I. Minutes: None were read due to time constraints.

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

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair: The Chair requested that only urgent reports be given today. All others are to be e-mailed or sent to the chair for distribution.

B. President Baker: no report

C. Statewide Senators: Reports will be submitted to the Academic Senate office.

IV. Discussion Items:

A. Academic Senate Resolution on the Cal Poly Plan. (Hood) Myron Hood presented the Academic Senate Resolution on the Cal Poly Plan. President Baker spoke to the need for a change, citing needs of students, parents, alumni, faculty and staff. With increased enrollment anticipated, there is need to increase revenue, reduce cost, and improve access in order to show that the increase of quality and productivity will add value. Cal Poly must have an incentive not to lose funding because it is efficient.

Questions and concerns raised included the following:
- How can fees be raised without cutting well qualified students?
- Would more expensive programs get proportional increases?
- The report is too general and, before implementation, it must be voted upon by Academic Senate.

President Baker expects to have the fee information by November 28 for the final reading of the plan. The surveys will be tabulated by then, and the costs of various items will be available. The Steering Committee will then be able to focus on costs vs. quality, priorities and investment needed.

Q. Are we to approve "continued development of the plan" or approve this as a plan? By the December meeting, President Baker hopes to have more details concerning:
- the growth plan;
- how the plan relates to increasing the quantity of faculty hiring at entry level;
- how some 4-8 elements would affect the fee;
- definition of target numbers for goals; and
- the contract and the process.

The plan then will be available for further discussion on campus, with legislators, the CSU, etc. We could hope for action by the Board of Trustees in May. The Council of Deans would be instrumental in deciding where and what proportion of the available dollars is distributed based on the forums.

B. PSSI (Performance Salary Step Increase) Committee. Chuck Dana reviewed the policy recommendations of the committee and summarized the key decisions made. He noted that a policy must be approved by the Academic Senate by December 15, 1995, or President Baker will make all decisions.
The suggested procedure is as follows: The individual will apply (or be nominated) to the college committee. The college committee will "recommend" or "not recommend". All applications will go to the President. If collectively applications equal the number of awards available, the President must approve at least half of them. There is no ranking or any required mix from each college.

Questions and concerns raised included the following:

• What levels of review will there be?
• How many awards would be approved by the President? (He must approve at least half of the people who apply)
• What is the ranking of the types of meritorious service? (Do any carry more weight?)
• It would be helpful to know how many slots are available to give colleges a reasonable number to recommend.
• What would be a "fair" time element to use for application? Suggestions included open season for the first year, i.e. all data since last award or promotion, etc.
• The number of committee levels versus quantity of persons to serve. (Only the non-meritorious faculty could be on the committee)

This policy will exist for only this year. The policy for 96-97 will be completed by the end of spring quarter.

IV. Adjournment: MSP to adjourn at 4:58 P.M.

Submitted by

Maureen Forgeng, for Sam Lutrin
Secretary, Academic Senate