

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE
805.756.1258

MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Tuesday, October 16, 2001
UU220, 3:00 to 5:00pm

- I. Minutes:
Approval of minutes for Academic Senate Executive Committee meeting of September 25, 2001 (pp. 2-4).
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Provost's Office:
 - D. Statewide Senators:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. ASI Representatives:
 - G. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Academic Senate and university-wide committee vacancies:** (p. 5).
 - B. **Approval of advertisement and election of representatives to the Consultative Committee for the Selection of Dean for the CAGR:** (pp. 6-7).
 - C. **Reappointment to the Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing (IACC).**
 - D. **Approval of new MS in Agribusiness:** Ahern, CAGR caucus chair and Agribusiness representative (to be distributed).
 - E. **Approval of new MS in Polymers and Coatings:** Jones, Chemistry and Biochemistry representative (to be distributed).
 - F. **Reactivation of the Foundation Oversight Committee:** (p. 8).
 - G. **Resolution on Name Change for Extended Studies:** Parks, Dean of Extended Studies, (pp. 9-12).
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
 - A. **Discussion of President Baker responses to:**
 - 1. **AS-558-01/EC, "Resolution on Enrollment Growth for Fall 2001":** (pp.13-25); and
 - 2. **AS-566-01/IC, "Resolution on Commencement":** (p. 26-27).
 - B. **Issues to be discussed/decided by the statewide Academic Senate: (1) What should the statewide Academic Senate discuss with its campus chairs at its next meeting on November 1st? (2) What should the CSU administration discuss with Senate chairs on November 1st?**
 - C. **Input to William Siembieda re the Consultative Committee for Selection of Vice President for Administration and Finance:** (p. 28).
- VII. Adjournment:

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF
The Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, September 25, 2001
UU218, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Preparatory: the meeting was opened at 3:10 p.m.

- I. Minutes: The minutes from the May 8, May 15, May 29, and June 5, 2001 Academic Senate meetings were tabled until the Academic Senate meeting scheduled for October 2 for approval.
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair: (Menon) President Baker will address important issues. Jack Robison has been appointed to serve on the Housing Committee. Resolution on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure will return to the Academic Senate with minor modification on feedback to be added by President Baker. Provost Zingg will address the issue of minimum number of units required to graduate.
 - B. President's Office: (Baker) Some of the main issues discussed included:
 - Budget** – This year \$360 million was requested from the Trustees but actual funding was less than \$250 million. With additional students, we are funded at full marginal costs of \$8800 per student minus financial aid. Compensation was reduced by legislature to 2% from the 6% requested. Cal Poly is right on target with the number of students. There has not been much progress with differential funding but the Chancellor has hired two consultants to work with Cal Poly on this issue. ASI is working on a referendum regarding fee increase for students.
 - Resolutions** - President Baker agrees with recently passed resolution on enrollment and explained that marginal cost is just barely adequate for lower cost programs with the biggest problem being faculty cost. The resolution dealing with Environment issues has been approved.
 - Housing** – first set of townhouses for faculty and staff will be available Summer 2003.
 - RTP** - Senate resolution on Retention Promotion and Tenure will be approved with the addition of a feedback component putting more emphasis on department and college feedback.
 - Computing** – Faculty needs to be clear on the rules regarding privacy and state computers. Faculty members need to be assured that the report on computing policy was not an attempt to search or monitor what is on a faculty's computer.
 - Calendar** – Meeting were held during Summer quarter to come up with a report that provides compelling reasons for whatever decision is made.
 - Terrorist events** - Due to the recent terrorist events of September 11, everyone is asked to be more alert. Several steps have been taken to address issues of tolerance and to raise the level of consciousness as well as a sense of vigilance and sensitivity towards students is needed at this time.
 - C. Provost's Office: (Zingg) Cal Poly is within four students off enrollment target with the base target for next year being 16,205. The target on continuing students was exceeding possibly due to the slowing economy. Cal Poly currently has 5300 students between on

and off campus housing including 30 at The Cliffs Hotel. This Fall, Cal Poly hired 48 new tenure-track faculty members, the most number of faculty members since 1989. There is a very strong expectation from the Chancellor's office to limit the number of units required for graduation to 180-quarter units even though a handful of programs have increased the number of units required. Assessment and accountability with the new program review process will include internal and external review. There are several events in honor of the Cal Poly's Centennial celebration taking place on campus this week.

- D. Statewide Senators: (Hood) Statewide Academic Senate met to discuss budget and the contract. (Gooden) The Statewide Academic Affairs Committee will re-address graduation requirements.
- E. CFA campus president: (Fetzer) the healthcare changes involving insurance coverage are not a union issue but one of Cal Pers. (Foroohar) CSU and CFA were unable to negotiate a contract by June 30 due to an impasse. CSU has cancelled several negotiating meetings with mediator. Major discussion issues include workload, compensation, year-round operations, lecturer's security, and the processing of grievances. The issue of computer use is making progress on campus and since this is an emerging area, that faculty members need to be informed and especially department chairs need to be very clear with part-time faculty on what is expected.
- F. ASI Representatives: ASI is out for a referendum to increase students' fees. A vote will go out mid-November.
- G. Other: none.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:

- A. **Academic Senate and University-wide committee vacancies:** The following appointments were made:
Change of Committee Chair – Harvey Greenwald will replace Stephen Kaminaka as Chair of the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee during Fall quarter.

University-wide Appointments:

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Eldon Li | Academic Council on International Programs |
| Myron Hood | Athletics Governing Board |
| Dan Levi | Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee |
| Kent Morrison | Deans' Admissions Advisory Committee |
| Lynn Hamilton | Information Resource Management Policy and Planning Committee |
| Del Dingus | University Union Advisory Board |
- B. **Selection of campus representative to the Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP):** Eldon Li, Management Area, was appointed to serve the 2001-2004 term.
- C. **Assigned time for Academic Senate officers and committee chairs:** 64 units of assigned time for the Senate officers were approved.
- D. **Resolution on Calendar System:** This resolution stating Cal Poly's position to remain on a quarter system was agendized.

- E. **Resolution on Department Name Change for Soil Science Department:** This resolution, requesting a name change, was agendized.
- F. **Resolution on Department Name Change for Psychology and Human Development Department:** This resolution, requesting a name change, was agendized.
- G. **Resolution of Commendation for Frank Lebens:** This resolution is presented in recognition of his many accomplishments and contribution as he retires, was agendized.

VI. Discussion Item (s):

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Gladys Gregory', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate

ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES
Vacancies for 2001-2002

College of Architecture and Environmental Design
Grants Review Committee

College of Business
Grants Review Committee

College of Liberal Arts
US Cultural Pluralism Subcommittee

UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITTEES
Vacancies for 2001-2002

Department

Disabled Students Advisory Committee
(4 Representatives/1 Vacancy)

Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing (IACC)
(1 Representative – must be Executive Committee member/1 Vacancy)

Student Health Advisory Committee
(1 Representative/1 Vacancy)

(DRAFT ADVERTISEMENT)

DEAN, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE

THE POSITION: As the principal intellectual leader of the College, the Dean provides support for the faculty of the College by creating a positive environment for teaching, scholarship, research and professional engagement, and service to the University and community. The Dean is responsible for the quality of academic programs and for managing the fiscal, human resources, and the physical facilities of the College. The Dean is expected to build partnerships with alumni and the business community, and to seek supplemental financial support for both new and existing programs. The successful applicant should be prepared to demonstrate the leadership ability to distinguish the College of Agriculture as a nationally-prominent learning center that is reflective of the polytechnic character of the University. The Dean participates in the development of University-wide policy as a member of the Academic Deans' Council and the President's Strategic Management Group. The Dean reports directly to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

QUALIFICATIONS: Significant academic and administrative experience, an earned doctorate in one of the instructional areas within the College and credentials appropriate for a tenure appointment at the rank of professor. A demonstrated capacity for academic leadership and team building; evidence of a strong commitment to excellent teaching and scholarship; commitment to fostering a technology-enhanced collaborative learning environment; capability to expand alliances with the private sector; strong experience and a commitment to engage the College in a comprehensive program of advancement activities; ability to work effectively with an ethnically and culturally diverse campus community and to address student needs in a multicultural educational environment. The candidate should be familiar with significant agricultural issues affecting U.S. food, fiber, and natural resource industries and institutions in both the domestic and global markets.

COMPENSATION: Salary is commensurate with the background and experience of the individual selected. The Management Personnel Plan adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees governs all rights associated with this appointment.

APPLICATIONS AND NOMINATIONS: The search committee will begin to review nominations and applications on January 17, 2001; applications received after that date may be considered. Each application should include a current resume and a statement, in not more than two pages, of the applicant's view on academic administration and on the role and responsibilities of the faculty in a college of agriculture. Please reference Recruitment Code 223 on all correspondence. The preferred starting date for the position is July 1, 2001. Application, nominations, letters of reference, and inquiries should be addressed to: Dr. Paul J. Zingg, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, California 93407. For additional information contact Academic Personnel (805/756-2844 or fax 756-5185); e-mail: academicpersonnel@polymail.calpoly.edu; website: www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu.

THE COLLEGE: The College mission is to provide the highest quality education in agricultural and renewable resource sciences. The 120 faculty members in the College of Agriculture are experts in their disciplines and are dedicated to the philosophy of "Learn by Doing." Eleven instructional departments are Agribusiness; Agricultural Education and Communication; Animal Science; BioResource and Agricultural Engineering; Crop Science; Dairy Science; Environmental Horticulture Science; Food Science and Nutrition; Military Science; Natural Resources Management; and Soil Science.

The College of Agriculture at Cal Poly is the fourth largest undergraduate agriculture program in the nation, with more than 3,500 students enrolled in sixteen undergraduate majors. The College

awards an average of 650 baccalaureate degrees each year, nearly half of all baccalaureate agriculture degrees granted in the state. The College also offers Master of Science degrees in Agriculture and in Forestry Sciences.

More than 6,000 acres are allocated for agriculture instruction on the campus at San Luis Obispo. There is rangeland for grazing, and more intensively cultivated parcels are used for orchards, vineyards, fruit and nut crops, vegetable production, field crops, agroforestry and turf management. Greenhouses, the Leaning Pine arboretum and shops and facilities for livestock, meat, fruit and vegetable processing are available for production and instructional use. A modern dairy processing plant and a poultry complex were completed in 1995. The College of Agriculture also operates the 3,200-acre Swanton Pacific Ranch in Santa Cruz County.

Several Centers of Excellence are based at the College of Agriculture. These Centers promote cooperation among experts from Cal Poly, industry and other universities. Resource development, research and in-depth educational opportunities highlight the work of the Ag Safety Institute, the Brock Center for Agricultural Communication, the Coastal Resource Institute, the Dairy Products Technology Center, the Global Agricultural Trade and Marketing Research Project (GATMAR), the Irrigation Training and Research Center (ITRC), the Multicultural Agriculture Program (MAP), and the Urban Forest Ecosystems Institute (UFEI).

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

B A L L O T


**TO ELECT TO THE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
FOR THE SELECTION OF DEAN FOR THE
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE**

Place a checkmark in the space provided to indicate your choice. Vote for no more than **TWO** individuals.

| | | |
|-------|------------------|----------------------------|
| _____ | Fanchon, Phillip | Economics, COB |
| _____ | Fujitani, Sharon | Library, PCS |
| _____ | Gay, Larry | Industrial Technology, COB |
| _____ | Krieger, Dan | History, CLA |
| _____ | Nulman, Dennis | UCTE |

-8-
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF
The Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, July 21, 1998
38-114, 3:00-5:00pm



A request has been made to reactivate the Ad Hoc Committee on Foundation that was initially approved by the Academic Senate Executive Committee on July 21, 1998 (see below). A committee was formed to draft a resolution establishing the committee, its charge, and its membership; but this was never completed. A fuller discussion of the prior committee will be presented to the ExecCom at its September 25 meeting.

V. Business Items:

- A. Approval of the 1998-1999 Calendar of Meetings: was M/S/P unanimously.
- B. **Formation of an ad hoc committee on Foundation:** President Baker has indicated his acceptance of an advisory committee on the Foundation that would advise him regarding the use of Foundation funds. The committee would report to him not to the Foundation. Policy and priorities of discretionary funds would be items of advisement.

Possible committee membership would include: the two faculty representatives to the Foundation Board of Directors; the two student representatives to the Foundation Board of Directors; one representative each from the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee, Grants Committee, and Academic Senate Executive Committee; the President or designee (ex officio position); a Foundation representative (ex officio position); and a staff representative.

Discussions by this committee may have to be implemented in a more timely manner than the Senate allows. When this occurs, the committee should bring matters to the Executive Committee for its discussion. Kersten stated the membership should be reviewed by legal counsel since there may be restrictions on the number of committees certain Board officials can serve on. This committee should be put into effect via a resolution. The charge to draft the resolution will be sent to the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee. Chair Hood asked to be the Executive Committee's representative to this committee. M/S/P by consensus that Chair Hood appoint the members of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Foundation.

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

AS-____-01/

**RESOLUTION ON
NAME CHANGE FOR EXTENDED STUDIES**

- 1 WHEREAS, Extended Studies has requested its name be changed to the **College of**
2 **Continuing Studies** to better reflect the program currently being offered; and
3
4 WHEREAS, The request for this name change has been approved by the Provost and Academic
5 Deans Council; therefore, be it
6
7 RESOLVED: That the name of Extended Studies be changed to the **College of Continuing**
8 **Studies.**

Proposed by: Extended Studies
Date: October 8, 2001

RECEIVED

OCT - 8 2001



State of California
Memorandum

To: Unny Menon, Chair
Academic Senate

Date: October 8, 2001

From: Paul J. Zingg *Paul J. Zingg*
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Copies: Dennis Parks

Subject: Name Change Request—Extended Studies

Enclosed is a request from Dr. Dennis Parks, Dean of Extended Studies, to change the name of Extended Studies to the College of Continuing Studies.

I would appreciate it if the Academic Senate would review this request as soon as possible as there are a number of pending matters in Extended Studies awaiting this review. This name change request was favorably reviewed by the Academic Deans' Council at its September 24 meeting.

Thank you, and should you have any questions regarding this issue, please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Parks directly.

Enclosures

Cal Poly Extended Studies
Office of the Dean
Name Change Summary

Extended Studies is:

- > A continuing education, lifelong learning, outreach, and public service unit of Cal Poly
- > Primarily an academic credit unit; an average of 70% of all revenue (excluding conferences) is generated by courses and programs awarding academic credit
- > A composite of programming functions implementing a strategic plan to extend Cal Poly's academic resources to the region and the state
- > A place for innovation, discovery, and exploration
- > An access point to Cal Poly for those normally excluded

Mission Statement – The mission of Extended Studies is to provide the highest quality educational activities and opportunities for the citizens of California, the nation, and the world. Extended Studies accomplishes this mission by expanding the intellectual resources of Cal Poly, furthering the University's outreach and public service mission, and providing lifelong learning opportunities to a variety of identified constituencies.

Vision Statement – By 2005, Extended Studies will be a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary academic unit capable of meeting the lifelong learning needs of a global community through credit and non-credit programs offered through traditional and eLearning methodologies.

Extended Studies function is to:

- > Develop academic programs in support of Cal Poly's mission
- > Develop academic programs and services for traditional and non-traditional age students
- > Provide lifelong learning opportunities to businesses, corporations, K-12 education, community organizations, and other constituencies
- > Design, plan, and implement conferences, seminars, workshops for internal and external organizations
- > Support program development efforts arising from Cal Poly's academic units
- > Serve as a multidisciplinary unit where departments and units from all colleges can collaborate, share ideas, and develop new programs for traditional and non-traditional students

Extended Studies serves:

- > About 10,000 people each year: 4,000 in courses and 6,000 through conferences
- > Faculty, staff, and regularly matriculated students at Cal Poly
- > The business, corporate, agricultural, governmental, and industrial sector
- > K-12 educators
- > Cal Poly alumni and friends
- > Citizens of the Central Coast

In the future, Extended Studies will become a stronger academic unit as:

- > Academic programs like Jump-Start, and summer quarter enhancements are coordinated through Extended Studies
- > More people enroll through Open University

- 12-
- > New programs that serve a blended population (traditional age and non-traditional age students) are developed and support on-campus programs and activities
 - > The University takes advantage of the CSU special session option to offer degrees and other programs
 - > Academically sound non-credit programs for teachers, executives, and others seek approval to be offered as credit courses/programs (especially with the elimination of professional development credit)

Continuing Education Units at other CSU's:

- > CSUSB – College of Extended Learning
- > CSPU – College of the Extended University
- > SDSU – College of Extended Studies
- > CSUN – College of Extended Learning
- > CSULB – University College and Extension Services
- > SSU – School of Extended Education

Why Change the Name Now?

- > Phase one of the reorganization is complete – Extended Education is now merged into Extended Studies
- > The time is right - Extended Studies is currently in a transitional stage as it seeks new ways to fulfill its mission and vision
- > The term "extended" is not widely recognized outside of higher education in general and in California specifically
- > The name Extended Studies is often confused with an Agricultural Extension Unit
- > Within Cal Poly, people still use various names to refer to the University's continuing education operation including Open University, EUPS, Extended Education
- > A strong and identifiable continuing education operation will help Cal Poly fulfill its state-wide mission and move to the next tier of national recognition
- > To enhance fundraising activities in support of college specific and university wide needs

It was therefore recommended that Extended Studies change its name to:

The College of Continuing Studies

**Discussion of President Baker's
Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-558-01/EC,
"Resolution on Enrollment Growth for Fall 2001"**

On September 19, 2001, President Warren Baker responded to Academic Senate Resolution AS-558-01/EC, Resolution on Enrollment Growth for Fall 2001. The Academic Senate believes that the response of the President is extremely disappointing in that it failed to address the serious impacts to the campus that have resulted from the significant jump in enrollment that occurred in Fall 2001. (Institutional Studies reported that the head count for the Fall 2001 is 18,078, as compared to 16,860 for the Fall of 2000.) Furthermore, this increase in enrollment violated many of the principles of enrollment growth contained in Academic Senate Resolution AS-524-99/B&LRPC, a resolution that has already been accepted by the President.

Principle #1. The enrollment growth at Cal Poly shall not adversely affect academic quality.

In order to meet some of the demand associated with this increase in enrollment, many departments were forced to increase enrollment in a number of sections. In particular, a number of upper division GE classes are being taught in large lecture sections. Many of these classes were intended as writing-intensive classes. (See Academic Senate Resolution AS-565-01/DK.) It is clear that the quality of education for students in these large lecture classes is being compromised.

For other classes, this erosion of quality due to the increase in class size is more insidious. How does one measure the impact of teaching a class (designed for 35 students) to 42 students?

An increase in class size, an increase in the faculty/student ratio, and the use of a greater number of non-tenure track faculty to teach our courses will negatively affect academic quality. We may even be endangering our national ratings and our ability to attract good students.

Principle #2. The enrollment growth at Cal Poly shall not adversely affect the academic progress of those students who were enrolled at the time of growth.

In the Mathematics Department most of the calculus and precalculus courses were closed prior to the conclusion of the regular rotation of Capture. For engineering students, the failure to enroll in a calculus course will almost certainly delay graduation. This inability to meet enrollment demand has been repeated in a number of other departments. This increase in enrollment seriously jeopardizes Cal Poly's attempt to improve the throughput of its students.

Principle #3. The enrollment growth at Cal Poly shall be fully funded for any additional students admitted.

Cal Poly continues to be funded for additional students using system-wide figures that are well below the marginal cost for our campus. As a result of this inadequate funding the quality of our academic programs is continually being undermined by increasing

enrollments. It is possible that the increase in enrollment this fall is so great that Cal Poly will not receive funding from the CSU for some of these additional students, further jeopardizing our programs.

Moreover Provost Zingg stated at the Senate Meeting of October 2, 2001 that we may not get any additional support from the Chancellor's Office for students in excess of 200 over our FTE target number. Currently we are 337 over our FTE target number.

Principle #4. The enrollment growth at Cal Poly should not occur until the facilities to support the additional students are in place.

The housing to support the enrollment growth is not in place at this time. Motels both in San Luis Obispo and in Shell Beach had to be rented to provide space for many of these students. The University through its housing fund has had to substantially subsidize the cost of housing these students in motels.

Many anxious and upset students and parents contacted department and other University offices before the Fall Quarter in an attempt to deal with the prospect of no housing. The Housing Office at Cal Poly acted in good faith in dealing with the housing shortage, but the University should never have allowed the problem to occur.

Continuing housing problems will further diminish the attractability of Cal Poly.

Principle #5. The enrollment growth at Cal Poly should occur in planned phases to allow for analysis of the effect of this growth on the campus.

The increase in head count from 16,677 on the first day of class, Fall 2000, to 18,068 currently, is exactly what Principle #5 recommended that we not do. Housing units are currently being built. Phased growth would have allowed for the enrollment growth to coincide with the opening of the new housing units, thus avoiding many of the housing problems that we experienced this past fall.

Furthermore, because the number of new admitted for Fall 2001 is far higher than the classes admitted four and five years ago, admitting the same number of new students for Fall 2002 as were admitted this fall, would create an enrollment that far exceeded our physical capacity. As a result far fewer new students will be admitted for Fall 2002. This wild fluctuation in the number of new majors will cause significant problems for most of our academic programs. All of this could have been avoided had the enrollment growth occurred in planned phases.

We have the following recommendations.

Recommendation #1.

The Academic Senate should have real input in setting future enrollment targets. This input could be through the Academic Senate Executive Committee with analysis from the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee. Enrollment targets should be set with the realities of our limitations – housing, instructors, classrooms and other accommodations – clearly in mind.

Recommendation #2.

At the time that enrollment decisions are made for the following academic year, all departments shall be notified of the enrollment targets. Included in this notification shall be an analysis of the effect of this enrollment target on the departments. Hiring decisions are often made well in advance of the new academic year. In addition, many departments compete with Cuesta College for employment of part-time instructors. As much as possible, advance notice of expected enrollment changes would be most helpful to departments.

Recommendation #3.

At the time that enrollment decisions are made for the following academic year, the ASI shall be notified. Students have a right to know if enrollment changes will affect their opportunities to enroll in classes as well as their opportunities for housing. Some students may choose to attend summer classes in order to enroll in certain high demand classes. In a difficult housing market, many students may want to ensure housing for the following year at the earliest possible opportunity.


Recommendation #4.

The deadlines for new student intent to enroll, May 1, should coincide with the deadline to apply for housing. Many of our better students apply to schools such as Berkeley and Stanford. These students often may not be able to make a decision concerning schools until nearly May 1. Our goal should be to attract the brightest students and to present the fewest obstacles to their enrollment at Cal Poly. Extending the housing deadline would also provide Cal Poly with the most complete housing demand for new students. We could craft earlier and better strategies for dealing with the housing demand for new students.

State of California
M e m o r a n d u m

To: Unny Menon
Chair, Academic Senate

Date: September 19, 2001


From: Warren J. Baker
President

Copies: Paul Zingg
Linda Dalton

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-558-01/EC
Resolution on Enrollment Growth for Fall 2001

I would like to take the opportunity in responding to the Academic Senate's concerns about enrollment growth for Fall 2001, to place enrollment at Cal Poly in its larger historical context. A number of the issues raised in this resolution reflect concerns both on and off campus, so it is helpful to put the whole picture in perspective. In this response, I will address the following distinct, yet related points from both the "whereas" and "resolved" clauses in the resolution:

- Enrollment trends, including the proportion of new freshmen;
- Facilities – including office space, class rooms and scheduling;
- Instructional requirements to meet enrollment needs – operating budget, faculty;
- Implications for educational quality;
- Implications for student housing and
- Consultation regarding enrollment planning, in the context of the new Master Plan and several recent Senate resolutions.

Throughout the discussion of enrollment, it is important to distinguish between our past enrollment and current capacity, and enrollment growth proposed under the new Master Plan. Until we receive funding from the California State University to expand our instructional facilities to meet the growth discussed in the master plan, our enrollment is limited by our existing capacity.

Enrollment Trends

I would like to start with several facts that are often neglected in public discussions of Cal Poly's enrollments both on and off campus.

First of all, Cal Poly's fall headcount and year-round enrollment (College Year Full-Time Equivalent Students or CY FTES)¹ were less this past year than in 1990-91. The same is true for the target for 2001-2002.

¹ As a reminder, Full-time Equivalent Students or FTES is calculated by dividing the total units taken by all students by the number 15 – the load assumed to represent full-time enrollment at a level that would allow a student to complete an undergraduate degree in four years.

Unny Menon
Page 2
September 19, 2001

| | Fall Headcount | CY FTES |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| 1990-91 | 17,758 | 16,893 |
| 1995-96 | 16,023 | 15,102 |
| 2000-01 | 16,877 | 15,882 |
| 2001-02 (<i>campus target</i>) | 17,666 | 16,564 |

Many of us remember well that Cal Poly significantly reduced its enrollment in the early 1990s due to budget cutbacks, then began to recover from 1995 to the present. However, we don't always recognize that recent enrollments are still below Fall 1990 – nor do we realize that the projected head count and FTES for Fall 2001 will still be below Fall 1990.

In late fall or early winter each year, the California State University System sets an enrollment level for each campus for the subsequent college year – summer, fall, winter and spring. During the past decade our enrollment has sometimes exceeded the assigned level and sometimes been below – with a range from 98% (in 1999-00) to 109% (in 1992-93, when funds were reduced dramatically during the State's fiscal crisis).

We have not been penalized for under-enrollment in the past; and we have sometimes received supplemental funds (one-time) when we have exceeded expectations by more than 2%. However, the CSU has now indicated that, due to the impacted status of our undergraduate programs, under-enrollment (below the assigned level) will not be acceptable. Therefore, to provide a margin of error for not coming in below the assigned level, we set a campus target about 2 percent above the CSU expectation.

In order to establish a total enrollment that allows for the 2 percent margin, we have to balance our estimates of how many current students will return the following Fall with the number of new students to be admitted. We estimated that about 12,710 students from Fall 2000 would continue to enroll in Fall 2001. Subtracting this number from the total Fall headcount, and allowing for a 2 percent margin, we determined that we would need to enroll 4956 new students. We then estimated how many would be new post-baccalaureate students, new transfer students and new freshmen. It is important to make these distinctions in comparing one year with another, so that we can see the differences. The following table shows the data for several comparative years (and the data from it should be substituted for the numbers listed in the first two "whereas" clauses in the resolution).

| Fall | Total Headcount | Continuing | New PB | New Transfer | New Freshmen |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1990 | 17,758 | 14,739 | 355 | 1,012 | 1,652 |
| 1995 | 16,023 | 11,764 | 335 | 1,417 | 2,507 |
| 2000 | 16,877 | 12,554 | 338 | 874 | 3,111 |
| 2001 (<i>campus target</i>) | 17,666 | 12,710 | 360 | 1,080 | 3,516 |

The comparison shows that more of the students in Fall 1990 were continuing students, and that proportionately more of the new students were transfer students than today. While the total enrollment is similar, these different patterns clearly affect the particular courses that need to be offered as well as other campus services.

Unny Menon
Page 3
September 19, 2001

Facilities – including office space, class rooms and scheduling

Prior to the development of our new master plan, Cal Poly received funding for facilities to achieve an enrollment level of a net 15,000 full-time equivalent students during the academic year. The nature of instruction at Cal Poly determines the amount of space required to meet this enrollment level. Thus, it allows for office space and laboratories as well as lecture instruction by discipline. However, it excludes all forms of "supervision" and any courses that are not scheduled at a specific time or place on campus. Further, facility requirements are based on an expected level of "utilization" of classrooms and laboratories from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. The CSU has underscored its expectations about facility utilization recently – noting not only that courses should be distributed more widely across the day and week, but also that more instruction should occur during the summer.

The academic year enrollment for 2000-01 was 15,137 full-time equivalent students (AY FTES). However, after subtracting off-site instruction and instruction on campus not requiring scheduled facilities, as we are required to do, the net AY FTES was 14,206. Our campus target for 2001-02 is 15,802 AY FTES, which discounts to 14,792 net AY FTES. Thus, the campus has, according to CSU space standards, the physical capacity to educate the number of students projected for Fall 2001. However, to ensure that we have sufficient faculty offices we will be bringing in some modular units to supplement current office space.

Instructional Requirements to Meet Enrollment Needs

Here, I would like to begin with the operating budget. We receive new enrollment funds each year for the amount of enrollment growth set for us by the CSU. These funds are added to the campus base budget at an "average marginal cost" as calculated for the System. For the 2001-02 year, the CSU calculated this marginal cost to be \$7,519 per FTES. This figure is comprised of the following: 44 percent for direct instruction (salaries and benefits), 30 percent for instructional equipment and support, 12 percent for student services, and 14 percent for general institutional support. This figure assumes an average salary for new faculty of \$44,940.

We all recognize that this funding level is less than what Cal Poly requires given our academic program mix. Therefore, the campus has been working on supplementary funding for the past decade, including the Cal Poly Plan (which includes a campus academic fee) and the Workforce Initiative (which was funded by the State in 2000-01).

Cal Poly has allocated \$1.5 million for new enrollment growth in 2001-02 to the Division of Academic Affairs to increase course offerings and other services in direct support of instruction. Although this amount had not been determined at the time that the Senate resolution was adopted, it is greater than the estimate provided in the resolution, and represents slightly more than the CSU allocated for enrollment growth at Cal Poly from 2000-01 to 2001-02. (It is helpful to remember that the actual enrollment in 2000-01 was about 160 FTES below the CSU-funded target. Thus, the campus set enrollment targets for 2001-02 to compensate for this deficiency as well as to meet the new CSU target, which is 195 FTES above 2000-01.)

Unny Menon
Page 4
September 19, 2001

Implications for Student Housing

Private property owners and managers have historically provided a significant share of the housing for Cal Poly and Cuesta Community College students as well as for other young people and others in the area who are interested in multi-family housing. In addition, some students share townhouses, duplexes and single-family homes. Seven housing facilities are organized as the Off-Campus Student Housing Association. Together, they have space for over 2,600 students (assuming a minimum of two students per unit).

Background analysis for the new Cal Poly Master Plan revealed the following about trends in the overall regional housing market:

"During the past decade housing supply has not kept pace with demand, particularly for rental housing. The *1999 Regional Profile* published by the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments indicates that multi-family units represented only 5 percent of the new housing authorized for construction in 1997 in San Luis Obispo County (as compared with about 20 percent in Monterey County and 40 percent in Santa Barbara County)" (p. 130).

The *1999 Regional Profile* also shows that San Luis Obispo provides more multi-family housing than any other community in the County. However, the City of San Luis Obispo's General Plan does not designate significant amounts of land for additional multi-family housing; and market studies have shown little near-term development potential in the area close to campus.

Some residential complexes formerly rented to students have been converted for other appropriate purposes, such as housing for senior citizens. While these changes do not show up in the data regarding the number of multi-family housing units, they dramatically affect the rental housing supply that is available to students.

During the past decade, Cal Poly's lower enrollment has impacted housing in San Luis Obispo less than it did in the late 1980's and 1990's. In sum, there is evidence that the current housing crunch stems from the following sequence of events. When Cal Poly reduced its enrollments in the early 1990's, due to state budget reductions, owners of some housing formerly rented to Cal Poly students converted their property to other uses. Then, as Cal Poly began to build its enrollment back towards its existing capacity, the rental housing market did not recover to meet that demand. In addition, the local population grew for reasons unrelated to higher education. This scenario would explain why the housing situation appears to be worse today, when Cal Poly has fewer students total and a higher percentage of local students; and the City has more housing units and a lower household size, than it did in 1990.

Student Housing at Cal Poly

Cal Poly has provided housing for some of its students from the beginning. In the past thirty years the percentage of students housed has not changed dramatically. During the 1980s, the campus provided housing for about 17 percent of its students. That percentage dropped to under 16 percent in Fall 1990 when enrollment was at an all-time high. In Fall 2000 the percentage was about 16.5 percent, and for Fall 2001 the percentage will be about 16 percent.

Unny Menon
Page 5
September 19, 2001

The primary exception occurred when Cal Poly deliberately curtailed its enrollment during budget reductions in the early 1990s. During the 1992-93 academic year, Cal Poly closed two residence halls. In addition, during the 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95 academic years Cal Poly opened vacant dormitory spaces to Cuesta students. In Fall 1992 Cal Poly housed 49 Cuesta students; the number increased to 194 in Fall 1993; and then decreased in Fall 1994 to 116 Cuesta students. This step permitted the University to find a revenue source to meet payments on bonded indebtedness for the existing residence halls during these three academic years.

Typically, members of the campus community as well as the general public are not aware that student residence halls are not built with taxpayers' funds. Instead, the University sets up a separate fund to finance student housing and recover the costs through rents over time. Since approval of student housing projects requires a financial plan that will secure bond funding, project plans cannot be submitted until it is clear that the revenue estimates can be attained. Thus, planning cannot go forward until an excess demand is identified.

In addition to the students who live on campus, about 40 percent of Cal Poly's students live in student-oriented housing and fraternities within one mile. Another 27 percent live elsewhere in the City of San Luis Obispo and about 15 percent in other parts of the County. The percentages living on campus and in San Luis Obispo have been relatively stable over the past fifteen years. In addition, Cal Poly now enrolls a larger percentage of local students than in 1990.

CSU policy does not allow campuses to provide housing that is exclusive in any way. Thus, Cal Poly cannot build a "fraternity row" to meet these students' needs.

In anticipation of a return to earlier enrollment levels, Cal Poly has maintained its historic student housing stock, collaborated with off-campus housing partners to secure housing for its students by making referrals to off-campus housing partners and, as I will review below, developed plans for additional on-campus housing.

Strategies for Meeting Student Housing Demand

We believe that moderate, phased enrollment growth, if anticipated by expansion in student housing capacity, can allow Cal Poly to meet its obligations under the State Master Plan for Higher Education, without overtaxing the area's housing stock. The University is committed to meet its obligations in a responsible and responsive way. We believe there is also a role for the City of San Luis Obispo to play in supporting and facilitating greater responsiveness by the housing market to the housing needs of students and other low and moderate income residents. We believe further that all of this can be accomplished without compromising the region's environmental and quality of life values, planning principles and priorities.

In the new campus Master Plan Cal Poly recognizes the importance of housing as a community concern, and the University takes several steps to both respond to housing demand and to create a more integrated residential community learning experience for its students. The primary components of the plan are these:

- Constructing a new apartment-style residence complex for 800 students to meet present housing needs – ground breaking occurred in early June, with the expectation that the units will be ready for occupancy in Winter 2003.
- Currently analyzing additional sites on campus for up to 700 more students by the end of 2003. When these are complete, the percentage of students living on campus will increase from about 16 percent now to 24 percent.

Thus, the Master Plan calls for Cal Poly to provide student housing at an aggressive rate that exceeds future enrollment growth.

In addition, as stated on p. 136 of the Master Plan:

"Cal Poly will review and revise [recent] market studies to inform each phase of Master Plan housing development and enrollment growth. Relevant comparative data includes vacancy rates, rents, land available for housing, financing options, and the nature and importance of amenities. Studies will also address student housing preferences and challenges in locating suitable off-campus housing."

"Further, Cal Poly will monitor the local market closely, and, if continuing students are not able to find suitable housing, the campus will develop a strategy to house a larger proportion of the University's students in the future. Strategies may involve working with off-campus partners to identify suitable housing locations and provide financing. Cal Poly and Cuesta College are also exploring ways to cooperate in assuring appropriate housing for their students. Finally, Cal Poly will participate with non-profit organizations in seeking broader solutions to community housing needs."

I included much of the information in this response in a letter to Mayor Allen Settle earlier this summer. In that letter, I also indicated that the University stands ready to play an active and creative part in addressing the greater community housing challenge, while carrying out its statewide educational mission. I suggested that the City of San Luis Obispo join the University and other community agencies in a working group to seek a better understanding of the dynamics of the regional housing market and to explore strategies through which it might be made more responsive to the housing needs of students and other low and moderate income residents. The City has indicated its interest in pursuing this initiative.

The Timing of Enrollment Growth and Student Housing

It has been well known for some time that the CSU would ultimately expect the campus to build back up to enrollment levels achieved before the State's budget crisis. I have emphasized on numerous occasions over the past decade in campus and community forums that the CSU is facing a "tidal wave" of new students from increased numbers of high school graduates and that Cal Poly would be asked by the CSU to restore enrollments to historic levels and prepare for some enrollment growth as part of its new Master Plan.

As discussed above, and based on its prior Master Plan, Cal Poly has sufficient instructional capacity to enroll approximately 17,900 students each Fall. (The precise capacity depends on the kinds of courses students take.) Cal Poly is the campus in most demand in the CSU because of its program mix, high quality and outstanding service to students. Indeed, many of the programs at Cal Poly are not available

Unny Menon
Page 7
September 19, 2001

elsewhere in the State. Presently, Cal Poly has to deny admission to about 8,000 applicants for Fall undergraduate admissions who meet CSU eligibility requirements (out of a total of over 20,000 applicants). We cannot justify to the taxpayers of California not filling a campus to its current capacity when the campus is as heavily impacted as Cal Poly.

However, once Cal Poly reaches its present instructional capacity, Cal Poly does not intend to increase enrollment on campus during the academic year until new instructional buildings have been completed. At the earliest, the campus will have new instructional capacity in 2006. Thus, Cal Poly has the opportunity over the next five years to add student housing without increasing enrollment during the academic year.

During this time, any enrollment growth will occur primarily in the summer term when the campus does have unused capacity for instruction. Indeed, the new Master Plan calls for an increase in summer and off-campus enrollments as a way to educate more students without increasing the physical capacity of the campus and impacting the surrounding community.

I do not see that enrollment for Fall 2001 and the 2001-02 year is inconsistent with Academic Senate Resolution AS-524-99/B&LRPC because this enrollment is within the capacity of our previous master plan, and as noted earlier, below Fall 1990 and the entire 1990-91 year.

At the same time, the development of the new Master Plan was guided by the principles in Academic Senate Resolution AS-524-99/B&LRPC, with specific provisions for most of the specific items stated in the resolution – including academic quality, student progress to degree, facilities improvements, and community impact. Further, the Master Plan is grounded in Cal Poly's academic mission and establishes enrollment increases in planned phases.

Consultation

Finally, with respect to the request for consultation, I would like to review the consultation processes already in place. The Master Plan was developed through an extensive consultative process in which students, faculty, staff and community members were engaged over a four-year period. The Academic Senate and its Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee as well as the ASI Board of Directors received numerous presentations during that process, and individual faculty and students participated directly in task forces and public meetings. The Academic Senate is represented on the Deans' Enrollment Planning Advisory Committee, where long-range enrollment planning is a central topic, and at meetings of the Council of Academic Deans, where annual enrollment targets are discussed. Therefore, rather than suggest additional consultative procedures, I suggest that the Executive Committee of the Senate may want to include an update on enrollment planning as an agenda item – perhaps once each quarter – so that the Senate and its constituents may be informed regularly about planning under way across the campus.

Adopted: March 13, 2001

**ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-558-01/EC
RESOLUTION ON
ENROLLMENT GROWTH FOR FALL 2001**

- 1 WHEREAS, Cal Poly increased its enrollment with the addition of 3,985 new students in the
2 fall of 2000; and
3
4 WHEREAS, Cal Poly will increase its enrollment for the fall of 2001 with a target of about
5 4,450 new students; and
6
7 WHEREAS, This increase in enrollment will require a substantial increase in the number of
8 sections of mathematics, English, and other General Education courses; and
9
10 WHEREAS, A conservative estimate of the costs needed to hire sufficient faculty to cover the
11 additional sections required to meet projected student demand is in excess of
12 \$1,000,000; and
13
14 WHEREAS, There is no indication of an increase of that magnitude in next year's Academic
15 Affairs budget; and
16
17 WHEREAS, There does not exist adequate faculty office space to house the additional faculty
18 needed to teach these sections; and
19
20 WHEREAS, Finding classrooms for these sections will require significant changes in the
21 current method of scheduling rooms such as more early morning, late evening,
22 and/or weekend classes; and
23
24 WHEREAS, Neither the Cal Poly campus nor the surrounding communities have adequate
25 housing to meet the demand that will be required for new and continuing students
26 at both Cal Poly and Cuesta College; and
27
28 WHEREAS, It is morally wrong for Cal Poly, or any educational institution, to be required to
29 admit students without being able to guarantee them classes and housing;
30 therefore, be it
31

31 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly believes that with the enrollment of the
32 projected number of new students for fall 2001, the quality of Cal Poly's
33 educational program will be jeopardized and its reputation impaired; and be it
34 further
35

36 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly urge its administration to publicly explain
37 how the enrollment target for fall of 2001 complies with the principles of
38 enrollment growth contained in Academic Senate Resolution AS-524-
39 99/B&LRPC (attached); and be it further
40

41 RESOLVED: That Cal Poly administration consult with the Academic Senate and the ASI
42 Board of Directors in setting future enrollment targets.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: February 27, 2001
Revised: March 6, 2001

Adopted: May 25, 1999

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

AS-524-99/B&LRPC
RESOLUTION ON PRINCIPLES TO GOVERN
ENROLLMENT GROWTH AT CAL POLY

Background: In concert with the current Cal Poly Master Plan Update, the Budget & Long Range Planning Committee of the Academic Senate was asked to review two documents from the past and to update them as needed to reflect today's concerns. The two documents that were reviewed were:

1. Academic Senate resolution AS-279-88/LRPC, *Resolution on Enrollment Growth to 15,000 FTE and Beyond*, adopted: March 8, 1988; and
2. *Demographic Factors Affecting Cal Poly Enrollment*, dated February 8, 1988. The Committee felt that most of the text of the original documents was still relevant and elected to re-emphasize what it felt to be some important basic principles that should be considered whenever enrollment growth is discussed.

WHEREAS Cal Poly is engaged in a major update of its Campus Master Plan; and

WHEREAS Enrollment growth will have significant impacts upon academic quality, facilities utilization, and resource allocations; therefore be it

RESOLVED That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the following principles:

1. That enrollment growth at Cal Poly should not adversely affect academic quality.
2. That enrollment growth at Cal Poly should not adversely affect the academic progress of those students who were enrolled at the time of growth.
3. That enrollment growth at Cal Poly should be fully funded for any additional students admitted (either on this campus, at satellite facilities, or at programs taught through distance learning or other technological means).
4. That enrollment growth at Cal Poly should not occur until the facilities needed (including instructional facilities, housing, and parking) to support the additional students are in place.
5. That enrollment growth at Cal Poly should occur in planned phases to allow for analysis of the effect of this growth on the campus.
6. That enrollment growth at Cal Poly should reflect and maintain Cal Poly's role as a polytechnic university and the adopted mission statement of the University.
7. That enrollment growth at Cal Poly must be sensitive to Cal Poly's impact on its surrounding communities and environment.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Budget and
Long Range Planning Committee

Date: April 21, 1999

Revised: May 20, 1999

Revised May 25, 1999

Margaret R. Camuso

From: Unny Menon
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2001 3:44 PM
To: Unny Menon
Cc: Mary K. Fiala; Kenneth B. Barclay; David Conn; Robert C. Detweiler; Kimi M. Ikeda; Euel W. Kennedy; Andrea L. Kerns; Bonnie T. Long; Valene B. Mathews; Barbara A. McCaleb; Linda P. Sullivan; Patty Warnick; Paul J. Zingg; Thomas L. Zuur
Subject: Response to AS-566-01/IC



AS 566-01.doc

On September 21, 2001, President Warren J. Baker responded, via memorandum, to Academic Senate Resolution AS-566-01/IC - Resolution on Commencement.

I have attached the President's response in its entirety as a Word document; however, I am also providing the text of the memorandum below for those who have e-mail systems that do not handle attachments.

If you have any questions, please call.

Mary K. Fiala
Executive Secretary to the President's Office
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
805/756-6000 Fax: 805/756-1129
e-mail: mfiala@calpoly.edu

President Warren J. Baker's response of September 21, 2001, to Academic Senate Resolution AS-566-01/IC, Resolution on Commencement.

"I hereby acknowledge receipt of the above-referenced Academic Senate Resolution.

The concerns expressed in this Resolution are well understood and appreciated. Although the administration agrees with the spirit and intent of the Resolution, in the face of severely limited resources, the timeline to implement the Resolution is uncertain. Insuring that students meet the Senate's criteria would severely impact the workload of the Academic Records Office at the present time. However, the Senate's advice and consultation will certainly be taken into consideration in the future, and we will reconsider the Resolution when the new degree audit system is in place.

Please extend my thanks and appreciation to the Instruction Committee for its interest in bringing this matter to our attention."



Adopted: May 15, 2001

**ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California**

AS-566-01/IC

**RESOLUTION ON
COMMENCEMENT**

- 1 WHEREAS, Cal Poly maintains high academic standards and integrity; and
2
3 WHEREAS, Commencement is a ceremony for the conferring of a degree marking the completion of
4 all academic requirements (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary); therefore, be it
5
6 RESOLVED: That students shall be made aware that participation by students who are not scheduled
7 to complete all degree requirements is contradictory to the spirit of academic integrity
8 and of the commencement ceremony; and be it further
9
10 RESOLVED: That it shall be the policy of Cal Poly that for a student to participate in graduation
ceremonies, the student must satisfy at least one of the following:
11
12 1. The student shall have completed all degree requirements and not have participated
13 in a graduation ceremony previously.
14 2. The student shall currently be enrolled in classes that would complete all of that
15 student's degree requirements.
16 3. The student shall be registered for classes for the following term that would allow
17 the student to complete all of his/her degree requirements;
18
19 and be it further
20
21 RESOLVED: That Cal Poly's administration, in consultation with the Academic Senate, develop a
22 timeline to support and implement this resolution.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: February 5, 2001
Revision: May 15, 2001

October 8, 2001

-28-

To: Academic Senate Executive Committee

From : William Siembieda, Academic Senate Representative.

RE: State Report – Consultative Committee to the President Baker on the Search for a VP of Administration and Finance position.

Beginning in June, and continuing through the summer, the Consultative Committee has been working to bring to campus candidates for the position of the VP of Administration and Finance. This is the most important non-academic post on campus after the President.

There have been some 67 applications (partial and complete). The Committee has used the services of a professional academic administration search firm in the process for purposes of locating and due diligence. The Committee's work is coming to a close as there are three candidates scheduled to visit the campus this fall. Each candidate has demonstrated competence in finance, facilities, and operations. A fourth candidate visit may occur.

| <u>Candidate</u> | <u>Dates of Visit</u> | <u>Present Affiliation</u> |
|------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Laurence Kelly | 10/22-23 | Treasurer & Associate VP for Business, Georgia State University - Atlanta |
| George Ross | 10/25-26 | VP, Chief Operating Officer, Clark University - Atlanta |
| LeEtta Overmyer | 10/29-30 | Asst. Vice Provost, Administrative Services, Arizona State University - Tempe |

During each visit there will be an Open Forum period where a short presentation will be given and Q&A time allotted.

Kelly, 10/22 from 2-3 p.m., location TBA

Ross, 10/26, from 1-2 p.m. Location TBA

Overmyer, 10/29 from 11-12 p.m., location TBA

There also will be a closed session with the Consultative Committee.

Actions Requested:

- (1) I am requesting that the Academic Senate Executive Committee provide me with one or two questions you wish to have asked during the closed Consultative Committee session.
- (2) The second faculty member on the committee is Steve Kaminaka. Steve is presently on sabbatical and in Hawaii for five weeks. As I will be in Washington, D.C. October 25-26. There is a need for the Senate to appoint a 'stand-in' for those dates.
- (3) Announce the Open Forum dates and times to the faculty.
- (4) Suggest any other issues that seem relevant to you at this time.

I will be happy to discuss any and all of the above with the committee.

Sincerely,

William Siembieda, Professor
City and Regional Planning
Tel 6-1315