Academic Senate  
Tuesday, April 2, 1996  
UU 220, 3:00-5:00pm

I. Minutes: none

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President's Office:
C. Vice President for Academic Affairs:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. Staff Council representative:
G. ASI representatives:
H. IACC representative:
I. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
   Resolution Commending Steven Marx (for his efforts involving the proposed
   route for the State Water Project): first reading (to be distributed).

VI. Discussion Item(s):
   The Cal Poly Plan: President Baker will be in attendance for this discussion. (See
   enclosure: Keeping Cal Poly's Promise: Phase one.)

VII. Adjournment:
WHEREAS, Funding for higher education in the State of California is an unprotected category in the state budget; and

WHEREAS, Federal and State funding levels of financial aid for students are seriously threatened, and a decrease in funds from those sources could result in a larger portion of the Cal Poly budget being used for financial aid; and

WHEREAS, The current Cal Poly budget does not provide sufficient funds to maintain, replace, or upgrade the equipment needed for instructional programs; and

WHEREAS, Reduced or even constant levels of funding threaten to diminish the quality of education at Cal Poly, and such funding levels would greatly inhibit Cal Poly's ability to meet the educational demands of the future; and

WHEREAS, Enrollment growth at Cal Poly is an expectation of the Governor and the State Legislature; and

WHEREAS, Increased enrollment at Cal Poly will cause significant stress on the infrastructure of the University; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Plan is an effort to address the above concerns, and it offers the flexibility for Cal Poly to respond to additional challenges; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Plan is being developed through a collaborative process involving all constituents of the University; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly support the continued development of the Cal Poly Plan provided that revenues generated through this plan will not be used to reduce funds allocated to Cal Poly from CSU sources; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly support the continued development of the Cal Poly Plan provided that any savings resulting from innovative efficiencies in its operations be dedicated to reducing the fees charged to the students or to the local enhancement of educational quality; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly support the continued development of the Cal Poly Plan provided that the priorities of use of the additional revenues raised by this plan be determined through a collaborative process that involves all constituents of the University; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly support the continued development of the Cal Poly Plan provided that a process be established to evaluate the effectiveness of the Plan and allow for adjustments of the Plan in order to maintain and enhance educational quality; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly encourage the Cal Poly community to work together to develop a Cal Poly Plan that meets the conditions of this Resolution.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Budget Committee
November 7, 1995
WHEREAS, One of the most important aspects of the Cal Poly Plan is its promise to use any extraordinary fees* to enhance the quality of education at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, The success and continuation of the Cal Poly Plan require that the University be able to assess the plan's impact on the education process at Cal Poly; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Plan include a budgetary mechanism to account for the collection and expenditure of any extraordinary fees; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That an integral part of the Cal Poly Plan include the identification and assessment of the outcomes resulting from the expenditures of those extraordinary fees, and how they contribute to the enhancement of the quality of education at Cal Poly.

* The term "extraordinary fees" refers to any fees that would not be part of the usual CSU and Cal Poly budget; i.e., any additional fees charged to the students as a direct result of the implementation of the Cal Poly Plan.
CAL POLY PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

Keeping Cal Poly's Promise: Phase One

Preliminary Report, March 1996
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Executive Summary

Purposes and Goals

The Cal Poly Plan is a multi-year initiative to reinforce educational quality at Cal Poly in the face of significant State budget reductions that began in 1990-91. The Plan's purposes are:

- Renewal and enhancement of educational quality;
- Increased student learning and timely progress to degree completion;
- Improvement in Institutional productivity; and
- Development of accountability and assessment measures and procedures.

Planning and Consultation Process

The Cal Poly Plan is emerging through a process that integrates campus consultation with the management processes of the University. Key roles are played by:

- The deans and vice-presidents who consider University-wide issues as well as implications for their colleges or divisions.
- A Steering Committee that represents organized campus constituency groups:
  - Academic Senate
  - Associated Students, Inc. (ASI)
  - Staff Council
  - Labor Council

The Plan builds on the University’s Strategic Plan and several key campus committee reports, including studies of curricular revisions, student throughput, program review, educational equity, and quality improvement. It is based on extensive consultation with constituencies through focus groups, forums, survey research, and e-mail comments to the Cal Poly Plan's polyplan@oboe address.

Principles

The Steering Committee developed a set of principles including continued broad consultation, modest enrollment growth, and accountability for investments and outcomes. Financial support for the Cal Poly Plan derives from a partnership involving additional State funding, redirection of State tax revenues and operational efficiencies by the University, contributions from Cal Poly's friends and patrons, and fees from students. Thus, in considering a campus-based fee to support the Cal Poly Plan, the Committee emphasized that revenues from this source be supplementary to other sources and that they be invested to benefit student education directly and visibly.

The Steering Committee calls upon the creativity of the Cal Poly community in finding ways to meet the purposes of the Plan, particularly through fiscal flexibility, curricular revision, and the use of information technology.
Recommendations

Steering Committee recommendations for 1996-97 include the following:

- That Cal Poly grow by approximately 200 additional Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) during the next academic year, with support to be provided by additional State funds.
- That new investments be financed by a campus-based fee, and supported by University fund-raising, redirection of State tax revenues, and exploration of operational efficiencies.
- That a Request for Proposal (RFP) process be used to allocate revenues from the campus-based fee to ensure that investments meet the purposes and goals of the Cal Poly Plan and to encourage the best thinking campus-wide about educational quality, student progress, institutional productivity, and accountability and assessment.

In addition, the Steering Committee initiated a multi-year plan and funding strategy that integrates the first year of the Plan with future years, including the following recommendations:

- That future fee increases be phased in, up to a level not to exceed one-third of the State University Fee, with the following tentative schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fee Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-97, Year One</td>
<td>$45/quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98, Year Two</td>
<td>$93/quarter (maximum of $279 for academic year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99, Year Three</td>
<td>$120/quarter (maximum of $360 for academic year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000, Year Four</td>
<td>$120/quarter (maximum of $360 for academic year)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- That priorities for future years build on the first year, expand financial aid, and add funding for faculty and for career services:

  - **Instructional technology and equipment** to ensure student access to laboratory equipment and information technology to prepare them for life and work in the twenty-first century -- investment beginning in 1996-97;
  - **Instructional programs and academic advising**, including curricular revisions, that enable students to succeed academically and advance toward their degree goals -- investment beginning in 1996-97;
  - Tentative target of approximately 30 **tenure-track faculty positions** to support student progress to degree completion, contribute to teaching and learning productivity, assist in implementing curricular revisions, and/or apply new teaching and learning models or instructional technologies -- investment beginning in 1997-98 and expanded in 1998-99;
  - **Career services** -- investment beginning in 1997-98; and

- That confirmation of tentative fee increases and investments for future years be based on progress in attaining demonstrable results consistent with Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals.
Cal Poly Mission

As a predominantly undergraduate, comprehensive, polytechnic university serving California, the mission of Cal Poly is to discover, integrate, articulate, and apply knowledge. This it does by emphasizing teaching; engaging in research; participating in the various communities, local, state, national, and international, with which it pursues common interests; and where appropriate, providing students with the unique experience of direct involvement with the actual challenges of their disciplines in the United States and abroad.

Cal Poly is dedicated to complete respect for human rights and the development of the full potential of each of its individual members. Cal Poly is committed to providing an environment where all share in the common responsibility to safeguard each other's rights, encourage a mutual concern for individual growth and appreciate the benefits of a diverse campus community.

California Polytechnic State University Strategic Plan, as amended through 1995

This report summarizes the work of the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee from summer 1995 through winter 1996. Following campus review, the University will revise and submit the report to the California State University Board of Trustees. After briefly discussing the purposes of the Cal Poly Plan, the report addresses the campus planning and consultation process, recommendations regarding the initial year of implementation, and the elements of a multi-year plan and funding strategy.

1. Cal Poly Plan Purposes and Goals

The Cal Poly Plan is a focused multi-year plan and funding strategy to enable the University to build upon its traditions of excellence and service to the people of California, and to meet the public's expectations for continued access, quality, and increased accountability. Four linked terms express the purposes of the Plan: (1) renewal and enhancement of educational quality, (2) increased student learning and timely progress to degree completion, (3) improvement in institutional productivity, and (4) development of accountability and assessment measures and procedures. This initiative is a means toward achieving the promise of the University's Strategic Plan, adopted in 1994.
Educational Quality Goals
- Renewal and enhancement of educational programs in the face of significant reductions in State funding that began in 1990-91;
- Reinforcement of the polytechnic mission of the University and its "learn by doing" approach to education emphasizing laboratory activities, projects, and field experience;
- Preparation of graduates with state-of-the-art knowledge and competencies needed for life and work in the twenty-first century.

Student Learning and Progress Goals
- Improvements in access to classes, academic advising, and other measures to assure academic success and timely progress to degree completion;
- Moderate increase in enrollment during the academic year, consistent with the Cal Poly mission and the University’s physical resources.

Institutional Productivity Goals
- Promotion of greater productivity in learning, teaching, support, and administrative services;
- Greater efficiency in the use of physical resources and fixed costs, including the potential for expanded summer enrollment as the University explores a year-round calendar.

Accountability and Assessment Goal
- Development of measures of accountability and procedures for assessment that demonstrate the stewardship of the University to both internal and external constituents.

The Cal Poly Plan calls upon the University community to consider innovative ways to achieve these purposes and goals. In particular, the University must seek greater fiscal flexibility in the pursuit of additional revenues and in the expenditure of all revenues for educational purposes, including financial aid. The Plan asks the faculty to consider curricular revisions that support student progress and enhance teaching and learning productivity as well as meet educational quality goals. Finally, the Cal Poly Plan expects the University to make effective use of information technology in all campus operations.

The Need for a Cal Poly Plan

When Cal Poly experienced budget reductions during the early 1990s, the University deliberately reduced enrollment to minimize the effects on educational quality. Nevertheless, the campus had to undertake measures that could affect quality in the long-term, such as reductions in faculty and staff, delays in equipment replacement, cuts in operating budgets, and deferral of facility maintenance.

In the future the campus will continue to depend on the State tax revenues as its primary source of operating revenues. However, the Cal Poly Plan recognizes that these revenues alone are not likely to be sufficient to maintain the quality of education upon which the campus reputation is based nor to enable students to complete their degrees on schedule. The basis for the allocation of additional State funds does not recognize the investment required to sustain Cal Poly’s polytechnic mission and "learn by doing" approach to education. With over 70 percent of the undergraduates pursuing degrees in programs that emphasize a rich combination of theory and practice in the curriculum through laboratories and projects, the University needs both to supplement State funding and to improve its productivity to assure every student of timely progress through a quality program.

The investment and finance strategies of the Cal Poly Plan emphasize the theme of partnership and shared responsibility, connecting the following:

- The State through funding for higher education from tax revenues;
- The University through the allocation of State tax revenues and State University Fees and through operational efficiencies;
- Friends and patrons of Cal Poly through private contributions; and
- Students and their families through a campus-based fee.
2. Planning and Consultation Processes

Linkage with Earlier Initiatives and Concurrent Planning Activities

The Cal Poly Plan process builds on the Strategic Plan adopted in 1994 and the "charter university" committee reports prepared during 1994-95. In addition, the process incorporates a number of recent and concurrent studies in different divisions: e.g., "Visionary Pragmatism," general education, student throughput, program review, educational equity, and quality improvement.

Steering Committee

President Warren Baker formed the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee during Summer 1995 to help formulate the issues to be addressed, to provide communication to and from their constituencies, and to develop a consensus on the principles the Cal Poly Plan would apply. The Steering Committee draws together representatives of organized University constituency groups including the Academic Senate, Associated Students (ASI), Staff Council, and Labor Council. ¹ In addition, the President asked the deans and vice-presidents to contribute to the development of the Plan, considering University-wide issues as well as implications for their colleges or divisions. Thus, through these groups and individuals the Cal Poly Plan integrates a campus consultation and the management processes of the University.

Campus Information and Constituency Involvement

President Baker introduced the campus to the need for a Cal Poly Plan during Spring 1995 with a short Outlook publication and a series of meetings with student, faculty, and staff groups. "Keeping Cal Poly's Promise" became the theme for the 1996 Fall Conference opening session, with President Baker's remarks distributed campus-wide.

Steering Committee members have provided information and promoted understanding of the Plan among their constituencies. During Fall 1995 the faculty, staff and students sponsored focus groups and the college deans held forums to discuss issues associated with the Plan. In addition, coverage by the Mustang Daily Update and Cal Poly Report has kept the community informed. Further, the e-mail account polyplan@oboe was established for inquiries and suggestions about the Plan.

On November 28, 1995, the Academic Senate adopted a resolution encouraging the University to continue work on the Plan, subject to some important conditions regarding protection of the University's base budget and State support for enrollment growth, and campus control over the expenditure of all new revenues generated by the Plan. On January 25, 1996, the Academic Senate Executive Committee adopted another resolution, urging assessment of how the expenditure of fee revenues associated with the Cal Poly Plan meets its goals.

Survey Research

To complement group discussion of issues associated with the Cal Poly Plan, the campus sponsored a series of systematic surveys to assess opinion on the quality of education at Cal Poly and priorities for investments. The Steering Committee also had access to earlier studies, such as the "Student Throughput Study," and "Student Needs and Priorities Survey." The Cal Poly Plan surveys during Fall 1995 included a few questions posed to students during Fall and Winter CAPTURE registration and a more extensive questionnaire from a cluster sample of classes; an Academic Senate survey of all faculty and professional consultative services staff; a Human Resources survey of all State-funded, Foundation and ASI employees; and surveys by the Student Affairs Assessment and Testing Office.

¹ Members include President Warren Baker as chair; vice presidents Paul Zingg (interim), Juan Gonzalez, Frank Lebens; Academic Senate representatives Harvey Greenwald, John Hampsey, Jack Wilson; ASI representatives Cristin Brady, Mike Rocca, Tony Torres; Staff Council representatives Eric Doepel, Pat Harris, Bonnie Krupp; and Labor Council representative George Lewis.
of a sample of parents, honored alumni, and members of advisory groups. Appendix A contains a summary of investment priorities emerging from these surveys.

Cal Poly Plan Principles

To guide their deliberations the Steering Committee, deans, and vice-presidents developed a set of guiding principles for the Cal Poly Plan as fall discussions progressed. Appendix B summarizes these planning and decision-making principles and choices. Critical principles include the following:

- That planning is based on joint governance and constituency consultation;
- That modest enrollment growth will be consistent with the Cal Poly Strategic Plan;
- That revenues from a new campus-based fee will be supplementary to other revenue sources (and augmented by State funds and private contributions, and by operational efficiencies);
- That investment of such fee revenues will be of direct, visible benefit to students;
- That the University will establish measures of accountability to mark progress toward meeting Cal Poly Plan purposes; and
- That results of the Cal Poly Plan can serve as models for transferable quality and productivity improvements.

The California State University Chancellor's Office supports the development of the Cal Poly Plan because the system is interested in exploring different ways campuses can meet the challenges facing higher education as we approach the twenty-first century. Thus, Appendix B also lists the emerging understandings with the Chancellor's Office regarding the Plan.

Integration of Year One (1996-97) as part of Multi-Year Plan and Funding Strategy

During Winter 1996 the Steering Committee faced the need to make recommendations regarding the initial year of implementation of the Cal Poly Plan while at the same time addressing longer-term issues. The next section of this report contains those recommendations. Mindful that agreements about the initial year might be too narrowly focused and/or that they might set precedents that would be too binding or restrictive for future years, the Steering Committee determined that a multi-year plan and funding strategy to meet Cal Poly Plan purposes must be part of the initial agreements.

In making detailed recommendations about a campus-based fee and identifying investment priorities for 1996-97, the Steering Committee recognized that it must also adopt a process for reaching decisions about investments, resources, financial aid, and fee increases for subsequent years. Thus, the multi-year funding strategy includes the assumption of future campus-based fee increases up to a level not to exceed one-third of the State University Fee. Fee increases are to be phased in based on needs established by the multi-year plan and progress attained in reaching its goals, and through constituency consultation, particularly with the students. The multi-year funding strategy also assumes that a greater portion of fee revenues will have to be dedicated to meeting financial aid as the level of the campus-based fee increases. The last section of this report outlines the multi-year plan and the first steps toward accomplishing it.

2 The Steering Committee notes that some priorities from the campus surveys conducted during Fall 1995 cannot be met during the first year of the Cal Poly Plan with limited new fee revenues. For example, tenure-track hiring requires curriculum planning and advance recruitment, so programs cannot expect to add permanent faculty until future years. Nevertheless, the University can still meet immediate needs for classes with funds available from the CSU for enrollment growth. In other instances, the Steering Committee determined that the University should draw upon other resources to meet campus needs. Thus, the University will redirect some State tax revenues to restore library services; meet facility needs through other State funds; and increase fund-raising efforts for private scholarships and to match some technology and equipment needs.

3 This cap assumes a stable or gradually increasing State University Fee, and would be subject to review following the first four years of the Cal Poly Plan, or if the State University Fee were to change significantly.
The Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee has reached the following recommendations for 1996-97 and future years:

- That the State (CSU) support enrollment growth of 275 college year full-time equivalent students (CY FTES) -- with approximately 75 additional CY FTES during summer 1996 and 200 additional FTES during the academic year. The State will provide additional resources to support this enrollment growth from State funds and State University Fee revenues.

- That Cal Poly begin to charge a differential campus-based fee for academic year 1996-97 with the following assumptions: The Steering Committee will move forward on a comprehensive plan to address issues and priorities identified through the Cal Poly Plan process and a multi-year funding strategy, which integrates 1996-97 investments with future years. In addition, the University will initiate a focused effort to raise scholarship funds to supplement financial aid to assure that the University's financial aid program provides adequate support for needy students. Further, the University will explore no cost and low cost strategies and operational efficiencies to achieve Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals.

- That the multi-year funding strategy include the consideration of future fee increases up to a level not to exceed one-third of the State University Fee (currently $1584 for the academic year), to be phased in based on needs established by the multi-year plan and progress attained in reaching its goals, and through constituency consultation, particularly with the students. This cap assumes a stable or gradually increasing State University Fee, and would be subject to review following the first four years of the Cal Poly Plan, or if the State University Fee were to change significantly.

- That the campus-based fee for Year One be implemented in Fall 1996 as a flat fee of $45/quarter per student. (The Steering Committee acknowledges that fee levels in future years may require a different fee structure, and a larger proportion for financial aid.)

- That, for 1996-97, Cal Poly provide for additional financial needs as follows:
  - $5 of the $45/quarter campus-based fee will be devoted to supplementary financial aid for the neediest students;
  - The University will solicit matching scholarship support from private sources, including annual giving; and
  - Some investments of campus-based fee revenues to meet priorities listed below will involve student employment, e.g., as teaching, grading, and lab assistants.

- That, during 1996-97, Cal Poly invest campus-based fee revenues to improve student progress, and enhance educational quality and productivity through these initial priorities:
  - Instructional technology and equipment; and
  - Investments in instructional programs and academic advising, especially to support student progress and curriculum revision.

- That the University use a Request for Proposals (RFP) process to allocate Year One revenues to projects or activities in the two investment categories that meet Cal Poly Plan purposes. The Steering Committee will provide oversight for the process by establishing the guidelines for the RFP, particularly the outcomes sought in each of the investment categories. Proposals will be reviewed through the management processes of the University. The Steering Committee will provide final comment and advice to the President after reviewing the analysis and recommendations provided by the deans and vice-presidents.

- That the University redirect State tax revenues to begin to restore library services in 1996-97.
• That the Steering Committee consider a plan to promote student academic success and progress to degree, in part through curriculum revision and academic advising, as the first element in the multi-year plan and funding strategy.

• That the investment and funding strategy for future years be flexible to allow the University to anticipate and respond to changing circumstances.

• That the University seek to retain all revenues currently subject to system-wide pooling for State University Grants, and develop outcome-based policies for distribution of financial aid grants at Cal Poly.

• That the campus-based fee be increased during Year Two and Year Three, and then not changed in Year Four. The Steering Committee proposes the following as the total Cal Poly Plan campus-based fee per student per quarter for successive years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fee Per Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-97, Year One</td>
<td>$45/quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98, Year Two</td>
<td>$93/quarter (maximum of $279 for academic year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99, Year Three</td>
<td>$120/quarter (maximum of $360 for academic year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000, Year Four</td>
<td>$120/quarter (maximum of $360 for academic year)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• That Cal Poly invest campus-based fee revenues to improve student progress, and enhance educational quality and productivity through these accumulating priorities:

  • Instructional technology and equipment:
    Investment beginning in Year One.

  • Instructional programs and academic advising, especially to support student progress and curriculum revision:
    Investment beginning in Year One.

  • Faculty positions that enhance educational quality (especially student learning), support student progress to degree completion, contribute to teaching and learning productivity, assist in implementing curricular revisions, and/or apply new teaching and learning models or instructional technologies:
    Investment beginning in Year Two, expanded in Year Three (Target: approximately 30 new tenure-track faculty, with 15-20 to be hired for 1997-98).

  • Career services:
    Investment beginning in Year Two.

  • Financial aid:
    Investment beginning in Year One, expanded in Year Two and Year Three as campus-based fees increase, assuming supplementary University fund raising to help meet need.

• That the tentative fee increases and associated investments for future years be confirmed based on progress in attaining demonstrable outcomes each year toward the achievement of Cal Poly Plan goals and purposes.

---

4 The Steering Committee notes that initial investments in the following categories may support some pilot projects. Further, some of the continuing funds in each category except tenure-track faculty may be used for new projects or activities as well as recurring items in succeeding years.
4. Outline of Comprehensive Multi-Year Plan and Funding Strategy

(Each section of the multi-year plan will include specific objectives to be accomplished; different ways to achieve the objectives; and a schedule.)

Student Learning and Progress
During Spring Quarter 1996 administrative analysts will work with faculty, student and staff representatives to develop explicit expectations and a timetable regarding a comprehensive approach to aiding student progress to degree completion. For example, recommendations from present curriculum revision efforts, including "Visionary Pragmatism" and General Education and Breadth, should be incorporated into the Cal Poly Plan, particularly as they contribute to student progress. With a comprehensive plan in hand, it will be possible to refine funding levels required in Year Two, including funding for new permanent faculty positions. Timing is particularly important in that decisions to hire tenure-track faculty for 1997-98 need to be made in late spring to start recruitment in late summer or early fall.

- Curriculum revision
- Faculty augmentation/access to classes
- Academic advising and support
- Investments in technology
- Faculty and staff support for instruction
- Enrollment management
- Year-round operations

Educational Quality and Institutional Productivity
The first step toward this portion of the multi-year plan is to develop working definitions of quality and productivity. Focus groups and open-ended questions on the faculty and staff surveys during Fall 1995 elicited some current campus interpretations of these concepts. The RFP process for first-year investments should identify additional aspects. However, the Cal Poly Plan needs a more thorough approach, to be developed during Spring Quarter 1996 and implemented in subsequent years.

- Teaching effectiveness
- Laboratory equipment (instructional)
- Investments in technology
- Faculty and staff support for instruction
- Student support services
- No cost/low cost operational efficiencies

Accountability and Assessment
Assessment and accountability measures need to be developed that will demonstrate Cal Poly Plan accomplishments, both within the University and to external constituents.

- Definitions and measures
- RFP

Monitoring and Oversight
The process will be reviewed at the end of 1996-97.

- Steering committee
- RFP

Funding Strategy
The plan will show the contribution from each partner.

- State General Fund budget, including redirection of present revenues and no cost/low cost operational efficiencies
- Private fund-raising
- Student fee revenues
- Financial aid
### Appendix A. Combined Top Ranking from 1995 Cal Poly Plan Surveys

#### Ranking by Constituency Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FACULTY Ranking</th>
<th>STAFF Score</th>
<th>STUDENT Score</th>
<th>PARENT Score</th>
<th>ALUMNI Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEB classes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Classes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>9'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer major classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer GEB classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Assistance/Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time for course development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graders/student assistants</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduced teaching load</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching assistants</td>
<td>23'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduce class size</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn by Doing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17'</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY AND STAFF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>19'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure-track faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>release time for research</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel/professional meetings</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Support</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical/computer support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clerical/administrative support</td>
<td>23'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY-STUDENT INTERACTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career planning/placement</td>
<td>47'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student health/wellness services</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic advising</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic assistance</td>
<td>47'</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus Housing</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>18'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY AND EQUIPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment maintenance (general)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty equipment (including computers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department office equipment</td>
<td>14'</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| number returned | ±350 | ±350 | 432 | 885 | 685 | 557 | 267 | 75 |
| number of items in initial list | 57   | 57   | 28  | 24  | 24  | 15  | 8   | 8  |
| date of results reported | 15-Nov | 15-Nov | 18-Dec | 21-Nov | 21-Nov | 19-Jan | 19-Dec | 19-Jan |
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## Appendix A. Combined Top Ranking from 1995 Cal Poly Plan Surveys

### Computer Technology/Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rank by FACULTY Score for Increasing Quality and Productivity</th>
<th>Rank by STAFF Score for Increasing Quality and Productivity</th>
<th>Rank by STUDENT Score for Importance</th>
<th>Rank by PARENT Score for Importance Gap</th>
<th>Rank by ADVISORY GROUP Score for Increasing Funding</th>
<th>Rank by Honored ALUMNI Score for Increasing Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>computer labs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer lab assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructional technology access for classes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new computer equipment</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>software</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computers/equipment for majors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information technology/networks</td>
<td>19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic computer training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imaging, scanning, etc.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAN support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data access (e.g., Project ODIN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FACILITIES AND CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Facilities</th>
<th>Rank by FACULTY Score for Increasing Quality and Productivity</th>
<th>Rank by STAFF Score for Increasing Quality and Productivity</th>
<th>Rank by STUDENT Score for Importance</th>
<th>Rank by PARENT Score for Importance Gap</th>
<th>Rank by ADVISORY GROUP Score for Increasing Funding</th>
<th>Rank by Honored ALUMNI Score for Increasing Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lab availability</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional classrooms</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the top ten items are listed for each survey, except for the faculty survey which had an initial list much longer than the others.

* Denotes items which ranked among the top five for a particular group (top ten for faculty given longer list of items to rate).

* Denotes items for which ranking was tied with another item in the list.
### Planning

**Process Principles for Cal Poly Plan:**
- Build on prior committees and planning efforts, particularly the University's Strategic Plan;
- Consult with those whom Cal Poly serves:
  - Media announcements and presentations,
  - Surveys,
  - Focus groups,
  - Forums;
- Refine joint governance process that is clear, fair, consistent, and consensual, further developing the Steering Committee members' understanding of and effectiveness with the process;
- Develop an integrated multi-year plan to address the issues and priorities identified through the Cal Poly Plan process in a comprehensive manner, including a multi-year funding strategy;
- Continue Steering Committee and involvement of Vice-Presidents and Deans to monitor progress regarding student progress to degree, quality, enrollment growth, funding, improvements in efficiency and productivity;
- Develop an analytical base to support deliberations about priorities, to enable future monitoring and assessment of success, and to facilitate transferability.

### Enrollment

**Enrollment Principles for Cal Poly Plan:**
- Return to 15,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES) for the academic year (Cal Poly's Master Plan level) over the next three to five years (approximately 17,000 students);
- Rebuild summer enrollment;
- Consider Master Plan improvements to accommodate future enrollment growth to 17,400 AY FTES.

**Distribution of future enrollment growth by level and program, applying the following:**
- Cal Poly's mission with respect to the program mix,
- Diversity/representation,
- Demand for graduates,
- Facilities & equipment -- quality & capacity,
- Staff/Service capacity,
- Student and applicant quality,
- Needs of the State of California,
- Academic program/Teaching capacity,
- Community and environmental impacts.

### Finance and Investments

**Finance and Investment Principles for Cal Poly Plan:**
- Recognize Board of Trustees' policy that the State University Fee will not increase to more than one-third of the cost of a student's education;
- Continue State support for enrollment growth;
- Recognize quality and costs associated with Cal Poly mission, as stated in the campus Strategic Plan ("learn by doing" -- what makes Cal Poly unique);
- Affordability -- assure financial aid sufficient to provide at least the same level of support as at present;
- Assure access for an increasingly diverse student population;
- Regard any new campus-based fee as supplementary to other sources of revenue in the General Fund operating budget, with revenues to remain on campus, and not used to supplant current budgets;
Finance and Investments (continued)

- Derive the level of any new campus-based fee from the level of investment necessary to make a demonstrable difference toward student progress and educational quality;
- Invest revenues from any new campus-based fee solely in visible (identifiable) quality and productivity enhancements (including student progress toward degree completion);
- Invest all revenues from any new campus-based fee to directly benefit students, their teaching and learning;
- Match new campus-based student fee revenues with State funds and private contributions, to maximize Cal Poly Plan investments;
- Develop fiscal flexibility;
- Address some priorities without financial investments, through no-cost and low-cost efforts as well as operational efficiencies.

Priorities for Allocation of Campus-Based Differential Fee, considering the following:
- Ability to achieve Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals rather than pro rata allocation based on a unit's historic proportion of the campus budget;
- Findings from surveys of students, faculty, staff, parents, alumni, and advisory groups, and other forms of constituency consultation;
- Assessment of needs by divisions and colleges.

Additional Investment Considerations:
- Incentives and support sufficient to encourage faculty and staff experimentation, and innovations in student learning,
- Potential as a model for transferability, or broader applicability or benefit, beyond the unit initiating a proposal,
- Contribution to Cal Poly's Strategic Plan goal of achieving a pluralistic campus with a diverse student, faculty and staff population,
- Immediate impact as well as long-term value of investments,
- Ongoing obligations as well as fixed-term investments,
- Direct support costs associated with selected investments,
- Sequencing of investments in initial and future years.

Remaining Finance and Investment Choices:
- Future campus-based fee structure and phasing;
- Future financial aid structure, pending Board of Trustees' approval.

Process for Defining and Building Quality, Productivity, and Accountability

Principles Regarding Process for Quality, Productivity and Accountability:
- Involvement of campus constituents in defining and measuring quality and productivity;
- Accountability at institutional and program levels;
- Linkage between planning, resource allocation, and performance;
- Continuing investments in quality and productivity:
  - Student productivity -- More effective student learning; retention and progress toward degree goals; curricular flexibility;
  - Institutional productivity -- More effective use of fixed resources;
  - Individual faculty and staff productivity -- Capitalization of faculty; innovation in meeting responsibilities.

Remaining Choices Regarding Process for Quality, Productivity and Accountability:
- Structure and schedule for continuing dialog to define quality and productivity, to develop accountability measures for both, and to create internal links between performance and resource allocation.
Mutual Understandings between Cal Poly and CSU

Core themes established during summer 1995:
- Cal Poly Plan as a unified whole whose parts are inter-related and should not be unilaterally altered;
- Enrollment decisions about student mix based on sound academic reasons and the Cal Poly Strategic Plan goals (including diversity and affordability);
- State appropriations and State University Fees allocated for enrollment growth or quality enhancement not to fall below system-wide averages as a result of the Cal Poly Plan. Long-term financial arrangements to assure that Cal Poly can maintain the resources to preserve its polytechnic mission;
- Chancellor's Office to work with Cal Poly regarding financial aid policies and their impact on student access and campus revenues;
- Cal Poly and the Chancellor's Office to work together to develop definitions of costs, baselines, and timelines for assessing the fiscal impact of the Cal Poly Plan.

In addition, Cal Poly was encouraged to pursue the following:
- Fiscal flexibility, including the pursuit of other revenue sources and control the expenditure of new revenues generated through the Cal Poly Plan;
- Employee relations with respect to supplemental collective bargaining agreements;
- Initiatives to enhance institutional, student and faculty/staff quality and productivity;
- Process assessment to improve the quality and effectiveness of campus services;
- Curricular issues, including general education, articulation, and degree approval; and
- Capital improvements to accommodate future enrollment beyond 15,000 AY FTES.
March 6, 1996

To the Faculty, Staff and Students of Cal Poly:

The Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee, working with the University's deans and the vice presidents, is nearing completion of a multi-year planning and funding proposal. This proposal, to be presented this week for consideration by the University community, will be submitted for CSU System review once campus consultation has taken place. While final System approval for the Cal Poly Plan is not yet in hand, we must begin now to prepare for its implementation. As a central element in preparation for the first year of the Plan, I have authorized issuance to the faculty, staff and students of the University the attached Request for Proposals (RFP). The purpose of this RFP is to invite the best thinking of the University community about ways in which to achieve progress toward attainment of the goals of the Cal Poly Plan.

The Cal Poly Plan will help the University restore, reinforce and enhance the quality of its academic programs in the face of significant reductions in state funding which began in 1990-91. The Plan will also aid the University in preserving its polytechnic mission and the extensive laboratory and "hands-on" component of its programs. The principal goals of the Cal Poly Plan, further elaborated in the "Cal Poly Plan Preliminary Report," include:

1. Renewal and enhancement of educational quality;
2. Increased student learning and timely progress to degree completion;
3. Improvement in institutional productivity; and
4. Development of accountability and assessment measures and procedures.

In order to encourage and support progress toward attainment of these goals, the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee has recommended implementation of an undesignated campus supplemental fee, to be phased in over several years and to be supplemented by revenues from other sources—including private donations and general fund revenues. (The Chancellor's Office has been working for some time on development of a fee policy for the CSU System. It now appears that consideration of this policy by the Board of Trustees will be delayed, and this might affect the schedule of the Cal Poly Plan. Despite some uncertainty regarding the schedule for consideration of the Cal Poly Plan, I believe it is important to move ahead with preparations to initiate implementation of the Cal Poly Plan in 1996-97, including issuance of the attached RFP. With or without the funds to be derived from a supplemental student fee, the responses to the RFP will aid the University in its decisions about the allocation of funds from other sources.)
Assuming CSU System approval, it is estimated that the new student fee will generate up to two million dollars in revenues in Year One for investment in Cal Poly Plan initiatives and financial aid. Year One funds are to be focused on investments in two key priority areas:

1. **Instructional technology and equipment**, to ensure that Cal Poly students have access to the instructional equipment and information technology they will need to be prepared for life and work in the twenty-first century; and

2. **Instructional programs and academic advising** to facilitate student academic success and progress to degree.

Each proposal for Year One funds is expected to indicate how the strategies it proposes will contribute to progress in one or both of these priority areas, and how it will evaluate the success of these strategies. Proposals that identify ways to use campus resources more efficiently or that commit matching funds from other sources are especially encouraged. While the principal focus of the RFP is on 1996-97 initiatives, it also invites proposals for the hiring of new faculty (starting in Fall 1997) to help in addressing the broad purposes of the Cal Poly Plan.

Guidelines and a timetable for submission of proposals are included in the RFP. Proposals will be reviewed and evaluated by an administrative screening committee including the University deans and vice presidents. At the end of May this committee will forward its funding recommendations to the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee for review and comment, and I will make final decisions about funding after receiving the administrative committee’s recommendations and the Steering Committee’s comments.

The RFP is intended to encourage creative, forward-looking responses to both the promising opportunities and the daunting challenges that Cal Poly faces. I would like to encourage your participation in this process. I look forward to receiving your ideas and recommendations about how we can act to secure and enhance Cal Poly’s tradition of excellence and innovation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Warren J. Baker
President

Attachment
I. THE CAL POLY PLAN -- BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Cal Poly Plan is a focused multi-year plan and funding strategy to enable the University to build upon its traditions of excellence and service to the people of California, and to meet the public’s expectations for continued access, quality, and increased accountability. The overarching intent of the Plan is to reinforce the quality and effectiveness of the educational experience at Cal Poly as we prepare our graduates with the knowledge and skills needed to lead productive and satisfying lives in the twenty-first century. Additionally, to provide evidence for its accomplishments, the Cal Poly Plan will provide for the development and application of definitions, criteria, and measures to assess overall institutional success in promoting the purposes of the Plan.

During Fall 1995, the Cal Poly Plan focused first on process -- linkages with past and concurrent planning efforts (including the Cal Poly Strategic Plan and "Visionary Pragmatism"), consulting with constituencies, and increasing campus understanding of the need for a Cal Poly Plan. President Baker formed the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee during Summer 1995, with representatives from the Academic Senate, ASI, Staff Council, and Labor Council. Further, administrative analysts prepared studies of Cal Poly Plan issues such as enrollment and financial conditions. Finally, to complement group discussion of issues associated with the Cal Poly Plan, the campus sponsored a series of systematic surveys to assess opinion on the quality of education at Cal Poly and priorities for investments.

Financial analysis shows that the campus can continue to depend on the State as its primary source of operating revenues, and that additional State funds and State University Fee revenues can support modest enrollment growth. However, the Cal Poly Plan recognizes that these revenues are not sufficient to maintain the quality of education upon which the campus reputation is based, nor are they sufficient to reduce significantly the time for students to complete their degrees. The basis for the allocation of State funds for additional enrollment does not recognize the investment required to sustain Cal Poly’s polytechnic mission and "learn by doing" approach to education. With over 70 percent of the undergraduates pursuing degrees in polytechnic and professional programs that emphasize a rich combination of theory and practice in the curriculum through laboratories and projects, it is necessary to both supplement State funding and improve our productivity to assure every student timely progress through a quality program.

Thus, the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee is recommending a differential campus-based fee as one way to support investments in educational quality, increased access to classes to reduce time to degree completion, curricular innovation, and other areas that increase

---

1 Members include President Warren Baker as chair; vice presidents Paul Zingg (interim), Juan Gonzalez, Frank Lebens; Academic Senate representatives Harvey Greenwald, John Hampsey, Jack Wilson; ASI representatives Cristin Brady, Mike Rocca, Tony Torres; Staff Council representatives Eric Doepel, Pat Harris, Bonnie Knupp; and Labor Council representative George Lewis.
productivity and efficiency in learning and teaching. Cal Poly Plan Principles recognize that any new resources from a differential campus-based fee must be devoted exclusively to visible investments in the following Cal Poly Plan purposes:

- Renewal and enhancement of educational quality;
- Increased student learning and timely progress to degree completion; and
- Improvement in institutional productivity.

In addition, these investments must be accountable. Students, and the campus as a whole, must be able to identify clearly the benefits to be gained. Following campus review of the Cal Poly Plan Preliminary Report, March 1996, Cal Poly will revise and submit this report for California State University system review.²

II. CAL POLY PLAN INVESTMENT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

The Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee developed this Request for Proposal (RFP) to allocate the revenue from the proposed campus-based fees, supplemented, where possible, by revenues from other sources (including State funds and private donations). This procedure has been proposed to ensure that Cal Poly Plan fee revenues will be allocated based on the purposes and goals of the Cal Poly Plan and to encourage the best thinking campus-wide. As Cal Poly Plan fee revenues are new, campus-generated resources, they will not be allocated by existing procedures and/or formulae for allocating past General Fund revenues.

Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>RFP issued to campus community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Initial orientation meeting for potential proposers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location: Building 03, Room 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time: 12-2 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29</td>
<td>Second orientation meeting for potential proposers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location: Building 03, Room 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time: 3-5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8</td>
<td>Statement of intent due to Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs (strongly encouraged, yet optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>Final proposals due to Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>Steering Committee review of Cal Poly Plan budget for Year One</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review Process: All units and members of the Cal Poly community are invited to propose activities and/or projects for funding that meet the purposes and goals of the Cal Poly Plan. Collaborative and innovative proposals are encouraged. Review of the optional statement.

² The Chancellor’s Office has been working for some time on development of a fee policy for the CSU system. It now appears that consideration of this policy by the Board of Trustees may be delayed, which may affect the schedule of the Cal Poly Plan. Despite some uncertainty regarding the schedule for consideration of the Cal Poly Plan, the University believes that it has a strong case for its proposal and President Baker has requested that work continue on preparations to initiate implementation of the Cal Poly Plan in 1996-97.
of intent will include an assessment of how related proposals might be combined, or partnerships encouraged. Statements of Intent should be submitted directly to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs as well as to the appropriate dean or vice president. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs will keep the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee informed about all proposals submitted.

All final proposals will require signature by an authorized financial officer (i.e., dean or vice president) and by the unit responsible for managing the project or activity if selected for funding. Thus, deans and division heads may set a deadline earlier than May 13 for their review. Deans and division heads will forward all final proposals to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs with optional comments regarding how well the proposal fits college or division needs and goals, as well as Cal Poly Plan purposes. The deans and vice presidents will analyze all proposals and refer the projects and/or activities that they have recommended for funding as part of the initial Cal Poly Plan budget to the Steering Committee for review and comments.

III. CAL POLY PLAN PURPOSES, GOALS, AND PRINCIPLES

The purposes and goals of the Cal Poly Plan are further developed in the Cal Poly Plan Preliminary Report, March 1996. Appendix B of that report, Cal Poly Plan Principles and Choices, Winter 1996, lists more detailed expectations regarding the Cal Poly Plan. The finance and investment principles stress that proposals will be evaluated with respect to how they meet Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals; that experimentation and innovation will be considered; and that sequencing is important. The quality, productivity, and accountability principles emphasize campus involvement in defining these terms and determining appropriate measures. A key aspect of this RFP process is that proposers (divisions, colleges or other units, or individuals) will be responsible for showing how they will define and measure quality and productivity for the funds they request. In other words, proposers are being asked to take the initiative in defining and measuring these terms — i.e., how they should be held accountable for meeting Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals.

IV. CAL POLY PLAN INVESTMENT PRIORITIES

In order to develop a funding strategy for the Cal Poly Plan, the Steering Committee and the deans and vice presidents have drawn from the Fall 1995 surveys to establish investment priorities. These priorities constitute the basis for this RFP. Approximately $1.8 million is projected to be available for the initial year (1996-97), after setting aside $5 for financial aid from the initial campus-based fee of $45/quarter. Tentative fee increases and associated investments for future years have been identified, and will be pursued based on progress in attaining demonstrable outcomes toward achievement of Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals.

Investment Categories: The following investment priorities emerged from the Cal Poly Plan surveys (see summaries in Appendix A of the Cal Poly Plan Preliminary Report, March 1996). In order to use the limited revenues available in Year One most effectively, the Steering Committee decided to focus approximately half of the revenues on each of two categories. Please note that proposers may submit combined activities that contribute to both investment categories.

3 The Steering Committee notes that some priorities from the campus surveys conducted during Fall 1995 cannot be met during the first year of the Cal Poly Plan with limited new fee revenues. For example,
A. **Instructional Technology and Equipment** proposals should assure that Cal Poly students have access to the instructional equipment and information technology they need to be prepared for life and work in the twenty-first century. For example, such proposals might consider the following:

- State-of-the-art equipment for laboratories and classrooms;
- Advanced computer technology (hardware and software) to support instruction;
- Expanded student access to advanced computer laboratories;
- On-line access to databases, instructional services and student information.

B. **Instructional Programs and Academic Advising** proposals should focus on enabling students to succeed academically and advance toward their degree goals. The University will consider proposals in Year One that could lead to implementation in future years, recognizing that some efforts to increase student progress to degree completion or improve educational quality may require a planning period or a pilot program before full-scale implementation. Both first-year and multi-year proposals might address the following:

- Electronic access by students and advisers to student records, including the ability to assess student progress (degree audit);
- Improved academic advising;
- Improved and expanded course scheduling to meet student needs;
- Course and/or curriculum redesign to improve educational and instructional quality and to facilitate progress to degree;
- Efforts to improve instructional effectiveness;
- Expanded academic assistance programs;
- Expanded teaching, grading, and technical assistance to students and instructors to enhance access and educational quality of lab, field, and other "learn by doing" activities.

Proposals for either category for Year One should show how the project and/or activity will contribute specifically to the Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals of (1) educational quality, (2) student learning and progress to degree completion, and/or (3) productivity enhancement as well as the outcomes suggested above. Regardless of the tenure-track hiring requires curriculum planning and advance recruitment, so programs cannot expect to add permanent faculty until future years. Nevertheless, the University can still meet immediate needs for classes with funds available from the CSU for enrollment growth. In other instances, the Steering Committee determined that the University should draw upon other resources to meet campus needs. Thus, the University will redirect some State tax revenues to restore library services; meet facility needs through other State funds; and increase fund-raising efforts for private scholarships and to match some technology and equipment needs.
particular investment, all proposals must be specific as to how they are designed to enhance student knowledge and skills.

C. Faculty Positions: Tentative investment priorities for Year Two call for the addition of tenure-track faculty positions that meet Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals. As recruitment for such positions requires nearly a one-year lead time, programs wishing to hire faculty for Fall 1997 should also respond to this RFP. Requests for faculty must show how a new position would enable the program to enhance educational quality (especially student learning), support student progress to degree completion, contribute to teaching and learning productivity, assist in implementing curriculum revisions, and/or apply new teaching and learning models or instructional technologies. (Note: Faculty positions required to meet enrollment growth projections will be supported by the State funds rather than by Cal Poly Plan campus-based fee revenues.)

V. CAL POLY PLAN INVESTMENT PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Statement of Intent: Potential proposers are strongly encouraged to submit a statement of intent, covering the following items, summarized in a maximum of 1 page (single-spaced). The purposes of this optional submission are twofold: for proposers to receive some initial feedback on the relevance of their project or activity to the Cal Poly Plan, and for the University as well as deans or division heads to assist with the refinement of appropriate proposals and to facilitate cooperation among related proposals.

A. Contact: Name of unit(s) (or entity) offering the proposal; primary contact individual; campus address, telephone number and e-mail address. The proposal should also identify other participants by name where appropriate.

B. Abstract: Project title and brief summary of proposed activities, clearly identifying which investment priority area(s) the proposal addresses.

C. Purposes and Goals: Statement of how the proposed project or activities would meet the Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals emphasizing student learning and preparation of graduates with the knowledge and skills needed to lead productive and satisfying lives in the twenty-first century: (1) educational quality renewal and enhancement, (2) student learning and progress, and/or (3) productivity improvements.

Final Proposals: Final proposals must include all information provided for the statement of intent (refined), plus the following (maximum of 6 pages, single-spaced):

D. Campus Needs: Statement of how the proposed project meets needs identified by the campus community through recent surveys, focus groups, or other needs assessments. (See survey results reported in Appendix A of the Cal Poly Plan Preliminary Report, March 1996.) Note how the activities will be targeted — which campus constituencies will benefit directly from the proposal, in what ways; and what proportion of the campus community does this represent?

E. Cal Poly Plan Finance and Investment Principles: Statement of how the proposed project addresses the Finance and Investment Principles in Appendix B of the Cal Poly Plan Preliminary Report, March 1996. In particular, note to what extent the
activity is innovative in addressing student learning and its potential transferability; and the timing associated with the project (how soon will the results be visible, does the project involve start-up, one-time and/or ongoing investments, what sequencing is required?).

F. **Budget:** Estimated costs for the first year (and future years, if not one-time). Budgets should include full personnel costs (salaries or wages and benefits), equipment, installation, training, and operating expenses, and any other costs associated directly with the project activities. Proposals should indicate the extent to which they may be able to redirect or refocus existing resources (rather than require new funds), and the extent to which a unit may be able to match Cal Poly Plan funds with other sources.

G. **Assessment/Accountability Plan:** Specific evidence, or qualitative and/or quantitative measures, of the results of the proposed investment, when such evidence should be available, and the form in which the evidence will be provided. The assessment or accountability plan must show how the outcomes of specific project activities will be demonstrated, as well as how to determine the extent to which the project meets the overall purposes and goals of the Cal Poly Plan. In addition, it must include an appropriate reporting schedule.

H. **Qualifications:** Statement of the qualifications of the primary individual or unit, and other key participants, as appropriate.

I. **Financial Authority:** Signature(s) of university officials responsible for project management.

VI. CAL POLY PLAN INVESTMENT PROPOSAL SELECTION CRITERIA

The principal criteria for evaluating and prioritizing all the responses to this RFP will be the following:

A. The proposal or project’s ability to meet established Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals of (1) **educational quality,** (2) **student learning and progress,** and (3) **productivity** improvements, both immediately and in the long-term;

B. How closely the proposal reflects the Year One investment priorities identified in this RFP, or faculty hiring priorities for Year Two;

C. How well the proposal meets campus needs, especially as identified by the students through Cal Poly Plan surveys and other forms of consultation; and

D. The potential of the proposal’s assessment/accountability plan to generate credible evidence for the extent to which Cal Poly Plan goals and project objectives are attained.

In addition, the following factors will be taken into account:

E. The extent to which the proposal reflects potential reallocation of existing resources or responsibilities, which may be used to match Cal Poly Plan funds;
F. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates innovative and creative ways of serving students and improving their learning outcomes, including the introduction of new teaching and learning models;

G. The potential of the project or activity and its results for transferability beyond the unit initiating the proposal;

H. The extent to which the proposal reflects collaboration among divisions, departments, or other units; and

I. The flexibility and/or ability of the project or activities to accommodate external pressures, requirements, and scrutiny.

VII. BACKGROUND RESOURCES

In developing proposals, the Cal Poly community should draw upon a variety of recent planning and committee reports, including, but not limited to, the following: Copies of this material are available on reserve at the Kennedy Library.

California Master Plan for Higher Education

Cal Poly Strategic Plan, adopted in 1994, amended in 1995;

Charter Campus committee reports, including fiscal flexibility;

"Visionary Pragmatism" committee report, presently under consideration by the Academic Senate;

"Keeping Cal Poly's Promise," A White Paper for the Cal Poly Plan, Fall 1995;


Cal Poly Plan surveys and focus group reports, Fall 1995;

Prior surveys and studies, as appropriate -- e.g., Student Throughput Study, Student Needs and Priorities surveys;


VIII. INQUIRIES

Questions regarding this RFP or the selection process should be addressed to the following:

Vice President for Academic Affairs
X 2186

or polyplan@oboe
Keeping Cal Poly's Promise
A Cal Poly Plan Update
March 1996

Background:
In order to maintain its quality programs, Cal Poly must respond to serious external pressures facing all of public higher education: pressures to enroll more students, operate under tighter budgets, and answer demands for greater accountability.
These challenges are especially threatening to a polytechnic university with many high-cost programs. Cal Poly has to change, or it will slowly and predictably lose its ability to provide a superior education.

What have we done?
A Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee was developed with three members from each constituency on campus (students, faculty, staff and administration), and one member from the Labor Council.
The Committee was charged with the development of a proposal which would address:
- Renewal/enhancement of educational quality,
- Increased student learning and timely progress to degree completion,
- Improvement in institutional productivity, and
- Development of accountability and assessment measures and procedures.

How did we find out what was important?
During Fall Quarter, survey information was gathered from students, parents, honored alumni, former ASI Presidents, Advisory Board Members, faculty and staff. The surveys provided a picture of what people feel to be special about Cal Poly and what we could do to make the University even better. Some common themes in the student survey responses: class availability, especially in major courses, was a top concern, followed by teaching effectiveness, career planning services, library access and academic advising.

What about a fee increase?
An increase in student fees is proposed to supplement other sources of revenue. The new fees will be invested to benefit student education directly and visibly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proposed Investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>Technology and equipment,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>Instructional programs, especially to support student progress through class access, advising and curriculum revision,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>Financial Aid beginning year one and expanding in two and three, assuming supplementary University fund raising to help meet need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting next year:
- Technology and equipment,
- Instructional programs, especially to support student progress through class access, advising and curriculum revision,
- Financial Aid beginning year one and expanding in two and three, assuming supplementary University fund raising to help meet need.

Starting in Year Two:
- Career Services, and
- Faculty positions for educational quality, student progress toward degree completion, teaching and learning productivity, and implementation of curricular revisions (approx. 30 new faculty, with 15-20 to be hired for 1997-98).

How will the money be allocated?
Proposals by individuals and campus units to make improvements in the investment areas will be reviewed by the deans, vice presidents and Steering Committee. The Committee will then monitor funded activities to ensure they accomplish their goals.
How can I find out more?
Copies of the Steering Committee's initial report are available in the library, the Academic Affairs and Academic Senate Offices, the Associated Students Executive Office in the University Union 217A, and can be accessed through the Cal Poly World Wide Web Home Page. (Student members of the Steering Committee: Cristin Brady, ASI President; Tony Torres, Chair, ASI Board; Mike Rocca, ASI Board.)

What happens next?
The final proposal will be submitted to the California State University Chancellor's Office. The entire campus is welcome to comment on the proposed Plan by participating in campus forums, or sending comments to the Committee via the Academic Affairs Office or through e-mail at polyplan@oboef.

Frequently Asked Questions

Q: Why should students support the Cal Poly Plan?
A: First, students will be able to graduate faster, saving money in the long run. All students will see the quality of their education enhanced. And by protecting Cal Poly's reputation, diplomas will retain their value for all graduates.

Q: Are student fees the only source of income that will be used for improvements?
A: State tax money will be redirected toward Cal Poly Plan priorities, and private donations will be used to support programs as well as financial aid.

Q: Will Cal Poly Plan money go to the Performing Arts Center or new athletic facilities?
A: No. Investments must relate directly to students' educations.

Q: Are computer modem charges part of the Cal Poly Plan?
A: No. Modem charges will be paid only by students who want increased access to the University's computer network. Cal Poly will continue to offer a free modem pool, and students can access the network from campus computer labs at no cost.

Q: Is the administration going to buy a new campus mainframe computer with student fees?
A: No. The University is addressing this issue through a completely separate process, and no Cal Poly Plan fee revenues will be expended for this purpose.

Q: I heard the administration wants to make changes in student advising?
A: Surveys showed that students want improved advising to help them better meet their academic goals, so the Committee hopes that the campus community will make proposals in this area.

Q: Will deans determine how the money is spent?
A: Deans and vice presidents administer campus units; they will be involved in decisions. But the Steering Committee will review all requests, listen to what deans and others have to say, and then provide advice to President Baker.

Q: How will the campus learn about funding decisions?
A: There will be no secrets. A list of all proposals will be published, and the University will be told the reasons why final selections were made.

Q: How will we know the money is spent efficiently?
A: The Steering Committee will monitor the use of funds, report to the campus, and make future planning recommendations that could include changes in both the proposed student fee structure and Cal Poly Plan expenditures, depending on the performance of campus units.

Q: Why not pay for more library hours?
A: Redirected State money will be used to restore library hours.

Q: What's being done for students with financial need?
A: Additional financial aid will come next year from student fees, private donations, and other University resources. More employment opportunities on campus will also help out. In following years, about one-third of all supplemental fees will be set aside for financial aid.
Background Statement: Steven Marx has been actively involved in trying to prevent (or minimize) the environmental damage which will result from having the State Water Project pipeline run through the Cal Poly campus and he has generated significant interest and support for preserving the campus environment. An agreement had been reached with the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to stop work on the pipeline construction pending discussions with Cal Poly concerning appropriate environmental safeguards. Dr. Marx was concerned that the construction crew would ignore the stop order and begin construction anyway. He arrived early on Thursday morning, March 21, and discovered that construction was about to begin in spite of the stop order. He informed Frank Lebens and stood in front of the bulldozer in order to prevent the continuation of the construction. Steven took considerable risk to himself but was successful in preventing further construction. As a result of these actions an agreement was reached that would reduce the environmental damage to the campus.

WHEREAS, Steven Marx has significantly raised the awareness of environmental issues on the Cal Poly campus; and

WHEREAS, Steven Marx has helped create an alliance of faculty, staff, students, administration, and community members to preserve the environmental at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, Steven Marx has taken actions at considerable personal risk; and

WHEREAS, These actions have helped reduce the scope of environmental damage to the campus; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That Steven Marx be commended and thanked for his work on behalf of the campus environment; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be permanently recorded in the Minutes of the Academic Senate.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
April 2, 1996