Minutes of the SPECIAL MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
April 2, 1996
University Union 220  3:10-5:00pm

I. Minutes: none

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none

III. Reports: none

IV. Business Item(s):

   A. Resolution Commending Steven Marx (for his efforts involving the proposed route for the State Water Project): first reading
      The Chair also commended verbally the role of the university administration in the effort to save the ancient oaks.

      MSP to move this item to a second reading.

      MSP to approve the Resolution Commending Steven Marx

   B. The Cal Poly Plan:

      Dalton referred senators to the handout entitled, "Keeping Cal Poly's Promise" which is dated March, 1996 and she retraced the steps leading to its development.

      Baker briefly recapped the external review process. The Chancellor's office has developed a broadbased fee policy which provides an umbrella for the CSU that will allow Cal Poly to bring forth the Cal Poly proposal for a differential fee increase. The team comprised of Chancellor's staff and Cal Poly Vice Presidents will convene again to map out the final shape of the plan. In the legislative area, there still is sensitivity about fee increases. and there will be no CSU fee increase for two years.

      An alumnus has committed $3 million to fund a trust for scholarships. Also the fee increase provides that one-third of revenues generated will be used to offset costs for students in financial need.

      Q. Are we going to meet student financial needs or simply mitigate them?
      R. We are trying to raise additional private funds. Also we want to explore ways to optimize the financial aid program for the students on our campus. In other words, we are looking for ways to avoid some of the restraints placed on financial aid by the system-wide approach.

      Q. I have a major concern about the possible new CSU funding policy that the state provide for one-third of the cost, student fees fund another third and development efforts raise the remaining portion. The Statewide Academic Senate has a lot of concern about raising fees to one-third. The original Cal Poly Plan has now become a system pilot. The statewide Academic Senate will be concerned that our vote will pre-empt discussion on the state's role in providing education.
      R. It is important that we keep our eye on the original premise because that original premise is still there. It is the intent of the Cal Poly Plan is to help us retain our special educational approach with lots of labs and faculty contact.
Q. Have you received further assurances from the Chancellor that our state funding level will not be reduced?
R. Yes. I am saying to the Chancellor that we will not pursue this plan if we do not get such assurance.

Q. You mentioned that a driving force was the high cost of some of the technical programs. If we recognize that some programs are more expensive to run than others, how can we provide equity of opportunity to receive funds across the campus?
R. Funds will be allocated based upon the criteria set forth in the RFP process which we have decided to try. For the first year the criteria are very narrow.

In response to questions regarding the details of the RFP process, Dalton outlined the following: There are two deadlines with the first being a concept paper which is optional. The concept papers will first go to the Academic Affairs office and to the deans. The steering committee will also look them over and copies of all of them will be available around campus for anyone who would like to see them. Those who have submitted proposals that are completely inappropriate (i.e. do not fit the narrow criteria) will be told so they don't waste their time preparing a full proposal. Final proposals are due May 13. They will be reviewed by the deans and the vice presidents who will also develop a budget identifying those proposals that should be funded. Then all proposals will go to the steering committee for its review. All comments will then go forward to Baker. Baker noted that the hope is there will be a lot of collaboration. Zingg noted that the intent of the RFP process is to provide for real consultation.

In regard to funding new faculty positions with funds obtained by the differential fee, Baker said that the decision to propose tenure-track position, lecturer positions or a combination of both will have to address the issue of quality. Clearly a department needs tenure track faculty to ensure quality of the departmental offerings. However departments that already have 100% tenured faculty positions won't be able to argue that case.

Greenwald outlined several options for action available to the Senate, one of which being to reaffirm AS-459-95/BC (November 7), Resolution on the Cal Poly Plan.

It was moved and seconded to reaffirm the November 7 resolution.

MSP to move this item to second reading status.

MSP to reaffirm the November 7 Resolution on the Cal Poly Plan and to approve the investment priorities and the RFP process.

Submitted by

Sam Lutrin, Secretary
Academic Senate