I. Minutes:
   Approval of the February 9, 1988 Minutes (pp. 5-7).

II. Communications:
   A. Materials available for reading in the Academic Senate office (pp. 2-4).
   B. President Baker has approved the following resolutions:
      AS-265-88 Resolution on Miscellaneous Catalog Changes
      AS-267-88 Resolution on GE&B...Course Proposal(s)...for TH 210X and TH 328X
      AS-269-88 Resolution on the Foundation Election Process
   C. Memo from Wilson to Deans dated 2/3/88 re Lottery Funding for 1988-89 (pp.
      8-9).
   D. Memo from Naples to Presidents dated 1/29/88 re Administrative Fellows
      Program for 1988-89 (pp. 10-17).
   E. Memo from West to IRM Designees re Call for Proposals for Academic
      Computing Enhancement Institute Project Funding (pp. 18-19).

III. Reports:
   A. President
   B. Academic Affairs Office
   C. Statewide Senators

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
   A. Resolution on Indirect Costs Utilization: CAM 543-Jamieson, Chair of
      the Research Committee, Second Reading (pp. 20-25).
   B. GE&B Course Proposal for PSY 494-Lewis, Chair of the GE&B Committee,
      Second Reading (pp. 26-28).
   C. Resolution on Enrollment Growth to 15,000 FTE and Beyond-Dalton,
      Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, First Reading (pp. 29-
      40).
   D. Resolution on Report on Faculty Position Control-Conway, Chair of
      the Budget Committee, First Reading (pp. 41-45).

VI. Discussion Items:

VII. Adjournment:
Materials Available for Reading in the Academic Senate Office (FOB 25H)

(New reading materials highlighted in bold)

1987-88 AY  Minutes from the bimonthly meetings of the Multiple-Criteria Admissions Program Technical Study Group (Cal Poly, SLO)

June 1987  Documents/statistics/reports/etc. provided at the Student Retention Conference in June 1987

6/10/87  Correspondence from Eric Seastrand reallocating lottery funds to the CSU and Board of Trustees' Committee on Finance Report on the Lottery Revenue Budget Process

6/22/87  Publications from the Office of the Chancellor re Teacher Education

7/14/87  CSU Committee of the Whole: New Priority Topics for 1987-88


July 1987  The Master Plan Renewed, Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education

8/3/87  Quarterly Internal Report on Enrollment-Summer 1987 (Cal Poly, SLO)

Aug 1987  Subject Matter Assessment of Prospective English Teachers (CSU)

9/4/87  Capital Outlay Program 1988-89

9/15/87  Board of Trustees' Agenda, September 15/16, 1987

9/23/87  1986/87 Discretionary Fund Reports (Cal Poly, SLO)

10/12/87  Executive Review Policies and Procedures

10/20/87  Funding Excellence in Higher Education (CPEC)
The State's Interest in Student Outcomes Assessment (CPEC)
State Incentive Funding Approaches for Promoting Quality in California Higher Education: A Prospectus (CPEC)
Assembly Bill #2016 - Higher Education Talent Development


10/28/87  State Incentive Funding Approaches (memo from Kerschner to VPAA's dated 10/28/87)

10/30/87  Organizational charts of administrative positions throughout the CSU system (CSU)

11/2/87  Academic Mainframe Computer Replacement Plan (CSU)

11/5/87  Earthquake Status Report (CSU, Los Angeles)

11/6/87  Quarterly Internal Report on Enrollment-Fall 1987 (Cal Poly, SLO)
Materials Available for Reading in the Academic Senate Office (FOB 25H)
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11/12/87 Retreat Rights for Academic Administrators (Cal Poly, SLO)
11/16/87 Summary Notes of the President's Council Meetings (Cal Poly, SLO)
11/16/87 Status of Current Major Capital Outlay Projects (Cal Poly, SLO)
Nov 1987 Computer-Aided Productivity Center (Cal Poly SLO)
Nov 1987 Development Activities of the University Relations Division (Cal Poly, SLO)
Nov 1987 Recommendations of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan
Nov 1987 Cal Poly IBM Specialty Center (Cal Poly, SLO)
11/13/87 Internationalizing Undergraduate Education Conference Highlights (CSU)
11/13/87 Asilomar Retreat of the Academic Senate CSU (Nov 13-15, 1987). Summary of the Executive Committee and campus Senate chairs' meetings (Academic Senate CSU)
11/30/87 Allocation of MPPP Awards 1987-88 (number of awards to each school) (Cal Poly, SLO)
12/1/87 Summer Bridge and Intensive Learning Experience: Second Year Evaluation (CSU)
1/12/88 CSU Systemwide Full-Time Faculty by Tenure Status, Sex and Ethnicity: 1975-1987 (CSU)

Jan '88 CALIFORNIA DEMOGRAPHICS: IMPACT ON EDUCATION - CAL POLY. HAROLD HODGKINSON, A LECTURE IN CHUMASH AUDITORIUM (Video Cassette)
CALIFORNIA: THE STATE AND ITS EDUCATION SYSTEM by Harold L. Hodgkinson (booklet)

1/14/88 Enrollment by Ethnic Categories in the California State Colleges (Cal Poly)
1/6/88 Report of the Technical Study Group on the Multiple-Criteria Applicant Selection Process (Cal Poly)
1/14/88 Statistical Abstract to July 1986 (CSU)
1/20/88 CSU IBM Academic Mainframe Speciality Center (CSU)
1/22/88 Call for Proposals for Academic Computing Enhancement Institute Project Funding (CSU)
1/27/88  Status Report #3 - FY 1988/89 Governor's Budget (Cal Poly)
1/28/88  State Policy for Faculty Development in Public Higher Education (California Postsecondary Education Commission)
1/29/88  Foundation Financial Reports for December 31, 1987 (Cal Poly Foundation)
Feb '88   Exploring Faculty Development in Higher Education (California Postsecondary Education Commission)
2/1/88   Joint Legislative Hearing on the Master Plan (Academic Senate CSU)
2/3/88   Lottery Funding for 1988-89/General Guidelines (CSU)
1/3/88   CPEC High School Eligibility Study (Trustees of the CSU)
2/4/88   Size, Growth, and Cost of Administration at the California State University (California Postsecondary Education Commission)
2/8/88   Proposal on the Performing Arts Center (Cal Poly)
2/8/88   Campus Liability Regarding Personal Property of Faculty Members (Trustees of the CSU)
2/9/88   CSU Admissions Criteria (Academic Senate CSU)
We have received preliminary information from the Chancellor's Office staff about Lottery Funds available for 1988-89. Best estimates are that there will not be any radical changes from last year's categories and guidelines.

Following the practice used in the 1987/88 lottery allocations program, the Instructional Program Resources Advisory Committee has been given responsibility for making recommendations about the allocation of these funds on campus. To give faculty and staff as much time as possible to prepare proposals, IPRAC recommends issuing a call for proposals immediately. The call assumes that when the CSU allocations and guidelines reach campus, there will not be significant alterations in guidelines or funding categories. If there are, we should be able to make adequate adjustments within the discretionary authority granted to the campus.

I accept the committee's recommendation that the highest priority be given to funding equity programs, and the full discretionary authority to move funds from one category to another be used to direct funds toward equity programs (assuming this is consistent with the guidelines we eventually receive from the Chancellor's Office). If the number, amount, and quality of equity proposals warrant additional funding, the campus may request permission to redirect funds from one category to another subject to the eventual guidelines. Once the proposals have been submitted and are reviewed, IPRAC will recommend on this matter.

Proposals for equity programs should be within the guidelines of the Cal Poly Equity Plan and the individual plans developed by each instructional school. Proposals from units outside the Academic Affairs Division should be tied to the school equity plans, or to the support of activities evolving from those plans. Instructional schools are encouraged to develop proposals cooperatively with support units outside the Academic Affairs Division as appropriate.
It is anticipated that funding will be available in the following competitive categories:

1. Discretionary
2. Non Formula Based Instructional Equipment
3. Distinguished Visiting Scholars/Lecturers/Artists
4. Instructional Program Improvement/Enrichment
5. Student Internships and Community Service Programs
6. Educational Equity
   a. Faculty Mentoring Program
   b. Retention Incentive Program

As was the case last year, proposals are to be kept brief—no more than two pages. Attached is the format for proposals and the 1987-88 guidelines for funding categories. As information on the 1988-89 Lottey Revenue Budget is made available by the Chancellor's Office, it will be forwarded to you. The budget summary and the program description are to be submitted to Frank Lebens no later than March 18, 1988. If you have any questions regarding the process, please contact Frank Lebens, Associate Vice President for Academic Resources.

Attachments
Date: January 29, 1988

To: Presidents

From: Caesar J. Naples
Vice Chancellor
Faculty and Staff Relations

Subject: Administrative Fellows Program for 1988-89

We are pleased to announce the initiation of the 1988-89 Administrative Fellows Program. The Trustees' proposed budget provides support for the Program and although the funding must still go through review by the executive and legislative branches of the State, we believe that the Program will continue to receive full or partial support. Despite the budget uncertainties, it is advisable to provide as much lead time for the receipt and screening of applications as possible. Therefore, the timetable which follows calls for the initiation of the program in February. It is important to note in all announcements of the Program, however, that appointments will be contingent upon funding being provided in the final Budget which will not be signed until June 30, 1988.

Announcement

Attached is an "Announcement of the CSU Administrative Fellows Program" which includes information regarding: the timetable for applicants; description of the program; selection process; application forms; and confidential evaluation forms.

There are 30 complete packets for the large campuses and 15 for others. Please duplicate more packets as needed. The format of the 1988-89 Administrative Fellows Program will be essentially the same as it was in 1987-88.

(over)

Distribution: w/o attachments

Vice President, Academic Affairs
Vice Presidents, Administration
Personnel Officers
Affirmative Action Officers
Associate Vice Presidents/Deans
Faculty Affairs
Administrative Fellows Campus Coord.'s
Chair, Statewide Academic Senate
Chairs, Campus Academic Senates
Business Managers
Payroll Supervisors
Auxiliary Organizations
Chancellor Office Staff
Candidates

The Program is directed toward individuals, especially women and minorities who have had administrative experience, or who have demonstrated the potential for administration through leadership activities that may have involved organizing work, accomplishing tasks through others, decision making, or problem solving.

We have a continued interest in attracting, along with those mentioned above, applicants who have had appreciable experience in academic administration and are seeking development for executive positions and who could benefit from the opportunity to work in an environment which involves styles of management, geographical locations, community involvement, academic programs and governance that are different from those on their home campuses. Those who have had significant administrative experience in positions such as Associate Deans, Deans, Business Manager, Director, etc., and are seeking the opportunity for advancement to Dean, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice President for Business or Administrative Affairs, President, etc., and who have potential for executive assignments would fit into this category.

In summary, because there is a need to increase the representation of women and minorities at all levels of administration and management in the CSU, we would like to attract candidates with a variety of types of administrative experience. Especially tailored learning plans and, if necessary, special workshop experiences can be formulated to meet the development needs and the career objectives of the successful candidates.

Publicity

To assure that those who are interested in applying for the program are aware of its existence and its requirements, we are requesting that you give the program as much publicity as possible on the campus. We will be asking the fellows and mentors who have participated in the program to help make it known on campus and to encourage those with potential to apply. We will also keep your Administrative Fellows Campus Coordinators informed of the program so that they can serve as campus liaisons for questions or to facilitate the application process. Special emphasis should be given to making the program known to women and ethnic minorities.

You will know best where to place the responsibility for the administration of the program, for facilitating the paperwork and for submitting the general statistical data that are required.

Attached is a draft of a one-page announcement of the program. You may find it helpful in preparing your informational material. (See Attachment #1)

General Guidelines for the Campus

The campus selection process and the selection criteria are outlined in the attached announcement.

Campus selection committees should interview candidates in the process of making recommendations to the Presidents, and should submit with their recommendations to the President, short evaluations on each of the candidates.
SELECTION PROCESS FOR MENTORS

The President should recommend persons ordinarily holding positions at the Dean's level and above to serve as mentors. Persons to be recommended as mentors should possess good counseling and supervisory skills; be perceived as a good role model; be willing to commit the time involved and be willing to provide the fellows with experiences that enhance their personal and professional development.

The Presidents should send their recommendations for mentors to the Chancellor at the time they submit the names of the candidates for the Fellowship Program.

Responsibilities of Campus Mentors

Because the needs, strengths, and experiences of each fellow, as well as the special character and needs of each campus will vary considerably, guidelines and specific responsibilities for mentors must be broadly articulated. Moreover, we believe that the most rewarding Fellowship experiences will be made possible where mentors and fellows cooperatively work out specific details concerning mentor responsibilities and reduce such details to a "learning plan." This model, based as it is on mutual consent, will provide an effective tool for evaluating Program participants, as well as the overall program.

There are, however, some minimal universal responsibilities that are applicable to all mentors.

It is expected, for example, that mentors will identify and assign each fellow to a specific set of managerial tasks which will require the gathering of facts about a particular problem or campus concern, analysis of those facts, development of appropriate recommendations for solving the problem or concern and defense of those recommendations before the principal decision-making bodies of the campus.

Additionally, each mentor must make a commitment to involve the fellow assigned to her/his office in all aspects of the decisional processes of that office.

If desirable, fellows may be assigned on occasion to submentors for specific projects, particularly when work assignments involve detailed and technical procedures and practices, or for orientation and training in other program areas.
Following is a list of other somewhat generalized responsibilities of campus mentors. The mentor must:

1. Make sure that the fellow has an appropriate physical working location in close proximity to the mentor's office.

2. With the fellow, develop and revise as necessary, the Learning Plan.

3. Expedite the fellow's acceptance on and knowledge of the campus by developing and exposing the fellow to a broad-based orientation to the total operation of the campus, including its governance structure.

4. Schedule regular meetings with the fellow (weekly meetings are the minimum).

5. Develop and assign the fellow to carry out a series of short assignments of a diverse nature which will expose her/him to the total human political environment of the campus.

6. Build in both observer and participant roles in restructuring the fellowship role with the fellow.

7. Assign the fellow to planning sessions, work groups and decision-making activities throughout the campus community.

8. Structure the fellow's assignments to provide for interplay between the solution of specific problems involving real people and actual situations and the underlying theoretical policy issues and implications of these solutions.

9. Provide the fellow with literature such as catalogs, descriptions of special programs, organization charts, management studies and audits, reports, and studies from the Chancellor Office.

10. Participate with the fellow in developing mid-year and final evaluations of the fellow's performance.

It must be remembered that mentors are the key to a successful Fellowship Program. Accordingly, it will be desirable for mentors to hold positions in the offices of Presidents, Vice Presidents, or Deans. Where appropriate, joint mentorships may be developed.
Information for Reports

The Legislative Analyst's Office has asked us for extensive information about the Program. Please keep records that will answer the following questions and submit them along with the names of the candidates recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Pay Plan Employee</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Other United Employee</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. No. of application packets completed or filed.

2. No. of candidates recommended by campus selection committee to President.

3. No. of candidates recommended by President to Chancellor.

If you have any questions about this Program, please call Dr. Tim Dong at (ATSS 635-5540). Dr. Dong would be pleased to respond to any phone inquiries from potential applicants also.
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(or fill out a Confidential Evaluation Form). Efforts should be made to include ethnic minorities, women and disabled employees on the campus selection committees.

In evaluating the candidates from the applications, references and interviews, please consider along with all other factors, the ways in which the successful fellows' experiences can be utilized if and when they return to their home campuses following the Fellowship. Although some fellows have moved to other positions or to other campuses after their Fellowships, others return to their home campuses. Since it is desirable that the "post fellowship" experiences (such as special or interim assignments) build on the year of training and development of the fellow (as a benefit for both the fellows and the campuses), this factor should be considered as recommendations are made by the campus committee, the President, and the systemwide committee.

**Mentors**

Presidents should submit to the FSR Fellow's Program Coordinator the names of those persons who would be appropriate mentors. The persons recommended ordinarily should hold positions at the Dean's level or above. The FSR Coordinator is available to answer any questions about the role and responsibilities of the mentors and discuss the purpose of the Administrative Fellows Program. As fellows are selected by the Chancellor's Committee, the Presidents will be asked for further assistance about placement of fellows with mentors on their campuses.

Attachment #2 is a statement on the Selection Process for Mentors and the responsibilities of campus mentors.

**Timetables**

Following is the timetable for the 1988-89 selection and appointment process:

- **February 5, 1988**
  - Announcement of the Program will be made by all campuses. Campuses are encouraged to announce the program much earlier if possible.

- **March 14, 1988**
  - Deadline for applications to be filed.

- **March 25, 1988**
  - Campus selection committees make their recommendations to the respective Presidents.

- **April 8, 1988**
  - President sends ranked recommendations to the Chancellor. President submits list of recommended mentors to the Chancellor.

- **April 19, 1988**
  - Administrative Fellows Selection Committee reviews recommendations.

- **April 26 and 28, 1988**
  - Administrative Fellows Selection Committee interviews or conducts background checks on finalists and makes recommendations to the Chancellor.

- **May 16, 1988**
  - Offers of appointment are made to the fellows after consultation with Presidents of host campuses.
SUGGESTED DRAFT ANNOUNCEMENT

The Trustee's Budget includes funds for continued support for the CSU Administrative Fellows Program. Although the Trustee's request must still go through review by the legislative and executive branches of the State, there is at this time no reason to think that the Legislature will not support this program, fully or in part.

It is essential, however, that all applicants understand that appointments will be contingent on funds being provided in the final Budget which will not be signed until June 30, 1988.

Full details of the program and application materials may be obtained from the President's Office, The Administrative Fellows Campus Coordinator's Office, (or whatever office is so designated.)

Purpose of the Program

The purpose of the program is to provide an opportunity for upward mobility especially aimed at ensuring that women and persons from ethnic minority backgrounds are given equal opportunities for career development leading eventually to placement and advancement in administrative, managerial and executive positions in the CSU.

Applicants

Application for the Administrative Fellows Program is open to academic and administrative personnel who desire to prepare themselves for a career option in administration or management. Final selection of fellows and operation of the program will be on a nondiscriminatory basis.

The Administrative Fellows who are selected will normally be assigned to a campus other than their own. Assignments at the home campus are possible where relocation would impose an undue personal hardship and where the fellowship experience would be clearly enhanced by remaining at the campus. In instances where fellows remain at their home campus, assurances should be made by appropriate campus staff that such an arrangement will be supported as a new assignment, clearly distinguished from the current responsibilities of the selected candidates.

The fellowship is for the Academic Year, 1988-89. Fellows will receive their regular salary, vacation and retirement benefits as if they were in their regular position at their home campus.
Timetables

Following is the timetable for the 1988-89 selection and appointment process:

February 5, 1988  Announcement of the Program will be made by all campuses. Campuses are encouraged to announce the program much earlier if possible.

March 14, 1988  Deadline for applications to be filed.

March 25, 1988  Campus selection committees make their recommendations to the respective Presidents.

April 8, 1988  President sends ranked recommendations to the Chancellor. President submits list of recommended mentors to the Chancellor.

April 19, 1988  Administrative Fellows Selection Committee reviews recommendations.

April 26 and 28, 1988  Administrative Fellows Selection Committee interviews or conducts background checks on finalists and makes recommendations to the Chancellor.

May 16, 1988  Offers of appointment are made to the fellows after consultation with Presidents of host campuses.
To: Information Resource Management Designees

From: Thomas W. West
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Computing and Communications Resources

Subject: Call for Proposals for Academic Computing Enhancement Institute Project Funding

Attached is the Call for Proposals for Academic Computing Enhancement (ACE) Institute project funding for the 1988/89 fiscal year. It delineates proposal guidelines, submission procedures and budget information.

The function of the ACE Institute, a body created by the Academic Computing Planning Committee (ACPC), is to foster the introduction of new computing technology into the instructional program of the CSU. One of the activities of the Institute is the funding of systemwide specialization centers. The role of the center is to introduce and disseminate new technology throughout the system.

There are currently four projects being funded by the ACE Institute. These projects include the Molecular Design Laboratory project - a computational chemistry project based at Fullerton; the Social Science Instructional Modules project - designed to develop five instructional modules for the social sciences, coordinated through San Bernardino; participation in the Inter-University Consortium for Educational Computing project by Northridge and Hayward - a consortium spearheaded by Carnegie-Mellon University to foster the inclusion of advanced workstations and faculty designed software into higher education; and, the Multi-Disciplinary Graphic Information System Center at SFSU to facilitate the use of computerized graphic maps and related databases.
The ACE Institutes's project budget for FY 1988/89 is $100,000. One project – the Multi-Disciplinary Geographic Information System Center at San Francisco State University – has been funded for $36,428. This leaves $363,572 available for new projects to begin July, 1988 – the subject of this memo. ACE funding in the past has ranged from $15,000 to $150,000 annually for individual projects. We are now issuing a call for proposals to be submitted to the ACE Institute by May 2, 1988.

Projects will be reviewed and evaluated by ACE Institute. This elected group has representation from Academic Vice Presidents, Computer Center Directors, Instructional Computer Coordinators, Discipline Representative Designees and staff from the Office of Computing and Communications Resources.

Proposals should be submitted to Ray Clark, CO/SWRL, P.O. Box 92289, Long Beach, CA 90809-2289, by 5:00 p.m., May 2, 1988. Late proposals will not be considered. Awards will be announced by mid-June, 1988.
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Background Statement:

Three and a half years ago a modification to the formula for distributing overhead earned on sponsored projects was put in place which froze administrative costs to encourage research activity. The plan was to return more funds to schools, departments, and faculty. In the past few years, there has been an increase in proposal activity and sponsored grants. The number of proposals sent off campus has almost doubled, and Cal Poly's grants have increased from $2.2 million in AY 1985 to over $4.4 million in AY 1987.

It is difficult to ascribe this increase to any single cause. A good many other changes were made during that period which were directed to improving grant activity. However, it is understood that an important element in continuing grant activity on campus is the seeding of related work through development activity and small grants. The proposed revision to CAM 543 will support both those ends.

RESOLUTION ON

INDIRECT COSTS UTILIZATION: CAM 543

WHEREAS, An experiment in the distribution of indirect costs earned on sponsored projects was implemented beginning with AY 1985; and

WHEREAS, It has been tested for a three-year period; and

WHEREAS, It is a complicated procedure; and

WHEREAS, It is desirable to simplify the procedure and maintain the value of the original plan; and

WHEREAS, Administrative changes have also occurred which should be reflected in CAM 543; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the attached changes to CAM 543 be endorsed and forwarded by the Academic Senate to the President for consideration.

Proposed by: Research Committee
On: November 18, 1987
PROPOSED CAM REVISION

543  Indirect Costs--Definition

Indirect costs are defined by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) as those costs incurred in the development, administration, and running of sponsored programs that go over and above the direct costs of any specific project. These costs include expenses for space and facilities, office and laboratory equipment, maintenance, utilities, library use, accounting functions, departmental and school administration, university administration, and program development, as they are incurred on government and privately sponsored research, development, instructional, training, service, and demonstration projects.

The indirect cost rate is negotiated periodically with the DHHS and changes to reflect shifts in costs. Project developers should consult the Research Grants Development Office to determine current rates before discussing indirect costs with prospective sponsors.

543.1  Policy on Indirect Cost Recovery

The university will seek full indirect costs reimbursement for each sponsored activity, whether administered through the university or through the Foundation. Because indirect costs are real expenses, funds recovered through indirect costs reimbursement are not available to provide additional support for the direct expenses of a project.

543.2  Utilization of Indirect Funds

As indirect cost reimbursements for projects administered fiscally either by the university or by the Foundation are accumulated, they may be utilized by the respective business office to pay for the financial administration of the projects according to the approved rate. All other funds shall be placed in appropriate Foundation or university trust accounts designated "Unallocated Overhead," which is to be used for covering associated costs as well as for sharing throughout the university.

543.3  Report on Expenditure of Indirect Costs and Proposed Utilization

At the beginning of each fiscal year (or more frequently if required) the Director of Research Development Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development in cooperation with the Vice President for Business Affairs and the Foundation Executive Director will develop a summary statement that will include the following:

A.  Indirect cost income during previous fiscal year, including any balance of unused direct costs reimbursements remaining in the trust accounts.

B.  Charges during the previous fiscal year for:
1. University fiscal administration

2. Foundation fiscal administration and reserves

3. Other, including space reimbursement, professional association dues for the Foundation, fees for partial support of the University Services and the CSU University Services Program, and so on.

C. The Director of Research Development Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development will use the above statement as the basis for developing a proposal for the use of unallocated overheads during the current year. The proposal will be developed in consultation with the University Academic Senate Research Committee. Its objective shall be to fund adequately each of the following in priority:

4. Reserves for audit purposes;

21. Operating Supplementary budget support for the Research Grants Development Office;

32. Reserve for program development/contingency; and

43. Uncommitted funds for use by the university, including funds remaining after the termination of fixed-price contracts.

The above summary statement and proposal will be reviewed and endorsed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and sent to the President for approval.

543.4 Policy for Maintenance and Utilization of Reserve for Program Development/Contingency

The goal of the reserve for program development/contingency is a level sufficient to assure adequate resources for the continuing support of the research grants development activity. Its use will be restricted generally to costs associated with major proposal development or grant negotiation and to reserves necessary to ensure continuity in funding for the Research Grants Development Office. Recommendations for expenditures are made by the Director of Research Grants Development and approved by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development.

543.5 Policy for Allocating Uncommitted Indirect Cost Reimbursements

Uncommitted overhead funds approved for allocation will be distributed in the following manner and for the following purposes. Seventy-five percent of the uncommitted overhead will revert to the dean of the school responsible for securing the grant or contract. The dean may use this money for equipment and supplies, travel, student assistance, or research or project development, subject to the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Twenty-five Sixty percent of uncommitted indirect cost reimbursements will be available to the University Academic Senate Research Committee, which will
solicit proposals from the faculty for research, development, or other scholarly and creative activities, equipment and supplies, travel to professional meetings, publication costs, or and recommend grants other projects consonant with the educational functions and policies of the university, subject to the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The program under which the University Academic Senate Research Committee recommends proposals to the Vice President for Academic Affairs is called CARE, for Creative Activity/Research Effort.

The ceiling for the distribution of uncommitted overhead to the University Research Committee and deans is set by the Vice President for Academic Affairs upon recommendation of the Director, Research Development.

543.6 Policy for Allocating Incremental Indirect-Cost Reimbursements

Thirty percent of the uncommitted overhead will go to the administrative unit directly sponsoring the project (e.g., department, dean's office, institute, or center). Such funds are not discretionary, but are restricted funds, intended to be used to reinforce and foster such activities as those that led to the grant that earned them. These activities may include, but are not limited to, support for research assistants, equipment, travel to attend professional meetings, books and journals, and society memberships.

Remaining indirect costs, called incremental overhead, are distributed according to the following formula: 25% to the individual project director for professional development activities, 25% to the department for the promotion of sponsored activities; 25% to the sponsoring unit (institute or center or, if none, the department) for similar activities; and 25% to the Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office.
EXHIBIT A

Overhead Utilization: CAM 543 Present Formula

Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$237,481</td>
<td>$233,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foundation Administered Projects

Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$44,040</td>
<td>$38,979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Administered Projects

CAM 543.3

Grants Development and Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$239,238</td>
<td>$271,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uncommitted Overhead

CAM 543.5

A.S. Res. Committee*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4618</td>
<td>$808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deans*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$12,388</td>
<td>$2424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incremental Overhead

CAM 543.6

25% Project Director

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7680</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25% Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$15,360</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25% Center or Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25% Vice President, Academic Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7679</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fixed price reserve included for ASRC and Deans.
EXHIBIT B

Overhead Utilization: CAM 543 Effect of New Formula if Used 1984-85 and 1985-86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation Administered Projects</th>
<th>University Administered Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-85</td>
<td>84-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$237,481</td>
<td>$44,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-86</td>
<td>85-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$233,516</td>
<td>$38,979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAM 543.3 Grants Development and Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$239,238</td>
<td>$271,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAM 543.5 Uncommitted Overhead (Fixed-price Contract Reserve)

- 60% Academic Senate Research Committee
  - Care Grants
    - 84-85: $28,063
    - 85-86: $1,939

- 30% Dept. Dean's Office, Center, or Institute
  - 84-85: $14,136
  - 85-86: $969

- 10% Project Director
  - 84-85: $4,772
  - 85-86: $646
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate GE&B Committee

From: GE&B Area D Subcommittee

Subject: Evaluation of PSY 494

Date: December 2, 1987

File No.: Copies: Charles Slem

Area D Subcommittee: M.L. Anderson

Dan Bertozzi

Lee Burgunder

Bob Burton

Pat McKim

Our subcommittee met several times this Quarter to evaluate the appropriateness of PSY 494 for possible inclusion into Area D. It is our unanimous recommendation that this course not be approved for Area D.

In considering any proposed course for Area D, we emphasize the "fit" between that course and the Area D language in E.O. 338 as well as the Cal Poly Skills and Knowledge Statement. Specifically, we believe PSY 494 is inappropriate for Area D for the following reasons.

1. The focus of PSY 494 is too narrow. The justification on the New Course Proposal for PSY 494 states, "This course is designed to support the proposed Master of Engineering degree program with specialization in Manufacturing Systems Engineering. It would also offer a vehicle for students (involved in technological change, e.g., Computer Integrated Manufacturing Center) to understand the psychological impact of their advanced manufacturing technologies on people and organizations." The proposers of this course have clearly targeted PSY 494 for a specific audience which is contrary to the spirit of GE&B courses.

2. PSY 494 does not meet the stated criteria of the Area D language in E.O. 338. Courses approved for Area D "should reflect the fact that human social, political and economic institutions and behavior are inextricably interwoven. Problems and issues in these areas should be examined in their contemporary as well as historical setting, including both Western and non-Western contexts." While PSY 494 does address a human behavior dimension, it does not emphasize the political and economic areas of human behavior nor is there an identifiable non-Western segment of the proposed course. The Area D Subcommittee has been consistent over the years in holding that courses appropriate for Area D.4b must address all of the dimensions in the E.O. 338 language, not just one or two of them.

3. PSY 494 does not meet the appropriate Knowledge and Skills Statement, in this instance statement number 6: "Cal Poly graduates, because of the increasing international character of society and the growing interdependence of nations, should be able to see themselves in relation to people of foreign countries, their geography, political and economic systems, and religious and ethical values." The focus of PSY 494 appears exclusively Western oriented.

Our response to PSY 494 is based solely upon its suitability for GE&B Area D.4b. We were favorably impressed by the content of the course and wondered why it was not submitted for consideration as a F.2 course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>2. PROPOSER'S DEPT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Slem</td>
<td>Psychology and Human Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (Include section, and subsection if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEB D.4.B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION, ETC. (use catalog format)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psy 494 Psychology of Technological Change (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examines the impact of technological change on the psychological and social characteristics of organizations. Identification of organizational factors which provide obstacles and opportunities for technological change. Survey of methods of reducing the negative impact of change on people and organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite: Psy 201/202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against (unanimous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See attachment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. GE &amp; B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against (7-0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION                                       |
### New Course Proposal

**Title:** Psychology of Technological Change

**Course Code:** Psy 494

**Units:** 3

**Description:**
Examines the impact of technological change on the psychological and social characteristics of people and organizations. Identifies personal, social, and organizational factors which provide obstacles and opportunities for technological change. Survey of methods of reducing the negative impact of change. 3 Seminars. Prerequisite: Senior level or graduate standing.

**Prerequisite:**
Senior level or graduate standing.

**Catalog Description:**
Examines the impact of technological change on the psychological and social characteristics of people and organizations. Identifies personal, social, and organizational factors which provide obstacles and opportunities for technological change. Survey of methods of reducing the negative impact of change. 3 Seminars. Prerequisite: Senior level or graduate standing.

**Department:** Psy & HD: SPSE

**Date:** 1/27/87

**Prepared by:** Charles Slem and Dan Levi

**Approval:**
- Department Head
- School Dean
- Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
- University Dean

---

Courses proposed for inclusion in GE8 must be submitted to the GE8 Committee.
Background statement:

During the summer of 1987, Chancellor Reynolds requested Cal Poly (as well as other CSU schools) to consider how to expand student enrollment to meet the growing need for higher education in the state. The Chancellor asked for a report by April 1, 1988. President Baker sought the advice of the Academic Senate (through its Long-Range Planning Committee) and the Deans' Council regarding growth to the current Master Plan limit of 15,000 and possibly beyond in the future.

The Long-Range Planning Committee and Deans' Council held some joint meetings, shared information, and consulted individuals outside Cal Poly for their expertise (such as demographer Harold Hodgkinson). However, no time was available to collect new primary data nor to conduct special studies. The attached report summarizes the information available to the Long-Range Planning Committee. In addition, a complete set of the background papers prepared by the committee is on file in the Academic Senate Office.

The following resolution is presented in five parts: demography and educational equity, composition of the student body, program characteristics, growth to 15,000 FTE, and extent and phasing of growth beyond 15,000 FTE. Both the reasoning (WHEREAS clauses) and the implications (RESOLVED clauses) are grouped accordingly to aid discussion. However, it must be stressed that the five parts together constitute one Resolution regarding enrollment growth. In other words, the reasoning is cumulative so that the clauses pertaining to educational equity and composition of the student body apply to program characteristics, and all of these apply to both potential levels of growth (to 15,000 and beyond 15,000 FTE).

RESOLUTION ON
ENROLLMENT GROWTH TO 15,000 FTE AND BEYOND

Demography and Educational Equity:

WHEREAS The changing demography in California means that Cal Poly will not be able to continue to draw so many of its students from its traditional pool of predominantly white applicants; and

WHEREAS The concept of educational equity requires that Cal Poly increase its proportion of under-represented students; and

WHEREAS Enrollment trends show a decrease in the average student load as well as an increase in the number of terms required to complete a degree;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED That any increase in enrollment at Cal Poly give primary consideration to qualified underrepresented students; and be it further
RESOLVED: That Cal Poly support, expand or create the following kinds of programs to draw and retain more ethnic minority students (especially, Black and Latino): (1) To increase eligibility and recruitment through high school counseling, and "feeder" or "farm" programs at specified community colleges for certain majors to effectively guarantee transfer to Cal Poly as juniors; (2) To increase community support through residential choice on and off campus, and appropriate social opportunities; (3) To increase retention through faculty and staff models and mentors, academic advising and personal counseling, easing procedures for changing majors and financial aid; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly expand student support services, including record keeping, food service and book store supplies to accommodate the needs of students with different cultural backgrounds and of part-time students and others who do not progress at a "normal" rate or enroll continuously from quarter to quarter.

Composition of the Student Body:

WHEREAS The Master Plan Renewed calls for the composition of CSU enrollment to consist of at least 60 percent transfer students and, at most, 40 percent first-time freshmen; and

WHEREAS Cal Poly typically admits between 54 and 60 percent transfer students over the academic year (although the Fall Quarter percentage is almost the reverse, ranging from 42 to 49 percent transfer students); and

WHEREAS Cal Poly admits more transfer students to some schools than to others; and

WHEREAS The Cal Poly mission emphasizes undergraduate education, but recognizes the importance of graduate programs "to enrich ... the undergraduate experience;" and

WHEREAS Graduates students currently constitute less than 10 percent of all Cal Poly students;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That schools or programs which admit less than 55-60 percent transfer students attempt to redesign their curricula (especially pre-requisites and sequencing of courses) to articulate with appropriate preparation at community colleges so as to facilitate the admission of more transfer students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That graduate programs be allowed to expand and new graduate programs be added that fit the polytechnic character of Cal Poly and support existing undergraduate programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly provide support services appropriate to the educational, financial and social needs of graduate students to the extent that they differ from undergraduates.

Program characteristics, discussed in committee:

WHEREAS Recent employment trends and projections for the future show that not all currently impacted programs will continue to be in high demand; and
WHEREAS The Cal Poly mission statement emphasizes polytechnic education and the application of scientific knowledge to contemporary problems; and

WHEREAS There are opportunities for an interdisciplinary approach to instruction between schools to take advantage of the polytechnic character of Cal Poly;

THEREFORE BE IT
RESOLVED: That enrollment increases should not occur in programs which are impacted at Cal Poly but not elsewhere in the CSU system; and be it further

RESOLVED: That enrollment increases in programs at Cal Poly which are also impacted throughout the CSU system only be considered when there is a demonstrated demand for employment in that field continuing to and beyond the year 2000; and be it further

RESOLVED: That all future academic programs (especially in the liberal arts) attempt to embody the special polytechnic character of Cal Poly.

Growth to 15,000 FTE:

WHEREAS A number of new programs which would generate about 464 students (about 420 FTE based on current student loads) have been approved but not implemented; and

WHEREAS The number of high school graduates in California is expected to reach a low point in 1990 and then begin to increase again; and

WHEREAS Some facilities, such as the Recreation Center, Dairy Science Instruction Center, addition to Business Administration and Education, and new Faculty Office Building, designed to meet current deficits and/or to support enrollment growth to 15,000 have been approved by the Trustees, but remain subject to continued funding as part of a state-wide bond issue;

WHEREAS Other facilities, such as the university union, administration building, library, outdoor recreation space, and student services (even after the new Student Services Building is completed) are inadequate to meet current enrollment levels and/or are inadequate to support an increase to 15,000 FTE, and no specific plans have been approved to expand them; and

WHEREAS Academic Senate Resolution AS-220-86/LRPC (approved by the President, July 23, 1986) states that facility deficits must be met before any enrollment expansion be considered;

THEREFORE BE IT
RESOLVED: The first phase of growth toward 15,000 FTE accommodate programs which have been approved but not yet implemented; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly consider entering this first phase of growth in enrollment toward 15,000 FTE no sooner than the 1991-1992 academic year to allow time for recruiting and counseling efforts to reach students who will be at the forefront of the new increase in high school graduates; and be it further
RESOLVED: That Cal Poly consider entering a second phase of growth toward 15,000 after the approved facilities have been completed and funds have been approved to alleviate other shortages (especially in non-instructional space).

Extent and phasing of growth beyond 15,000 FTE:

WHEREAS The number of high school graduates in California is expected to increase steadily after 1990 (at about 3.7 percent per year); and

WHEREAS Cal Poly's polytechnic emphasis is especially suited to prepare students for future jobs in the state; and

WHEREAS Some growth in enrollment can create opportunities for educational diversity; and

WHEREAS Some growth in enrollment can create opportunities for new faculty positions in departments which do not expect to experience any turnover; and

WHEREAS Some growth in enrollment can bring new resources to the University; and

WHEREAS The campus infrastructure (utility systems) have excess capacity (the most limiting of which are sewage transmission lines); and

WHEREAS Cal Poly's campus has a limited amount of space remaining to construct buildings within a 10-minute walking radius; and

WHEREAS New structures increase the density of development and supplant open space on the campus; and

WHEREAS Students rate the geographic setting and appearance of the campus second only to its academic reputation as reasons for selecting Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS Vehicular ingress and egress from Cal Poly is already inadequate (especially in the event of any areawide emergency); and

WHEREAS Cal Poly has a significant impact on overall population growth, housing and traffic congestion in the surrounding community, at the same time as it contributes to the area's economy; and

WHEREAS The growth of the City of San Luis Obispo and surrounding communities is constrained by limitations on water supply, sewage treatment capacity, and buildable land; and

WHEREAS Population in San Luis Obispo County is expected to grow at about 2.3 percent per year through the year 2000; and

WHEREAS The communities in San Luis Obispo County which have the greatest capacities for growth are in the southern and northern parts of the County, farthest removed from Cal Poly and least well-served by public transportation; and

WHEREAS Academic Senate Resolution AS-220-86/LRPC (Approved by the President, July 23, 1986) states that "expansion should only occur after a detailed expansion plan is developed;"
THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly consider a modest expansion in enrollment beyond the 15,000 FTE in the current Master Plan for Higher Education; and be it further

RESOLVED: That such growth must fit within the parameters of community growth policies and constraints; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the first phase of growth beyond 15,000 FTE be considered no sooner than two to three years after enrollment reaches 15,000 FTE; and be it further

RESOLVED: That such growth occur in increments, whereby two to three years of growth are followed by two to three years of stabilization to permit time for catching up and for assessment of the impacts of growth before considering a new phase; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly consider each new phase of growth after facilities have been completed and funds have been approved to alleviate any shortages in instructional space, non-instructional space, and supporting services; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly maintain its visual image of smallness and rural setting, by limiting the size (height and bulk) of new structures, by sensitive placement and landscaping of new buildings, by preserving open space within the campus, and by maintaining open land around the campus; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly maintain its ambience of smallness and intimacy by retaining small class sizes, early affiliation of students with a specific program or department, participation in student activities and access to student services; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly consider reducing its impact on housing and traffic congestion by adding residential facilities on campus (including necessary infrastructure and supporting services) and establishing a policy of requiring on-campus residence for first-time freshmen; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly consider limiting vehicular access to the campus; create more incentives to encourage commuting by means other than the automobile; and provide more facilities for non-auto-users; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly assign a full-time professional staff position to campus planning to coordinate a comprehensive plan for the modest level of growth contemplated in this resolution, covering demographic projections, composition of the student body, program addition and expansion, facility location and timing, and community impact.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee
February 11, 1988
Academic Senate  
Long-Range Planning Committee  
February 11, 1988  

Summary of Information and Issues Regarding  
Enrollment Growth to 15,000 FTE and Beyond  

The following report summarizes the information used, issues raised, and, in some instances, the reasoning followed during Long-Range Planning Committee deliberations about future enrollment growth. This report builds on AS-220-86/LRPC, passed two years ago, which also addressed enrollment issues. Key excerpts from that Senate Resolution are attached. More complete information is available in a set of working papers on file at the Academic Senate office and from the sources cited in the Reference list attached to this report.  

Demography and Educational Equity  

The committee examined data on nationwide trends in higher education, on high school graduation and matriculation by ethnic group, on demographic change in California, and on enrollment characteristics of Cal Poly. The committee also met with demographer Harold Hodgkinson to discuss some of the ramifications of change in California for Cal Poly. From this, several key factors emerge:  

1. The absolute number of high school graduates is currently declining, but will turn around (in California in 1990).  
2. College students are becoming older, on average, and less-likely to enroll full-time and/or complete a degree within 4-5 years.  
3. The increasing non-white population in California is not being reflected to the same extent in college enrollments. (Asians participate at a higher rate; Blacks and Latinos at a lower rate than whites.) Cal Poly enrolls even fewer non-white students than most other CSU schools.  
4. Ethnic groups vary significantly according to their choice of major or occupation and their college preferences.  
5. Attaining educational equity requires extraordinary efforts by colleges and universities and special attention to high school preparation and recruiting.  

Composition of the Student Body  

The committee found a need for clarification of the current percentages of undergraduate transfers vs. first-time freshmen. While common knowledge holds that Cal Poly’s enrollment represents the reverse of the CSU system in general, the committee found that this is only true of Fall Quarter. Indeed, data for enrollment across the entire academic year revealed that the percentage of undergraduate transfers has ranged in recent years between 54 and 60 percent -- not far off the state mandate of a minimum of 60 percent!
Discussion of any need to increase the relative percentages of undergraduate transfer students vs. first-time freshmen reflects countervailing forces at Cal Poly.

On the one hand, the state legislature and Master Plan Renewed report insist that CSU schools enroll at least 60 percent transfer students. Reasons are partly financial -- it is significantly less costly for students to attend community colleges than CSU or UC schools. In addition, under-represented minority students are more likely to attend community colleges initially, so increasing the proportion of transfer students can also increase the prospects for achieving educational equity goals. Finally, fulfillment of General Education and Breadth requirements at the community colleges relieves CSU schools of much of this burden (both on facilities and faculty), allowing more attention to advanced study (upper division courses) in the CSU.

On the other hand, Cal Poly's practice of requiring students to declare a major upon admission as freshmen means that most majors are designed for a four-five year sequence. Further, many of the polytechnic majors require careful course sequencing to ensure that students have completed pre-requisites before entering advanced courses. Such sequencing has been difficult to coordinate with community colleges, especially in specialized fields where the community colleges cannot reasonably be expected to provide all of the necessary pre-requisites to allow students to transfer to Cal Poly as juniors.

The role of graduate education has received less attention. While acceptable according to the Cal Poly mission, graduate programs are small and unevenly distributed in the university. (For example, they range from only 2.5 percent in liberal arts to near 19 percent in Professional Studies and Education.)

**Program Characteristics**

The committee looked primarily to Cal Poly's mission statement to discuss what kinds of programs might be expanded or added in the future. Thus, the committee was concerned with maintaining, indeed capitalizing on, the special polytechnic character of Cal Poly.

In addition, future employment prospects for graduates are critical. However, projection of future demand for specific programs depends upon reliable economic forecasting, which was not available to the committee. (The committee plans to submit a supplementary forecasting report.) Further, individual members lacked sufficient expertise to assess the prospects for specific areas. The committee discussed a few possibilities for the future, such as biotechnology, but concluded that it would be more responsible to establish some criteria for evaluating future program proposals. Thus, proponents of a particular program could be asked to conduct a market analysis and provide the evidence of future demand for the field at the time that they submit a proposal. This approach provides flexibility for the university -- both to avoid remaining committed to programs which are currently popular but may decline in the future as well as to take advantage of new opportunities as they arise.

**Growth to 15,000 FTE**

Although Cal Poly has been budgeted at 14,200 FTE since 1977-78, enrollment has been projected to increase to 14,600 in 1990-91 and to 15,000 in 1991-92. The committee felt that this schedule should be delayed one year, to wait out the decline in high school graduates which reaches the bottom of the trough in 1990. With respect to programs, the increment from
14,200 to 14,600 has already been allocated to programs which have been approved but not yet implemented.

Facility planning has proceeded accordingly with recent approval by the CSU trustees of key instructional facilities. However, the committee found no assurance that non-instructional facilities and support services would keep pace with the instructional facilities. For example, both the Administration Building and University Union were built for fewer than the current number of students (13,000 and 12,000 respectively). Also, certain computing services and the library budget for periodicals and new acquisitions are insufficient to support current enrollment. Further, outdoor recreation space is at a premium and students lack indoor space for studying and socializing. On the other hand, parking is more than sufficient -- complaints stem from inconvenience rather than lack of space.

**Extent and Phasing of Growth Beyond 15,000 FTE**

Growth beyond 15,000 is complicated by many factors. A state-wide increase in high school graduates after 1990 creates a need for additional capacity in the CSU system. Indeed, some enrollment growth can be beneficial to individual schools. Increases in enrollment can bring more resources to the university and permit program expansion or addition without jeopardizing existing programs. Further, departments which have been unable to hire any new faculty because of lack of turnover would benefit from an increase in enrollment that would generate new tenure-track positions.

However, because growth beyond 15,000 FTE goes beyond the existing Master Plan for Higher Education and would create a number of impacts, an Environmental Impact Report would have to be prepared. To do so, Cal Poly would need to address how rapidly it would grow, what facilities and other resources would be required, how students would be housed, and how traffic congestion would be handled. The rate and extent of growth would affect the image and character of Cal Poly, both visually and educationally. Basic infrastructure is apparently sufficient (water and sewer), but the campus has very limited space for new buildings within a ten-minute walking radius without giving up open space. Further, internal circulation (of cars, bicycles and pedestrians) becomes more difficult to manage as numbers increase. Just as importantly, unless Cal Poly provides more housing on campus, all new enrollment would lead to a greater demand for student (and faculty and staff) housing in San Luis Obispo and other nearby communities. Already, many of these face constraints on growth due to limits on water supply, sewage treatment and/or buildable land. More commuting would mean more cars, more traffic congestion and more need for parking. Thus, a careful plan to address these issues would be essential.

**Attachments**

Selected excerpts from AS-220-86/LRPC, "Revised Enrollment Recommendations"

List of Long-Range Planning Committee Working Papers on Enrollment Growth

**References**
"There is strong consensus ... to hold the size of Cal Poly at 14,200 FTE until such time as the current shortages of facilities (e.g., classrooms, laboratories, faculty offices) are corrected."

Data for 1985-1986 showed that Cal Poly only had sufficient facilities to support an enrollment of 11,900 FTE (or a facility deficit of 2300 FTE). "This would suggest that any increase in enrollment beyond our authorized 14,200 should only occur when currently planned physical plant expansion projects are completed in 1990-91...."
List of Working Papers on Enrollment Growth to 15,000 FTE and Beyond
(Complete set on file in Academic Senate office)

1. Model for considering enrollment options
2. Demographic factors affecting Cal Poly enrollment
3. Selective summary: Master Plan Renewed
5. Potentials for future programs
6. Cal Poly growth to 15,000 FTE
7. How to handle planned growth beyond 15,000 FTE
8. Some thoughts on numbers beyond 15,000 FTE
9. Image/character of Cal Poly
10. City and community consequences of enrollment growth at Cal Poly
11. References

NOTE: These papers are in various states of refinement, and sometimes include personal recommendations or viewpoints held by individual members of the committee which were refined during subsequent discussions.
References


California Department of Finance, Population Research Unit. Sacramento, CA; 1987.

California State University. Student Needs and Priorities Survey.


Enrollment Management Considerations. San Luis Obispo: California Polytechnic State University; 1984.


ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-____-88/____

RESOLUTION ON
REPORT ON FACULTY POSITION CONTROL

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University accepts and endorses the recommendations in the attached Report on Faculty Position Control submitted by the Academic Senate Budget Committee.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Executive Committee
February 16, 1988
INTRODUCTION

For some weeks now the Academic Senate Budget Committee has been considering the issue of faculty position control for Summer Quarter as well as the rest of the academic year. Our consideration of the issue became more focused when the Personnel Policies Committee submitted their Emergency Resolution on Summer Quarter Funding. Our committee took a position in opposition to the resolution and was in the midst of attempting to develop an alternative resolution, when the resolution was withdrawn from consideration. Just because the issue was withdrawn does not mean that the university no longer faces a problem in dealing with faculty position control for Summer Quarter and beyond. Some form of dollar control of faculty positions seems inevitable.

The university wishes to maintain a quality educational program for the Summer Quarter as well as the regular academic year. The university has gone on record arguing the necessity of maintaining Summer Quarter as a fully funded state supported academic term. Some of the reasons for this position include:

1. Student demand
2. Enhanced progress toward graduation
3. The impacted nature of the campus
4. Overutilization of facilities
5. The use of Summer Quarter as a recruitment tool for faculty hires

The Vice President for Academic Affairs office is currently surveying departments to see how much of a deficit will be created, if any, by currently proposed Summer Quarter staffing. Once the amount of the deficit, if any, is determined, then measures to meet the revenue shortfall will have to be addressed. The Budget Committee believes that some guidelines should be proposed for dealing with this potential summer
shortfall, as well as dealing with faculty position control for the academic year(s) to come.

THE CURRENT PROBLEM

There was a substantial faculty salary deficit for 1986-87, which meant that $483,000 had to be transferred from other budget categories including replacement equipment to cover the shortfall. Of the total amount, $180,000 could be attributed to Summer Quarter. A similar deficit could occur in 1987-88.

CAUSES OF THE PROBLEM

Because the university is put in a position where it must hire new and leave replacement faculty positions at a higher rank than Assistant Professor Step 8, and must hire Summer Quarter faculty members at a higher level than Associate Professor Step 12, a deficit is created in faculty salaries. Some of the reasons why this deficit occurs include:

1. The maturing of the faculty in rank at Cal Poly
2. The higher proportion of faculty in DMD (Designated Market Disciplines) positions at Cal Poly. (This problem is addressed in the 1988-89 budget cycle.)
3. The lack of an available pool of lecturers in the community surrounding Cal Poly in many disciplines to cover summer teaching positions and leave replacements
4. Due to market conditions, a similar problem is also created by initial hires and leave replacements being hired at levels above state funding formula

The university has also been facing other fiscal restraints which have exacerbated the problem. In recent years the university has lost much of its ability to reallocate resources internally to meet actual and de facto budget cutbacks/shortfalls. Some of the causes of this situation include the following:

1. In 1986-87 meeting a midyear deficit reduction plan, with Cal Poly's total equaling $393,054
2. 1987-88 reallocation of campus budgets to fund the nonfaculty MSA's (Merit Salary Adjustments) in the amount of $450,000
3. Meeting increased commitments to the OASIS Project to upgrade our inadequate Student Information System

4. Increasing contingency fund balance to help meet shortfalls in other budget areas including enrollment mix changes from part-time to full-time students leading to a revenue shortfall in 1987-88

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the belief of the Budget Committee that any internal budgetary solution to this externally caused problem sends the wrong kind of message to the Chancellor's Office, the Department of Finance, and the State Legislature by setting a precedent in dealing with budget cutbacks/shortfalls.

External - Long-term Solution to the Problem

1. The university should contact the Chancellor's Office, the Department of Finance, and the State Legislature and request additional funding for Summer Quarter 1988, and ask that the formula for determining Summer Quarter faculty positions and academic year new hires and leave replacements at Cal Poly be made reflective of actual experience or on the basis of average rank of faculty at Cal Poly.

2. The university should support an increase in faculty positions based upon 100% of Mode and Level funding instead of the current 92%.

3. The university should support State and Chancellor's Office funding of nonfaculty MSA's.

Internal - Guidelines for Dealing with the Problem

If an internal campus solution of the problem is required after exhausting all other alternatives, then the following guidelines should be applied.

1. In the development of any plan related to faculty position control, full consultation between the administration, faculty, and students will occur.

2. Whatever plan is approved should be applied equally to each of the seven instructional schools.
3. If the proposed plan involves a change in working conditions over past practice, then those changes must be negotiated with the Unit Three bargaining agent, the California Faculty Association.

4. Any plan proposed and later adopted should not indicate that an increased workload is acceptable to the faculty.

5. Prior to any proposed plan development, a full accounting of how these deficits have been met in the past needs to be provided by the administration along with documentation that leave replacement and Summer Quarter hires are the main cause of the budget deficit/shortfall. Also the results of the Vice President for Academic Affairs office's survey on the Summer Quarter situation needs to be distributed to the academic community in a timely fashion.

6. That before any proposed solution is adopted, all budgets including soft money budgets (Foundation, Annual Giving Fund, etc.) be reviewed to see if other funding sources are available to assist faculty salary deficits. A fee increase for students attending Summer Quarter should also be studied as a possible alternative.

7. Any budget adjustments related to funding Summer Quarter positions or leave replacements should be spread across the entire university rather than being taken from only one funding source.

CONCLUSION

The Budget Committee will continue to study this issue, and will attempt to absorb any new information that sheds light on the situation. The Budget Committee welcomes your comments and input concerning any additional guidelines that should be considered. Time is needed to study all the ramifications of this issue before coming forward with a resolution that proposes a specific solution to this complex problem.
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate

From: Linda Dalton, Chair
Long-Range Planning Committee

Subject: Alterations to Resolution on Enrollment Growth to 15,000 FTE and Beyond, proposed by the Long-Range Planning Committee on February 11, 1988

Based on the discussion of the Academic Senate Executive Committee on February 16, the Long-Range Planning Committee has discussed alterations in two of the proposed resolutions to clarify their intentions.

Page 1, last line, revise resolution to read as follows:

RESOLVED: That any increase in enrollment at Cal Poly give priority to CSU qualified under-represented students;

Page 3, revise first resolution to read as follows:

RESOLVED: That priority for enrollment increases should occur in programs which are impacted at Cal Poly and elsewhere in the CSU system, or in programs which are in newly emerging fields;

In addition, at the request of the Executive Committee, Wally Mark of the Institutional Studies Office has prepared the attached revision of his working paper on "Cal Poly Growth to 15,000 FTE" which reveals the commitments Cal Poly has already made to new programs as a result of proposals previously approved by the Academic Senate.
CAL POLY GROWTH TO 15,000 FTE

As the campus considers moving upward from the long established plateau of 14,200 FTE taught on the Cal Poly campus (in 1986-87 100 non-capacity FTE were added for Cooperative Education), the commitments made for previously proposed programs must be considered. The total number of students added in the growth of 800 FTE from 14,300 to 15,100 will be approximately 890, based on current average student load. There are currently many programs which are in various stages of review, have been approved and implemented at reduced levels, or are approved but have not been implemented. The following list provides information on the commitments Cal Poly has to proposed programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Additional Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A. in Music</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Aeronautical Engineering</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Architecture</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Minor</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Civil and Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Based Education Specialization</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. in Computer Engineering</td>
<td>333 (original proposal, modified to 120 for first three years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Electrical/Electronic Engineering</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Engineering</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Environmental Design</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Structural Engineering</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 730 (probably 517 with CPE modification)

These commitments leave approximately 470 students available for growth in other areas. There are many things to consider when looking at how these students might be distributed among various existing programs and what new programs might become available.

The enrollments for the programs were taken from program proposals reviewed and approved by the Academic Senate and submitted to the Chancellor’s Office, except in the case of the M.S. in Architecture, M.S. in Environmental Design, and the M.S. in Structural Engineering where the numbers come from the materials submitted to update the Academic Master Plan or the proposals on file in the Academic Programs Office. All proposals and follow-up documentation are on file in Academic Programs.
The proposal for the Music Major was endorsed by the Academic Senate in resolution AS-150-83. The proposal for a degree was included in the material submitted to update the Academic Master Plan in October, 1987.

These programs were proposed and approved by the Academic Senate for inclusion in the 1986-88 Catalog; however, the review by the Chancellor's Office and CPEC did not allow for their inclusion. The program approvals from the Chancellor's Office were received in December, 1987 and January, 1988.

The MS in Architecture is a proposal to change the M. Arch. to an MS program and increase the enrollment level in that program. This was included in the material to update the Academic Master Plan in October, 1987.

The Minor in Business was approved for inclusion in the 1986-88 catalog by the Academic Senate. This has not been implemented pending identification and allocation of the faculty resources needed to implement. The majors shown would not be in business, but rather in other degree programs and represent an addition to the university because the minor would have to be an add-on minor for most majors.

The Computer Based Education Specialization under the M.A. in Education was approved by the Chancellor's Office in May 1985. The additional students will bring the enrollment to the level proposed.

The B.S. in Computer Engineering was proposed and approved by the Academic Senate with an enrollment level of 333 majors for inclusion in the 1984-86 catalog. The Chancellor's Office approval for the program was received in May of 1987. The original enrollment targets have undergone some revisions and currently stand at 115-120 majors in the third year of the program with a review to take place at that time to determine future targets.

The M.S. in Environmental Design and the M.S. in Structural Engineering were included in the material to update the Academic Master Plan in October, 1987. The number of majors for these programs is yet to be determined. The proposals for implementation have not been developed and reviewed by the campus.
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