

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California 93407  
ACADEMIC SENATE

Meeting of the  
Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Tuesday, February 16, 1999  
UU220, 3:00-5:00pm

1.5 and 1.26.99  
minutes were  
removed

- I. Minutes: Approval of the Executive Committee minutes for January 5 and January 26, 1999 (pp. 2-5).
- II. Communication(s) and announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair:
  - B. President's Office:
  - C. Provost's Office
  - D. Statewide Senators:
  - E. CFA Campus President:
  - F. ASI Representative:
  - G. Other:
- IV. Consent agenda:
- V. Business item(s):
  - A. **Academic Senate and University committee vacancies:** (pp. 6).
  - B. **Appointments to the Student Grievance Board.**
  - C. **Appointment to the Cal Poly Plan Universitywide/Collaborative Projects Advisory Committee** for the 1999-2001 term (one appointment from any college/UCTE).
  - D. **Resolution on Program Review and Improvement Committee Bylaws Change:** Stanton, chair of the Program Review and Improvement Committee (pp. 7-8).
- VI. Discussion item(s):
  - Academic Senate involvement in Merit Pay.**
- VII. Adjournment:

2.8.99

**Academic Senate Committee Vacancies  
For 1998-1999**

**College of Architecture and Environmental Design**

Two academic senators (one 1-year term, one 2-year term)  
Grants Review Committee

**College of Science and Mathematics**

Program Review and Improvement Committee (replacement for Ray Terry)

---

**University Wide Committees Vacancies  
For 1998-1999**

**ASI Facilities and Operations Committee**

(1 Current Vacancy)

Adopted:

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

**AS-\_\_\_-99/PRAIC  
RESOLUTION ON  
PROGRAM REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE  
BYLAWS CHANGE**

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

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

- WHEREAS,     The *Bylaws of the Academic Senate*, Section VIII.B, reads: "Ex officio members shall be voting members unless otherwise specified in the individual committee description;" and
- WHEREAS,     Ex officio members are voting members of nearly every Academic Senate committee; and
- WHEREAS,     Students can provide an important perspective in the program review process; and
- WHEREAS,     Students are ex officio voting members of nearly every Academic Senate committee; and
- WHEREAS,     Faculty members who are not tenured full professors are eligible to be members of nearly every other Academic Senate committee; and

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

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

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

a. **Membership**

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

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

Proposed by the Academic Senate Program Review  
and Improvement Committee  
February 16, 1999

Final - Spec Com 2.16.99

To: Executive Committee  
From: Myron Hood  
Date: February 16, 1999  
Subject: Criteria and Standards for Faculty Merit Increases

As a result of attending the Statewide Academic Chairs meeting last Thursday, and from the email that I have received from the State Academic Senate that met on Friday, I have found that the criteria and standards for FMI's are to be determined by the Academic Senate of each campus. Thus, assuming that the TA will be ratified, we should be prepared to have these in place as soon as possible after February 28th. (That is the day that the new contract will be implemented.)

As I see it, we have a number of choices:

1. We could use a modification of our criteria and standards that were approved by the Senate last year. Mike Suess has begun work on this.
2. We could adopt the criteria and standards that the Statewide Academic Senate adopted last Friday. (*Enclosed*)
3. We tell the departments to use the same or some slightly modified version of the criteria and standards that they use for RPT.
4. We could come up with our criteria and standards.
5. We could do nothing--thinking that the TA will not be approved or that the Administration will do it.

What is your pleasure?

At the meeting last week, I asked the following two questions--neither of which were answered:

1. Who determines the composition of the department review committees? (I.e. is this also a duty of the Academic Senate?)
2. Can't we delay the FMI procedure so that we have the time to do it in a more expeditious and professional manner? (Dave Spence did say that he would look into postponing the process, but he did think that the TA did spell out specific dates. He also said that the final wording of the TA was still be hammered out by both sides, and that the final agreement would not be ready until Friday, Feb. 19.)

Enclosed is a copy of the time line that Mike Suess has gleaned from the TA.

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2438-98/Floor/  
Charnofsky, Highsmith,  
Whitney  
February 12, 1999

**Criteria and Standards for Faculty Merit Increases**

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt and urge the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to adopt the following criteria and standards for Faculty Merit Increases (provided in Article 31 of the Unit 3 MOU) as applicable to the increases granted effective July 1, 1998, and July 1, 1999. The Academic Senate CSU shall reexamine the criteria and standards for Faculty Merit Increase cycles effective July 1, 2000, and thereafter following its evaluation of the effectiveness of the Spring 1999 campus processes.

Teaching is at the center of any system of merit increases. Faculty Merit Increases may be granted for:

- the quality of the unit member's teaching alone;
- teaching and scholarship;
- teaching and service to the University and community; or
- teaching, scholarship, and service to the University and community.

Faculty unit employees whose work assignments do not encompass all the criteria (e.g., lecturers, coaches, department chairs, librarians) shall be eligible for Faculty Merit Increases on the basis of their performance in their particular work assignments.

Teaching is broad and inclusive. Teaching encompasses instruction and such activities as advising, mentoring, supervision (e.g., individual studies, thesis direction, field supervision), and a range of contributions to improving student learning (e.g., curriculum revision, course and program coordination, assessment of learning outcomes, and applications of technology).

Scholarship is also broad. Scholarship includes discovery (traditionally labeled research, especially published or presented to professional audiences), integration (e.g., inter- or cross-disciplinary efforts), application (e.g., used in teaching or solving social, community, or technical problems), and creative activity (e.g., works of art, performances).

Service to the University and community is likewise broad. Service to the University and community includes the activity necessary to the

faculty role in shared governance of the institution (CSU and its campuses) and activity applying the unit employee's expertise to benefit the University and its community in general. Examples of service include significant committee work; student outreach and retention; participation in university and community organizations, professional associations, California Faculty Association, and appropriate governmental boards and commissions; advancement of public support for the University; and lectures and seminars to community groups.

Campus Senates shall immediately develop, and report to the Academic Senate CSU, the standards of performance for implementing the criteria established above.

*RATIONALE: The Academic Senate CSU was asked by the CSU Chancellor's Office and the California Faculty Association to develop standards and criteria for the awarding of Faculty Merit Increases consistent with the Academic Senate's responsibility under HEERA. The above standards and criteria are developed to implement Article 31, section 31.14 of the Unit 3 Tentative Agreement.*

APPROVED – February 12, 1999

# **DRAFT**

## **1998-99 Faculty Merit Increase Schedule**

- March 1 - March 19** Departments establish departmental FMI committee or request Dean to convene College Review Board to serve as departmental FMI committee.
- April 1, 1999** Faculty submit Faculty Activity Reports (FAR) to department chair/head.
- April 1 – April 15** Department FMI committee reviews Faculty Activity Reports and submits recommendations to department chairs/heads with copy to faculty member.
- April 16 -- April 29** Department chair/head reviews Faculty Activity Reports, and after considering department FMI committee recommendations, submit separate recommendations to dean (appropriate administrator) with copy to faculty member.
- April 30 -May 14** Deans (appropriate administrators) review Faculty Activity Reports and submit positive recommendations and all Faculty Activity Reports to President via Provost
- April 21** FMI Appeals Committee consisting of five administrators and five faculty members is appointed by Provost.
- May 15 – May 19** Faculty eligible to appeal must submit written appeal to Provost who forwards appeal to appropriate Appeal Panel of two administrators and two faculty members.
- May 20 - June 1** Appeal panels review files and provide recommendations to President via Provost.
- July 1, 1999** President or designee announces 1998-99 FMI decisions retroactive to July 1, 1998.
- 14 days after  
Chancellor's office  
distributes budget.
- President or designee announces 1999-2000 FMI decisions effective July 1, 1999.