Preparatory: the meeting opened at 3:14pm.

I. Minutes: none.

II. Communications and Announcements:

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost’s Office:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. ASI Representative:
G. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V.

VI. Business Items:

VI. Discussion Item(s):
A. Panel on admissions criteria and Multiple Criteria Admissions (MCA):
Panel members were: (1) Mike Botwin, Professor of Architectural Engineering (2) Phil Fetzer, campus President for CFA (3) Jim Maraviglia, Executive Director of Admissions and Recruitment (4) Roxy Peck, Associate Dean of CSM, and (5) Paul Zingg, Provost.

Maraviglia gave a brief history of the MCA that has been in existence since 1983. It has been modified several times, most recently since the passage of Proposition 209. The current admissions process is as follows: The first criterion is minimum academic scores. Next are academic factors (GPA in college prep and CSU required courses, work experience, and extracurricular activities). Bonus points are given to veterans, local area residents, students in community colleges, and first generation college students. The latest modification allows bonus points for students whose parents’ income and educational status is low.

Peck summarized the approach the Deans’ Admission Advisory Committee (DAAC) took in developing the 1998-1999 MCA Admissions Model. The charge to this committee was to retain student quality and reflect the diversity of the state. The DAAC is advisory only; it does not set policy. The previous MCA model had bonus points for ethnicity, gender, and other socioeconomic variables. With the passing of Proposition 209, state universities were prohibited from using ethnicity and race in their models for admission. After Proposition 209 education and economic factors were all that were available for application to maintain socioeconomic diversity in admissions criteria. Parents’ education and income levels were identified as consistent variables across all ten programs used in the DAAC’s study as reliable indicators for socioeconomic diversity.
The question was asked whether there was any increase in the need for remediation as a result of using these criteria during 1998-1999. Maraviglia stated that students admitted during 1998-1999 had the highest profiles in Cal Poly's history.

Botwin expressed his personal feeling that the Academic Senate had been “lied to and deceived.” The Executive Committee made its decision to approve the 1998-1999 MCA model with the promise that criteria for 1999-2000 would be brought to the full Senate. This was not done. Zingg responded by stating that the promise to the Senate had been kept in three ways: (1) by having today’s forum (2) by increasing the membership of the DAAC to include more faculty representation, and (3) since no changes to the policy had been made for the 1999-2000 year so there was nothing to bring before the Senate for discussion.

Fetzer spoke to the issue of merit and questioned its current concept. Based on his research and the research included in the current book by Bok and Bowen, *The Shape of the River*, test scores and grades may not be the best indicators of academic success. SAT scores disadvantage the admission opportunities of identifiable ethnic groups and could arguably show a preference for white and Asian students thereby violating Proposition 209. He suggested alternative admissions criteria such as interviews by faculty and/or alumni that give a more complete profile of the applicants, a personal statement written by the applicant, and class rankings. The question that should be asked is “who will take the most advantage of educational opportunities and make the greatest contribution?” Fetzer would redefine “merit” to weigh in the sense of commitment the student has towards her/his own personal academic success.

Senator Amspacher spoke against the manner in which the MCA was handled during 1998-1999 because California has a law and it seemed the MCA criteria were trying to get around it—is the University above state law? Hood responded that Governor Davis has said that the state’s universities should reflect the population of California. The MCA criteria developed by the DAAC was a useful and legally defensible tool for accomplishing this.

Zingg referred to the MCA as a tool to achieve institutional values and reminded the Senate of the two resolutions it passed last year on the value of diversity. He said that the admissions criteria should be used to provide the strongest cohort possible and to contribute to the diversity of the environment. He also returned to Fetzer’s discussion of merit as a critical issue and agreed that class rank may become a more valid instrument to measure academic achievement than test scores. He spoke of the obligation of the university to serve the State of California by providing educated graduates who will serve the state.

**B. Faculty Merit Increases (FMI) Policy:**

A draft of the new FMI policy was distributed. The policy incorporates the language of the Tentative Agreement into the PSSI policy passed by the Senate last year. A resolution on Standards and Criteria for Faculty Merit Increases was also distributed. Both the resolution and FMI procedures are available on the web at the Academic Senate site. The resolution was introduced as a first reading business item and will appear on the March 2 Senate agenda as a second reading item.

**VII. Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.
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