Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 2:40 pm.

I. Minutes:

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

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair: none
B. President's Office: none
C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: none
D. Statewide Senators: none
E. CFA Campus President: none
F. ASI representatives: none

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:

A. Student Throughput Committee:
   The following individuals were elected to the Student Throughput Committee:
   CAGR  Ken Scott  Agribusiness
   CAED  Ed Turnquist  Construction Management
   CBUS  Mary Beth Armstrong  Accounting
   CENG  Russ Cummings  Aero Engineering
   CLA   Dan Levi  Psychology and Human Dvlpmt
   CSM   to be announced
   PCS   George Stanton  Testing Office

B. Strategic Plan: The Chair distributed two different preambles as samples for the committee's review. The committee will be drafting a final version during winter quarter. The preamble should state that the Strategic Plan is not a license to enact the goals set forth in the document WITHOUT further consultation. Faculty are to review any policy/procedure recommendations after a thorough study has been made. The Strategic Plan is a plan upon which policy can be based. It is not intended to circumvent the normal process of program approval and policy enactment.

C. Academic Senate involvement in the budget review process:
   The Academic Senate Executive Committee will be developing a plan for review of the university budget during January 1993. Burgunder asked why the Executive Committee was doing the review instead of the Budget Committee. He felt the Executive Committee should not be a budget recommending committee when it had several other matters to look at. Carnegie responded the Budget Committee has not been able to obtain information outside of the Academic Affairs area and it was felt the Executive Committee would have more opportunity for receiving this information. The Chair added this would not be just a review of the budget but policy issues would be involved as well. He stated the committee had a responsibility to look at the overall budget and university-wide allocation of funds, and have input to this process. The recommendations of the Executive Committee will be brought to the full Senate. Brown asked if there was a way for the Executive Committee to get the information for the Budget Committee and have it do the investigation with the Executive Committee acting as coordinator. Carnegie replied that the faculty members on the Budget Committee were transitory. The other half of the committee were administrators and permanent members to the committee. The Executive Committee would
be able to do the review without administrative members determining what information was/wasn't important to view. Gooden mentioned the Executive Committee would have the disadvantage of having to learn the background structure of university budgeting in order to understand the process. Mori added that the committee is at a disadvantage when only the academic side of the budget is disclosed. We need to have the advantage of understanding the entire budget.

Carnegie stated there was a tremendous lack of faith between faculty and administration regarding budget matters. The Budget Committee is trying to build bridges between faculty and administration, but to continue to request information and continually be denied would be to continue banging one's head against the wall. Gamble stated the Executive Committee doesn't have to be an expert in budgeting, but, as a committee, it should set forth priorities and be able to say what areas money should be directed to and what areas money should not be directed to. Mueller felt it was important that members of the committee become literate in reading spreadsheets and numbers because this is how the whole university is now being operated.

Vilkitis clarified that the Executive Committee would be involved in the decision making "process." It would not be making the decisions. Carnegie expressed his hope that this effort would create more trust among faculty if faculty could see that the same degree of funding was being cut from areas outside of Academic Affairs. Brown indicated the role of the committee should be to establish direction. In order to do this, members of the committee need to understand the numbers. He felt it would be important to have the members of the Budget Committee attend the review meetings to lend their expertise.

Andrews added the Executive Committee would also need to work with the Curriculum Committee to determine a method for allocating funds to new courses since the old formulas are gone. There is no established measure of efficiency regarding the cost of instruction. Carnegie stated the Budget Committee had been told that baseline budgets would be allocated as they had been historically (mode and level). The same amounts would be allocated with modifications made according to Program Change Proposals. Budgets would move off this baseline as a result of Program Change Proposals and the planning process. There will be a three-prong approach to budgeting procedures:

- **Planning:** to be determined by the Academic Senate and the administration;
- **Development:** administration will develop the procedures to implement the planning;
- **Implementation:** requires faculty involvement. Does the development correspond to the original plan? The Senate will have to establish flags that will alert it if departments are getting off-track or if the process gets out of balance.

M/S/P to have the Executive Committee participate in the budgeting process. The review process will be determined during January 1993: recommendations will be drafted; and these recommendations will be presented to the Academic Senate. It was further decided that after looking at the figures of each area, the vice president of each area would be invited to discuss the activities of that area with the Executive Committee. Organizational charts would be requested with a description of what each area does and the costs of providing its services. (This information will be kept in-house.) This information will be reviewed before meeting with each administrator so the committee can prepare intelligent questions. Andrews enumerated other items which should be looked at: (1) what organizational structures are supported by ASI fees; (2) what are the sources and uses of all revenue received; (3) what is the percentage of the total budget these revenues represent?

VI. Discussion: none

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:10pm.

Recorded by:

Margaret Camuso, Academic Senate
MEMORANDUM

Date: December 4, 1992

To: ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

From: Jack D. Wilson, Chair
Academic Senate

Subject: Meeting During Finals Week

The Executive Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 8, 1992 from 2:30 to 4:30 in building 47 (Faculty Office Building) - room 24B, to:

1. select faculty for the Student Throughput Committee
2. make a decision on the approach we are to take in examining the budget. The enclosed page summarizes most of our thoughts from our previous discussion. Also enclosed are (a) memo from C Crabb with some definitions and other information, and (b) a memo from R Ramirez on general fund budget information

Thank you for your cooperation this quarter. I know it has been especially trying for the Executive Committee. You are tired and in the midst of exams and this is a lot to ask; but, I believe it is important to meet one more time.

I'm also enclosing two stabs at a Preamble to the Strategic Plan. I think that the discussion yesterday at the full Senate meeting pointed out the need for one.

Enclosures
THOUGHTS ON ANALYSIS OF BUDGET

I. Philosophy of budget cuts
   A. Horizontal vs. vertical cuts: In fact, the overwhelming majority of cuts to date have been horizontal. What has been the effect on programs? Look at staffing levels from FAD reports for the past four or five years.
   B. Balancing the elimination of positions versus the reduction of direct support (e.g., O&E).
   C. Classification of functions as:
      1. extremely important
      2. nice to do
   D. Recommendations in case of:
      1. 5% budget reduction
      2. 10% budget reduction
      3. 15% budget reduction

II. How to study the budget
   A. By organizational structure within:
      1. Academic Affairs
      2. Business Affairs
      3. Human Resources
      4. Information Systems
      5. Student Affairs
      6. University Relations
   B. Determine function of groups within an organization (e.g., what is the function of the Systems and Analysis Group of Academic Records under Academic Affairs?)
   C. Determine the level (if possible) and source of funding of groups (e.g., in Student Affairs, not all of the funding is from the state budget).

III. How would we expect Cal Poly to look in 5, 10 years given the best information we have about the economy and the short and long-term political support for higher education in California? How do we suggest responding?
TO: Deans
    Department Heads/Chairs
cc: W. Baker
    R. Koob
    F. Lebens
    J. Wilson
    J. Conway

FROM: A. Charles Crabb
Interim Associate Vice President for
Academic Resources

SUBJECT: Academic Affairs Budget Notes

Attached is the first in a series of budget notes from Academic Affairs. The information in the notes are meant to help faculty and staff in instructional areas better understand budget related issues that impact this campus. It is our hope that with more information faculty and staff will be able to be more active participants in the budget planning for future years.

I hope you will make an effort to distribute the notes to your faculty and staff. If there are questions that arise from the information presented in the notes or if you have topics that you feel should be covered in a future note, please feel free to contact me by PROFs (DU202) or phone (X 2186).

Attachment
Academic Affairs Budget Notes - November 30, 1992

Enrollment Numbers

There has been considerable adjustments to the budget and enrollment targets for Cal Poly over the course of the last few years. The terminology associated with the communications about the budget and enrollment has changed as well. To help the campus community understand better the enrollment issues it is important that everyone understand the terminology. This budget note is meant to help the campus community to better understand some of the terminology of some of the actions taken this year.

FTES - Full Time Equivalent Students

Based on a "full time" student taking 15 units per quarter. Calculated by taking the total number SCUs taken divided by 15.

AY FTES - Academic Year Full Time Equivalent Students

Sum of FTES for fall, winter, and spring quarters divided by 3.

SQ FTES Annualized - Summer Quarter FTES Annualized

Summer Quarter FTES divided by 3.

CY FTES - College Year Full Time Equivalent Students

Sum of AY FTES and SQ FTES Annualized.

Master Plan Enrollment Ceiling - The upper limit on the number of FTES that Cal Poly is expected to teach. Prior to 91/92 the Cal Poly Enrollment Cap was 15,000 AY FTES.

Benchmark Enrollment - The FTES enrollment that Cal Poly was originally funded for FY 93. This enrollment reflected the reduction in funding associated with the permanent budget reductions that have occurred.

Threshold Enrollment - Two percent below the benchmark enrollment. Falling below the threshold enrollment, a campus would risk having their budget reduced mid-year.

Academic Program Recovery (APR) Funds - A portion of the funds generated by the increase in the State University Fee has been set aside for the Academic Program Recovery Fund. Those campuses
that anticipated being able to teach FTES in excess of their benchmark enrollments could apply for APR funds.

Prior to FY 92, the campus enrollment was targeted at 15,000 AY - FTES. With the budget reductions that the campus has faced, the CSU has recognized that the system and individual campuses would not be able to provide access to as many students as outlined in the Master Plan.

In May of 1992, the Chancellor's Office issued a memo (BP 92-20) which outlined a possible budget reduction of 8%. In that memo the campuses were informed that enrollment reductions of up to 8% would not impact funding at the campus level. In August, coded memo BP 92-29 introduced the term "Benchmark Enrollment." The benchmark enrollment represents a 10.3% reduction from our Phase I enrollment target. The 10.3% reduction in FTES was calculated by taking the estimated 8% budget reduction ($123,020,907 for the system) divided by the system marginal costs per student ($4,433) to determine the number of students the system would not be able to serve. The August benchmark enrollment for Cal Poly was 14,203 CY-FTES.

In late September the campus received coded memo BP 92-41 which described the adjustments made to the CSU budgets as a result of the final state budget passed. The cuts made to the CSU budget exceeded those in earlier planning documents and resulted in the CSU adjusting the benchmark enrollments for FY 93. The Cal Poly benchmark enrollment prior to the APR Fund allocations was set at 13,957 CY-FTES.

In anticipation of the Legislature passing the 40% State University Fee increase, the Chancellor's Office established an Academic Program Recovery (APR) fund. The original plan was to allocate APR funds based on the ability of each campus to enroll additional FTES and provide additional sections. Based on enrollment projections and reviewing early enrollment patterns in CAPTURE, we estimated that we would be able to exceed our benchmark enrollment for fall term by 1,329 FTES. With further negotiations with the Chancellor's Office we were granted an enrollment increase of 650 FTES above our benchmark enrollment. Based on the marginal costs per FTES, the campus was allocated an additional $2,881,450. For the fall quarter, APR funds have been used to staff critical need courses which were in the schedule but for which no instructor had been identified, restore course offerings, allow positions left vacant by retirements to be refilled, and further mitigate the impacts of the increased budget reduction target.

The 650 FTES is added to the 13,957 CY-FTES Cal Poly benchmark enrollment. Our revised benchmark enrollment is now 14,607 CY-FTES or a 13,492 AY FTES.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Ed Carnegie, Chair
   Academic Senate Budget Committee

FROM: Rick Ramirez, Director
       Budget Planning and Administration

SUBJECT: General Fund Budget Information - Revisions and Additions

DATE: November 24, 1992

FILE NO: ASBC

COPIES: Attached
         ASBC Members
         (All with attachments)

Submitted is another set of the four displays of budget information I recently transmitted with explanatory footnotes added to make the data more useful. The person-years and dollars have not changed. Also attached to supplement the four tables of numbers are two line graphs and a stacked column graph.

Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person-Years</td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>Person-Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>2123.4</td>
<td>122,099,362</td>
<td>1805.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid Grants</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2,632,171</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Volume Acquisitions</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,308,825</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2,653,948</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses &amp; Equip.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9,437,356</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Reductions</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-10,798,181</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals, Expenditures</td>
<td>2123.4</td>
<td>127,333,481</td>
<td>1805.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-19,738,437</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net, State Support</td>
<td>2123.4</td>
<td>107,595,044</td>
<td>1805.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 11-24-92
FY 1992/93 General Fund, Final Budget (After Permanent Budget Cuts)
Recapitulation of Mandated Budget Reductions and Initial Campus Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Reductions to Phase 1</th>
<th>FY 1992/93 Initial Budget Allocations (after cuts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial 8% Cut</td>
<td>Additional Cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BP 92-20)</td>
<td>(BP 92-44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>-5,388,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>-813,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>-598,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations</td>
<td>-28,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>-44,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Affairs</td>
<td>-1,219,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated/Exec Mgt</td>
<td>-1,679,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals, Expenditures</td>
<td>-8,092,837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Receipts

Net, State Support

93,870,197

* CSU budget augmentation for Cal Poly from the CSU Academic Program Recovery Fund; received after reduction targets had been distributed. The A.R.F. is funded from the Fall 1992 State University Fee increase.

Date: 11-24-92
**FY 1992/93 General Fund, CSU Final Budget (November 1992)**

*Initial Budget and University Reallocations (After Permanent Reductions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget Allocations (after permanent cuts)</th>
<th>University Reallocations</th>
<th>FY 1992/93 Final Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person-Years</td>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>Staff Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>1248.9</td>
<td>61,578,660</td>
<td>15,910,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>161.9</td>
<td>6,365,683</td>
<td>1,685,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>3,399,652</td>
<td>835,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>442,821</td>
<td>133,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>523,488</td>
<td>157,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Affairs</td>
<td>275.8</td>
<td>8,580,048</td>
<td>2,585,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Management</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1,038,317</td>
<td>312,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Wide</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>167,133</td>
<td>28,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals, Expenditures</td>
<td>1805.1</td>
<td>82,095,802</td>
<td>21,668,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net, State Support</td>
<td>1805.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The following University-Wide and/or restricted allotments are contained in the Operating Expenses & Equipment category:

- State Univ. Grants, SEOP Grants, and other State-supported student aid of $4.17 million are administered in Student Affairs.
- Telephone and Postage budgets of $1.65 million and Utilities allotments of $1.89 million are scheduled in Business Affairs.

Date: 11-24-92
## General Fund Expenditures

**Summary of Past Years Actual Expenditures and 1992/93 Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988/89 [1]</td>
<td>75,143,392</td>
<td>18,614,594</td>
<td>93,757,986</td>
<td>13,872,618</td>
<td>107,630,604</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-14,099,167</td>
<td>93,531,437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOOTNOTES:**

[1] Actual year-end expenditures reported as of June 30th.


[3] Fiscal year notes on Employee Compensation Increases:
   - **FY 1988/89:** Effective June 01, 1989, +4.7% for faculty and +6.0% for non-faculty.
   - **FY 1989/90:** Effective January 01, 1990, +4.8% for faculty and +4.0% for non-faculty.
   - **FY 1990/91:** Effective January 01, 1991, +4.9% for faculty and +5.0% for non-faculty.
   - **FY 1991/92 and FY 1992/93:** No compensation increases were approved.

**Date:** 11-24-92
General Fund - Expenditures

(Dollars in Millions)

- Actual Expend.
- '86/87 Dollars*

*HEPI, 1986/87 = 100

Date: 11-24-92
General Fund - Expenditures per FTES

- Actual Expend.
- '86/87 Dollars*

HEPI, 1986/87 = 100

Date: 11-24-92
General Fund: Sources of Funds

Date: 11-24-92
The Strategic Plan is meant to set the direction for the university as it prepares to enter the 21st century.

The process of developing the Strategic Plan is perhaps as important as the document itself. The process which has involved hundreds of faculty and staff and many students over a period exceeding two years has forced these constituencies to reexamine and in some cases rethink their vision of the university as it moves ahead. The world is changing, California is changing, and Cal Poly must respond to those changes in a constructive manner. At the same time there will be the challenge to maintain the high quality of education for which this campus is well known.

When the process began, the present serious budget situation that exists in California was also just beginning. So, superimposed on the process and the plan is the reality of the severe budget cuts that have occurred over the past two years with no relief apparently promised in the near future.

The Strategic Plan sets out general goals which include a number of objectives. The goals and objectives selected by the faculty, staff and students to represent the Strategic Plan will set the direction of the university for the immediate future. However, within that framework there must be some flexibility. Some of the goals and objectives represent new ground to be broken. Careful, thoughtful planning will be required for their implementation. A document such as this cannot hope to address all the possible concerns of the campus community or the exigencies that occur from time to time.

The Strategic Plan must account for the differences in programs on this campus. There must be some latitude in some objectives that enable programs to function in a manner that makes sense for them. For example laboratories are essential to some programs. They do not necessarily make sense in others. However involving the students in their learning makes sound pedagogical sense in all programs. That is a primary reason for the success of Cal Poly measured both by the popularity of its programs and the success of its graduates in all areas. On the other hand the effort to reach the Diversity goals must be made uniformly across the campus. There can be no latitude in this effort.

In the final analysis this document is a living document. It is not carved in stone. However, the goals of the Strategic Plan determined by the university constituencies represent that which this campus shall make every possible effort to reach and attain.
PREAMBLE

Cal Poly's Strategic Plan was developed to guide the direction of the institution over the next several years. It establishes a process for achieving the mission of the university and sets forth the goals and priorities which will direct its future planning, resource allocation, and decision making.

Due to the changing conditions in higher education and budgetary uncertainties, the goals of the Strategic Plan may periodically be revised. This flexibility allows the document to remain a functional tool for strategic planning.