicums, enterprise projects, and service/club-related activities; and

WHEREAS, Experiential education constitutes a valued part of Cal Poly's curriculum; and

WHEREAS, Such courses call for student design and implementation of course methods and goals; and

WHEREAS, Such courses represent a highly individualized educational experience for the student and raise difficulties in ensuring standardized expectations across the university; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That grading for experiential courses be on a C/NC basis only.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Curriculum Committee
May 8, 1995

[Signature]
Key Decisions of the ad hoc PSSI committee
Summarized by Chuck Dana, who is responsible for its content.

0. How long should this policy be in place?
   *(committee chose:)*
   This year only. No time to refine ideas that might be applicable for future years.

1. Should funds be allocated to entities (most likely Colleges) or be kept in a single campus-wide pools of money?
   *(committee chose:)*
   campus-wide pool.

2. How many levels of faculty reviewing committees should there be? [At what levels should they be?]
   *(committee chose:)*
   committee in colleges (and units) only.
   1 level of faculty review.
   *(other choices considered:)*
   -- 1 university-wide committee
   [1 level of faculty review.]
   -- per college (and unit) committees plus a university-wide committee
   [2 levels of faculty review]

3. In establishing the qualifying criteria for the step increase, how should the relative performance in different areas be judged?
   *(committee chose:)*
   outstanding in at least one area and meritorious in all other areas
   *(other choices considered (among others -- the possibilities are numerous) )*
   -- Outstanding or meritorious in one area; satisfactory performance in all other areas.
   -- require outstanding in teaching; outstanding or meritorious in other areas.
   -- outstanding or meritorious in 2 of 3 areas (teaching must be one) and satisfactory in the third.
   -- are 'outstanding' and 'meritorious' even different?
   -- Just use "outstanding" and meritorious" like the contract and let the committees decide.

4. Should applicant/nominee be asked to specify which area(s) they feel are outstanding?
   *(committee chose:)*
   yes
   *(other opinions:)*
   no -- someone could be outstanding, but shy about saying so.
5. Over how long a period should the performance in question extend?

**Committee chose:**
- 5 years (or time at Poly, if less)

**Other choices considered**
- 3 years
- any time at Poly.

6. Should we include definitions of 'outstanding' and 'meritorious'?

**Committee chose:**
- yes [sections 2.4 and 2.5]

7. Should examples of criteria to use (section 2.6) in an area

**Committee chose:**
- yes

**Other choices considered**
- no. professionals should be insulted with a list like that. The committees will be mature enough to judge.
- no. anybody who is outstanding or meritorious would be insulted being told what to consider

8. Should committees prioritize (rank) all applications?

**Committee chose:**
- no

They will categorize applications into 3 categories:
- highly recommended, recommended, not recommended.

9. Should Colleges (units) first establish policies and criteria of their own?

**Committee chose:**
- no

[no time for colleges to set up policies this year]

10. Should committees recommend the number of steps to give?

**Committee chose:**
- yes

**Other ideas possible (not much discussion here)**
- have applicant request a particular number of steps; will get no more than that number.
- have applicant request a particular number of steps; and will get EXACTLY what they requested or nothing.

11. Should applicants for PSSI's be eligible to be on review committees (if so, they would not rule on their own applications).

**Committee chose:**
- no
12. Should there be a limit on the length of the application?
   committee chose:
   yes -- 6 pages.

13. How should College (unit) committees be formed?
   committee chose:
   each department has an opportunity to select a representative
   other choices considered:
   -- each department elects a rep.
   -- members elected at large by vote of faculty run through senate office.
   -- allow each colleges (unit) to set up the procedure.
PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE POLICY

This policy is considered interim for the 1995-96 academic year. It shall be reviewed and monitored by the appropriate Academic Senate committee during 1996 Winter and Spring Quarters. A permanent policy shall be considered by the Academic Senate prior to the conclusion of Spring Quarter 1996.

1.0 Performance Salary Step Increases

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

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

1.3 During academic year 1995/96 no candidate shall receive more than four (4) PSSIs. In 1996/97 and in any future year no candidate shall receive more than five (5) PSSIs. (MOU 31.18)

1.4. The effective date of all PSSIs shall be January 1 of each year that there are negotiated PSSIs. (MOU 21.11)

2.0 Eligibility and Criteria

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

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

2.3 Applicants/nominees are expected to be outstanding in at least one area and meritorious in all other areas. Applicants will identify which areas they consider their performance to be outstanding.

2.4 For the purposes of this document, the following working definitions shall apply.

Outstanding: exceptional performance; superior to others of its kind; distinguished, excellent; readily acknowledged as a model for other faculty to follow.
2. Meritorious: deserving of reward or praise; cooperative and productive work with colleagues.

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

AREA 1: TEACHING PERFORMANCE and/or OTHER PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE.

-- teaching effectiveness recognized by peers and/or students;
-- curriculum development and application of innovative and effective teaching methods and materials including such activities as development of new courses, programs, majors, or degrees;
-- scholarship of teaching (see Cal Poly Strategic Plan, Section 2);
-- performance of professional responsibilities by librarians, counselors, or coaches.

AREA II: PROFESSIONAL GROWTH and ACHIEVEMENT

For a full description of the following kinds of activities, see "Cal Poly Strategic Plan", Section 2, and Administrative Bulletin 85-2, "Role and Definition of Professional Growth and Development."

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

AREA III: SERVICE TO UNIVERSITY, STUDENTS AND COMMUNITY

-- participation in university governance at the department, college/division, university or CSU levels.
-- participation, as an advisor or mentor, in student organizations;
-- involvement in diversity-related activities;
-- involvement, e.g. by presenting talks, organizing colloquia, or service as an officer, in the work of community groups related to one's teaching/professional area;
involvement with the K-12 community provided that these activities go beyond those required in the faculty unit employee's normal instructional program and are related to one's teaching/professional area;

community-related service projects provided that these activities go beyond those required in the faculty unit employee's normal instructional program and are related to one's teaching/professional area.

participation in governance and committees of the exclusive bargaining agent (CFA).

3.0 Application

3.1 The period of consideration for outstanding or meritorious performance is five academic years immediately preceding the academic year in which submission of the application/nomination is made.

3.2 Signed applications/nominations shall be submitted to the department chair/head. To go forward as an application to the College (Unit) PSSI Committee a nomination must have the approving signature of the nominee. The approving signature of the applicant/nominee authorizes access to their personnel action file to those involved in considering PSSIs. Only one application/nomination may go forward for any candidate.

3.3 Applicants/nominees shall provide the College (Unit) PSSI Committee with relevant documentation regarding outstanding or meritorious performance.

4.0 Review by College PSSI (Unit) Committee

4.1 Each department shall have the opportunity to select a tenured faculty member to serve on the College (Unit) PSSI Committee. For the purpose of considering PSSIs, coaches will be merged with the faculty of Physical Education and Kinesiology; and faculty unit employees from the Library, University Center for Teacher Education, and Counselors shall be combined to into a single "Unit."

4.2 Applications and nominations shall be forwarded to College (Unit) PSSI Committees consisting of tenured Unit 3 employees. No more than one Unit 3 employee from a department shall serve on the College (Unit) PSSI Committees except in cases where this would result in a committee of fewer than three people.

4.3 College (Unit) PSSI Committees shall review and categorize all applications. Three categories shall be used: highly recommended; recommended; not recommended. For those candidates recommended favorably, the College (Unit) PSSI Committee shall recommend the number of steps to be awarded.
4.4 Applicants for PSSIs shall not serve on College (Unit) PSSI Committees.

4.5 College (Unit) PSSI Committees shall inform all applicants of their recommendations at the time that they are forwarded.

5.0 Review by the President

5.1 All recommendations are forwarded to the President or his/her designee no later than March 15, 1996, and no later than December 1 of each year in which negotiated PSSIs are awarded in the future.

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

5.2 The President or designee shall review all of the applications/nominations which have been submitted, and select the recipients of the increases from among this candidate pool by April 1, 1996, and no later than January 1 of each year in which negotiated PSSIs are awarded in the future. He/she shall also determine the appropriate number of steps to be granted. (see MOU 31.28)

5.3 The decision to grant or deny an increase for meritorious performance, and the number of steps to be granted, shall not be subject to the grievance procedure. (see MOU 31.28 and Section 8, below)

6.0 Special Provisions (see MOU 31.29--31.31)

6.1 At least fifty percent (50%) of the candidates receiving a PSSI must have received a positive recommendation from the College (Unit) PSSI Committees provided that:

The College (Unit) PSSI Committees make a positive recommendation for enough candidates to fully expend the campus pool for PSSIs in that fiscal year and

The College (Unit) PSSI Committees meet the time requirement for the review and recommendations of all candidates to the President as specified above.

6.2 If the College (Unit) PSSI Committees submit fewer than the minimum number of positive recommendations needed to expend fully the pool for PSSIs in any fiscal year, then the percentage of candidates receiving a PSSI that must also have received a positive recommendation from the College (Unit) PSSI Committees shall be reduced proportionately from fifty percent (50%).
7.0 Relationship to RPT Deliberations

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

8.0 Peer Review of Performance Salary Step Denials (see MOU 31.36-31.42)

8.1 Candidates who have received a favorable recommendation from the College (Unit) PSSI Committee and who subsequently fail to receive a PSSI shall be eligible to have the increase denial reviewed by a University Peer Review Panel.

8.2 The University Peer Review Panel shall be selected by lot from among all full-time tenured faculty who did not serve on that year's College (Unit) PSSI Committees.

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

8.4 All requests for peer review must be submitted in writing to the Vice President of Academic Affairs no later than April 15, 1996, and no later than January 15 of each year in which negotiated PSSIs are awarded in the future.

9.0 Reporting of Awards

9.1 The University shall report to the Academic Senate annually by College (Unit) the appropriate aggregate statistics regarding the number of candidates in each category, the number of recipients and the number of steps granted.
PERFORMANCE SALARY STEP INCREASE (PSSI) APPLICATION/NOMINATION FORM

Name:

Department/College (Unit):

Date of Application:

If Applicable, Nominated By:

Applicants/nominees are expected to be outstanding in at least one area and meritorious all other areas within the five academic years preceding application. Applicants are encouraged to identify which of the following areas they consider their performance to be outstanding:

- ___ teaching performance and/or other professional performance
- ___ professional growth and achievement
- ___ service to the university, students, and community

Applicants should describe in six (6) or fewer pages their vita, achievements and the significance of these activities. Please clearly specify which area(e) you are addressing.

My signature certifies that the statements in this application are true and factual and authorizes review of my personnel action file by those involved in considering PSSIs. I understand that the PSSI committees reserve the right to request and review additional documentation.

Applicant's Signature ___________________________ Date ____________
The PSSI Committee originally voted 9-2 in favor of establishing a University level committee to make final recommendations to the President. There were two major reasons cited for the importance of such a committee:

1. To retain faculty control over as much of the process of choosing PSSI recipients as possible. The President has the right to choose 50% of the recipients; however, without a University-wide committee to compile a final list of faculty recommendations, we leave the President with far greater choice and discretion.

2. To provide a University-wide standard for outstanding performance. The committee recognized the unique and specialized demands of the varied disciplines represented within the University and for that reason recommended the formation of college level committees. At the same time, in order to insure that all awards are given fairly and without prejudice to any discipline or college, faculty should determine equivalent levels of performance deemed to be outstanding.

The recommendation to establish a University level committee was reversed late in the committee's proceedings by a vote of 6-4, with members citing the short amount of time available for both the formation of such a committee and the review of all applications by two levels of faculty review.

The Senate should consider whether procedure should be established with a view to fairness, or in terms of practicality. PSSIs are bound to be contentious, and I would argue that fairness should be our primary criteria in establishing the procedures for their award.

I propose that the language of the PSSI committee report be amended as follows (changes in capital letters, except PSSI):

Review of College AND UNIVERSITY PSSI Committee
4.1 Each department shall have the opportunity to select a tenured faculty member to serve on the College (Unit) PSSI Committee. For the purpose of considering PSSIs, coaches will be merged with the faculty of Physical Education and Kinesiology; and faculty unit employees from the Library, University Center for Teacher Education, and Counselors shall be combined into a single "Unit." EACH COLLEGE AND THE CTE/LIBRARY/COUNSELORS UNIT SHALL SELECT A TENURED FACULTY MEMBER TO SERVE ON THE UNIVERSITY PSSI COMMITTEE.

4.2 Applications and nominations shall be forwarded to College (Unit) PSSI Committees consisting of tenured Unit 3 employees. No more than one Unit 3 employee from a department or appropriate unit shall serve on the College (Unit) PSSI Committees except in cases where this would result in a committee of fewer than three people.

4.3 College (Unit) and University PSSI Committees shall review and categorize all applications. Three categories shall be used: highly recommended; recommended; not recommended. For those candidates recommended favorably, the College (Unit) AND UNIVERSITY Committees shall recommend the number of steps to be awarded.

4.4 Applicants for PSSIs shall not serve on College OR UNIVERSITY PSSI committees.

4.5 College (Unit) AND UNIVERSITY PSSI Committees shall inform all applicants of their recommendations at the time that they are forwarded.

Time has precluded the addition of committee members names to this report. I would ask the Senate to note the split within the committee over the votes on this issue.

PSSI Minority Report

Nancy Clark, page 2
Here is my substitute language for paragraph 2.3 of our proposed Performance Salary Step Increase (PSSI) Policy. I understand that it will be a part of the minority report that will be distributed to members of the Senate.

 Applicants/nominees who are recommended are expected to be outstanding or meritorious in 2 of 3 areas (teaching performance and/or other professional performance; professional growth and achievement; service to the university, students, and community), one of which must be teaching and/or other professional performance; and are expected to be performing satisfactorily in the third area.

 Dan
Enclosed is a minority report concerning the proposed performance pay policy.

==============================================================
Harvey Greenwald
Mathematics Department
Office: 25-201
Phone: (805) 756-1657
email: hgreenwa@oboe.aix.calpoly.edu

------- Forwarded message -------
Date: 10 Nov 95 09:10:27 PST
From: DI612@ACADEMIC.CALPOLY.EDU
To: Harvey Greenwald <hgreenwa@oboe.aix.calpoly.edu>
Subject: Uncl: Minority report for PSSI document (fwd)

From: Mike Suess
Director of Faculty Affairs
Phone: 756-2844

Iyl...

Dan Bertozzi, page 2
Performance Salary Step Increases are provided for outstanding or meritorious performance in the area of teaching, as well as other professional accomplishments and service to the University community.

For the Academic Year 1995/1996 the minimum criteria in the area of teaching performance will be measured by guidelines and activities listed under The Scholarship of Teaching in the Cal Poly Strategic Plan, as well as by evidence supplied by the candidate that demonstrates the application of innovative and effective teaching methods and materials, curriculum development, and student evaluations with corresponding grade distribution data. Additional criteria may be developed by the separate College Criteria Committees by December 8, 1995.

For the Academic Year 1995/1996 the minimum criteria in the area of professional development will be measured by guidelines and activities listed under The Scholarship of Discovery, The Scholarship of Integration, and The Scholarship of Application in the Cal Poly Strategic Plan, as well as by the activities found in The Role and Definition of Professional Growth and Development issued in Administrative Bulletin 85-2. Additional criteria may be developed by the separate College Criteria Committees by December 8, 1995.

For the Academic Year 1995/1996 the minimum criteria in the area of Service to University, College, Department, Students, and Community will be participation in on-campus committees, interaction with student organizations, and interaction with off-campus organizations with significant educational interests or activities. Additional criteria may be developed by the separate College Criteria Committees by December 8, 1995.

2. On November 30, 1995, the faculty of each College may select a College Criteria Committee with up to one representative from each department to examine the documents referred to in Item No. 1 above. If the College Criteria Committee chooses to adopt additional definitive criteria they must do so by December 8, 1995, and submit it to the president on that date. The criteria may be rank-specific and may vary according to the number of steps moved up in the salary scale (which will range from one to four during Academic Year 1995/1996). The final criteria approved by the President will be published and made known to the faculty by January 1, 1996. After December 8 all College Criteria Committees go out of existence. The president’s final decision about each college’s criteria must be made by no later than December 15, 1995.

3. In addition to college standards and criteria, procedures consistent with the MOU shall be determined by the President or designee, after consideration of the recommendations made by the appropriate campus Academic Senate committee and the various College Criteria Committees.

4. The deadline to apply or be nominated for a Performance Salary Step Increase during Academic Year 1995/1996 shall be February 1, 1996.

5. All faculty unit employees who submit an application or who are nominated by faculty unit employees or academic administrators shall be deemed eligible for a Performance Salary Step Increase.

6. The completed application and/or nomination forms shall be limited to six pages in length and shall designate the number of salary steps for which application is being made. Supporting documents may be placed in the faculty member’s personnel action file.

7. On February 1, 1996, each department will elect a representative to serve on the College Evaluation Committee. The representative may not be an applicant for a Performance Salary Step Increase.
8. On February 1, 1996, each department will determine whether it will participate in the competitive mode or in the cooperative mode. Participation in the cooperative mode will be nullified by one negative vote.

9. If a department has determined to participate in the cooperative mode it must write and adopt a Department Compact by February 14, 1996. The Compact will summarize the accomplishments of the Department during the preceding three years, outline its goals during the coming year, and itemize each department member's specific plans and commitments for helping the department reach its goals. During Academic Year 1995/1996 the department will send forward only one member from its applicants to the President. The one member will be selected from among the applicants. As part of the Department Compact, the chances for winning the lottery may be made dependent upon rank. To continue in the cooperative mode, the Department Compact must be ratified by the Department without dissent by February 15. Failure to ratify will automatically place the department in the competitive mode.

10. Each department operating in the cooperative mode will forward its candidate's application to the President. The application will be accompanied by a copy of the Department Compact. The President will place equal weight upon the individual's application and the department's compact. The President must receive each application/dept compact by March 15, 1996.

11. Each application made by members of departments in the competitive mode will be sent to the appropriate College Evaluation Committee by March 1, 1996. The College Evaluation Committee must judge each application by the criteria developed by the College Criteria Committee and approved by the President. Each application will be classified as being in one of the following three categories: Highly Recommended, Recommended, Not Recommended. The recommendation must be made for the same number of salary steps as requested by the applicant. If the applicant does not satisfy the criteria for the number of salary steps requested then the application should be classified as Not Recommended. The application should be forwarded to the President by March 15, 1996. The College Evaluation Committee shall have access to the personnel action file of the applicant for the purpose of making a careful consideration of the candidate's supporting documents.

12. The President or designee shall review all of the applications/nominations which have been submitted in both modes and select the recipients of the Performance Salary Increases from among this candidate pool by April 1, 1996.
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The Cooperation Option at the Department Level

by Gary Epstein, Math Dept

It is proposed that each department be given a choice between two kinds of PSSI options to be known as the Competition Option and the Cooperation Option.

In the Competition Option the focus is on the individual PSSI applicant's record of achievement in a well-defined previous period of time. He will most likely find himself in competition with faculty from his own department and college as well as from the wider University community. If his application is successful and he receives a salary increment there will be no particular benefit that redounds to his colleagues, to his department's program, or to the students his department serves. He is clearly a winner; but the only winner. Hard to calculate is the effect of lingering feelings of resentment held by some faculty. This resentment may be directed toward the PSSI program as well as toward the particular faculty who applied. Undoubtedly there will also be well-qualified faculty who won't be able to overcome inner feelings of modesty or deferential behavior to assert the required claims of outstanding or meritorious performance even if nominated by others. So the awards will go primarily to those whose strong personalities are adept at self-promotion.

In the Cooperation Option the focus is primarily on the Department and secondarily on the individual PSSI applicant. Once the department chooses to pursue the Cooperation Option, work begins on the Department Compact.

This work begins with a survey of all the activities of the department that go beyond the basic duties of instruction and overhead. Examples would include colloquium talks delivered by department faculty, outside speakers sponsored by the department, high school student competitions arranged by the department, meetings of professional societies hosted by the department, publications by department members, university-wide and Academic Senate committee memberships and chairmanships held by department faculty, outreach programs to Alumni, department publications, honors and awards received by department faculty, etc. In a way this survey gives a measure of a department's metabolism, energy, and what this department is all about.

A second survey would be of the services and products that each faculty member would declare a willingness to share with the department as a
whole or with individual faculty members. Examples include mentoring of fellow faculty who would like to venture into new research areas or publishing, collaboration on grantsmanship, sharing of computer programming abilities or products, training in the use of new computer hardware or commercial software or use of the World Wide Web, rewriting of lab manuals or redesign of lab experiments, joint design of new courses or challenging projects for student groups to work on, etc. In a way this survey gives a measure of the potential for improvement by the department faculty. The survey will reveal a veritable marketplace for new interactions among the faculty, overcoming the old problem of faculty knowing (or caring) little about the work of their own colleagues.

The Department Compact would register the whole array of commitments that the faculty would pledge to fulfill during a prescribed period of time in the immediate future. In particular, each applicant for a PSSI would commit himself in writing to his personal resolve to engage in the commerce of exchange of particular services and products (in both directions) with his department colleagues.

The written plans authored by the PSSI applicants would be circulated to the faculty for input, comments, or suggestions. After a round of modifications of these plans the Department Compact would be put to a vote.

Because the contract gives each faculty person the prerogative of applying for a PSSI without the prior approval of any group, it will be necessary for the department vote on the Compact to be adopted unanimously, or at least with no negative votes cast by the PSSI applicants. The same would have to apply to the initial vote by the department to take the Cooperation Option. This is similar to the *liberum veto* in which the Polish Sejm -- composed exclusively of nobles -- gave each of them the authority to nullify any proposal of all the rest and bring the whole issue to an end. The failure, then, of a department to adopt a compact will automatically place it in the Competition Option.

If the Department Compact is adopted then how should the PSSI applicants be put forward? The answer is by lottery. This will solve the problem of resentment. It also opens up the Win-Win potential of the Cooperation Option. Here is how that works: Whichever faculty body makes the final recommendation and President Baker (who makes the final decision) will be instructed to judge Cooperation Option applicants by a different standard than the Competition Option applicants. For the
Cooperation Option they will be judging the total department achievements and immediate future plans as much as those of the PSSI applicant. How is this a Win-Win plan? Whether the applicant receives a salary increment or not, it is clear that his colleagues will benefit from their mutual efforts at improvement of themselves. The department program benefits as a direct result. And the students will benefit as well. If the department fulfills most of its commitments then its credibility will increase. That will enhance the prospects of future PSSI applicants in its ranks. Eventually those departments with the best records will receive more individual performance salary increments than those departments that do little more than teach their courses. It's a case of All For One and One For All. A classic Win-Win situation!
CAL POLY STRATEGIC PLAN

Section 2 -- Faculty Scholarship
1.6 Cal Poly shall provide a campus environment where a strong commitment to teaching and learning exists, and all members of the campus community are motivated to work together in the pursuit of educational goals.

1.7 Cal Poly's instructional programs will vary in size depending on such factors as:
- relevance to mission
- quality of program, faculty, students, and staff
- support of the university's Educational Equity and Affirmative Action plans
- projected demand by students and employers
- overlaps with programs in other institutions, including the number and size of similar programs offered elsewhere in the state
- requirements of accreditation associations
- resource requirements (variety of faculty, staff, facilities, equipment, library resources).

1.8 Cal Poly's decisions about academic programs and administrative organizations shall be based on the educational needs of students and society and the efficient, effective and appropriate use of resources within a program.

1.8.1 Cal Poly shall review these decisions regularly.

1.9 Cal Poly shall participate in self-supporting programs that offer educational opportunities for nontraditional, nonmatriculated students.

1.10 Cal Poly shall ensure that the academic curriculum is appropriately infused with issues of gender and cultural and racial pluralism.

1.10.1 Cal Poly shall require for graduation, successful completion of course work that focuses on the issues of gender and cultural and racial pluralism.

1.10.2 Cal Poly shall ensure that the content of courses across the curriculum include relevant issues of gender and cultural and racial pluralism where appropriate.

2. FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP

The faculty shall be encouraged to be proficient and current in their disciplines as well as their teaching skills. Cal Poly shall continue to encourage faculty to belong to appropriate
professional organizations. Cal Poly will provide the necessary support to ensure that faculty have the opportunity to achieve success in the scholarships identified below.

Faculty Professional Development

Excellence in teaching is the primary purpose of Cal Poly's faculty, and active participation in various types of scholarly activities is essential to meeting this goal. Cal Poly recognizes and endorses four types of scholarship as part of the expectations for faculty. A Carnegie Foundation report entitled Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate identifies these as the Scholarship of Teaching, the Scholarship of Discovery, the Scholarship of Integration, and the Scholarship of Application. Each of Cal Poly's faculty members must be active and proficient in the Scholarship of Teaching. While activity in the three remaining areas characterizes the career of a faculty member, at any given time it is likely that one area will receive greater emphasis than the others.

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 also a dynamic endeavor which must bring students actively into the educational process. Further, teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well. In the end, inspired 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.

2.1 Cal Poly shall continue to encourage its faculty members to be proficient and current in the subjects they teach.

2.2 Cal Poly shall continue to improve opportunities for each faculty member to be skilled in classroom or comparable modes of instruction and to have the most up-to-date means of information technology available.

2.2.1 Cal Poly shall continue to place particular emphasis upon teaching methods that require students to take an active role in their own learning.
2.3 Consistent with its expectations, Cal Poly shall continue to improve classroom space, classroom equipment, supplies, study space, communication and information technologies, books, periodicals, and other resources.

2.4 Cal Poly shall develop an on-going and effective program of conferences and workshops on teaching and use of information technology to ensure the highest possible quality of instruction across the campus.

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, give meaning to the effort. The probing mind of the researcher is a vital asset to Cal Poly, the state, and the world. Scholarly investigation 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 nonspecialists, 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?

2.5 Consistent with its expectations, Cal Poly shall continue to improve its support for the Scholarships of Discovery, Integration, and Application. Such support shall include but not be limited to assigned time, facilities, equipment, travel, and research assistance.

2.6 Cal Poly shall recognize and support professional activities to the disciplines (such as holding office, editing journals, reviewing books and participating in professional meetings) and service to the university and larger community (such as serving on committees and activity in community groups and activities).

3. STAFF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ACHIEVEMENT

Excellence in support of students and faculty is the primary goal of Cal Poly's staff, and participation in activities that lead to professional growth and achievement is essential to meeting this goal. Professional growth and achievement includes continuing education related to a staff member's current position as well as education and training for future careers. Professional growth and achievement may entail different activities for different staff members.

In a university, it is appropriate for all members of the campus community to have the opportunity to seek further learning.

3.1 Cal Poly's staff members shall have the opportunity to pursue additional education and training whether in pursuit of a degree, certification, or personal life-long learning.

Staff members must have available to them the tools necessary for professional growth and achievement. This shall include the opportunity to enhance skills in their current fields, to be exposed to recent developments in technology and information, and to acquire additional education.

An important part of professional growth and achievement, especially on a campus as relatively isolated as Cal Poly, is participation in professional organizations and opportunities to attend professional conferences.

3.2 Cal Poly's staff shall be encouraged to be proficient and current in their professions in order to provide the highest quality support to students, faculty, and
ADMINISTRATIVE BULLETIN 85-2

"Role and Definition of Professional Growth and Development"
Improving the climate for professional growth has been an issue of special concern to me ever since I came to Cal Poly in 1979. A modern university needs a faculty that is up-to-date in its field. I am, therefore, committed to doing whatever is necessary to ensure that end.

To do so, we have already taken several steps. The first of these has been to define the role of research. Previously, research had been viewed by many as a questionable activity, unrelated, perhaps even inimical, to the aims of the institution. In the Fall of 1981, I issued Administrative Bulletin 81-2 with the intention of dispelling that notion. That bulletin identified research as an important and valid form of professional development, appropriate to the purpose of the institution. It also asserted that professional development is essential to maintaining a viable educational program, and is second in importance only to instruction.

The Academic Senate saw the need for a fuller statement on professional growth and development to provide a context for the role of research. Previously, research had been viewed by many as a questionable activity, unrelated, perhaps even inimical, to the aims of the institution. In the Fall of 1981, I issued Administrative Bulletin 81-2 with the intention of dispelling that notion. That bulletin identified research as an important and valid form of professional development, appropriate to the purpose of the institution. It also asserted that professional development is essential to maintaining a viable educational program, and is second in importance only to instruction.

The Academic Senate approved the report in February of 1983 and forwarded it to me with a recommendation for adoption. An Administrative Bulletin was drafted based on that report and shared with other members of the academic community in the Fall of 1983. Further suggestions for improvement were received, evaluated, and, as appropriate, used to refine this version of the bulletin, which follows.

Parallel with these developments, the Academic Planning Committee was seeking to define more clearly Cal Poly's overall mission. A final statement, originated by this Committee, was issued in September of 1983 after much consultation. Once again, the importance of intellectual and professional growth to the campus was asserted, as follows:

Cal Poly is committed to establishing and maintaining an environment that fosters the complete growth of the individual—student and faculty member alike. Commitment to inquiry and the search for truth is a foundation for intellectual and personal growth. Cal Poly strives to instill among its students intellectual maturity, an appreciation of learning, and a dynamic professionalism. To foster professional development among faculty, it strives to stimulate faculty members to challenge themselves—to develop professionally through organizations, creative activity, consultation, professional leaves in business and industry, or applied or basic research.

Supporting a strong program of professional growth is a costly enterprise, and financial support for faculty development is scarce. The University is aware of the history of deficiency in this vital area and recognizes its responsibility to continue to take action to help alleviate these resource constraints. Clearly it is in the State's best interest to protect its investment in students by insuring the continued development of its teachers.

But the State has not always recognized these responsibilities and their potential benefits. In recent years it has turned down requests for augmented funding with distressing regularity. Consequently, problems that were once nuisances have accumulated and been compounded until quick remedies are no longer possible.

Fortunately, that era seems to be turning around in California as in other states. Although attempts to reduce the teaching load have failed, Cal Poly's FTE faculty allocations have been augmented recently, giving us a student/faculty ratio considerably lower than it was four years ago, making some assigned time appointments possible. Faculty allocations should continue to grow, at least into the near future, with no accompanying growth in student numbers.

Our teaching laboratories are not ideally suited for some advanced forms of professional development, but the outlook for funds to replace equipment and purchase new equipment is considerably improved. In addition, plans are being considered for conversion of facilities being replaced by new construction to space which could be made available...
for faculty development and research efforts. Private faculty offices are also being added as each new building is completed. Approved capital improvement projects could add 150 private offices to the campus by the Fall of 1987.

Our technical and clerical support staff is still not adequately funded to assure the most productive use of faculty time, and travel to attend professional meetings has never been sufficient to meet realistic needs.

However, a recent program change proposal increased state support for technical staff in some disciplines and the Governor's budget this year formally recognizes faculty professional development in a program change proposal although the funding level is still quite small. The annual giving program along with other private support programs established by the Development Office continued to improve each year to help ameliorate our shortage of resources for faculty professional development.

These changes are happening now, and further initiatives are underway, undertaken at many different levels by various constituencies. I have personally informed key legislators, the Department of Finance, the Governor's Office and, of course, the Chancellor of our need for help, and of the State's responsibility to remedy these problems. In addition, I am redoubling our efforts to gain private support. With the appointment of the new Vice President, University Relations, we have made another major commitment to finding support from the private sector.

In the meantime, this Administrative Bulletin is intended to define professional development, to assert its importance, describe various avenues of professional development, and outline its role in faculty personnel actions.

Clearly, if we were provided adequate funding for professional development, we could do much. Even though we are not, we cannot choose to do nothing at all. As an institution of higher education, we have an obligation to ourselves, our colleagues, our profession, and our students to do the best we can with what we have. Within that context, this bulletin defines the unique role professional development plays on our campus. I encourage each of you to do your best to preserve and enhance the vitality of teaching at Cal Poly.

Warren J. Baker
Feb. 22, 1985
Role and Definition of Professional Growth and Development

The vitality of Cal Poly as a university depends on an intellectually active and professionally vigorous faculty. Those who continue to grow professionally also continue to grow as teachers. Indeed, scholarship, professionalism, and teaching are so interdependent that scholarship can become invigorated without the stimulation of a professional commitment, and teaching can become irrelevant without the revitalization of scholarship or the touchstone of the marketplace.

As a special institution of higher learning, Cal Poly can profit from a wide range of professional development modes. This Administration Bulletin is intended to guide faculty into those directions of professional growth most useful to Cal Poly and to define the role professional growth and development plays in the instructional program of the University.

Definition of Professional Development

Professional development is defined as the generation of knowledge, or the acquisition of experience, skill, and information that enables one to perform at a higher level of proficiency in his or her profession.

Role of Professional Development

Excellence in teaching is the primary purpose of the University. Professional growth and development is essential to meeting this goal.

Avenues of Professional Development

The instructional programs at Cal Poly range from the basic to the applied. In turn, any of a number of professional development activities can fit Cal Poly’s spectrum of disciplines and professions.

The campus has a faculty of diverse interests as well, whose professional pursuits cannot be neatly categorized. Typical activities can be listed, however: They fall into two major modes: generation of knowledge concerning teaching or the discipline; and acquisition of further knowledge in, or professional contributions to, one’s own or related fields.

1. The generation of knowledge concerning teaching or the discipline.
   A. Contributions to the teaching profession.
      Examples of this type of professional development include studies of pedagogic technique, papers on pedagogy presented at professional meetings or submitted to professional journals; presentations on pedagogy given in invited talks, seminars, and workshops; development and marketing of audio-visual aids; and development and publication of textbooks or manuals.
   B. Contributions to the general body of knowledge in an academic discipline. Generation of knowledge in a discipline may involve basic and applied research or creative productions. The various forms of research have already been defined in AB 81-2, “Role of Research.” In the visual, performing, or literary arts, creative contributions in the discipline involve the production of art works and techniques that become part of the general body of literature of an artistic discipline. Contributions to knowledge may also include creative works protected by copyright or patents.
      Dissemination of new knowledge occurs through papers presented at meetings or published by professional journals, and through contributions to colloquia or seminars. Dissemination of works of art and new modes of artistic expression occurs through publication, gallery shows, public performances, and presentations at meetings/seminars.

2. The acquisition of further knowledge in one’s field or a related field.

Examples include service to or study in a different but related academic discipline; classes, seminars or conferences attended to enrich or update professional knowledge or skills; international development and education appointments; professional experience in industry or government; challenging consultancies; internships or residencies at appropriate institutions or organizations; participation in national and international professional programs; projects undertaken to improve teaching skills; the completion of advanced degrees, professional licenses, or additional advanced studies; participation in appropriate institutes, seminars, and workshops; active participation in profes-
Appraisal of Professional Development

Each discipline or department at Cal Poly must decide on the combination of professional development activities best suited to its individual character. It is the responsibility of each academic department to ensure that the professional activities of individual faculty members are an asset to the university and are supportive of its educational mission. This responsibility should be carried out in a manner consistent with established departmental criteria.

The direction of research, scholarship—indeed, of any professional development activity—is often uncertain and can take unexpected turns. Recognizing that specificity is often not possible, it is helpful nonetheless to have a plan for guidance. It is important, therefore, that each faculty member carefully consider and document general plans for professional development, and modify these plans as necessary.

Departments can help orient new faculty by clarifying what modes of professional development are most consistent with departmental goals, and by endorsing general plans. The faculty member's immediate colleagues are usually the people best suited to evaluate the quality of the work done. The department head, in consultation with the tenured and senior faculty, is responsible for informing individual department members about how well their professional activities are meeting these criteria, both in plan and performance.

Because of the crucial relationship between teaching and professional development, it is campus policy that evidence of professional development is and continues to be an important requirement for all faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. Cal Poly's health as a university depends on the vitality of its faculty. Teaching can continue to be invigorating only if it is energized by regular involvement in the recreative activities of professional development. This bulletin is intended to clarify and assert the importance of encouraging and nurturing this most vital element in Cal Poly's continued success.

Resources for Professional Development

In order to create an atmosphere in which faculty can strive for excellence both in the classroom and professionally, a university must provide an academic environment that encourages pride in one's work, and an opportunity to do that work well. The university must strive to provide faculty sufficient time and resources to pursue both professional growth and teaching excellence, so that these two types of endeavors may be mutually supportive rather than competitive.

The present teaching load is such that faculty often compromise the quality of their teaching because of inadequate time to develop new approaches and new material. Finding time for professional development is extremely difficult and can further compromise and limit improvements in quality. Efforts should be made to bring the teaching load into line with the expectations for continual improvement and professional development.

Facilities need to be improved and expanded for basic teaching activities. Furthermore, the current facilities utilization formulas do not recognize the need for facilities to support the teaching effort through faculty development. Adequate recognition must be given to provide facilities for both teaching and professional development.

The working environment should be sufficiently attractive to acquire and retain faculty dedicated to teaching excellence fostered by continual professional development activities. This means that adequate support should be sought for salaries, sabbaticals, professional travel, publication, private offices, library and computing facilities, and technical, clerical, and student assistant help.

Professional growth and development is extremely important for the competence of our faculty and for the vitality of our academic programs. Both the faculty and the university must cooperate in this effort of mutual benefit. The faculty bear the responsibility of engaging in appropriate professional activities, and the university bears the responsibility of providing appropriate time and resources for these activities.
MOU 31.17 - 31.42

Performance Salary Step Increases
General Salary Increase

31.16 For fiscal year 1995/96, the steps on the salary ranges of all bargaining unit classifications, except those classifications with Designated Market Discipline salary schedules, shall be increased by one and two-tenths percent (1.2%) effective July 1, 1995, provided that all of the following occur:

a. the combination of both the final increase in revenue resulting from an increase in the State University Fee for fiscal year 1995/96, and/or any final state budget augmentation allocated to the CSU specifically to offset such student fee increase, equals at least the equivalent of a 10% increase in revenue resulting from such student fee increase; and

b. that the final state budget general fund appropriation and allocation to the CSU is no less than the level of the general fund appropriation to the CSU in the Governor’s Budget for fiscal year 1995/96, and

c. that the Union ratifies the tentative parties reach final agreement on a successor contract by no later than October 4, July 15, 1995.

31.17 In the event that the conditions of provisions 31.16 (a) and (b) above are not met, then the parties shall reopen negotiations in order to determine what, if any, General Salary Increase shall occur in fiscal year 1995/96.

Performance Salary Step Increases

31.17 The parties are committed to provide special incentives for outstanding or meritorious performance in the area of teaching, as well as other professional accomplishments and service to the University community. This shall constitute the interim academic year 1995/96 criteria for this Performance Salary Step Increase program in the event that local standards and criteria are not established pursuant to the timelines and procedures provided below.

31.18 The recognition of outstanding or meritorious performance by a faculty unit employee shall be in the form of a permanent increase in the base salary of the individual, in one or more steps on the salary schedule in Appendix C. During academic year 1995/96 no candidate shall receive more than four (4) Performance Salary Step Increases. In future years, no candidate shall receive more than five (5) Performance Salary Step Increases.

31.19 All faculty unit employees, who submit an application for consideration on forms provided by the President or designee, or who are nominated by faculty unit employees or academic administrators, shall be eligible for a Performance Salary Step Increase. Application and nomination forms shall be developed at the campus level by the academic senate, subject to review and
approval by the President. Applications and nominations shall be submitted to the department chair, with a copy to the President or designee.

31.20 The campus standards and criteria, as well as the procedures consistent with this Agreement, for the award of Performance Salary Step Increases shall be determined by the President or designee, after recommendation by no later than December 15, 1995, by the appropriate campus Academic Senate committee.

31.21 Applications for Performance Salary Step Increases shall be reviewed by:

a. the department and/or other appropriate campus committee of tenured faculty unit employees, and

b. academic administrators and/or the president.

31.22 Campuses may establish additional levels of review for Performance Salary Step Increases, provided that the additional review procedures do not prevent the award of increases by January 1 of each year that there are negotiated Performance Salary Step Increases.

31.23 Applications/nominations for Performance Salary Step Increases may be reviewed by the department chair in cases where the department chair is not a member of the department or other appropriate review committee. The review by department chairs shall take place after review by a departmental or other appropriate faculty committee; and before review by any school, college or university level faculty review committee.

31.24 All levels of review shall forward all applications/nominations, as well as its recommendation on each of the applications/nominations, to the next level of review each year in which negotiated Performance Salary Step Increases are awarded.

31.25 Faculty members shall not review his/her own application/nomination for a Performance Salary Step Increase. Recommendations may include not only whether the candidate is recommended to receive a Performance Salary Step Increase, but how many steps are recommended for those candidates receiving a positive recommendation. Failure to meet any established deadline for recommendations shall automatically result in the forwarding of all applications/nominations to the next level of review.

31.26 If there are insufficient tenured faculty unit employees available to comprise a departmental or other appropriate review committee, a campus may utilize tenured faculty from other departments or administrative units in forming a review committee.
31.27 Campus procedures shall be established so as to ensure that all applications/nominations for Performance Salary Step Increases, and all recommendations, are forwarded to the President or his/her designee by no later than March 15, 1996, and no later than December 1 of each year in which negotiated Performance Salary Step Increases are awarded in the future. Recommendations may include not only whether the candidate is recommended to receive a Performance Salary Step Increase, but how many steps are recommended for those candidates receiving a positive recommendation. Failure to meet the above deadlines for recommendations shall automatically result in the forwarding of all applications/nominations to the President for his/her award of Performance Salary Step Increases.

31.28 The President or designee shall review all of the applications/nominations which have been submitted, and select the recipients of the increases from among this candidate pool by April 1, 1996, and no later than January 1 of each year in which negotiated Performance Salary Step Increases are awarded in the future. He/she shall also determine the appropriate number of steps to be granted, consistent with the limitation provided in provision 31.19 above. The effective date of all Performance Salary Step Increases shall be January 1 of each year that there are negotiated Performance Salary Step Increases. The decision to grant or deny an increase for meritorious performance, and the number of steps to be granted, shall not be subject to the grievance procedure as provided in Article 10 of the Agreement.

31.29 At least fifty percent (50%) of the candidates receiving a Performance Salary Step Increase must have received a positive recommendation from the highest level faculty committee provided that:

a. The highest level faculty review committee makes a positive recommendation for enough candidates to fully expend the campus’ pool for Performance Salary Step Increases in that fiscal year, and

b. The highest level faculty review committee meets the time requirement for the review and recommendation of all candidates to the President by the date specified in provision 31.28 above.

31.30 If the highest level faculty review committee submits fewer than the minimum number of positive recommendations needed to expend fully the campus’ pool for Performance Salary Step Increases in any fiscal year, then the percentage of candidates receiving a Performance Salary Step Increase that must also have received a positive recommendation from the highest level faculty review committee shall be reduced proportionately from fifty percent (50%). The percentage of candidates receiving a Performance Salary Step Increase and with a positive recommendation from the highest level faculty committee must be at least fifty percent (50%) of the number of
positive recommendations received divided by the minimum number of recommendations required.

31.31 As used in this article, the term "highest level faculty review committee" shall be defined as the last faculty review committee on any campus that makes its recommendations to an academic administrator or the President.

31.32 The amount of funds dedicated to this program in the CSU in fiscal year 1995/96 shall be $900,000. The amount of funds dedicated to this program on each campus in fiscal year 1995/96 shall be based upon the number of filled full-time equivalent faculty positions. There shall be no requirement to allocate funds for Performance Salary Step Increases to the school, college or any other organizational unit on a campus. However, such an allocation on a campus by a president is not prohibited under this Agreement.

31.33 There shall be no requirement to expend all funds identified in provision 31.33 above for such increases. Any portion of the funds not expended in any fiscal year shall automatically carry forward to the Performance Salary Step pool in the next fiscal year. In the event that the parties negotiate the elimination of this program in the future, any such funds that have been carried forward shall be used for the professional development opportunities identified in provision 25.1 of this Agreement.

31.34 For each year that there are negotiated Performance Salary Step Increases, the CSU shall provide to the CFA, no later than two (2) months after final decisions regarding such increases, a report containing a list by campus of individual faculty unit employees receiving Performance Salary Step Increases, the amount of each increase, and the total funds expended on the increases for the January 1996 pay period.

31.35 The decision to grant or deny a Performance Salary Step Increase shall not be considered during deliberations regarding the granting of reappointment, promotion or tenure. This shall not preclude the consideration of any facts during RTP deliberations which are also considered during Performance Salary Step Increase deliberations.

Peer Review of Performance Salary Step Denials

31.36 Candidates who have received a favorable recommendation from the highest level faculty committee and who subsequently fail to receive a Performance Salary Step Increase, shall be eligible to have the increase denial reviewed by a Peer Review Panel as provided below. All requests for Peer Review must be submitted in writing to the Vice President of Academic Affairs no later than April 15, 1996, and no later than January 15 of each year in which negotiated Performance Salary Step Increases are awarded in the future. This
Peer Panel Review shall be the sole forum for any reconsideration of any denial of a Performance-Salary Step Increase.

31.37 The President shall establish a panel consisting of all full-time tenured faculty. No employee may be eligible for this panel if he/she has been directly involved with the salary denial reconsideration submitted by the employee to peer review.

31.38 The membership of the Peer Panel to review a specific Performance Salary Step denial shall be selected by lot from the panel established pursuant to provision 31.37 and consist of three (3) members and one (1) alternate.

31.39 The Peer Panel shall begin to review the specific Performance Salary Step denial within fourteen (14) days of its selection by lot. The panel's review shall be limited to a reconsideration of the increase denial of the nominee; and the Employer's written response to any allegations made by the affected employee. Except for presentations of the complainant and the administrator, if the administrator chooses, the peer review will be made from the documents set forth in this section.

31.40 The proceeding set forth in 31.39 above shall not be open to the public and shall not be a hearing.

31.41 No later than thirty (30) days after its selection, the Peer Panel shall submit to the President and the complainant a written report of its findings and recommendations. All written materials considered by the Peer 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. A panel may be established to hear more than one case under this section.

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

Merit Service Salary Adjustment Step Increases

31.43 Merit A Service Salary adjustments (MSAs) Step Increase (SSI) refers to annual upward movement between steps on the salary schedules. Such adjustments shall be one (1) step determined by the parties during salary and benefit negotiations annually, and shall be limited to no more than four (4) MSAs steps on the salary schedule in effect prior to the effective date of this Agreement, eight (8) Service Salary Step Increases under the current salary schedule, or a combination of both which does not exceed the total of eight