Meeting of the Academic Senate  
Tuesday, May 4, 2021  
https://calpoly.zoom.us/j/89034169574

I. Minutes: None

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: None
B. President’s Office: None
C. Provost: None
D. Vice President for Student Affairs: None
E. Statewide Senate: (p. 2)
F. CFA: None
G. ASI: None

IV. Consent Agenda:
A. University Faculty Personnel Policies Consent Agenda Revision from AS-908-21: (3-4)

V. Special Reports:
A. [TIME CERTAIN 4:15 p.m.] Budget Report: Cindy Villa, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, Angie Kraetsch, Associate Vice President Financial Services and David Valadez, Director of Budget and Finance
B. [TIME CERTAIN 4:35 p.m.] MPP Annual Report: President Armstrong, Cindy Villa, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, Angie Kraetsch, Associate Vice President Financial Services and David Valadez, Director of Budget and Finance (pp. 5-14)

VI. Business Items:
A. Resolution to Divest from Fossil Fuels: Lisa Swartz and David Braun, Academic Senate Sustainability Committee, first reading (pp. 15-42)
B. [TIME CERTAIN 3:40] Resolution on Creation of New Department for Computer Engineering: Lynne Slivovsky, first reading (pp. 43-68) and OneDrive link found here

VII. Discussion Item(s):

VIII. Adjournment:
Statewide Senate Report 5-4-21

FGA (the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs committee) has been lobbying legislators along with some on the Executive Committee of the ASCSU this week and the last. We are pushing the ASCSU-approved position on bills before the legislature as well as one additional bill which only came up in its current form after the last ASCSU meeting. We are also educating legislators and their staff on the recurring problems in a general way. These items include budgeting differences between the CSU versus the UCs and CCCs that have caused the CSU to suffer from unfunded mandates relative to those other systems, the distance roles of the ASCSU versus CFA, and the danger of legislation Higher-Ed policy by anecdote.
The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies which allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda.

In the recently approved policies on Sabbatical and Difference in Pay Leaves (UFPP 12.4, established by AS-908-21), one important policy was omitted from 12.4.10.3, though it was explained in the report for those new policies: the inclusion of the impact interviews with leave candidates had on the rank ordering of candidates that professional leave committees present to the dean. This action revises 12.4.10.3 to include that omitted policy.

**Summary of Chapter 12.4.10.3**

Explanatory text from report on UFPP 12.4: “When a PLC interviews its applicants, the committee must report to the dean the impact of the interviews on the rank ordering of leave applicants.”

Policy text approved in AS-908-21:

12.4.10.3. The PLC shall rank order all recommended sabbatical leave applications, and separately rank order any DIP leave applications under the scope of its review. The PLC report shall clearly state to the dean or appropriate administrator the reasons for recommending denial of an application, and this report should be forwarded to the dean or appropriate administrator along with the leave applications.

The intent of FAC to include the requirement of professional leave committees reporting the impact of interviews on rank orderings of candidates for leaves to the dean is now reflected in the following revised text:

12.4.10.3. The PLC shall rank order all recommended sabbatical leave applications, and separately rank order any DIP leave applications under the scope of its review. The PLC report shall clearly state to the dean or appropriate administrator the impact of the interviews on the rank ordering of leave applicants and the reasons for recommending denial of an application, and this report should be forwarded to the dean or appropriate administrator along with the leave applications.

**Impact on Existing Policy**

This revision of 12.4.10.3 only applies to colleges, the library, and counseling services insofar as they elect to require their professional leave committees to interview applicants. Those faculty units who elect not to include interviews in their professional leave committee procedures are not affected by this change.
The establishment of UFPP by the Academic Senate would oblige the Colleges and Library to restructure their faculty personnel policy documents into the same chapter division as UFPP. When a chapter of UFPP is approved by the Academic Senate and ratified by the President, the Colleges and the Library will now have a focused area of new or revised policy that they must consult and, if necessary, use to revise their documents accordingly.

UFPP 12.4 supersedes all other policies on sabbatical and difference in pay leaves as of Fall 2021 and this revision would be part of the new policies. Faculty units electing to include interviews in their leave approval processes need to include this policy in their leave policies for Fall 2021.
Overview

Cal Poly’s total projected salary expenditures for FY 2020-21 decreased $3.09 million from the prior fiscal year. The annualized estimated salary expenditures, based on October 2020 payroll, for the university were as follows:

- Faculty - $105.67M, a decrease of $1.17M (-1.1%) from the prior year.
- Represented Staff - $73.95M, a decrease of $546K (-0.7%) from the prior year.
- MPP - $35.2M, a decrease of $1.38M (-3.8%) from the prior year.

The measurement period for this report is November 2019-October 2020. During this period the university experienced significant financial and operational impacts due to the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result, the university implemented a hiring chill, requiring presidential approval for all hiring actions.

To help with the impending budget shortfall, the university implemented an Early Exit Program (EEP) for campus employees during fall quarter 2020. This program resulted in 92 participants (14 MPP, 11 Faculty and 67 Staff). The impact of this program will be reflected in next year’s report.

University divisions and departments have been encouraged to carefully examine staffing levels and explore departmental reorganizations to minimize the need to replace all vacated positions. Such reorganizations should ensure an equitable distribution of departmental duties and compensation amongst remaining staff.

MPP Changes from Fall 2019 to Fall 2020

The university experienced a net decrease of 10 MPP positions as noted in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Action</th>
<th>Admin I</th>
<th>Admin II</th>
<th>Admin III</th>
<th>Admin IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Hire/Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclass Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclass Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclass within MPP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization/Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignation/Retirement/Separation</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp Position/Interim Replacement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>-9</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Affairs – net decrease of one (1) position

The Division of Academic Affairs did not add any new MPP positions during the year. The Division experienced a reduction of nine (9) MPP staff due to resignations, retirements, or separations, and replaced seven (7) of those positions. Additionally, one faculty member was reclassified to an MPP position.

Administration & Finance – net increase of two (2) positions

The Division of Administration and Finance added two (2) MPP positions during this reporting period. These included an associate director in University Budget and Fiscal Planning and a project manager in Facilities Planning and Capital Projects (FPCP). FPCP is primarily a self-support unit funded through construction project management fees. Accordingly, staffing for this unit will fluctuate based upon the resources provided by and staffing needs of active construction projects.

Enrollment Management & University Strategy (EMUS) – net decrease of one (1) position

Enrollment Management & University Strategy MPP staffing levels remained unchanged from the prior year. At the end of the reporting period, EMUS had a vacancy of one (1) MPP position due to a retirement. It is anticipated that this position will be filled at a later date.

Information Technology Services (ITS) – no change

ITS did not add any new MPP positions during this reporting period.

Office of University Diversity & Inclusion (OUDI) – net decrease of one (1) position

The level of MPP staffing for OUDI remained unchanged for this reporting period. However, as of the end of the reporting period, one (1) MPP position was vacant due to an incumbent returning to a faculty position. It is anticipated that this position will be filled at a later date.

President’s Office – no change

There were no changes in the number of MPP staff for the President’s Office during this reporting period.

Research, Economic Development and Graduate Education (R-EDGE) – no change

There were no changes in the number of MPP staffing in R-EDGE during this reporting period.

Student Affairs – net decrease of eight (8) positions

During the reporting period, Student Affairs had a reduction of 10 MPP positions due to resignations, retirements or separations. Two (2) positions for University Housing were filled and while it is anticipated that several of the remaining positions will be refilled, the division is carefully evaluating all hiring actions.

Additionally, two (2) MPP positions were reclassified during this cycle. A position in the Office of the Vice President was reclassified from an Admin II to an Admin III due to additional duties assigned as a result of a reorganization that eliminated a vacant MPP position. The other reclassification occurred in Student Affairs Diversity and Inclusion, moving an Admin I to an Admin II due to increased responsibility and oversight.
University Communications and Marketing – net increase of one (1) position

University Communications and University Marketing were combined into a new division in 2020. As a result, one (1) existing MPP position was reclassified from an Admin III to an Admin IV, and one (1) new MPP position was added as the director of Strategic Initiatives.

University Development – net decrease of two (2) positions

Since the last reporting period, the division experienced a number of shifts in fundraising positions both centrally and in the colleges. There were three (3) resignations, three (3) reassignments within the division (leaving one college MPP fundraising position vacant), and the addition of one (1) college MPP fundraiser. These changes resulted in a net decrease of two (2) MPP positions. These two vacant MPP positions are anticipated to be filled and will be reflected in a future MPP report.

University Support – no change

University Support has had no change in the number of MPP staff with one conversion of an existing MPP from an Admin II to an Admin III due to expanded scope of responsibility.
## MPP Headcount by Level - Fall 2019 vs. Fall 2020*

### UNIVERSITY TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>301</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STUDENT AFFAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Communications and Marketing</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Support</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Diversity &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management &amp; University Strategy</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Services</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Economic Development, and Graduate Education</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Average MPP Salaries by Division - Fall 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPP</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>A&amp;F</th>
<th>EMUS</th>
<th>ITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP IV salary</td>
<td>$250,242</td>
<td>$258,860</td>
<td>$226,524</td>
<td>$244,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP III salary</td>
<td>$152,554</td>
<td>$177,708</td>
<td>$160,622</td>
<td>$165,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP II salary</td>
<td>$111,166</td>
<td>$106,527</td>
<td>$111,394</td>
<td>$127,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP I salary</td>
<td>$82,774</td>
<td>$82,177</td>
<td>$69,827</td>
<td>$100,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP salary</td>
<td>$128,015</td>
<td>$117,396</td>
<td>$107,396</td>
<td>$140,823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPP</th>
<th>OUDI</th>
<th>PRES</th>
<th>R-EDGE</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP IV salary</td>
<td>$246,660</td>
<td>$264,204</td>
<td>$275,004</td>
<td>$258,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP III salary</td>
<td>$154,098</td>
<td>$175,992</td>
<td>$168,456.00</td>
<td>$110,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP II salary</td>
<td>$141,972</td>
<td>$76,698</td>
<td>$98,844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP I salary</td>
<td>$80,004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP salary</td>
<td>$163,332</td>
<td>$203,088</td>
<td>$170,175</td>
<td>$110,309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPP</th>
<th>UCM</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP IV salary</td>
<td>$224,832</td>
<td>$116,510</td>
<td>$168,456.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP III salary</td>
<td>$140,688</td>
<td>$189,768</td>
<td>$116,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP II salary</td>
<td>$116,505</td>
<td>$76,698</td>
<td>$98,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP I salary</td>
<td>$108,486</td>
<td>$76,698</td>
<td>$98,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP salary</td>
<td>$145,623</td>
<td>$111,646</td>
<td>$133,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MPP Salaries - Averages by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPP</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP IV salary</td>
<td>$249,596</td>
<td>$252,441</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP III salary</td>
<td>$161,836</td>
<td>$159,783</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP II salary</td>
<td>$111,166</td>
<td>$110,817</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP I salary</td>
<td>$82,774</td>
<td>$79,800</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average MPP salary, excluding campus President</td>
<td>$122,072</td>
<td>$121,366</td>
<td>-0.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Average Salaries - Faculty / Represented Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>$117,125</td>
<td>$116,510</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$100,317</td>
<td>$100,387</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$87,924</td>
<td>$87,973</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>$69,189</td>
<td>$68,646</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represented Staff</td>
<td>$60,119</td>
<td>$60,154</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MPP Total Compensation Paid by Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPP</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total MPP IV</td>
<td>$ 6,934,809</td>
<td>$ 6,834,336</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MPP III</td>
<td>$ 15,295,014</td>
<td>$ 14,788,351</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MPP II</td>
<td>$ 22,824,801</td>
<td>$ 21,007,820</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MPP I</td>
<td>$ 10,616,008</td>
<td>$ 10,702,271</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MPP other, excluding campus President</td>
<td>$ 55,670,632</td>
<td>$ 53,332,777</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Compensation Paid - Faculty / Represented Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>$ 61,375,467</td>
<td>$ 60,341,552</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$ 22,213,200</td>
<td>$ 25,738,024</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$ 27,561,293</td>
<td>$ 24,733,321</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>$ 41,309,809</td>
<td>$ 39,448,002</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach, Librarian, Counselor</td>
<td>$ 9,553,916</td>
<td>$ 9,285,635</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>$ 162,013,686</td>
<td>$ 159,546,535</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Represented Staff</td>
<td>$ 117,075,352</td>
<td>$ 115,760,683</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of MPP's shown in this report does not match the number of MPP's in the Fact Book and other publications produced by Institutional Research (IR) due to timing. Human Resources freezing their data on October 31st and IR freezing their data in mid to late November. The IR freeze date is established by the Chancellor's Office.

**Note: Total Compensation Paid includes salary and benefits.
### Cal Poly San Luis Obispo MPP Summary
#### Fall 2020 Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Fund</th>
<th>Academic Affairs</th>
<th>Administration &amp; Finance</th>
<th>Enrollment Management &amp; University Strategy</th>
<th>Information Technology Services</th>
<th>Office of Diversity &amp; Inclusion</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Research, Economic Development and Graduate Education</th>
<th>Student Affairs</th>
<th>University Communications and Marketing</th>
<th>University Development</th>
<th>University Support</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Hire/Position</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclass Faculty</td>
<td>98,433.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclass Staff</td>
<td>81,696.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclass within MPP</td>
<td>$ 80,085.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>754,452.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignation/Retirement/ Separation</td>
<td>(874,197.60)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp Position/Interim Replacement</td>
<td>235,500.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total Operating Fund: $214,187,113,963 (128,380) $133,908 (61,256) $537,812 $153,696 (496,820) $6,480

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$85,008.00</td>
<td>$110,004.00</td>
<td>$(123,776.00)</td>
<td>$(103,788.00)</td>
<td>$107,509.20</td>
<td>$184,008.00</td>
<td>$220,008.00</td>
<td>$(93,648.00)</td>
<td>$(431,258.40)</td>
<td>$(257,064.00)</td>
<td>$(158,868.00)</td>
<td>$(76,860.00)</td>
<td>$(208,044.00)</td>
<td>$160,008.00</td>
<td>$(395,020.00)</td>
<td>$180,839.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$85,008.00</td>
<td>$110,004.00</td>
<td>$(123,776.00)</td>
<td>$(103,788.00)</td>
<td>$107,509.20</td>
<td>$184,008.00</td>
<td>$220,008.00</td>
<td>$(93,648.00)</td>
<td>$(431,258.40)</td>
<td>$(257,064.00)</td>
<td>$(158,868.00)</td>
<td>$(76,860.00)</td>
<td>$(208,044.00)</td>
<td>$160,008.00</td>
<td>$(395,020.00)</td>
<td>$180,839.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $ (1,505,123) $172,932 $ (61,260) $ (789,756) $153,696 $ (1,505,123) |
## MPP Headcount by Level - October 31, 2019 versus April 13, 2021

### UNIVERSITY TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>301</strong></td>
<td><strong>291</strong></td>
<td><strong>275</strong></td>
<td><strong>(26)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>(16)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>(9)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>(8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>(3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>(5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STUDENT AFFAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>(7)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-13%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRESIDENT’S OFFICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-10%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNIVERSITY COMMUNICATIONS AND MARKETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UNIVERSITY SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY DIVERSITY & INCLUSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESEARCH, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND GRADUATE EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Difference from 10/2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2019</th>
<th>10/31/2020</th>
<th>4/13/2021</th>
<th>Difference from 10/2020</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP III</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MPP I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has determined that humanity has less than ten years to make urgent and unprecedented changes to our society to cut our carbon emissions by 45% by 2030 to avoid the worst impacts of climate change; and
WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Statement on Diversity seeks to develop awareness and empathy for global communities, including people from historically and societally marginalized and underrepresented groups; and
WHEREAS, Failure to reduce carbon emissions will result in increased risk of devastating hurricanes, flooding, droughts, fire, pestilence, and food scarcity for hundreds of millions of people, especially for marginalized and underrepresented global populations most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change; and
WHEREAS, Cal Poly has a moral imperative to take every reasonable action to ensure that 2030 climate goals are met to avoid these consequences; and
WHEREAS, Every major fossil fuel company has either no plan for addressing climate change, or a climate plan grossly inadequate for cutting emissions 45% by 2030; and
WHEREAS, Fossil fuel companies currently pursue business models designed to consume fossil fuel resources, exceed safe carbon emission limits, and cause catastrophic climate change consequences; and
WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s endowment and other financial accounts investing in fossil fuels is tantamount to investing in violent and unjust consequences for current and future generations around the world; and
WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s mission statement states that “as an academic community, Cal Poly values … social and environmental responsibility”; and
WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Foundation’s fund managers reported in 2019 that the endowment would have grown by an additional 1% annually, if
endowment funds had been invested in ESG (environmental, social, governance) composite investments “due to [their] lower allocation to energy stocks (the worst performing sector in the U.S. over the period); and
WHEREAS, The long-term risk exposure of investing in fossil fuels are no longer consistent with lawful fiduciary responsibility under U.S. federal law according to the Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act and the Uniform Prudent Investor Act; therefore be it
RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate recommends that the Cal Poly Foundation, the Cal Poly Corporation, and all other university-affiliated financial accounts immediately freeze any new investment in fossil fuel companies; and be it further
RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate recommends that these accounts divest from all funds that include the largest 100 coal and the largest 100 oil & gas publicly traded companies within 5 years; and be it further
RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate recommends that these accounts reinvest at least 5% of Cal Poly’s endowment into profitable green revolving funds or profitable impact investments that generate social and environmental as well as financial returns; and be it further
RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate recommends that the Cal Poly endowment provide accessible accountability for the progress of fossil fuel divestment, such as quarterly investment reports available to the public and campus community; and be it further
RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate recommends to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, and CSU-wide Academic Senate that these divestment requests be implemented CSU-wide at every campus.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Sustainability Committee
Date: April 20, 2021
Supplemental Materials for the Resolution on Fossil Fuel Divestment

We recognize that investing in fossil fuel companies has made sense in decades past, but now ask you to consider that Cal Poly can best live up to its highest virtues of service to students, faculty, staff, leaders, and members of the global community by shifting our investment approach.

We call on Cal Poly to divest from fossil fuels for two core reasons – moral and financial, each of which stands independently of the other. We break down each of the reasons below, as well as address any lingering concerns that may be causing some hesitation toward divesting.

The announcement of fossil fuel divestment would be an amazing accomplishment for Cal Poly and for the CSU Board of Trustees, shining a bright spotlight on our forward thinking in a pandemic where hope and excitement has been hard to come by.

On a personal note: We realize this is long, but we read far more material and viewed far more resources than those represented here in order to write this document. We do not mean to make more work for our faculty, administrators, and leaders through our request, but of all reasons to adapt our usual capacities, the threat of climate crisis is among the most compelling.

Our ultimate reason for recommending divestment – and taking the time to thoroughly research it, write this, share about it with other students, and build a grassroots campaign around it - is because climate change is really scary, and we deeply want to help other people have a better chance at a happy future.

We are all on the same team - wanting what is best for the Cal Poly and CSU students, faculty, staff, and leaders, and wanting to make our universities proud. We are united by our vision for a better future.

Our students deserve the opportunity to graduate with a future not defined by climate crisis and expect our university to take every reasonable effort it can help to do its part to avoid it.

We really hope you take the time to read what we have to share about fossil fuel divestment.

Let's stand together on the right side of history.

Lisa Swartz
February 2020
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1. The moral imperative for divesting from fossil fuels

Nobel-prize winning scientists in the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) are very clear that exceeding 1.5°C of warming above pre-industrial level by 2030 would expose our planet to the most calamitous effects of climate change. To be clear, climate change effects are here already – but exceeding this 1.5°C limit unlocks natural feedback cycles that will drastically increase warming and spell out severe and deadly increases in:

- Extreme heat and heat-related mortality
- Destructive wildfires, such as those in California in 2020
- Devastating storms spelling disaster for hurricane-prone areas, like many Southern U.S. cities and metropolises on the Northeast seaboard
- Dwindling water resources, that will cause mortality and food shortages and increase global political instability, conflict, and violence
- Larger insect populations leading to higher incidences of diseases like malaria and dengue fever
- Unprecedented sea level rise as high as 48 inches by 2100, spelling out homelessness for millions, including many along California’s 800 mi coast, and sparking a global refugee crisis.¹

The IPCC projects that the costs of reaching even 2°C, just a half degree higher, include:

- 1.7 billion more people experiencing severe heatwaves at least once every five years
- Seas rising an additional 4 inches
- Up to several hundred million more people becoming exposed to climate-related risks and poverty
- The coral reefs that support marine environments around the world declining as much as 99 percent
- Global fishery catches declining by another 1.5 million tons.²

We do not have much time - As of 2018, global temperatures have already risen 1.0 °C since the pre-industrial era due to human activities. In order to not exceed 1.5°C, we must halve our emissions by 2030 over 2010 levels.³

Our energy sources must change dramatically if we are to avoid these most calamitous of effects. The science to model our “carbon budget” (how much we can burn without exceeding these levels) is ongoing and has been for decades, but the latest report from the IPCC indicates that at least 30% of our global fossil fuel reserves must not be burned, and the number could be as high as 75%⁴ (see Figure 1).

---

¹ IPCC Summary for Policymakers — Global Warming of 1.5 ºC
² Why Is 1.5 Degrees the Danger Line for Global Warming?
³ IPCC Summary for Policymakers — Global Warming of 1.5 ºC
⁴ The Sky’s Limit and the IPCC Report on 1.5 Degrees of Warming
Unfortunately, fossil fuel companies have climate plans that are **grossly inadequate** for reaching this goal, threatening a very real risk of unlocking the calamitous effects above. This is little surprise, considering that they invested less than 1% of capital expenditure in renewable energy in 2019 (Figure 2). For the top eight publicly traded oil and gas companies, there are no commitments to funding worker’s transition into new sectors, no intention of halting new exploration and extraction projects, no end date for oil and gas extraction, and for 6 out of the 8, no intention of even **declining oil and gas production by 2030** (Figure 3).

Fossil fuel “climate plans” are entirely incompatible with reaching this crucial climate goal. If things play out “business-as-usual” according to these plans, **students, staff, faculty, and people and ecosystems worldwide will suffer for it**. We see no way for Cal Poly to morally justify investing in these companies, given the enormous threat that they pose to students, staff, faculty, and people and ecosystems worldwide. **We are calling for divestment due to the fact that, sans adequate climate plan, the success of fossil fuel companies is entirely incompatible with a just future.**

---


5 **Discussion Paper: Big Oil Reality Check — Assessing Oil And Gas Climate Plans**
Figure 2: The top 8 publicly traded oil and gas companies 1% capex spending on renewable energy in 2019 gives little reason to believe that climate change can be averted by oil and gas companies transforming into renewable energy companies.

Source: Oil Change International, data from IEA
Figure 3: The oil majors have all climate plans that overall score as grossly insufficient to meet the climate goals necessary to avert disastrous warming effects.  
Source: Oil Change International “Big Oil Reality Check”
Furthermore, Cal Poly’s mission statement states that "as an academic community, Cal Poly values … social and environmental responsibility." How can we claim to value environmental sustainability while not only not speaking out against these companies whose very core business threatens our future, but also buying shares of such companies who fully intend to bring our planet past this devastating tipping point?

Additionally, the science is very clear that climate consequences disproportionately impact indigenous people and other vulnerable populations and reveal disparities that occur along race-, gender-, and class-based lines, often with those least responsible for causing the problem suffering the worst impacts. Climate change is one of the greatest threats to justice of our lifetimes. How can Cal Poly claim to value social responsibility when we own shares of companies who choose to disregard that lives that will be lost as a result of their actions?

Fossil fuels are not just deadly for their climate change impacts. A recent Harvard study found that exposure to particulate matter from fossil fuel emissions accounted for 18% of total global deaths - almost one in five - in 2018. A lead author of the study, Ian Hamilton, says that "the message is stark. Not only does delivering on Paris prevent millions dying prematurely each year, the quality of life for millions more will be improved through better health." The researchers estimated that China’s decision to cut its fossil fuels emissions nearly in half saved 2.4 million lives worldwide, including 1.5 million lives in China, in 2018. Another study author echoes that “we can’t in good conscience continue to rely on fossil fuels, when we know that there are such severe effects on health and viable, cleaner alternatives.” How can we in good conscience invest in the future of fossil fuels, when we know that there are such severe health effects and viable, cleaner alternatives?

It is no secret anymore that fuel companies have actively participated in misinformation campaigns to designed deceive the public about climate change. A report authored by an international group of scientists entitled, "America misled: how the fossil fuel industry deliberately misled Americans about climate change," summarizes more than a decade of peer-reviewed research showing that fossil fuel corporations have, for decades, "polluted the information landscape" and funded efforts to deceive people about the dangers of their product. As Dr. Steve Easterbrook of the University of Toronto states: “to put it bluntly, it is hypocritical for a university to claim to be at the forefront of knowledge production while simultaneously investing in companies that knowingly undermine that mission by spreading disinformation.”

We did not have to be the position we are today – had some of the very companies we now invest in considered the world their grandchildren would inherit and taken morally upright action to lead the world in diversifying our energy supply, we could have started efforts to curb climate change decades ago. The facts that:

---

6 Cal Poly Mission Statement
7 IPCC Summary for Policymakers — Global Warming of 1.5 °C
8 Deaths from fossil fuel emissions higher than previously thought
9 America Misled: How the fossil fuel industry deliberately misled Americans about climate change
10 Divest Canada Coalition calls for nationwide blanket divestment from fossil fuels at universities
1. Fossil fuels have created almost three-quarters of human-caused emissions in the past 20 years,\textsuperscript{11}
2. The industry has been aware of the long-term consequences of carbon emissions for nearly 70 years,\textsuperscript{12} and
3. Fossil fuel companies have responded by actively arranging and funding denial and disinformation to suppress action and protect status quo business operations\textsuperscript{13},

Taken together has led leading climate scientists to conclude that “major investor-owned fossil energy companies carry significant responsibility for climate change”\textsuperscript{14} - yet Cal Poly’s endowment continues to hold shares in these companies.

Our society and the quality of our lifestyles have benefitted immensely from fossil fuels – but the cost of bringing us face-to-face with a challenge that could bring much the world to its knees.

We buy investments because we hope to see them grow in the future and provide gains to support missions of our university. We wouldn’t invest in a company if we didn’t think it would bring returns. But to see these companies bring strong returns, especially in 5, 10 years from now, spells catastrophe for our millions, including Cal Poly students graduating into a world consumed by the climate crisis. **Cal Poly’s interest in the wellbeing of the Cal Poly community is directly incompatible with expecting returns from fossil fuel investments.**

\textsuperscript{11} Department of Energy – Fossil Fuels
\textsuperscript{12} Early oil industry knowledge of CO\textsubscript{2} and global warming
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{14} The climate responsibilities of industrial carbon producers
2. The financial call to divest from fossil fuels

When universities like Chico State divested from fossil fuels 7 years ago in 2014, with some divesting as early as 2012, there was not yet a compelling financial argument for divestment. That has changed. The research shows that divesting from fossil fuels will not expose our portfolio to losses, and if anything, may save us from losing money on fossil fuel stranded assets.

If Cal Poly has divested from fossil fuels in 2019, our endowment would have saved a significant amount of money amidst the 2020 economic crash. As you can see in the Figure 4, even though the value of the S&P 500 has grown from the beginning of 2020 to the end, stocks in Shell, ExxonMobil, and Chevron have tumbled and have not seen their value return.

But even before unimaginable 2020 crashes, fossil fuels have been proving to be risky investments; in the past 6 years, over 500 U.S. oil and gas producers have filed for bankruptcy, revealing deep debt and sending plummeting returns to the portfolios of investors like us.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{15} Haynes and Boone, LLP Oil Patch Bankruptcy Monitor
Some quick facts:

- **The traditional energy industry has been the worst-performing sector on Wall Street for a decade even before the pandemic hit.**
- By some measures, Big Oil’s downturn, compared to the broader market, was the worst performance of any sector going back to before the Great Depression.
- Shares of ExxonMobil have lost 47% of their value in the past five years - Over that same time span the S&P 500 has gained 84%
- These crippling losses once seemed unthinkable for such a titan, but in 2020 alone, the company’s market value withered from $300 billion to $176 billion.
- The story repeats itself across the oil, gas, and coal industries: BP, Shell, Conoco Philips, and Marathon Oil have all netted double-digit losses in their stock prices since 2016. Chevron remains the best performer with a mere 6% loss over five years.  

Despite these crippling declines, there is a much more serious financial problem facing those who have shares of fossil fuel companies. Remember how the IPCC indicated that at least 30% of our global fossil fuel reserves must not be burned, and the number could be as high as 75%? Let’s take a look at Figure 5 for how much fossil fuel production we can have in the next 10 years to reach those critical IPCC goals:

![Figure 5: Fossil fuel production must decline rapidly starting now to meet the 1.5°C goal. Source: Oil Change International, Carbon Brief analysis of data from IPCC SR15 and Global Carbon Project](image)

Seeing the sharp declines in coal, oil, and gas needed to secure a just future, **how can buying shares in fossil fuel companies be justified?** The world may never again consume as much gas and oil than in 2019. BP itself reported in 2020 that if the government takes significant steps
to curb climate change, oil demand will not return to pre-pandemic levels.\textsuperscript{17} \textbf{Peak oil is behind us.}

\textbf{The heavyweights of the financial world are sounding the alarm on fossil fuel investments.} Since large numbers of reserves will not be extracted if climate targets are to be met, fossil fuel assets are currently overvalued, creating a “carbon bubble.” Many senior figures and institutions in the financial world, including the World Bank, Bank of England, HSBC, Goldman Sachs and Standard and Poor’s, have warned that only a fraction of known fossil fuel reserves can be safely burned and that the remainder could plummet in value, posing huge risks to investors.\textsuperscript{18}

In 2015, HSBC privately advised its clients to divest from fossil fuels due to the risk, cautioning that investors who fail to get out of fossil fuels “may one day be seen to be late movers, on ‘the wrong side of history.’”\textsuperscript{19} HSBC warned that \textit{40-60\% of the market capitalization of oil and gas companies was at risk from the carbon bubble}. That is a lot of risk for smart, conservative investors like Cal Poly to be taking on.

Devaluation is here, now - in February 2021, Exxon Mobil Corp., Chevron Corp., and ConocoPhillips had their credit ratings lowered by S&P Global Ratings due to forecasts that stricter regulation and shifting demand patterns “will contribute to a more difficult operating environment for fossil fuel producers and will likely augment the risk of stranded assets and significant asset write-downs.” S&P also warned of “growing risks from energy transition due to climate change and carbon/GHG emissions, weak industry profitability and greater expected volatility in hydrocarbon fundamentals.”\textsuperscript{20} If the risks are growing, \textbf{why would Cal Poly wait a moment longer than necessary to get out of fossil fuels before their business drops even more?}

Not to mention that the United States’ new presidential administration is very serious about meeting the Paris Agreement goals and “lead[ing] an effort to get every major country to ramp up the ambition of their domestic climate targets.”\textsuperscript{21} This commitment spells out an ever more challenging regulatory environment for fossil fuel companies to profit within.

\textbf{Investing in an industry marked by past and projected decline is fiscally irresponsible and threatens our finances.} The fiduciary duty under U.S. federal law according to the Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act and the Uniform Prudent Investor Act includes appropriately managing risk exposures to the fund,\textsuperscript{22} meaning that Cal Poly has a legal obligation is manage risks in our endowment and other accounts such as these.

\textsuperscript{17} \href{https://bp.com/en/global/news-media/latest-news-and-events/2021/02/bp-says-oil-demand-may-have-peaked-last-year.html}{BP says oil demand may have peaked last year}
\textsuperscript{19} \href{https://www.huffpost.com/entry/hsbc-clients-fuel-investment-risks_n_5e47f90b5f75d00b9d6f3e1a}{HSBC Warns Clients of Fossil Fuel Investment Risks}
\textsuperscript{20} \href{https://www.reuters.com/business/energy/us-oil-majors-downgraded-by-sp-on-climate-risk-earnings-2021-02-16/}{US Oil Majors Downgraded by S&P on Climate Risk, Earnings}
\textsuperscript{21} \href{https://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/cea/plan-for-climate-change-and-environmental-justice/}{Plan for Climate Change and Environmental Justice | Joe Biden}
The long-term risk exposure of investing in fossil fuels are no longer consistent with lawful fiduciary responsibility.

Especially when alternatives abound.

The market for fossil fuels is seriously threatened by the blistering rise of cheap renewable alternatives. Some more facts to consider:

- The price of onshore wind energy has dropped from $135 per MWh down to $40 in 10 years, a reduction of more than 70%
- Utility-scale photovoltaic solar has made up even more ground, with a nearly 90% price reduction since 2009
- Solar is now the cheapest form of electricity over its lifespan, with an average unsubsidized cost of $37 per MWh
- While ExxonMobil lost 41% of its overall market value in 2020, the renewable leader NextEra gained 29%
- From 2017-2019, the S&P Clean Energy Index outperformed its coal, oil, and gas counterpart, the S&P Natural Resources Index at a ratio of 6:1, returning more than 66% over 3 years vs. only 11%.  

Fossil fuels used to be a safe, dependable investment, but that is no longer the case. A 2019 report shows state workers in California and Colorado lost a combined $19 billion in retirement funds over 10 years by remaining invested in fossil fuel assets. For California public school teachers, losses amounted to over $5,000 per person.

As a university at the forefront of so many fields, we do not need to use outdated, worn-out investment strategies, especially when there is mounting evidence challenging these strategies. Cal Poly stays on the cutting edge, and we do away with old strategies when we see they no longer serve us. That time is now for investing in fossil fuels.

The chief investment officers for the University of California, Jagdeep Singh Bachher and Richard Sherman, agree: “We believe hanging on to fossil fuel assets is a financial risk,” they said, and that they pose “a long-term risk to generating strong returns for UC’s diversified portfolios.” How could investing in fossil fuels be worth the risk to our portfolio? And to what gain? Handing ourselves, our children, and our grandchildren a climate crisis of historic scale? Investing in fossil fuels does not make sense.

---

23 [The Case for Pivoting into Renewable Energy](#)
24 [New Study Shows Oil, Coal and Gas Investments Drove Over $19 Billion in Losses for Major Pension Funds](#)
25 [Opinion: UC investments are going fossil free. But not exactly for the reasons you may think](#)
Please see each of these five studies and reviews for additional confirmation that divestment does not hurt a university’s endowment returns:

   
   “The investment performance of portfolios that exclude fossil fuel production companies does not significantly differ in terms of risk and return from unrestricted portfolios”

   
   “Fossil fuel divestment would not have reduced performance over 1927–2016.”

   
   “Over various sample periods ranging from January 4, 2010 to June 29, 2018, the low-carbon portfolio typically earns a slightly higher rate of return than the overall market, due to the poor performance of the fossil fuel industry”

   
   “Results from our difference-in-differences analyses of the effect of full and partial divestment suggest that either form of divestment does not yield discernible consequences–either positive or negative–for endowment values, at statistically significant levels”

   “However, we do find evidence that divestment improved the value for three of four universities that we examined through synthetic control analysis”


   “Objections to the Divestment Thesis Rely Upon a Series of Assumptions Unrelated to Actual Fossil Fuel Investment Performance”

   “The financial case for fossil fuel divestment is strong. Over the past three and five years, respectively, global stock indexes without fossil fuel holdings have outperformed otherwise identical indexes that include fossil fuel companies”

   “Fossil fuel companies once led the economy and world stock markets. They now lag”
3. How and Why Reinvest?

This section is short and simple. According to the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, in their 2021 report assessing the technological, policy, and social dimensions needed to achieve the deep net-zero-by-2050 decarbonization of the U.S. economy, “roughly $2 trillion in incremental capital investments must be mobilized over the next decade for projects that come online in 2030 to put the United States on track to net zero by 2050.”26 The government shoulders the responsibility for making a significant amount of this investment, but:

1. By investing ourselves in climate solutions, Cal Poly can set a distinguished example of our commitment to a just future for governments to follow.

2. There is an enormous opportunity to make money from investments in green revolving funds (GRFs) and impact investments.

Climate change will not be solved by divestment alone—it is an enormous task requiring policy, cooperation, innovation, across all sectors of the economy. Cal Poly, already a global leader in many fields, can be a climate leader by showing the world that our endowment can work two jobs—providing for the success of students and our learning and research institution, and fight for the healthy world we all want to see. Our research has uncovered two excellent investment categories for doing so: Green revolving funds, and impact investments.

Green Revolving Funds (GRFs):

Green revolving funds (GRFs) invest in energy efficiency upgrades and projects that decrease resource use, thereby lowering operating expenses. These operational savings are returned to the fund and then reinvested in additional projects.27 A major trend among universities divesting from fossil fuels is shifting university resources toward implementing Climate Action Plans. GRFs are an opportunity for universities to transform energy efficiency upgrades from perceived expenses to high-return investment opportunities.

“The attractiveness of GRFs as investment options is based on the track records of existing GRFs. Conservative estimates show that a green revolving fund can consistently earn a 20+ % annual return on investment yielding a median annual ROI of 32 %—with no losses—for 52 existing green revolving funds.”28 That is a much higher return than the 7-12% typical for endowment investments. It’s a little-known fact that the return on investment from programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions have a far higher rate of return than almost any investment in corporations.

26 Accelerating Decarbonization of the U.S. Energy System
27 Greening The Bottom Line
28 The Billion Dollar Green Challenge
For example, the Caltech Energy Conservation Investment Program (CECIP) was initiated in 2009. It manages $8 million within an existing fund in the school’s endowment, which had been created to finance capital projects. Any member of the Caltech community may submit a project proposal, and projects are approved as long as they have a 15 percent return on investment or a simple payback period of less than six years. CECIP has financed 13 large-scale building projects, ranging from lighting replacements to complete mechanical and control system retrofits. As of August 2010, these projects have reduced the school’s energy bills by $1.5 million. They have achieved an average return on investment of 33 percent and an average payback period of three years.29

The Sustainable Endowments Institute report, Greening The Bottom Line is an excellent resource and provides a comprehensive survey of GRFs at over 50 American and Canadian colleges and universities.

Impact Investing:

Impact investments are investments made with the intention to generate positive, measurable social and environmental impact alongside a financial return. Impact investing challenges the long-held views that social and environmental issues should be addressed only by philanthropic donations.30 Investments can be made across asset classes. A survey from Global Impact Investor Network found 59% of impact investors sought risk adjusted rates of returns, with 16% targeting below market rate. 89% of respondents reported the financial performance was in line or outperforming relative to expectations.31

*Final note: we recognize that buying public equity in companies that help fight climate change, such as large solar energy companies, does not directly translate into results such as more solar panels. GRFs and impact investments have a direct positive impact, which is why we urge reinvestment in these forms.

---

29 Greening The Bottom Line
30 What you need to know about impact investing
31 Ibid.
4. Responses to Possible Hesitations Towards Divestment:

1. “But the top oil and gas companies are shooting for net-zero emissions!”

Some oil and gas companies have released climate plans calling for net-zero emissions; unfortunately, almost every single one aims to be net-zero by 2050, with no goals for 2030. To avoid rise of 1.5 °C, the next 9 years are most important. If fossil fuel pollution continues to rise this decade, we could reach net zero by 2050 but still blow far past 1.5ºC.

Additionally, despite claiming to support climate policy, companies like ExxonMobil also remain members of associations and organizations that lobby to obstruct climate solutions.

2. “But natural gas is a bridge fuel!”

Not if we want to reach the 1.5°C goal of the Paris accord and prevent calamitous climate change effects. This excellent report breaks down how natural gas will break the carbon budget, is not essential for electric grid reliability as once thought and is increasingly beat out on cost effectiveness by wind and solar.

Additionally, since gas infrastructure with billion-dollar price tags are built to operate for decades, and there are serious barriers to closing infrastructure earlier than its expected lifespan, it is critical to cease new oil or gas infrastructure, like pipelines, to meet the 1.5 ºC goal.

Additionally, Mark Jacobson of Stanford University and colleagues have developed detailed roadmaps for how 139 countries could achieve 80% renewable energy by 2030, and 100% by 2050, as shown in Figure 6.

---

32 Path to net zero: Climate change takes center stage at more US oil companies
33 ExxonMobil’s climate plans are still “grossly insufficient”
34 The Sky’s Limit: Why the Paris Climate Goals require a managed decline of fossil fuel production
3. “But divesting does nothing to harm fossil fuel companies – our stocks go back into the marketplace, where they are bought by others at a slightly lower price”

This is a multi-part answer:

a. Why don’t we ask the companies themselves? In 2017 Shell’s Annual Report states that “some groups are pressuring certain investors to divest their investments in fossil fuel companies. If this were to continue, it could have a material adverse effect on the price of our securities and our ability to access equity capital markets.”\(^{35}\) This is quite fitting considering that Shell’s business has a material adverse effect on the planet.

b. According to current and former coal industry executives, the rise of fossil free investing has become big enough that it is indeed “constricting the industry’s ability to obtain capital.” David Stetson, CEO of Contura Energy, a major coal producer, admits that “If they can cut off your financing, they cut off your ability to function as a company.”\(^{36}\) Oil companies need enormous loans to find, purchase,

---

\(^{35}\) Strategic Report
and exploit reserves. The terms and the availability of these loans are related to the value of the company.

c. This is excellent news, because fossil fuel companies must be prevented from building new fossil-fuel infrastructure. The earlier-cited 2021 report by the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine, states that “analyses of model pathways to net-zero emissions in 2050 agree that in the next 10 years, the United States must build no new long-lived fossil fuel infrastructure (such as pipelines) that cannot be repurposed for use in a net-zero economy, and instead build network infrastructure to enable net-zero energy transition.” By lowering the actual and perceived value of the companies and thus limiting access to credit, divestment limits the ability of fossil fuel companies to expand their infrastructure and extraction.

d. Additionally, oil and gas executives are under enormous pressure to keep the stock price high. By publicly announcing our divestment due to reasons of financial risk, we make others less likely to invest, and less likely to scoop up shares we sell. This puts other shareholders at risk; The members of the Board of Directors representing company shareholders start taking climate change and our futures much more seriously when their own money is at stake.

e. Even still, the real power of Cal Poly and CSU divesting from fossil fuels is stigmatization. According to an Oxford University report, “the outcome of the stigmatization process, which the fossil fuel divestment campaign has now triggered, poses the most far-reaching threat to fossil fuel companies and the vast energy value chain.” Stigmatization severely affects the historically high political influence that these fossil fuel companies have enjoyed, since governments and politicians prefer to engage with ‘clean’ firms to prevent adverse spillovers that could taint their reputation or jeopardize their re-election. Additionally, stigmatized companies may be barred from competing for public tenders, acquiring licenses or property rights for business expansion, be weakened in negotiations with suppliers, or experience cancellation of multibillion-dollar contracts or mergers/acquisitions.

f. Meeting our most important climate goals involves deep change across many sectors and is not possible without climate-forward policies in place. By increasing awareness, divestment helps elevate policies that we as a planet depend on. For example, prominent divestments from tobacco and the subsequent awareness of the health risks of smoking led to several rounds of restrictive legislation beginning with the 1969 Public Health Cigarette Smoking

37 Accelerating Decarbonization of the U.S. Energy System
38 Stranded assets and the fossil fuel divestment campaign: what does divestment mean for the valuation of fossil fuel assets?
Act and progressing to state-led litigation.\textsuperscript{39} \textbf{Prior to the tobacco divestment campaign, there were no government anti-smoking campaigns.} “Calls for divestment of tobacco stocks have served as prominent banners... Such banners have rallied the faithful to successful political actions. The political actions of tobacco foes resulted in taxes and settlements in the many billions.” – Dr. Meir Statman, Santa Clara University.\textsuperscript{40} The South African divestment campaign famously led the U.S. to boycott South Africa over apartheid, and Nelson Mandela agreed the nationwide divestment campaign was a “catalyst” to ending the unjust system.\textsuperscript{41} \textbf{Divestment is not an insignificant act.}

---

4. \textit{“But we need our portfolios to be diversified as part of our fiduciary duty”}

As of January 2021, the entire energy sector of the S&P 500, which includes renewable energies, makes up less than 3\% of the value of the S&P 500.\textsuperscript{42} We can be adequately diversified without fossil fuels.

---

5. \textit{“We can have more of an impact with shareholder engagement”}

Between 2012 and 2018, 160 climate change shareholder resolutions were filed at 24 U.S. oil & gas companies. These resolutions resulted in a range of successes—from appointing climate-competent board members to reducing some operational greenhouse gas emissions. \textbf{Despite these resolutions, none of these U.S. oil & gas companies adopted adequate plans, or targets, to limit their carbon emissions.} As of 2018, the vast majority of these companies were continuing business-as-usual activities to maintain or expand production.\textsuperscript{43}

\textbf{Investor engagement passes the responsibility of climate action onto these corporations} who have already perpetrated decades-long misinformation campaigns that continue to conceal real, everyday dangers of a warming planet.

Shareholder engagement is unlikely to persuade a company to commit to eventually putting itself out of business. Implying that fossil fuel companies can be made sustainable enough to meet aggressive climate goals is like saying tobacco can be made healthy – it’s not in the books. Remember that the top oil and gas corporations only spent one percent on clean energy in 2018, and even if that number ratchets up significantly, it is simply not enough to meet the goals needed to avert the deadliest impacts of the climate crisis. \textbf{To mitigate the effects of climate change, it is more strategic to invest directly in solutions than to engage in the slow, incremental process of filing shareholder resolutions to reform the fossil fuel industry.} Advocating

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{41} \textit{South African Apartheid}
\textsuperscript{42} \textit{S&P 500 Sector Representation}
\textsuperscript{43} \textit{2020: A Clear Vision For Paris Compliant Shareholder Engagement}
piecemeal or gradual change does not challenge the fundamental business plan of corporations that profit off of planetary wreckage.

Besides, shareholder engagement does not reduce our endowment’s exposure to financial risk from write-downs and lowered share prices the way divestment does.

6. “But carbon-capture can save fossil fuels”

Unfortunately, The Department of Energy recently estimated that initial costs for carbon capture at natural gas plants would increase the cost of power by about 50%. Studies show it cannot be applied at great enough scale to justify the costs, and it would only slow down the transition to renewables.44

Carbon capture may have an important role in heavy industries that offer few low-carbon options, such as fertilizer producers, chemical producers, steel and iron mills, and cement makers.45 But for a huge portion of the oil and gas needed to power our lives, renewable solutions are cheaper, and far more effective at averting the worst impacts of climate crisis.

After a $7.5 billion carbon-capture power plant in Mississippi was never able to come online,46 the U.S. had only one power plant with carbon capture and storage (CCS) – and it shut down in January 2021 due to the low price of oil, marking “what may be one of the last gasps for carbon capture and storage technology in the U.S.” Additionally, the CCS technology at this plant, Petra Nova, required so much energy that the company made an entirely separate natural gas power plant - the emissions of which were not offset by the Petra Nova technology - just to power the scrubber.47

7. Fear of a slippery slope

The fear of a slippery slope can be used to counter any call for action in any area; it is not a valid argument unless there is evidence to show that taking one action will inevitably lead to another with costs that outweigh the benefits of the first action. There is no evidence that fossil fuel divestment will inevitably lead to actions like banning fossil fuel companies from coming to the career fair, considering that decisions like that must be approved by the Cal Poly President and administration. Furthermore, we acknowledge that fossil fuel companies are needed in the U.S. energy landscape, that employers of all kinds seek our talented students, and that students have the right to choose their employer. Allowing fossil fuel companies at our career fairs is much different than buying shares in those companies and linking their financial success to our own.

44 Carbon Capture Opportunities for Natural Gas Fired Power Systems
45 Transforming Industry through CCUS
46 Two Years Since Kemper Clean Coal Project Ended
47 The Only Carbon Capture Plant in The U.S. Just Closed
8. “Divesting is a political decision, and we don’t make political statements”

The definition of “political” is “of or relating to government.” We are calling for divestment due to the fact that the success of fossil fuel companies is incompatible with a just future, and due to the financial sensibility of doing so. Neither of these core reasons have anything to do with government or politics. Individuals across all shades of the political spectrum are increasingly understanding and responding to the threats of climate change. The need for a livable climate is not political.

9. “Cal Poly donors may not approve of this decision, and we don’t want to affect donations”

“As an academic community, Cal Poly values … social and environmental responsibility.” – Cal Poly Mission Statement

Ultimately, we recognize that investment in fossil fuel companies, sans adequate climate plans, is unfortunately tantamount to investment in violent and unjust consequences for current and future generations around the world, and thus investing in them violates our mission to act in accordance with our values of social and environmental responsibility. We hope all of our potential donors would also want to see that our adherence to our mission statement, not letting the promise of donations lead us away from our core purpose as an institution of higher learning dedicated to our values.

10. “Won’t it be hypocritical to divest while we still use fossil fuels?”

If Cal Poly is to do its due part in aligning our emissions with the limits of the Paris climate accord, then we will eventually severely cut our fossil fuel usage. Both divestment and cutting our usage are necessary in our eyes and the eyes of many others – they are not exclusionary. It is nearly impossible not to use fossil fuels in San Luis Obispo in 2021. But we do not invest for 2021 – we invest for 2031. There is nothing hypocritical in unavoidably using fossil fuels while choosing not to invest in their continued dominance.

11. “Fossil fuel workers will be hurt by divesting”

We advocate for a just transition, meaning that working-class people never get left behind. If fossil fuel companies will not retrain and transition their employees for new jobs in the energy sector, as they do not appear willing to do, for a transition that is not these workers fault, then that responsibility falls upon the government.
Furthermore, jobs in the fossil fuel industry are extremely dangerous. Oil rig workers and coal miners are at risk for a litany of illnesses and injuries, like the epidemic of Black Lung. Additionally, the death rate among those who work in the drilling industry in 2014, was almost five times that of all other industries combined. Renewable energy and other low-carbon industries (like child and elder care) offer safer job opportunities.

Lastly, extraction jobs are declining due to mechanization. In 1980, producing 100 tons of coal per hour required 52 miners; by 2015 that number dropped to 16. Even though more coal was being mined, coal mining lost 58 percent of its jobs between 1980 and 2015. As technology advances, extraction workers will continue to be displaced regardless of other market influences.

12. “(Lastly) It is technically too difficult to disentangle fossil fuel investments from our hedge funds, due to mutual funds, index funds, etc. And we do not have the resources to decide how/where to reinvest”

It is always possible to invest in fossil-free funds. Over 1400 institutions have committed to full or partial fossil fuel divestment, including over 200 other educational institutions like ours. In this list are notable names with endowments much larger than ours: Oxford, Brown, Cornell, George Washington, Boston University, the universities of Hawaii, Illinois, Vermont, and over half of the universities in the UK, and many others. The University of California finished divesting last year; perhaps we could ask them.

If our fund managers are unwilling to divest, there are many investment firms who specialize in socially responsible investing that would be happy to take the reins.

Examples include:
   - Natural Investments LLC
   - Trillium Asset Management
   - Boston Common Asset Management
   - Boston Trust & Investment Management Company
   - Impax Asset Management
   - Hemes Investment Holding, Inc.
   - Calvert Asset Management
   - Pax World • Portfolio 21 Investments
   - New Alternative Fund
   - Clean Yield

Many resources are available as guides to divestment and reinvestment even to lay-people like myself for free online. Please see a sampling below:

48 Just How Dangerous Is Oil Field Work?
49 Increased automation guarantees a bleak outlook for Trump’s promises to coal miners
1) **Fossil Free Funds** – A screening tool to search any of thousands of mutual fund or ETFs and find its exposure to fossil fuels, as well as easily find funds that have been negatively screened for fossil fuels companies already.

2) **How To Divest Invest – A Guide for Institutional Investors** – A comprehensive guide that provides the practical information for decision makers on how to integrate a “DivestInvest” strategy with the mission and asset allocation strategies of a fund. It includes case studies, implementation steps, and a break-down of the asset classes of climate solutions available to integrate into our portfolio, including:

- Active Equity
- Passive Equity
- Fixed income
- Real estate
- Private equity
- Infrastructure
- Direct investment in renewable energy assets
- Infrastructure funds
- Impact investing

3) **Maximizing Returns to Colleges & Communities: A Handbook on Community Investment** - This handbook provides an overview of community investment, including a step-by-step guide to implementing a community investment program that maximizes both financial and social returns. The benefits of community investment are numerous.

4) **Intentional Endowments Network** - IEN is a non-profit, peer-learning network advancing intentionally designed endowments – those that seek to enhance financial performance by making investments that advance an equitable, low carbon, and regenerative economy. IEN provides resources such as “Roadmap for Endowments,” “What Are Other Endowments Doing?,” “State of the Field,” “Financial Performance,” “General Sustainable Investing,” “Fiduciary Duty,” etc.

5) **The Clean200 2021** - A ranking of the largest publicly listed companies by their total clean energy revenues, with a few additional screens to help ensure the companies are building the infrastructure and services needed for what Lester Brown and many others have called “The Great Energy Transition” in a just and equitable way.
5. My Open Letter Calling for Divestment

Dear:

President Dr. Jeffery D. Armstrong,
Cal Poly Academic Senate,
Cal Poly Foundation Board,
CSU Campus Presidents,
CSU Campus Foundation Boards,
CSU Chancellor Dr. Joseph Castro,
CSU Board of Trustees,
CSU Academic Senate,

My name is Lisa Swartz from Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. I am in a new coalition calling for the Board of Trustees and Chancellor Castro to be climate leaders and pragmatic decision-makers by mandating that every campus endowment divest from fossil fuels and reinvest in more promising opportunities in climate solutions.

We believe this decision will benefit our financial portfolio AND directly impact the wellbeing of its past, current, and future graduating classes, who deserve the opportunity to graduate with a future not defined by climate crisis.

The CSU and Cal Poly will not be lonely: the support for fossil fuel divestment internationally has been staggering. The divestment movement is a rising wave encompassing hundreds of institutions: banks, philanthropies, religious organizations, corporations, pension funds, cities, and states to the tune of over $14 trillion divested so far. Norway’s Government Pension Fund — the world’s largest sovereign wealth fund — has sold off $13 billion in fossil fuel investments. BlackRock, the world’s largest fund manager, has pulled entirely out of coal. The country of Ireland is withdrawing every last euro invested in fossil fuels. The list of divestors goes on and on.

We will join almost 200 other educational institutions who have divested already, including over half of the universities in the UK, as well as Brown, Cornell, George Washington, Boston University, the universities of Hawaii, Illinois, Vermont, and many others, not to mention our other flagship university system, the University of California. Notably, the UCs cited financial risk, not climate change, as sufficient rationale for divesting. Fossil fuels “posed a long-term risk to generating strong returns for UC’s diversified portfolios.” The UC’s portfolio is already reaping financial rewards.

Even before unimaginable 2020 crashes, fossil fuels have been proving to be risky investments. In the past 6 years, over 500 U.S. oil and gas producers have filed for bankruptcy, revealing debt racking up to hundreds of billions of dollars and sending
plummeting returns to the portfolios of investors like us. Where is the risk-return? Investing in an industry marked by such volatility and short-sightedness is fiscally irresponsible, and our university can do better for the sake of our students.

Cities, states, countries, and institutions are reckoning with the gravity of the threats posed to our health, safety, and happiness by the climate crisis, and agreeing that it is morally wrong to continue business as usual greenhouse gas emission. But if it is wrong to destroy a healthy climate, it is also wrong to profit from that destruction. But are we even profiting?

Study after study has shown that fossil fuel divestment does not universities’ endowment returns. While the fossil fuel industry dances to the drumbeat of bankruptcy, renewable energy production and cost-effectiveness rises year after year, as well as its investment value. In most countries, renewable energy is cheaper than coal. Clean energy bought by corporations jumped 44% in 2019 (Forbes). In the stock market, the S&P Clean Energy Index is outperforming its dirtier counterpart, the S&P Natural Resources Index at a ratio of 6:1, returning more than 66% over 3 years vs. a measly 11% (Forbes). The renewable revolution has been called the “largest wealth-generating opportunity of this generation.” How can we let this opportunity fall to the wayside?

After all, this is today. What about tomorrow? Hundreds of cities and regions worldwide, including California, have committed to eventually sourcing 100% of the city’s electricity from renewable sources. No fossil fuels. The phase-outs we see now are only the beginning.

Yet, despite the enormous progress renewables have made over the past decade, investments in clean energy are still falling short of the level needed to put the world’s energy system on a sustainable path. Our action is needed. This is where the CSU can lead our nation as the U.S.’s largest university system and send a clear message to the fossil fuel industry and to investors worldwide: we prioritize our future and protect our portfolio.

We are at a tipping point. Climate change poses an “immediate and far-reaching threat to people and communities around the world and has implications for the full enjoyment of human rights.” We can choose to say no to a future marked by collapsing food systems, extreme heat, destructive wildfires, devastating storms, dwindling water resources, sweeping extinctions, increased insect outbreaks, and sea level rise measured in feet.

But the longer we wait, the more drastic reductions are needed to mitigate climate change. Our future can’t afford business as usual, and neither can our endowments.

We can put our money where our mouth is. We can leave a legacy our children will be proud of. What we cannot risk is placing bets on a plummeting industry, especially as the CSU faces severe budget constraints as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The announcement of fossil fuel divestment will be an amazing accomplishment for the Cal Poly and for the CSU Board of Trustees, shining a bright spotlight on our forward thinking in
a pandemic where hope and excitement has been hard to come by. But fossil fuel divestment is an achievement worth calling home about.

I try to remind myself every day that I work on this of why I’m doing it - to help other people have a better chance at a happy future. We are all on the same team - wanting what is best for the Cal Poly and CSU students, faculty, staff, and leaders, and wanting to make our universities proud. Let’s stand together on the right side of history.

To this end, for the good of our students and our nation, and to preserve the quality of life for this and future generations worldwide, we recommend and request that Cal Poly’s endowment:

1) Immediately freeze any new investment in fossil fuel companies (coal, tar sands, oil, and natural gas.)

2) Divest from the top 100 coal and the top 100 publicly traded oil & gas companies within 5 years.

3) Reinvest at least 5% of the endowment into climate solutions, including but not limited to active equity, passive equity, real assets, community investment, or revolving loan funds.

4) Provide accountability for the progress of fossil fuel divestment, such as quarterly updates and investment reports available to students.

We also recommend and request that the CSU Board of Trustees similarly mandate all three divestment conditions for all 23 campus endowments.

We are united by our vision for a better future. A college degree is an investment with benefits that lasts a lifetime. If only our universities’ investments were doing the same.

Thank you.

Lisa Swartz
(303) 570-7724
liswartz@calpoly.edu
San Luis Obispo, CA
RESOLUTION ON CREATION OF NEW DEPARTMENT FOR COMPUTER ENGINEERING

Impact on Existing Policy: \(^1\) \textbf{NONE.}

WHEREAS, Computer Engineering is currently an interdepartmental program, sponsored jointly by Computer Science and Software Engineering (CSSE) and Electrical Engineering (EE), within the College of Engineering (CENG); and

WHEREAS, The College of Engineering (CENG) has identified several benefits for elevating the shared program into a new department called the \textbf{Computer Engineering Department}; and

WHEREAS, The benefits and the structure of the new department are provided in the attachment to this resolution; and

WHEREAS, This change in status and name has been approved and endorsed by the Computer Engineering, Computer Science and Software Engineering, and Electrical Engineering department chairs/program directors and the CENG Dean; and

WHEREAS, Approval for elevating this program into a new department has been given by all college Deans and the Provost; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo approve the creation of a new CENG department, the \textbf{Computer Engineering Department}.

Proposed by: Computer Engineering Program
Date: April 6, 2021

\(^1\) (1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.

(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.

(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
Supporting Material for CPE Department Resolution

Overview

We propose a reorganization to transition Computer Engineering from a program to a department. Reorganization will allow the department to better serve its students by: improving student identity, sense of belonging, and connectedness; enabling an agile curriculum to better prepare graduates; and increasing the number of faculty dedicated to stewarding the department. Establishing a new department will empower Computer Engineering to realize its commitment to the following vision of culture, community, collaboration, and support:

- The Computer Engineering Department is a place that supports diversity in race, gender, sexuality, ability, class, and other social identities (in all their combinations) in a manner that transcends current institutional structures.
- The Computer Engineering Department is a place in which all find community, and where there are support structures that connect students with their peers, that provide mentoring between faculty and students, and that promote collaborative work between faculty. The Computer Engineering Department is a place where each of us can say, “I belong here.”
- The Computer Engineering Department’s faculty follows a distributed leadership model where all members are leaders in their own way. Faculty trusts in and actively backs each other as leaders. The department values the interdisciplinarity of faculty within and beyond CPE.
- The Computer Engineering Department is a place where if one encounters an unjust barrier, it is the system that yields. We acknowledge the immense cultural wealth that people bring with them to the Computer Engineering Department and we strive to act in a manner to ensure that wealth is valued and celebrated.
- The Computer Engineering Department is a place where all understand and value Computer Engineering being more than a sum of the traditional fields from which it grew. The Computer Engineering Department is a place that has insight into societal needs and is agile to adapt to address those needs from a critical theory orientation.
- The Computer Engineering Department is a place from which industry continues to seek new hires; they value our students’ technical expertise, and, of equal importance, seek out our students because of their diversity in body and voice, because of their ability to negotiate complexity and ambiguity, and because of their capacity, agency, and inclination for change. Our graduates pursue graduate studies and work in nonprofits and educational organizations in increasingly greater numbers.

Background

The Computer Engineering (CPE) Program was established in 1988 to support an interdisciplinary major in Computer Engineering, sponsored jointly from inception by the Computer Science and Software Engineering (CSSE) and Electrical Engineering (EE) departments, within the College of Engineering (CENG). The CPE program is designed to facilitate a holistic study of the design and implementation of computing systems to positively impact society. Computer Engineering is the comprehension and management of the complexity of computing systems as a whole transcending the aggregation of hardware and software components. The development of computing systems requires, broadly, efficient management of potentially limited resources, interaction with the environment external to the system, implementation of safeguards to recover from faults, and an intentional account for the impact of the system on the user and on society.
The Computer Engineering major is administered by the CPE director with support from one Administrative Support Coordinator and the CPE council with membership drawn from the CSSE and EE departments. The program’s average enrollment and degrees awarded over the past five years are 493 and 103, respectively, making it the sixth largest in the College of Engineering.

**Rationale for a New Department**

The Computer Engineering program is now a mature program educating students in a mature field of study. Becoming a department will enable CPE to control its destiny through strategic initiatives, the curriculum, and processes.

Transitioning from a program to a department benefits CPE students in the following ways:

- The CPE department will have greater curricular autonomy to design a more integrated computer engineering curriculum. CPE students will then be better positioned for industry and will better understand the complexity, nuance, and breadth of computer engineering.
- Establishing a CPE department will improve the sense of identity and community among CPE students by establishing clear associations among a set of faculty dedicated to service to the CPE department and to the CPE students.
- Improvements in the major identity and community will improve student engagement while at Cal Poly (a positive for retention) and after graduation.

Transitioning from a program to a department benefits the CPE faculty and department in the following ways:

- With the CPE faculty better able to focus their service activities, the needs of the department and the CPE major will be better supported through both curriculum development and the RPT process.
- The CPE department will be better positioned to modify the curriculum as the field evolves in order to remain current, exciting, and engaging to students.
- As a department, CPE can be more intentional and agile about how it grows with respect to classes offered, areas of research, and faculty recruitment.

**Process to Establish the New CPE Department**

This process has involved all of the CSSE, CPE and EE faculty and staff, through multiple open forums with an outside moderator, department discussions, discussions at retreats, a six-month working group facilitated by an outside moderator, and a follow-on task force. In addition to these opportunities to provide input, Dean Fleischer maintained an open-door policy, meeting with numerous faculty and staff 1:1. There were additional opportunities to provide anonymous feedback through online survey instruments.

In the winter of 2019, the Dean convened a Working Group to examine the potential for reorganization involving the CPE program, the CSSE department, and the EE department. Working Group membership included faculty from the program and both departments, the program director and both department chairs, a representative from the college dean’s office and was led by an outside facilitator. The working group examined several possible reorganizations, the advantages and disadvantages of each, gathered input from all stakeholders, and presented its findings to the Dean. Upon reviewing the findings, and in
unanimous agreement with the CPE program director and CSSE and EE department chairs, the Dean decided to transition CPE from a program to a department.

In the winter of 2020, the Dean convened a CPE Task Force to design and plan the transition from program to department. Task Force membership included the CPE program director, faculty from the program and both departments, a lecturer, and a staff representative. It oversaw the creation of structures and policies necessary for a functioning department.

**Resource Implications of a new Computer Engineering Department**

Many of the resources to support the new department are already in place or secured. There are currently 16 tenure-line faculty (eight full-time faculty equivalent) associated with the CPE Program and we expect most of them to maintain their affiliation in one form or another. Overall, we anticipate that the creation of the CPE department is a resource-neutral activity.

**Department Chair**
The makeup of the faculty will be reorganized in the new department under a Department Chair.

**Faculty**
We anticipate meeting the faculty needs for the new department in a number of ways. First, faculty within the EE and CSSE departments engaged in CPE Program work will have the opportunity to move all or part of their tenure-line appointment to the new department via a process approved by the Dean of the College of Engineering. Second, faculty within the EE and CSSE departments engaged in CPE Program work will have the opportunity to establish Memoranda of Understanding (MOU). Each such faculty member’s MOU will establish the division of teaching, professional development, and service responsibilities between the CPE department and a second department, dependent on the home of their tenure.

**Staff**
We believe that the support staff required for the new department are currently in place. This includes administrative support staff and technical support staff. Currently, the program is supported by a single ASC I.

**Budget**
The college currently supports the CPE program with a Director position, Administrative Support Coordinator, and additional items such as course offerings and laboratories through the CSSE and EE departments. A constraint on transitioning CPE from a program to a department was that the change be budget-neutral. The Dean, CPE program director, and CSSE and EE department chairs will adjust existing budgets to support the needs of the CPE department.

**Space**
The CPE Program has existing office space for the Department Chair and the Administrative Support Coordinator; this space will carry over to the CPE Department. In addition, the college has designated laboratory and research space currently allocated to the EE and CSSE departments that will transition to the CPE department. Faculty that transition to the CPE department will maintain their current office spaces.
Preamble:

As advised by the Chair of the Academic Senate and Provost’s Office, and guided by procedures outlined on the Academic Planning and Personnel website (APP1), on April 6, 2021 the Director of the Computer Engineering (CPE) Program presented to the Executive Committee (EC) of the Academic Senate (AS) a proposal to reorganize the current CPE Program into a CPE Department.

Presented with the proposal, the EC is charged with providing this report indicating if the EC agrees the proposal is “non-contentious.” If the EC does not agree the proposal is “non-contentious,” and requires more information than Items 2A and 2B, it is to label the proposal “contentious.” As per APP1, these designations determine the pathway to agenizing the proposal to the floor of the AS.

The EC discussed this matter in detail in closed session on April 6, April 9, and April 13, 2021.

Below, the “affected departments/programs” and “affected faculty” refer to Electrical Engineering (EE), Computer Science and Software Engineering (CSSE), and the current CPE Program.

Report:

The EC thanks the CPE Director and collaborators for the proposal. Obviously, considerable work and effort has gone into this process spanning several years and we thank all the stakeholders for their thoughtful and substantive efforts.

While the proposal has non-contentious aspects, the EC feels the proposal requires additional information that must be addressed before it is presented to the AS, so cannot be labeled formally non-contentious by the language of APP1. Very broadly, the proposal requires: 1) more evidence of transparent consultation with all faculty in affected programs; 2) a clearer outline of curricular impact on the affected programs; and 3) a clearer outline of the budgetary and associated personnel impact on the affected programs.

In that light, the EC would like to offer a couple paths forward to obtain the required elements of the proposal. The EC advocates for the Flexible Pathway (A) to allow for additional information gathering while still providing a timely path to the AS floor:

A. Flexible Pathway: If the following information under Proposal Addenda is provided to augment the current proposal, and the EC is satisfied all elements of the request were provided, the proposal can be agendized as a resolution to the AS in First Reading during the Spring of 2021 on the Flexible Timeline outlined below. This augmented proposal would then be included as supplemental material in the resolution as presented to the AS.
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B. **Formal Contentious Pathway:** If the Flexible Pathway above is not agreeable, the last Information to EC deadline is missed on the Flexible Timeline, or the augmented proposal is still incomplete as viewed by the EC, the EC must label the proposal “contentious” in a formal sense based on the language of APP1 and will follow the Formal Contentious Pathway as outlined in Item 4 on APP1. The proposers may also choose to select the Formal Contentious Pathway directly by the Information to EC deadline on the Flexible Timeline.

**Proposal Addenda:**
“Items” refer to the elements in APP1:

1.1. **Access to Documents:** The Director of CPE indicated to the AS Chair that a larger set of documents were available as part of the CPE Department development process but were not provide to the EC as part of the presented proposal at the direction of the AS Chair. The EC requests access to this additional content. This content would not appear as supplemental material in the resolution but would be available to the AS and EC for review online (e.g. on OneDrive) at their discretion.

1.2. **Item 2C:** “A detailed account of the proposed administrative and curricular changes.”
   1.2.1. Complete list of courses that will be housed and controlled by CPE outlined in two categories: core courses and service courses.
   1.2.2. Evidence that the above lists were presented to the EE and CSSE departments and approved in accordance with the bylaws of the respective departments (e.g., minutes and qualitative vote data).
   1.2.3. A statement that presents the criteria used to decide if courses will be moved from either the EE or CSSE to the proposed CPE department.
   1.2.4. Evidence that the above criteria have been approved by the majority of the tenured faculty in EE and CSSE.
   1.2.5. Provide a more detailed budget as it pertains to administrative support (one ASC 1 seems rather understaffed) as well as administrative, faculty, and curricular budget lines.

1.3. **Item 2D:** “Compelling evidence to support the financial benefits the proposed reorganization relative to leaving the existing program unchanged.” The following could be provided in the support letter from the Dean or in the formal proposal:
   1.3.1. In light of EE and CSSE losing faculty locally to CPE in a college-level budget-neutral environment, include a five-year budget projection for hiring in CPE, EE, and CSSE.
   1.3.2. In particular, a clear case of the budget impact of how the hiring needs of CPE will affect the urgent and immediate hiring needs of EE and CSSE.

1.4. **Item 2E:** “An explanation of the probable effects of the proposed changes on accreditations,” in particular in the context of Accreditation Board for Engineering & Technology (ABET) for both EE and CSSE (for non-confidential data):
   1.4.1. Outline the section about affected faculty as written in the most recent ABET reports.
1.4.2. Provide the comments reported by the ABET evaluators regarding faculty and future needs and concerns.

1.5. **Item 2G:** “The number of students, the number of faculty at each rank, and the number of staff at each rank involved in the affected academic programs or units, and the most probable way(s) the proposed changes will affect them, including an account of how faculty and staff duties will change as a result of the proposed changes.” Some of this is already discussed in the proposal, but more clarity would be helpful on these two points:

1.5.1. The number of faculty at each rank from EE and CSSE that will move to CPE.

1.5.2. Indicate how the duties of each faculty will change.

1.5.3. A clear description of the vetting process by which faculty may move to the CPE department from EE or CSSE.

**Flexible Timeline (Spring 2021):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information to EC</th>
<th>Earliest Agendized to AS</th>
<th>Earliest AS First Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T April 20</td>
<td>T April 27</td>
<td>T May 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T May 11</td>
<td>T May 18</td>
<td>T May 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The trajectory to Second Reading cannot be guaranteed and is based on the parliamentary procedures of the AS and subject to uncertainty. Past practice of the AS dictates if a resolution on the senate floor is not adopted by the final AS meeting of the academic year (June 1, 2021), the resolution will need to be re-agendized by the EC into the AS for the following academic year (AY2021-2022 in the Fall of 2021).

**Reference:**

APP1: [https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/reorganization-academic-programs-and-academic-units-and-suspension-programs](https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/reorganization-academic-programs-and-academic-units-and-suspension-programs)

AS-715-10
Computer Engineering Department Proposal Response to the Executive Committee Report
4/20/2021
(4/28/2021 – Original appendices moved to shared OneDrive folder)

1.1. Access to Documents: The Director of CPE indicated to the AS Chair that a larger set of documents were available as part of the CPE Department development process but were not provide to the EC as part of the presented proposal at the direction of the AS Chair. The EC requests access to this additional content. This content would not appear as supplemental material in the resolution but would be available to the AS and EC for review online (e.g. on OneDrive) at their discretion.

We placed relevant materials in a folder on OneDrive for you to reference. The folder includes: an Excel spreadsheet containing an overall timeline listing most activities and events over the past few years; and salient documentation highlighting our process over that timeframe. The timeline spreadsheet also contains direct links to the supporting documents. This folder also includes current drafts of various Task Force documents (e.g., Shared Course Management (course list), draft MOU for joint appointments) and supporting documentation.

1.2. Item 2C: “A detailed account of the proposed administrative and curricular changes.”

1.2.1. Complete list of courses that will be housed and controlled by CPE outlined in two categories: core courses and service courses.

The complete list of courses (Shared Course Management) can be found in this folder on OneDrive. During the process to develop this course list, the Task Force explicitly prioritized fostering and maintaining collaborative efforts in course evolution for all courses considered “shared” between CPE and another department. The Task Force and the CSSE and EE departments are initiating such efforts through collaborative scheduling and periodic joint curriculum committee meetings across departments. With respect to curriculum, each department will have autonomy to choose the courses required in their curriculum (i.e., the courses and categorization in the curriculum sheets). Any changes to a course on that curriculum sheet, whether required or optional, will go through the standard course inventory management system process. The Task Force therefore recommends establishing a collaborative course modification review process prior to the submission of proposals through the course inventory management system. The goal is to establish a communal feedback process even when a course is officially housed in a single department.

Please refer to this folder on OneDrive for the proposed CPE/CSSE/EE Shared Course Management list, which contains:

- the rationale behind creating the course list (find greater detail in 1.2.3)
- a summary of the number of required courses in CPE, CSC, EE, and SE taught by CPE, CSSE, and EE in the current two-department and one-program structure; and in the proposed three-department structure
- the course list organized by degree program, indicating required/elective status, proposed home (indicating shift as applicable), proposed new cross-listing, and CourseLeaf management system info
1.2.2. Evidence that the above lists were presented to the EE and CSSE departments and approved in accordance with the bylaws of the respective departments (e.g., minutes and qualitative vote data).

Discussions and votes about the proposed CPE courses took place on the dates below (partial list). Please refer to this folder on OneDrive for Email Documentation and Minutes of items marked with an *asterisk and highlighted in **bold**:

- **2/7/2020**: CPE Council - Signature areas for CPE defined
- **3/6/2020**: CPE Council - Discussion on first Task Force draft of CPE courses. Feedback: value of having service courses, security, OS vs RTOS, circuits/electronics/357/service courses
- **5/11/2020**: Course list discussion with systems area faculty in CPE/CSSE/EE
- **5/22/2020**: CPE Council - Task Force discussion on CPE vision, faculty selection process, course list
- **6/5/2020**: CPE Council - Discussion on Task Force draft documents
- **6/12/2020**: CPE Council - Task Force documents update
- **9/18/2020**: CPE Council - Task Force document update, discussion, and explicit request for feedback
- **10/2020**: Task Force presentations to CSSE and EE departments
- **11/12/2020**: Task Force meets with embedded systems faculty to discuss appropriate homes for relevant courses
- **1/8/2021**: CPE Council - Task Force drafted resolution and supporting document
- **1/8/2021**: Task Force email to CSSE and EE leadership distributing draft CPE Course List
- **1/8/2021**: Email from Dale Dolan (EE assistant chair) to EE faculty distributing draft CPE Course List
- **1/9/2021**: Email from Chris Lupo (CSSE chair) to CSSE faculty distributing draft CPE Course List
- **1/15/2021**: CPE Council - CPE academic senate resolution update and CPE department vote (online)
- **1/19/21**: EE Department Curriculum Committee CPE Course List discussion
- **1/29/2021**: CPE Council – report on CPE department vote: 12 yes, 2 no
- **2/3/2021**: Discussion of proposed course list at CSSE department meeting
- **2/8/21**: EE Department Curriculum Committee CPE Course List discussion
- **2/10/2021**: Discussion of proposed course list at CSSE department meeting
- **2/22/21**: EE Department Curriculum Committee CPE Course List discussion
- **2/24/2021**: Discussion of proposed course list at CSSE department meeting
- **2/26/2021**: CPE Council - Task Force update and request for feedback
- **3/1/21**: EE Department Curriculum Committee CPE Course List discussion
- **3/8/21**: EE Department Curriculum Committee CPE Course List discussion
- **3/25/2021**: Email from Elizabeth Lowham (EE assistant chair) to EE faculty announcing Spring EE department meeting schedule – scheduled CPE course list discussion for 4/7/2021
- **3/29/21**: EE Department Curriculum Committee CPE Course List discussion
- **4/5/21**: EE Department Curriculum Committee CPE Course List discussion
1.2.3. A statement that presents the criteria used to decide if courses will be moved from either the EE or CSSE to the proposed CPE department.

Currently, the CPE degree curriculum includes courses under the CPE, CSC, and EE prefixes. In order to determine which courses would make sense to move to the CPE department, a detailed review commenced in the Winter 2020 quarter with many different stakeholders. This process began within the CPE task force with the definition of a set of guiding principles. These guideline principles specified that each course considered for the CPE department should exhibit:

- Alignment with the existing core CPE degree curriculum
- Alignment with the field of computer engineering
- Alignment with the CPE department vision
- Alignment with curricular areas CPE anticipates it will be able to staff
- Alignment with areas of strategic interest/potential growth for CPE

Following the definition of these guiding principles, the CPE task force began to populate a list of courses to be housed in the CPE department. The task force revised this list based on discussions and feedback from the CPE council. The task force then held discussions with the faculty teams who teach those courses for their insights and feedback. These faculty teams included the course coordinators and primary instructors for EE and CSSE courses in the security, embedded systems, systems, and architecture/parallel & distributed areas.

Following these meetings, the Task Force met to incorporate the feedback from the CPE, CSSE, and EE faculty and to develop the proposed course list. The direct faculty input was critical to developing the list of draft courses. With this list of draft courses in hand, the Task Force met with the CSSE and EE leadership, primarily Chris Lupo and Dale Dolan, as well as Dean Fleischer for their input and analysis of the proposed course list. In particular, this discussion addressed those courses on which the Task Force received conflicting feedback. The input from the department leadership was critical for those cases. This led to the development of the draft list of courses that was presented to the CSSE and EE departments. It is important to note that Aaron Keen (CENG Curriculum Committee Chair) served on the CPE Task Force and provided curricular insight throughout the process.
As an example, what follows is an overview of the process applied to courses in the security area. We met with security faculty to discuss the entire list of security classes. The security faculty were able to clearly segment all security courses between CPE and CSSE except one: CPE 321 (currently housed in CSSE). The general consensus was that this course could go either way and had different flavors based on who taught the class. One faculty member felt it should move to CPE so the Task Force put it on the proposed CPE course list. Once that list was distributed, we received questions about whether the course should move to CPE or not. The discussion continued over email with the feeling the course was slightly more CSSE than CPE (with one person indicating 52% CSSE). The Task Force moved the course off the proposed list and it will stay in CSSE.

The final list of proposed courses was voted on and approved by the EE department on 4/7/21 and CSSE department on 4/19/21.

1.2.4. Evidence that the above criteria have been approved by the majority of the tenured faculty in EE and CSSE.

While both the EE and CSSE departments reviewed, discussed and voted on the course lists, these votes were not separated out by faculty standing (lecturer, probationary, tenured). This is not typical in either department. Nor did the votes explicitly lay out any criteria for approval. Instead, each faculty member was able to apply their own criteria to their votes.

Per APP policy and AS-715-10, we did not see a vote on criteria as a required step for our proposal. Our process for generating the course list was more involved than applying a strict set of criteria. As described in 1.2.3, it was a combination of guiding principles, direct input from faculty who teach courses in the areas under consideration, feedback from CPE/CSSE/EE faculty, and feedback from CSSE and EE department leadership.

1.2.5. Provide a more detailed budget as it pertains to administrative support (one ASC 1 seems rather understaffed) as well as administrative, faculty, and curricular budget lines.

For details with respect to 1.2.5, please refer to the letter from Dean Fleischer dated 4/20/2021.

1.3. Item 2D: “Compelling evidence to support the financial benefits the proposed reorganization relative to leaving the existing program unchanged.” The following could be provided in the support letter from the Dean or in the formal proposal:

1.3.1. In light of EE and CSSE losing faculty locally to CPE in a college-level budget-neutral environment, include a five-year budget projection for hiring in CPE, EE, and CSSE.

1.3.2. In particular, a clear case of the budget impact of how the hiring needs of CPE will affect the urgent and immediate hiring needs of EE and CSSE.

For 1.3 (Item 2D), please refer to the letter from Dean Fleischer dated 4/20/2021.

1.4. Item 2E: “An explanation of the probable effects of the proposed changes on accreditations,” in particular in the context of Accreditation Board for Engineering & Technology (ABET) for both EE and CSSE (for non-confidential data):
It is important to note that ABET accredits degree programs, not departments. Therefore, future ABET accreditations of all four BS degree programs (Electrical Engineering, Computer Engineering, Computer Science, and Software Engineering) with courses taught by potential faculty members of an independent CPE department would only be affected by changes in curriculum, assessment methods and results, continuous improvement processes, available facilities and budgets, and the number and quality of faculty who teach in the program.

At a high level, the College of Engineering ABET Coordinator, Associate Dean Eric Mehiel, works with all programs across the six-year review cycle. He provides guidance and assistance to all program ABET coordinators, the individuals who lead the accreditation process in each program. The ABET coordinators for the current review cycle that is nearing its completion are Lynne Slivovsky (CPE), Zachary Peterson (CSC and SE), and Wayne Pilkington (EE). They have coordinated their review efforts in this cycle and we have every expectation that these individuals, and faculty who hold these positions in the future, will continue to coordinate and support each other, the three departments, and the college as a whole.

The ABET coordinators for CPE (Lynne Slivovsky) and EE (Wayne Pilkington) both served on the CPE Task Force, with Wayne Pilkington also serving on the CPE Working Group, and provided insight and guidance with respect to accreditation during our work.

**1.4.1. Outline the section about affected faculty as written in the most recent ABET reports.**

The College of Engineering ABET Coordinator maintains an overall self-study (i.e., ABET report) template to provide consistency across the programs and to support the individual program coordinators in writing their self-studies. Therefore, the same types of material are found in the CPE, CSC, EE, and SE reports. The reports address all eight ABET criteria. Faculty factor into many of them as they play a role in, for example, defining and revising Program Educational Objectives (Criterion 2.), assessing Student Outcomes (Criterion 3.), and participating in the Continuous Improvement process (Criterion 4.). Criterion 6 outlines expectations for program faculty. The following are the ABET accreditation criteria for program faculty:

*Criterion 6. Faculty*

*The program must demonstrate that the faculty members are of sufficient number and they have the competencies to cover all of the curricular areas of the program. There must be sufficient faculty to accommodate adequate levels of student-faculty interaction, student advising and counseling, university service activities, professional development, and interactions with industrial and professional practitioners, as well as employers of students.*

*The program faculty must have appropriate qualifications and must have and demonstrate sufficient authority to ensure the proper guidance of the program and to develop and implement processes for the evaluation, assessment, and continuing improvement of the program. The overall competence of the faculty may be judged by such factors as education, diversity of backgrounds, engineering experience, teaching effectiveness and experience, ability to communicate, enthusiasm for developing more effective programs, level of scholarship, participation in professional societies, and licensure as Professional Engineers.*

All four degree programs demonstrate their proficiency by documenting the following in a combination of narrative and tables:

- Faculty Qualifications, including areas of expertise, education, and experience
• Faculty Workload, including distributions of teaching/research/other and percentage of time devoted to the program
• Faculty Size, including details on student involvement on industry projects, relationships between faculty and student clubs, students interactions with external partners, advising, and service
• Professional Development activities, including support from the CTLT, ORED (now R-EDGE), and the Grants Development Office
• Statements about Faculty Responsibilities and Diversity, including inclusive hiring guidelines
• A complete listing of Faculty Vitae

1.4.2. Provide the comments reported by the ABET evaluators regarding faculty and future needs and concerns.

Cal Poly had its site visit (virtual accreditation visit) in Fall 2020. The accreditation team provides initial feedback in an Exit Statement, followed by a mid-year interim report, and the process will not be complete until the final report is received this coming summer of 2021. Cal Poly has opportunities to respond to the draft statements and reports during the year. The program evaluators noted concerns with respect to faculty numbers in their mid-year draft reports (confidential) for the computer engineering program, electrical engineering program, and software engineering program. No concern, weakness, or deficiency with respect to faculty was noted by the program evaluators for the computer science program.

Note: these are DRAFT findings which may change based on the college’s official response and action plan submitted to ABET this spring to address any program concerns, weaknesses, and/or deficiencies.

Attention to these concerns, and all aspects of successful accreditation, are of strategic importance to the CSSE and EE departments, the CPE program, and the College of Engineering. The college takes all identified concerns and weaknesses seriously. The formation of a CPE department with the expected transfer of faculty from the CSSE and EE departments to full participation or joint appointment in the CPE department will have no direct impact on the concerns raised by the EE ABET evaluator. The same courses in the EE and CPE curricula that are currently taught by EE and EE/CPE, CSC/CPE, and CSSE faculty will continue to be taught in the future by the same faculty; whether tenured, tenure-track, or lecturer. We expect that many current CPE faculty will maintain their joint appointments, resulting in further consistency. The formation of the CPE department neither helps nor worsens the issue that a significant number of course sections are necessarily taught in all four programs (EE, CPE, CSC, SE) by lecturers in order to meet student demand for courses so that students can make adequate and timely degree progress. Formation of independent departments will not affect the number of students in each program that must be mentored and advised, the curriculum requirements of each program, or the number of senior projects that must be supervised. The tenure density and need for additional T/TT faculty of the EE, CPE, CSC, and SE programs/departments is an independent issue that needs to be addressed to the satisfaction of future ABET evaluators with or without the formation of an independent CPE department.

As noted in her 4/20/2021 letter, Dean Fleischer is committed to maintaining and potentially growing faculty numbers which will address the identified concerns, and over the past few years twice approved searches in the EE department, although both searches failed. Searches are expected to be reauthorized in the near future, particularly in light of recently announced retirements. Three searches are ongoing in the CSSE department and will address recent losses in the software engineering degree program. The restructuring to a department should help address the concern in CPE which deals with student-faculty interaction and student advising. Currently CPE student advising is provided only by the program director,
and with the restructuring, additional faculty will be able to take on this role. Future hiring in all three departments would be considered strategically for the college as indicated by Dean Fleischer.

To give further insight to the faculty concerns raised with CPE and EE, we will provide a comparison to other programs in the college. Even with faculty departures for the CPE department, the faculties of the EE and CSSE departments will remain large enough to successfully function, and much larger than the smallest CENG departments. Among CENG departments, Materials Engineering (220 students) has four probationary/tenured faculty, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering (471 students) currently has nine probationary/tenured faculty and Aerospace Engineering (470 students) has nine probationary/tenured faculty. It is expected that both EE (736 students) and CSSE (990) will remain above these numbers (and above the CPE faculty numbers) even with the new department formation, and as noted by Dean Fleischer in her letter, hiring is ongoing or planned in both EE and CSSE.

1.5. Item 2G: “The number of students, the number of faculty at each rank, and the number of staff at each rank involved in the affected academic programs or units, and the most probable way(s) the proposed changes will affect them, including an account of how faculty and staff duties will change as a result of the proposed changes.” Some of this is already discussed in the proposal, but more clarity would be helpful on these two points:

1.5.1 Clarify the number of faculty at each rank from EE and CSSE that may move to CPE

Consistent with previous new department formations at Cal Poly, faculty affiliation with the new department cannot be undertaken until the department is formed. As the new department is not formed, and no faculty have had the opportunity to declare their intentions, it is premature to speculate at this point about the intentions of individual faculty. However, it is expected that the faculty of the CPE department will be formed through a combination of some EE and CSSE faculty moving tenure line homes, and some EE and CSSE faculty choosing to take joint appointments with the new department. We expect most, if not all, of these faculty are already involved with the CPE program.

All of the faculty expected to either move or take joint appointments already teach CPE courses in full or part. The CPE affiliated faculty currently includes 16 probationary or tenured faculty who are officially affiliated through the CPE program council, and several others who unofficially engage with the department in various ways. Additionally, there are several full and part-time lecturers who teach CPE courses.

It is expected that the new department will eventually have 7-10 FTE tenured/probationary faculty members who will fulfill the teaching needs required to serve the CPE students along with the EE and CSSE students who will also take cross-listed classes and potential service courses. This faculty size is consistent with other CENG departments of the same student enrollment. As with other departments, teaching needs will be fulfilled by a combination of probationary/tenured faculty and lecturers. No faculty will be forced in any way to consider a tenure line move. All faculty will get to make the best decision for their own careers with respect to their future affiliation(s) with CPE, CSSE, and/or EE.

1.5.2 Indicate how the duties of each faculty member will change

The roles of faculty are not expected to change when they move to the new department or accept a joint appointment. Faculty will still be expected to teach, engage in research/scholarship and do departmental service. For any individual faculty member, their research/scholarship is individually determined and will not change with a change in tenure home or a joint appointment.

Teaching loads for the faculty who change their tenure line into CPE will support both the CPE curriculum and service courses offered by CPE in support of the CSSE and EE curriculums. Faculty with joint
appointments will teach both courses in support of the CPE curriculum and their home department curriculum. This is not expected to lead to any significant teaching changes for any affected faculty as they are all currently teaching a mix of CPE, CSSE and EE courses. Scheduling of courses will be done collaboratively between CPE, CSSE, and EE, just as it currently occurs between departments that offer service courses for each other. Of course, the individual courses that a faculty member teaches may vary from quarter to quarter and year to year as the curriculum of all three departments evolves.

For those moving tenure lines to the new department, their service will be in support of CPE. In fact, finding the time to do dedicated service to this degree program has been a serious struggle for the CPE program faculty in the past, as most affiliated faculty have been doubled up in service to their home department and the CPE program including such examples as having to attend two department/program meetings each and every week for both their home department and the CPE program, and having to serve on two curriculum committees. Having a dedicated and committed set of faculty who can give the CPE degree program the attention that it needs with almost 500 enrolled students is a major advantage of the new department structure.

Faculty who choose joint appointments with the CPE department will have MOUs negotiated with the two department chairs that clearly spell out teaching and service expectations and eliminate any doubling of service loads. It is clear that the CSSE and EE departments may need to adjust service roles within their departments as a result, but the current situation of having faculty do double service is untenable and must be addressed.

1.5.3 A clear description of the vetting process by which faculty may move to the CPE department from EE or CSSE

The process of having faculty apply to change tenure home (or for a joint appointment) will be based on the general process used whenever any Cal Poly faculty member wishes to change tenure home. This process is not yet finalized, but the proposed outline is described below.

Faculty applying for a change of tenure home or a joint appointment will submit a letter of interest and a CV to the faculty selection committee. The letter of interest will include a description of the faculty members’ previous engagement with the CPE program; alignment with the proposed CPE department vision, teaching and service needs; alignment of their research/scholarship with the computer engineering field; how they expect to contribute to the department in the future; and motivation for the move.

Typically, when a faculty member changes tenure home, they would submit similar information to the proposed new tenure home department, and their move would be subject to a vote of the tenured faculty in the department they want to move to. In this case, the department does not exist, so there is no existing faculty to perform this step in the process. Thus, we have reached out to Academic Personnel to determine how best to proceed and they are vetting this process to ensure that it is fair and complies with all regulations of the CBA. Academic Personnel recommends forming a small committee comprised of faculty with relevant disciplinary interests, but with no intent to move tenure home or pursue a joint appointment with the new CPE department. Our understanding is that this is the same method used with the recent formation of the Interdisciplinary Studies in Liberal Arts department.

This committee will review the applications and make a recommendation on each application to Dean Fleischer. Dean Fleischer will then review the recommendations and make her own independent recommendation to Provost Jackson-Elmoore who will make the final decision. Dean Fleischer will form the selection committee and two of three members are already identified. Prof. Wayne Pilkington from the Electrical Engineering department and Prof. Aaron Keen from the Computer Science and Software
Engineering department have both agreed to serve in this role. They both bring disciplinary expertise but are not interested in moving to the new department in any role. They have each served as the EE representative and the CSSE representative respectively on the CPE task force for the past year. A third faculty representative will be identified from a different department in CENG in order to bring a diverse perspective to the committee.

For any faculty requesting a joint appointment in CPE, an MOU based on other successful joint appointments in CENG and developed with Academic Personnel will specify the details of the joint appointment, e.g., teaching and service requirements between the two departments. This MOU will be done in consultation with the faculty member, two department chairs, and dean who will all sign the MOU. This is an important step to ensure the needs of the faculty member and two departments are taken into consideration.
March 15, 2021

Dear Members of the Academic Senate,

Thank you for your consideration of the proposed change from program to department for Computer Engineering (CPE) that has been brought to you by the faculty of the CPE program. The program has been offered and stewarded as a joint program by the Computer Science and Software Engineering (CSSE) department and the Electrical Engineering (EE) department since its creation 32 years ago. Over that time, the program has grown along with the ever-changing field of computer engineering.

In 2018, faculty from the Computer Engineering program approached leadership in CSSE, EE, and the College of Engineering (CENG) about how to best position the program for success in the future. After a comprehensive, thoughtful, and inclusive process, we are proposing this transition from program to department.

The CPE faculty are dedicated to providing our students with an impactful and transformative educational experience at Cal Poly and recognize this will best be accomplished in the future as a department. By becoming a department, the CPE faculty will have the agency to implement its bold vision grounded in equity and justice and evolve its curriculum as the field continues to grow. Students will experience a greater sense of belonging, community, engagement, and identity with CPE. As a department, we will have new opportunities for collaboration and partnership across Cal Poly and with industry, all of which will ultimately benefit our students.

In an online vote that took place 1/22/2021-1/27/2021, the affiliated CPE faculty voted (12 yes, 2 no) on their support for the creation of the CPE department. This transition to a department is further supported with the included letters from faculty leadership in CSSE and EE and administratively by Dean Fleischer on behalf of CENG and Provost Jackson-Elmoore.

Thank you again for your consideration of our change from program to department.

Sincerely,

Lynne Slivovsky
Director, Computer Engineering Program
March 19, 2021

Academic Senate
California Polytechnic State University

Sub: Letter of Support for the Establishment of a Cal Poly Computer Engineering Department

Dear Senators,

On behalf of the Computer Science and Software Engineering (CSSE) Department, I offer my full support for the creation of the Computer Engineering (CPE) Department.

I have been integrated into the discussion of the formation of a CPE department from the very beginning, and have worked closely with Professor Slivovsky and Dean Fleischer throughout the process. This process began in the 2018-2019 academic year, and included several discussions with the Electrical Engineering and CSSE faculty and staff. All members of both departments were provided several opportunities to discuss and provide feedback to the department chairs, to the CPE Task Force, and to the Dean. The ultimate decision to transition CPE from a joint program to a department was made by Dean Fleischer, and several options were considered to address issues with CPE curriculum control, CPE faculty identity, and CPE student identity. The process was transparent and collaborative. The members of the CPE Task Force deserve special appreciation for their diligence and thoughtful approach to designing the structure and vision of the new department.

Dean Fleischer, and the leadership of CPE, CSSE, and EE were unanimous in their support for the creation of this new department. There is strong majority support in CSSE for this significant change as well, though complete consensus was not reached by all constituents of the department. In CSSE, there remain some uncertainties about which individuals may or may not choose to affiliate with the new CPE department, and we continue to discuss ways to share talent, curricula, and facilities such that all three departments can thrive and continue to collaborate through joint scheduling and periodic common curriculum meetings.

I look forward to continuing to work with Prof. Slivovsky on shared goals, strategies, and resources that support student success, enable Learn by Doing, and enhance faculty teaching and scholarship.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Chris Lupo

Department Chair
805-756-5659
clupo@calpoly.edu
www.csc.calpoly.edu/~clupo
March 17, 2021

LETTER OF SUPPORT – CPE DEPARTMENT

Dear Academic Senate,

I am writing this letter in support of the creation of the Computer Engineering Department at Cal Poly. The Computer Engineering Program has been sponsored jointly by EE and CSSE for several decades and has now matured and grown to a size where it would be best served by being run under its own department. Computer Engineering is a rapidly evolving field where curricular autonomy by those that are delivering the program is essential in order for a more impactful and integrated curriculum to be maintained. This will greatly benefit CPE students by ensuring that the curriculum is directly controlled by those that directly deliver it and ensuring that the program can adapt to changes in the industry more effectively. CPE Students are expected to have an improved sense of community and major identity which will increase engagement both before and after graduation. This will also benefit CPE faculty who will now be able to focus on service activities under one department and to more fully support students within CPE. A new vibrant CPE department will also help to create space for innovation, research and collaboration. This can also be seen as a positive for the EE department in that it will allow for EE to develop and create its own future focusing on new directions in the electrical engineering field.

Acting as the department chair for student and curricular issues I fully support this creation of the CPE department and will work collaboratively with the CPE department to foster an environment in both CPE and EE that benefits students allowing them to be better prepared for entering industry and society. As there are in many engineering majors, there are overlaps between EE and CPE and this will continue to allow great collaborations between both students and faculty in the two departments.

Sincerely,

Dale Dolan, Ph.D.
Interim Assistant Department Chair
Electrical Engineering Department
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
dsdolan@calpoly.edu
805-756-2495
March 17, 2021

The College of Engineering is in full support of the resolution to form a new Department of Computer Engineering that the faculty of the Computer Engineering program have brought to the Academic Senate.

Computer Engineering (CPE) began as a cross-disciplinary program situated within the Electrical Engineering (EE) and Computer Science (CSSE) departments in 1988. In the 32 years since its formation, the program has steadily grown, while the discipline of computer engineering has seen enormous change. The program now enrolls almost 500 students, making it the 6th largest degree program among the College of Engineering’s 14 degrees. The reputation of the degree is outstanding, and per US News and World Report it ranks as the #2 Computer Engineering degree program in the country at an undergraduate focused school.

However, as the program has grown, the needs of the students and the faculty in the program have also evolved. Serving 500 students effectively within a program structure has grown to be increasingly challenging, and the faculty struggle to balance the service and teaching demands of both the CPE program and their home departments. Additionally, curriculum innovation is challenging as it necessitates the need to navigate multiple departments and three curriculum committees. This is of particular concern in a field that evolves as rapidly as computer engineering.

In order to address these concerns, the College of Engineering undertook a study of the structure of the CPE program, beginning in the spring of 2019. This process invited all members of the EE and CSSE departments to participate - through multiple open forums with an outside moderator, department discussions, discussions at retreats and a six-month cross-disciplinary task force which also worked with the outside moderator. In addition to these structured opportunities to provide input, I maintained an open-door policy, meeting with numerous faculty and staff 1:1, and provided opportunities for anonymous feedback through an online survey instrument.

In the fall of 2019 at the conclusion of the process, the leadership team of myself, Dr. Dennis Derickson (then EE Chair), Dr. Chris Lupo (CSSE Chair) and Dr. Slivovsky (CPE Program Director) reviewed the data from all of these discussions and unanimously decided to pursue elevating the CPE program to department status. This decision was made because the leadership strongly believe that this will set the CPE degree program up for success and will simultaneously strengthen all of our programs. Some of the key opportunities that we expect include:

• **Strengthening our student experience**
  Formation of a CPE department will result in an enthusiastic community of faculty and staff who are fully committed to the success of our CPE students. CPE currently has no faculty with a primary affiliation to the program. All faculty are instead members of the CSSE or EE departments with secondary affiliations to CPE. The formation of a department will enable department faculty to clearly prioritize the experience of our CPE students. The CPE department will define what it
true means to be a computer engineer and develop student identity through activities, advising, clubs and classes.

- **Strengthening our curriculum**  
Formation of a CPE department will enable the creation of a dynamic, flexible and adaptive interdisciplinary Learn by Doing curriculum that educates our engineers to be industry leaders. CPE as a field is growing and changing, and it is imperative that our curriculum be nimble enough to adapt to changing needs in order to best serve our students. By creating a department with control of its own curriculum, the CPE faculty will be able to modify and implement its curriculum with ease as the field changes and create new courses specifically for the needs of the CPE population, strengthening the education of our CPE majors.

- **Strengthening our interdisciplinary opportunities**  
Due to the interdisciplinarity nature of the EE, CPE and CSSE degrees, a stronger more dynamic CPE degree will also strengthen the EE, and CSSE degree programs. In fact, it is expected that the department formation will lead to new and exciting opportunities for all students and to interact collaboratively and creatively.

- **Strengthening our corporate partnerships**  
Formation of a CPE department will result in greater visibility of the degree with our corporate partners and greater collaboration with industry to yielding excited and enthusiastic industry partners, donors and alumni. While the current program does have an advisory board, this board will be strengthened with elevation to a department and the board will be enlisted as advisors, helping to identify the needs of the computer engineer of today and tomorrow.

- **Strengthening our CPE department faculty and staff**  
Formation of a CPE department will yield an enthusiastic faculty and staff body with the motivation to build something new and impactful. It is expected that the faculty and staff will be a mix of full-time and joint appointments, drawn from the existing faculty of the CSSE and EE departments.

A department formation task force has worked diligently over the past year to reach this point. They have developed a clear and compelling vision in which the Computer Engineering Department is a place where all understand and value Computer Engineering as being more than a sum of the traditional fields from which it grew, championing collaboration, inclusivity and equity in the field while offering a dynamic and agile curriculum that reflects the ever-changing nature of the field.

This proposal has been reviewed with Provost Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore and the Provost-Deans Council. Both the Provost and the other Deans support this course of action.

For all the reasons above the College of Engineering supports this resolution.

Amy Fleischer  
Dean, College of Engineering
April 20, 2021

To the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate:
It is my pleasure to provide additional background information as it pertains to the proposal by the CPE program faculty to form a Department of Computer Engineering. This proposal is the outcome of a three-year process to address and alleviate ongoing concerns with the success of the CPE program. I have strived to foster an open and collaborative faculty-led process in which all faculty in EE, CPE, and CSSE could participate in some form to identify paths forward that would ensure the success of all. As well all know, when we work on challenging projects, a final solution will not solve every single problem, or fix every single concern because in the end some will conflict. Instead, I believe the faculty have worked collaboratively to find the solution that solves the widest number of concerns and which is acceptable to the widest number of affected faculty members.

As the process played out over the past three years, my goal has been to help all the faculty find the best path forward by fostering an open collaborative faculty-led process in which all faculty in EE/CPE/CSSE could participate in some form. This has included multiple full group meetings in which more than 50 faculty participated as well as two different working groups which included broad representation from CPE/EE/CSSE faculty. Multiple solutions were considered over this time frame, with the path that we are on now to form a department arising organically out of a process design to identify shared hopes for all three departments. In this letter I will address several requests for information from your recent report.

1.2.5 Provide a more detailed budget as it pertains to administrative support as well as administrative, faculty and curricular budget lines.
The College of Engineering has been running the CPE program for more than 30 years within our existing budget structure. It is not a new program, nor a new budget item for the college. Formation of the department is simply an administrative reorganization.

Unrelated to the formation of the CPE department, CENG has also recently restructured most of our college staff positions in the wake of the early exit program offered last fall. As the college executed this restructuring, the formation of the CPE department was considered. In terms of administrative support, based on feedback from the department chairs and program directors, the existing departments and programs within the college have been arranged into three groups, each of which shares administrative resources. Each group or “pod” distributes the departmental support tasks evenly across their staff members. These three groups are: BMED/GENE/ME, CPE/CSSE/EE and CEENVE/IME/MATE/AERO. These “pods” are supplemented by additional support for HR related tasks in the dean’s office.

With this reorganization of support, it can be seen that the administrative staff already supporting the CPE program (those from EE/CPE/CSSE) will continue to support the CPE department and the CSSE and EE departments. There are four administrative staff members
that will support these three departments, including an analyst, two ASCIIs and an ASCI. This organization will ensure a smooth transition and as little disruption as possible in support. Additional staffing needs in the CPE department include IT support and electromechanical staff support. Both of these functions have also been recently reorganized in the college. IT has transitioned from department-based support to a single college-wide team. Thus CPE will be supported by the college team. The organization of electro-mechanical technician staffing is also under review and plans are being made to roll out a program this summer with some elements of centralized support for EE/CPE/CSSE as well as for other departments which share common needs (chemical safety, mechanical safety, similar equipment). The formation of CPE as a department is being considered in this planning, and no change to technician staffing is expected. The same staff which currently supports CPE labs and faculty will continue to do so.

Similarly, we are not expecting any major shifts in the resources needed to support the faculty or curriculum as CPE moves from a program to a department. As noted, we are already currently supporting this program and the CSSE and EE departments within our college budget. It is true that as faculty move to CPE, the money allocated in the budget for faculty professional development/travel will move to the new department, as will the money to support the learn by doing aspects of the CPE curriculum. However, the EE and CSSE departments will no longer be responsible for supporting these activities as they are now. CPE focused events such as open house, IAB meetings and graduation are already supported by the budget allocated to the CPE program. CENG is transitioning to a metrics-based budget for operating costs, and extreme care will be paid to making sure that EE, CSSE, and CPE are all set up for success in this model.

As we look at resources beyond the state budget, the CENG development team is actively working with the CPE program to connect with corporations that regularly hire CPE graduates and with alumni from the program. There is a lot of excitement in these communities to support the new department financially, which will boost resources. An emphasis is being made on discretionary dollars which will give flexibility to the new department in its start-up phase. This is not expected to impact giving which supports the EE or CSSE faculty or curriculum, but is instead focused on new opportunities which independently emphasize the needs of CPE, creating enhanced revenue. Simultaneously, the EE and CSSE departments also have liaisons in CENG development who are establishing and expanding funding for those departments. Additionally, faculty members affiliated with CPE have put forward several NSF grants proposal focused on student success and engineering education, which will support department activities if awarded.

1.3.1 In light of EE and CSSE losing faculty locally to CPE in a college-level budget neutral environment, include a five-year budget projection for hiring in CPE, EE and CSSE. In particular, a clear case of the budget impact of how the hiring needs of CPE will affect the urgent and immediate hiring needs of EE and CSSE.
CENG is committed to the success of all our departments and degree programs. Hiring of faculty is an urgent need across the college, and indeed across the university. Over 96% of the CENG budget goes to personnel costs.

In the case of EE, CSSE and CPE, we are currently successfully offering the four degree programs (including software engineering) with our current faculty. Moving faculty from one reporting structure to another administratively will not impact our ability to offer these programs.

It is common across the entire college for one program/department to offer courses required for another degree program. For instance, mechanical engineering offers courses that are required in the IE, MFGE, CE, ENVE, MATE and AERO degree programs and IME offers a concentration open only to ME students. It is expected that the ability of CSSE or EE students to access and take a course that is run by the CPE department will not be affected, and vice versa for CPE students who need to take a course in the CSSE or EE departments. Thus our faculty numbers in steady-state should be sufficient to continue to offer these degree programs. It is noted that all four degree programs do have needs that the college hopes to address in the near future.

It is difficult to make five-year projections for hiring at this time, as the resources to add additional faculty are unknown. Certainly, as faulty retire or otherwise leave, we will work to replace those positions. There has been significant turnover in CSSE over the past five years and each time, replacement positions have been immediately authorized. Currently there are three active searches in CSSE (none related to CPE) including one authorized as recently as last week. CSSE has unique challenges in hiring that I am working on with the CSSE chair, Academic Personnel and the Provost. The challenges are centered around extremely high demand for PhDs in this field from other universities and from industry creating a salary structure which makes recruiting and retaining faculty a challenge.

There has also been turnover in EE but unfortunately, for reasons unrelated to CPE, there have been two failed searches in that department over the past three years, and no successful searches. The acting EE leadership has been working with the department faculty this year to clearly identify the department strategic needs, taking into account the formation of the CPE department, and it is expected that the college will be able to authorize hiring for EE next fall.

Future strategic hiring with the ability to add instead of simply replace faculty will be considered college-wide. Attention will be paid to areas with high student and employer demand and with the ability to grow the programs, as well as to areas that are considered to be under-resourced. Decisions will be made carefully at the Dean’s level with respect to any new authorized positions. In these decisions the needs of CSSE, EE and CPE will be considered equally, along with the strategic needs of the rest of the college.
I hope this explanation addresses the Executive Committee’s concerns around budget and hiring.

Amy Fleischer
Dean, College of Engineering