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

V. Business Items:

E. Resolution on Statement on Academic Freedom-Berrio, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, first reading. Amended version moved to second reading.
M. Hanson spoke in favor of the resolution. Faculty need to be able to hold differing views, but he did wonder about the disclaimer statement. M. Botwin suggested that we delete the disclaimer statement. Another suggestion was made to reword the disclaimer statement to read "Faculty shall not claim to be representing the university unless authorized to do so." R. Gooden wondered if the policy is redundant. M. Berrio said that the policy follows the AAUP statement.

F. Curriculum Proposals for the School of Architecture and Environmental Design-Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading. M/S/P as amended (Dalton/Botwin)
Attention was called to a memo written by Alice Loh concerning certain courses. T. Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee has asked for time to consider the questions raised and therefore has asked that the items in question be tabled. It was agreed to table these items.

G. Resolution on Revision of "Fairness Board Description and Procedures" to Include an Annual Reporting Clause-Wolf, Chair of the Fairness Board, first reading. Moved to second reading item. Resolution passed.

K. Stowe would like for the Senate to better oversee the operations of the Fairness Board because of complaints of unfairness from faculty in Physics. J. Harris suggested that Stowe take the complaints directly to the Fairness Board. K. Stowe said he would do that.

H. Resolution on Curriculum Proposals for the School of Business-Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading. M/S/P (Botwin/Peach)

I. Resolution on Curriculum Proposals for the School of Engineering-Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading. Passed as amended.

M. Botwin moved to delete CE 452 Wood and Wood Products in Civil Engineering from the new courses in the Civil and Environmental Engineering Department because this course is a duplication of Arch Eng 304. J. Murphy pointed out that CE 454 would also have to be deleted from the Changes to Existing Courses if the
deletion of CE452 was passed. This was considered a friendly amendment. H. Mallareddy spoke in favor of the addition of CE 452. Senate members voiced the opinion that the proposed change would actually add two new courses. L. Gamble spoke in opposition to adding a duplicate course to the curriculum in times of budget crises. The deletion of CE252 and CE454 was passed. (20 to 16).

J. Resolution on Curriculum Proposals for the School of Professional Studies—Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading. Moved to second reading. Resolution passed.

VI. Discussion

A. Resolution on Deferment of Merit Salary Adjustments—Freberg, Professor.

Discussion centered on three points. First, most senators felt that it was a good idea to defer merit salary adjustments for faculty if some jobs could be saved. Secondly, most of the senators present would not be affected by the merit salary adjustments and felt that it was unfair to deny these salary increases without any representation from the group affected. Thirdly, it was pointed out that saying faculty can do without MSAs is a bad precedent to set because it suggests that faculty can do without salary increases whenever the budget is tight which is almost every year. It was decided not to pursue this approach to saving jobs.

B. L. Dalton is concerned that the two year contract for lecturers begins a process of taking the retention of lecturers out of the peer review process. C. Andrews said that the Academic Senate had previously opposed the more frequent review of lecturers. It was viewed that lecturers in this category have greater job security than probationary faculty who are reviewed on a one year basis. L. Dalton would like to raise this issue as a governance question. J. Murphy will send this to the Personnel Policies Committee with a definite time-line for action.

C. S. Lutrin raised the question of athletic cuts. L. Freberg said that the Task Force had considered asking for a 100% cut in athletics as a symbolic action. C. Andrews said that non-athletes get an average of $500 in financial aid while athletes receive an average of $1000. Apparently, the students will be asked to finance athletics though a fee which will be voted upon next year. K. Stowe cautioned that faculty must be prepared to maintain academic standards in our programs. J. DeMers asked R. Zueschner for the reasons Recreation Administration was recommended for deletion. L. Gamble asked for the rationale in restructuring Journalism; R. Zueschner replied that Journalism was a high cost program. W. Amspacher was concerned about the cuts for Agriculture belying the lack of knowledge about the importance of agriculture in our society. The idea of keeping graduate programs while cutting undergraduate programs was questioned.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.
Memorandum

Date: 30 May, 1991

To: Tina Bailey, Chair  
    Academic Senate Curriculum Committee  
xc G. Smith, D. Ding  
Faruque, Pierce,  
Timmons, Bolt,  
M. Whiteford,  
R. Koob, G. Irvin

From: Alice Loh, Chair  
Landscape Architecture Curriculum Committee

Re: 1992-94 Catalog

Gere Smith, DH of Landscape Architecture has asked me to make changes and corrections as you requested, and forward them to you for the second reading scheduled for Thursday, May 30 during the 3:00-5:00 pm Academic Senate meeting. Enclosed, please find all the necessary paper work including the required new course proposal forms with accompanying expanded course outlines.

The following is our response to your comments, questions and suggestions:

1. LA 150 (16 units) deleted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Prerequisite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Proposal LA 150</td>
<td>Graphics Fundamentals (6 units)</td>
<td>No prerequisite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Proposal LA 151</td>
<td>Design Fundamentals (7 units)</td>
<td>No prerequisite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 110 (Existing)</td>
<td>Graphics Communication (3 units)</td>
<td>No prerequisite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. LA 212 corrected (enrollment in lecture size is 72)

3. LA 343 drop

   The units are used in increasing the value of LA 351, 352, 353 to 5 units each. This will bring the BSLA four-year curriculum in better alignment with the new BLA five-year curriculum. Since both curriculums must be offered for five to seven years, it will make it easier to teach both if the first four years of the BLA curriculum are similar to the BSLA curriculum.

4. LA 231 no change

   The correct prerequisites for this course should be LA 214, AE 237, Math 120 or 118 and 119. The reason for the addition of these prerequisites is that in the last catalog cycle LA 214 was added to the second year curriculum and was overlooked as a prerequisite for LA 231. The math and surveying prerequisites were added this year because our students have been postponing taking these courses and actually need to be taken in preparation for LA 231.

5. LA 247 corrected (Prerequisite: LA 153)

6. LA 410 changed

   Change the wording "ARC/INFO and UNIX" to "current G.I.S. software" in the course description and expanded course outline

We apologize for the typos and discrepancies in our package, and sincerely hope that our explanations are clear and acceptable.
Resolution on Deferment of Merit Salary Adjustments

WHEREAS the state CFA and the Board of Trustees have not reached an agreement to defer Merit Salary Adjustments for Faculty, and

WHEREAS MSA's will cost Cal Poly SLO approximately $1,000,000 for the 1991-92 academic year, and

WHEREAS the cost of maintaining MSA's for 1991-92 equates to approximately 18.5 faculty positions in addition to planned reductions, be it

RESOLVED that the Academic Senate strongly urge our campus CFA President to negotiate an 11 month deferment for MSA's for this campus, and be it further

RESOLVED that any funds saved as a result of MSA deferment be used for the sole purpose of maintaining existing faculty positions.

Submitted by L. Freberg, Senator, SPS
The purpose of this communication is to summarize the budget dilemma we face for the coming fiscal year, to review the process used to address the required reduction and to present the recommendations that have been made to me. In addition, Vice President Koob, through a series of letters to the campus community, has outlined a number of critical budget reduction issues facing the campus for the coming year. Several meetings have been held with various groups on the campus to present the issues and we issued a news release on May 1 outlining budget reductions recommended in areas other than Academic Affairs.

The Governor's proposed State budget presented in January contained substantially lower funding than required for the current operations of the CSU. In addition, there is a required carryover of reductions from the 1990-91 budget which has an impact on funds available for allocation. The Trustees took certain actions at the March meeting to deal with the reduced budget. These included a 20 percent increase in student fees, reallocating lottery funds, exemption of educational equity and affirmative action programs from reductions, the imposition of certain systemwide reductions and the allocation of further reductions to be determined by individual campuses. With the mandated carryover of the 1990-91 reductions, allocation of funds for some essential unmet needs, continuing the savings from 84 unfilled non-faculty positions from previous years, and estimating the 1991-92 budget allocation to the campus, it was evident that the campus would have to identify approximately $9 million in reductions from current operations. (Attachment A). After removing areas protected by legislative or Trustee policy and mandated areas, 77 percent of the remaining budget is in Academic Affairs and 23 percent in other program areas. This requires reductions of just over $7.0 million in Academic Affairs, with an estimate of 1.6 million of lottery funds available to help mitigate this reduction leaving $5.4 million in General Fund reductions for Academic Affairs (approximately 6 percent). Approximately $2 million in reductions must be made in areas outside Academic Affairs (approximately 7.5 percent).
The announcement on May 1, outlined the proposed reductions in the non-Academic Affairs areas based upon the review conducted by program administrators utilizing criteria that emphasized maintaining the educational mission of the university, maintaining the quality of the instructional programs, the preservation of the institutional infrastructure, compliance with external mandates, the preservation of the current investment in human resources, the preservation of health and safety on the campus and the future financial implications of the reduction. In summary, the proposal developed includes the permanent reduction of 47 administrative and non-faculty positions, including a permanent reduction of a minimum of 6.5 Management Personnel Program positions. While, most of the positions are either vacant or filled by individuals on part-time or temporary appointments, there is the potential for some layoffs. The University is currently exploring available alternatives for individuals affected to mitigate layoffs of as many full-time permanent personnel as possible.

These proposed budget reductions and the resulting implications were presented to affected employees and their collective bargaining unit representatives, the collective bargaining units, and the President’s Advisory Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (PACBRA).

As outlined by Vice President Koob in his April 22 communication, the instructional programs and other areas in Academic Affairs have been under review by a 14-member task force. (See Attachment B). Rather than simply allocate reductions evenly across the board to all programs and administrative units, the committee and Vice President Koob decided to make use of program evaluation criteria developed by the Academic Planning Committee as part of the university strategic planning in process this year. Using as a base the criteria from the work of the Academic Planning Committee, the task force consolidated the criteria into five evaluation areas (see Attachment C). Using data provided by the Office of Institutional Studies and department chairs, the committee spent long hours in intensive sessions reviewing programs against the criteria and making judgments on the allocation of the budget reductions. They worked evenings and weekends, and are to be commended for completing a very difficult task.

The recommendations of the committee to accommodate the $5.4 million reduction are summarized in Attachment D as expressed in terms of proposed dollar allocations by school and other administrative units. These committee recommendations were then considered collectively and individually by the deans who, after discussions with Vice President Koob, made their final recommendations yesterday which have been reviewed and endorsed by Vice President Koob. These recommendations will be presented to the President’s Advisory Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (PACBRA) on June 5 for review and comment.
Several recommendations need to be emphasized. Recognizing that the deans and Vice President Koob needed some flexibility in implementing the reductions, the committee used as a total target an amount that was 20 percent in excess of the anticipated required reductions. The recommendations of the committee are expressed simply as dollar reductions allocated to the schools. In some instances, comments and recommendations regarding specific programs are made. These have been reviewed by the deans and Vice President Koob and the resulting recommendations to me are listed below:

1. In the School of Liberal Arts, it is proposed that the Journalism Program be reduced in size and the department restructured or consolidated with other communications programs.

2. In the School of Agriculture, it is proposed to consolidate the Animal Sciences programs, phasing out sheep and swine units and to reduce the enrollment. It is proposed that the Ornamental Horticulture Program be restructured with the landscape design courses assigned to the Landscape Architecture Department and the Ornamental Horticulture Program also be reduced in size. It is further proposed to phase out the two-year technical program and to close the Horseshoeing Program.

3. It is proposed to phase out the School of Professional Studies over a period of three years based upon a number of assumptions, including:
   a. to restructure the Industrial Technology Program through a joint effort of the Schools of Business, Engineering, and Architecture and Environmental Design,
   b. to continue all viable programs in the school through a transfer and/or restructuring with other instructional programs in other schools,
   c. to phase out the Recreation Administration Program in the Physical Education Department, and
   d. to restructure the Physical Education Program and its relationship to intercollegiate athletics, including a 40 percent reduction in the P.E. activity classes.

4. In the School of Engineering, it is proposed to reorganize the Engineering Technology programs and reduce their size.

5. With regard to Athletics, while the proposal that will go to President's Advisory Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation
(PACBRA) calls for a 20 percent reduction, one of the largest of any single program area, it does not make as much of a reduction as that recommended by the committee. The committee recommended a 50 percent reduction in athletics and elimination of all P.E. activity courses. Since intercollegiate athletics receives considerable support from non-state funds and there is under development a plan to restructure intercollegiate athletics that will depend on a student referendum next year, the deans and Vice President Koob have recommended a 20 percent decrease in State support for athletics. Further, because of contract commitments, it would not be possible to realize a 50 percent budget reduction in 1991-92.

Most of these specific recommendations fall under criteria that considered program demand and resource requirements for programs combined with unnecessary overlap, thus improving the efficiency and utilization of the University's resources.

The proposed program could result in the reduction of approximately 75 faculty and administrative positions, and 16 staff positions. These reductions include a 10 percent reduction in the College Farm; a 7.5 percent reduction in the Library personnel with no reduction in the budget for acquisitions, however, there is no funding to meet inflationary cost increases for books and periodicals; and, a 60 percent reduction in Co-op Education which will be achieved by a reduction of resources to the Placement/Co-op Education Office and transferring the faculty coordination function to the instructional schools.

Finally, in addition to the reductions in non-academic programs previously announced and these outlined today in Academic Affairs, we are also looking at other administrative areas where reductions and efficiency of operations might be achieved. The Public Affairs Office as such is being closed, with some of the duties and responsibilities assigned to other areas, for a reduction of three positions. We are in the process of evaluating the integration of Facilities Administration and Business Affairs under a single vice president-level administrator. The Vice President for University Relations will continue to be held vacant for 1991-92 and funding for the Director of Student Housing will be transferred from the General Fund to the Dormitory Revenue Fund.

Because individuals in some of these positions are participating in the Early Retirement Program, and because there will be separation costs associated with others, it is unknown how much savings can be achieved during 1991-92. However, any funds generated will be used as a contingency to deal with a number of remaining budget uncertainties explained below.
We recently received notification that it did not appear that agreement with the collective bargaining units could be achieved on deferral of merit salary adjustments (MSA) for 11 months and the campuses would have to absorb the cost to pay the unfunded MSA. For Cal Poly, this will amount to an additional reduction of $837,493.

Other uncertainties are related to enrollment. The Governor's budget is predicated on an increase in enrollment for the CSU. All of the CSU enrollment increase, except for a small amount in our summer quarter, is planned at campuses other than Cal Poly. Nonetheless the CSU is expecting a reduction in the full-time equivalent student enrollment (FTES) as a result of the budget reductions. Normally, the CSU must return funds to the State if our FTES drop more than 2 percent below the budgeted level. What will happen for the coming year is not yet clear; nevertheless, a drop in enrollment will cause a shortfall in student fee income that will have to be offset in the budget. On the other hand, with the reductions being made in Academic Affairs, there may be serious registration bottlenecks which will have to be addressed. It is worth noting that efforts are being made at both the system and the campus level to address future enrollment levels that are more consistent with the resources available.

The complete management of utility costs was recently delegated to the campuses, including the responsibility to pay for rate increases and unpredictable costs which in previous years were offset by systemwide funds.

Except for faculty positions, we are still uncertain of the impact of the annuity cost associated with those participating in the Early Retirement Program.

There is also a pressing need to support an expanded Educational Equity/Ethnic Retention Program in Student Affairs and to provide increased instructional computing productivity improvements for the faculty.

The summer quarter is funded on a salary base of Associate Professor, Step 12 for the faculty positions. Actual salary expenditures are significantly higher, and the added costs have been in the past subsidized from the academic year budget. This subsidy is no longer feasible, and it is the intent of the budget plan to operate the summer quarter on a break even basis. This will require some adjustments and further adds to the uncertainty of the budget plan for the 1991-92 fiscal year.

Based upon the information provided thus far by the deans and Vice President Koob, the reductions in Academic Affairs will not require the layoff of any tenured or tenure-track faculty for 1991-92. The reductions will, however, certainly require reductions in temporary lecturer positions, both part-time and full-time, and may require layoffs of faculty in the
Faculty Early Retirement Program in some departments. Depending on how the reductions are finally accommodated at the school, department and program level, it may be necessary to layoff some individuals in other than faculty positions. As is the case with those in the other areas previously announced, every effort will be made to assist individuals within the provisions of the collective bargaining agreements.

A final word with regard to timing. As I have indicated previously, this proposal is a recommendation of the Review Task Force as implemented and modified by the Deans' Council and Vice President Koob. The proposal will be presented to the President's Advisory Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (Attachment E), Wednesday, June 5, for review and comment.

We are short on time and it is my hope and intent to announce final decisions on the budget on Friday, June 7. Accordingly, and in view of the extremely hard work of the Review Task Force and the very careful analysis and review which the members of that group conducted, combined with the extensive review by the Dean's Council and Vice President Koob, unless there are viable programmatic alternatives not yet uncovered or other compelling reasons, it is not likely that the recommendations will be significantly modified. However, we are committed to this consultative process, and if there exist better alternatives than those embodied in this proposal, we are open to hearing them through the President's Advisory Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation.

Further, I would like to emphasize the need to continue developing program evaluation criteria and procedures so that we have the appropriate means to make future informed judgments on resource allocations.
Date: 4/28/91

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
1991/92 General Fund, Support Budget
Estimation and Distribution of Budget Reduction Targets

I. Differences between the Governor's Budget and the Trustees' Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CSU Reduction ($ millions)</th>
<th>Total Est. Cal Poly Amounts</th>
<th>See page 2: Sources &amp; Uses of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Actions Reflected in the Governor's Budget (January 1991):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Change Proposals</td>
<td>$35.41</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Increases</td>
<td>$88.82</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue Section 3.80 of '90/91 Budget Act*</td>
<td>$30.18</td>
<td>$1,883,107</td>
<td>$1,883,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Incr. SU Fee &amp; NR Tuition (+SU Grants)</td>
<td>$40.27</td>
<td>$1,729,451</td>
<td>$1,729,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Maintenance &amp; Improvement</td>
<td>$53.16</td>
<td>$3,799,997</td>
<td>$3,799,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Increases</td>
<td>$11.90</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's Actions</td>
<td>$259.74</td>
<td>$7,412,555</td>
<td>$7,412,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Possible Actions to Implement the Trustees' (March 12-13) Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CSU Reduction ($ millions)</th>
<th>Total Est. Cal Poly Amounts</th>
<th>See page 2: Sources &amp; Uses of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$301,921</td>
<td>$301,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent 4.22% Non-Fac Cut (743.5)</td>
<td>$26.02</td>
<td>$1,680,000</td>
<td>$1,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent 5% MPP Cut (124.5)</td>
<td>$8.50</td>
<td>$452,500</td>
<td>$452,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Early Retirements*</td>
<td>$4.40</td>
<td>$274,560</td>
<td>$274,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defer All MSAs Eleven Months**</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>$1,049,450</td>
<td>$1,049,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical Leave Replacements (229.0)</td>
<td>$9.81</td>
<td>$621,792</td>
<td>$621,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode-and-Level (57.0 fac &amp; 15.9 non-fac)</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>($177,895)</td>
<td>($177,895)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty (330.1) &amp; Dept Chairs (12.0)</td>
<td>$15.10</td>
<td>$919,449</td>
<td>$919,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Operations-building delay (46.6)</td>
<td>$1.01</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Provisions (64.7)</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappropriate 1990/91 Savings</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Mandated Savings Targets*</td>
<td>$45.27</td>
<td>$2,824,996</td>
<td>$2,824,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Support at San Marcos (1.1)</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Actions to Implement Trustees' Plan | $142.74 | $7,946,773 |

* Estimated with a simple proration @ 6.24% for Cal Poly.
** Cal Poly budgets: Faculty ($478,507) and Non-Faculty ($570,943).

Totals, Governor's and Possible CSU Actions | $402.48 | $15,359,328 | $3,677,356 |

The $402 million is exclusive of the $57.8 million in cuts carried forward from 1990/91.
II. Estimated Cal Poly Sources and Uses of Funds

Sources of Funds

"Roll-Forward" 90/91 Savings $300,000
Non-Faculty Positions (84.9) $2,745,818
Less: Est. "MSA" budgets for 84.9 positions ($130,976)
Campus Budget Cuts
Total, Sources of Funds $2,914,842

Uses of Funds

Campus Unmet Needs:
Acad Aff-MCA/SIS+ Consultant-new $20,000
Coop Ed-continuation (2.7) $36,558
Admissions Proc-continuation (1.0) $22,692
Fin Aid Staff-new (2.0) $67,957
IS, AIX Programmer & OE-new (1.0) $83,692
IS, '88/89 Positions-continuation (3.9) $102,316
OASIS-continuation (7.2) $875,141
Personnel Staff & OE-new & cont. (2.0) $68,105
Empl Aff Action-S&W/OE-new & cont. $30,813
subtotal, Unmet Needs $1,287,274

Carry-Forward '90/91 Mandated Savings $3,770,744

Estimated Gov's Jan 1, 1991 Reductions:
Permanent Non-Faculty (48.0) $1,680,000
Permanent MPP (6.5) $452,500
Mandated Savings (Sec. 3.80 & '91/92 cut) $4,708,103
Total, Uses of Funds $11,898,621

Estimated Surplus or (Deficit) $8,983,779
Percent of "Unprotected" Campus Budget -7.5%

* As revised by Management Staff, April 24, 1991.
Date: 3/28/91

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
1991/92 General Fund, Support Budget
Estimation and Distribution of Budget Reduction Targets

III. Estimated Cal Poly Budget Reductions

| Cuts required to cover Sources & Uses deficit | 7.5% | $8,983,779 |
| Possible larger reduction | 10.0% | $11,970,000 |

IV. Distribution of Estimated Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Campus</th>
<th>Estimated (Gov's, 7.5%)</th>
<th>Possible Larger Cut (10%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs**</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>$6,917,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>$518,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>$480,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Relations</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>$30,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Administration</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>$584,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel and Employee Relations</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$32,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Affairs</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>$410,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Management</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>$8,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Affirmative Action</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$8,983,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Inclusive of a mandated 5% cut in MPP budgets.

** 1991/92 Budgets in the Lottery Education Fund of approx. $2 million would be available to mitigate Academic Affairs reductions for the Instruction Program.
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW TASK FORCE

The Task Force is a 14 faculty member group. Seven of the members, one from each individual school, were selected by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate through the process of having each Academic Senate School Caucus Chair name a representative. The other seven were selected by the administration. The original source of these nominees were faculty representation on the Academic Planning Committee, which also had been nominated by the Academic Senate School Caucus Chairs. Subsequently, two of the members asked to be replaced.

The composition of the Task Force included:

**Academic Planning Committee and/or School Representatives**

James Vilkitis (Natural Resources Management Department)
David Hatcher (Architectural Engineering Department)
Earl Keller (Accounting Department)
Jack Wilson (Mechanical Engineering Department)
Raymond Zeuschner (Speech Communication Department)
Lezlie Labhard (Home Economics Department)
Peter Jankay (Biological Sciences Department)

**Academic Senate Nominations/Representation**

Brent Hallock (School of Agriculture--Soil Science Department)
Jens Pohl (School of Architecture and Environmental Design--Architecture Department)
John Rogers (School of Business--Business Administration Department)
William Forgeng (School of Engineering--Materials Engineering Department)
John Culver (School of Liberal Arts--Political Science Department)
Laura Freberg (School of Professional Studies--Psychology and Human Development Department)
Myron Hood (School of Science and Mathematics--Mathematics Department)
CRITERIA UTILIZED BY THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW TASK FORCE

The committee utilized as a base the evaluation criteria developed by the Academic Planning Committee, but revised by the Task Force into five overall categories by which each program was subjectively ranked on a scale of 1 to 10 in five areas. These five areas were:

1. Relevancy -- consideration of Education Code 90404, support of Cal Poly goals, importance to Cal Poly community

2. Quality -- consideration of factors such as accreditation, quality of students, faculty and curriculum

3. Resource Requirements -- consideration of resource requirements, resource generation and efficient use of resources

4. Program Demand -- consideration of student demand, job placement and demand for program by California and society at large

5. Program Overlap -- consideration of unnecessary and excessive overlap within the University, the CSU system and the State.
Task Force Recommendation
• Deans Council Recommendation

Academic Affairs Proposed Budget Adjustments - 1991/92

Estimated Original Allocation
Task Force Recommendation
Deans Council Recommendation
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Academic Affairs Proposed Budget Reductions - 1991/92
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Academic Affairs Percentage Reductions - 1991/92
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### Academic Affairs Proposed Revised Budgets - 1991/92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAG</th>
<th>SAED</th>
<th>SBUS</th>
<th>SENG</th>
<th>SLA</th>
<th>SPS</th>
<th>SSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Original Allocation</strong></td>
<td>$10,062,000</td>
<td>$5,742,000</td>
<td>$4,624,000</td>
<td>$11,317,000</td>
<td>$10,098,000</td>
<td>$5,398,000</td>
<td>$10,691,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Force Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>$9,047,000</td>
<td>$5,310,000</td>
<td>$4,408,000</td>
<td>$10,669,000</td>
<td>$9,450,000</td>
<td>$4,102,000</td>
<td>$10,313,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deans Council Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>$9,047,000</td>
<td>$5,310,000</td>
<td>$4,408,000</td>
<td>$10,669,000</td>
<td>$9,450,000</td>
<td>$4,102,000</td>
<td>$10,151,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Reductions - Task Force and Deans Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAG</th>
<th>SAED</th>
<th>SBUS</th>
<th>SENG</th>
<th>SLA</th>
<th>SPS</th>
<th>SSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Force Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>($1,015,200)</td>
<td>($432,000)</td>
<td>($216,000)</td>
<td>($648,000)</td>
<td>($648,000)</td>
<td>($1,296,000)</td>
<td>($378,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deans Council Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>($1,015,200)</td>
<td>($432,000)</td>
<td>($216,000)</td>
<td>($648,000)</td>
<td>($648,000)</td>
<td>($1,296,000)</td>
<td>($540,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Units

### Academic Affairs Proposed Revised Budgets - 1991/92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UCTE</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>ESS</th>
<th>COOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Original Allocation</strong></td>
<td>$1,219,000</td>
<td>$1,422,170</td>
<td>$5,408,555</td>
<td>$2,185,615</td>
<td>$342,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Force Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>$1,003,000</td>
<td>$709,970</td>
<td>$4,868,555</td>
<td>$2,077,615</td>
<td>$126,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deans Council Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>$1,003,000</td>
<td>$1,137,170</td>
<td>$5,030,555</td>
<td>$2,077,615</td>
<td>$126,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Reductions - Task Force and Deans Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UCTE</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>ESS</th>
<th>COOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Force Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>($216,000)</td>
<td>($712,000)</td>
<td>($540,000)</td>
<td>($108,000)</td>
<td>($216,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deans Council Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>($216,000)</td>
<td>($378,000)</td>
<td>($108,000)</td>
<td>($216,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UCTE</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>ESS</th>
<th>COOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Force Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>-17.7%</td>
<td>-50.1%</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
<td>-63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deans Council Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>-17.7%</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
<td>-63.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Affairs Budget Comparisons - 1991/92

Instruction

Enrollment Support Services

Library

- Formula Generated Resources
- Anticipated Allocation Before Budget Reductions
- Anticipated Allocation After Budget Reductions
Academic Affairs Budgets as Percentage of Formula Generation - 1991/92

- Instruction
- Enrollment Support Services
- Library

Allocation as % of Formula Before Budget Reductions
Allocation as % of Formula After Budget Reductions
PARTICIPANTS IN PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS

James Landreth (Vice President, Business Affairs)
Robert Koob (Vice President, Academic Affairs)
Hazel Scott (Vice President, Student Affairs)
Art Gloster (Vice President, Information Systems)
Douglas Gerard (Executive Dean, Facilities Administration)
Mike Martin (Chair, Academic Senate's designee)
Gene Manyak (ASI President's designee)
James Conway (President of local chapter of the California Faculty Association)

Staff to committee:
Rick Ramirez (Business Affairs)
Frank Lebens (Academic Affairs)
Alan Yang (Student Affairs)