Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:15 pm.

I. Minutes: none.

II. Communications & Announcements: the following handouts were distributed:

1. **SCHEDULE FOR ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUDGET MEETINGS (1 page)**
2. **SUMMARY OF RECENT ORGANIZATION CHANGES/UNIVERSITY RELATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT (9 pp.)**
3. The Master Plan in Focus: Discussion Paper on Faculty, Instruction, and Research (1 page)
4. **CAL POLY ATHLETICS—FY 1992-93 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS (1 page)**

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: Jack Wilson observed there is presently a national search for a Dean of Graduate Studies.

B. & C. President's Office & Vice President for Academic Affairs: none.

D. Statewide Senators: Tim Kersten reported on some proposed changes in the university systems of California that are being discussed in Sacramento. [See the handout "The Master Plan in Focus: Discussion Paper on Faculty, Instruction, and Research."] He stated that the Assembly Committee on Higher Education will be meeting on February 23 to discuss these ideas. Burgunder asked who drafted the proposal. Kersten responded it was the committee's staff members. Several of the items were discussed. Kersten expressed the view that it seems like a reprise of ideas put forth previously by Assemblyman Tom Hayden. Marguerite Archie-Hudson is presently the chair of the committee, and she—and the other members—are new to the committee. Kersten urged us to contact the committee members and express our views and concerns, but he adamantly warned us against personalizing our comments.

IV. Consent Agenda: none
V. Business Items:

A. Presentation of the budget of University Relations and Development by Chuck Allen. He reported that annual support to our university by our alums has risen. In the past only 2% of our alums contributed, and that has risen presently to 15%. Last year we raised the 2nd-highest amount ever. R. Brown commented that the figures reveal we spent 2 million dollars in order to raise 5 million and asked if this was a healthy balance. Allen responded that the figures that should be consulted are on the last page of the handout: they show that the "take by University Relations and Development is only 21.1%. Gooden observed that their projected budget indicates they expect to draw increasingly upon the state general funds that come to campus. He also commented on their projections for fund raising and asked if their figures were based on some data or other reasonable foundation. Allen responded that the alumni base is growing and as our alumni grow older and they move into more lucrative and prosperous income brackets. He said we are rapidly broadening the base of support: most of the donations this year have been under $100. Gooden also asked what percentage of funds are usable immediately. Allen responded that 90% of the funds have some restrictions to them. He contrasted that figure with Northridge where 80% of the funds they raise are unrestricted. Vilkitis further elucidated that many donations to Poly are not liquid cash but come in the form of equipment, buildings, etc. Considerable discussion followed. Allen also observed that we raise the most money per student of any CSU campus. Ed Carnegie argued that we should try to divorce ourselves from complete dependency on general state funds—we need to diversify our funding sources. Gooden asked if the colleges that receive the benefits of fund raising should be taxed to help offset the expenses incurred by University Relations and Development in raising those funds. Koob answered that that policy has been tried but it creates resentment in those who are being taxed. It has been President Baker's judgement that it is worth the good will and increased morale to support fund raising centrally. Gooden asked if certain areas were given preference by University Relations and Development. In response, Koob explained that the technical areas have had an easier time raising funds [than non-technical areas]. Discussion continued. Allen closed by saying that he would like to develop an endowment the size of the budget.

B. Presentation of the budget of Athletics by John McCutcheon. He distributed a single sheet titled "CAL POLY ATHLETICS—FY 1992-93 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS." After a brief presentation of goals and objectives—which included the move to Division I sports in the NCAA—McCutcheon presented a budget overview. Andrews asked if the accounting was a sort of "shell game." McCutcheon responded that it was not and gave a detailed explanation of fund raising. Athletics has a four-prong approach to raising funds: 1) Annual Giving; 2) All Mustang Team (where a former athlete sponsors an athlete currently attending Cal Poly); 3) local boosters with the John Madden Tournament; and 4) Major givers. Gooden asked if gate receipts were contributing significantly to the budget. McCutcheon responded that Athletics is trying to establish a plan [for increasing gate revenues] and is actively reaching out to the community. Andrews asked about the status of the Diamond Club that has historically supported the Baseball Team. McCutcheon stated that he is trying to consolidate and coordinate efforts into one, so that there will be one effort instead of seventeen (one for each sport). Several asked about the status of the newly proposed football league in California. He stated we would know within a month or six weeks which teams will group together to form this new league. He predicted there will be at least four other schools in the conference: Northridge, Sacramento State, UC Davis, and UC Riverside. Southwest Utah and Bakersfield are among the other schools that are also seriously considering the possibility of joining this new league.

VII. Adjournment: the meeting was adjourned at 5:00.