

**PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS MEETING WILL
BE HELD IN BUILDING 25 (Faculty Offices-East), ROOM 229E**

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

**Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, July 16, 1996
25-229E , 3:00-5:00pm**

- I. Minutes:
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair:
 - B. President's Office:
 - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs:
 - D. Statewide Senators:
 - E. CFA Campus President:
 - F. Staff Council representative:
 - G. ASI representatives:
 - H. IACC representative:
 - I. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Approval of the Academic Senate Calendar of Meetings for 1996-1997: (p. 2)**
 - B. **Approval of Released Time for Academic Senate Officers and Committee Chairs: (p. 3).**
 - C. **Cal Poly Plan:**
 - (1) elect new members to the Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee
 - (2) continued oversight by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
 - (3) status report given by Linda Dalton
 - (4) general discussion
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
 - A. **Faculty Computer Workstations**
 - B. **Fall Enrollment**
- VII. Adjournment:

Academic Senate Calendar for 1996-1997

All Senate and Executive Committee meetings are held in UU 220 from 3:00 to 5:00pm unless otherwise noted.

September 24	Executive Committee
October 8	Senate
October 15	Executive Committee
October 29	Senate
November 5	Executive Committee
November 19	Senate
November 26	Senate (if needed)

December 2 through January 5, 1997 - finals and quarter break

January 7	Executive Committee
January 21	Senate
January 28	Executive Committee
February 11	Senate
February 18	Executive Committee
March 4	Senate

March 10 through March 23, 1997 - finals and quarter break

March 25	Executive Committee
April 8	Senate
April 15	Executive Committee
April 29	Senate
May 6	Executive Committee
May 20	Senate
May 27	Senate

June 2 through June 15, 1997 - finals and quarter break

The calendar is structured to have an Executive Committee meeting the Tuesday following each Academic Senate meeting. It also allows for 14 days between the Executive Committee and the next Academic Senate meeting for the completion and timely delivery of the agenda to the senators before the Academic Senate meetings.

June 27, 1996

Academic Senate Assigned Time

1995-96

Chair (includes Sum '95)	0.600	26.90
Vice Chair	0.090	4
Secretary	0.133	6
Budget Chair	0.067	3
Curriculum Chair	0.133	6
Fairness Board Chair	0.067	3
GE&B Chair	0.067	3
Instruction Chair	0.067	3
Prog Rev & Imp Chair	0.133	6
Acad Sen office assistant	<u>0.143</u>	<u>6.60</u>
	1.500	67.50

1996-97

Chair (includes Sum '96)	0.566	25.5
Vice Chair	0.089	4
Secretary	0.	0
Budget Chair	0.178	8
Curriculum Chair	0.178	8
Faculty Affairs Chair	0.	0
Faculty Awards Chair	0.	0
Fairness Board Chair	0.089	4
GE&B Chair	0.178	8
Grants Review Chair	0.	0
Instruction Chair	0.089	4
Prog Rev & Imp Chair	0.178	8
Research & Prof Dev Chair	<u>0.089</u>	<u>4</u>
	1.634	73.5

RECEIVED

JUN 25 1996

State of California

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Academic Senate

Memorandum

Date: June 21, 1996

To: Vice Presidents
Deans
Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee

File No.: Cal Poly Plan

Copies: L. Dalton
D. Howard-Greene

From: Paul Zingg, Provost

Subject: Cal Poly Plan Phase One Report to the Chancellor, and Update on Proposals
Recommended for First Year Funding

President Baker has forwarded the attached report on the Cal Poly Plan to the Chancellor for his review. In addition to a summary of the provisions of the Plan, the Report contains tables showing the four-year budget, first-year proposals recommended for funding, and how the first-year proposals meet the Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals.

In making recommendations for funding during the first year, the deans and vice presidents reviewed proposals that had been rated highly by both their units and an administrative committee. This process reduced the total from more than 150 proposals (valued in excess of \$10 million) to about 30, although the dollar value of the requests still exceeded \$3 million. The deans and vice presidents then re-examined the proposals from their units, trimming costs and looking for matching funds. Finally, the vice presidents selected proposals that could offer tangible benefits to students within the limited first year budget of \$1.8 million. All of these proposals clearly meet the Cal Poly Plan criteria, with the set balanced to include innovative applications of instructional technology and creative approaches to curriculum redesign, advising, and supplemental instruction. Among them, the proposals suggest ways to improve institutional productivity through better use of University facilities and administrative services; to increase student learning and progress to degree completion through improved advising, academic support, and curriculum redesign; and to enhance educational quality through providing state-of-the-art knowledge and equipment to prepare students for life and work in the twenty-first century. In addition, the proposals recommended for funding offered specific means by which they will be accountable, such as measuring success rates in high-risk lower division classes, and retention and graduation rates.

In recommending proposals for funding, the vice presidents reaffirmed the purposes and goals of the Cal Poly Plan. Within the goals and the two investment areas for the first year -- instructional technology and equipment, and instructional programs, including advising and curriculum revision -- units may need some flexibility as the first-year projects take shape. Thus, the final proposals are recommended for funding with the following conditions:

- **Funding of all proposals remains subject to the approval of the campus academic fee by the Chancellor of the California State University system.** Thus, while the units involved may be eager to begin implementation, listing of their proposals in the attached tables can only represent an intent to fund, not a commitment at this point.

*Min - Exec 7.16.96
(full report distributed
at meeting)*

Adopted: March 8, 1988

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

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 findings and recommendations of 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 based on the premises that some growth in enrollment is appropriate to Cal Poly, but that program addition or expansion should be carefully planned so as to respond to external pressures, to take advantage of academic opportunities, and to assure that necessary instructional and non-instructional facilities and services are available to support the increase in numbers.

AS-279-88/LRPC

RESOLUTION ON
ENROLLMENT GROWTH TO 15,000 FTE AND BEYOND

WHEREAS Cal Poly has been asked to consider when and how it might accommodate an increase in enrollment at two levels -- to 15,000 FTE and beyond 15,000 FTE;

THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University adopt the attached report prepared by the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee specifying criteria and conditions for educational equity, composition of the student body, and program addition and expansion; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly enter a first phase of growth in enrollment toward 15,000 FTE no sooner than the 1991-1992 academic year to allow time for the completion of approved facilities and for the approval of funds to alleviate other shortages (in both instructional and non-instructional facilities and services), as specified in the attached report prepared by the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly prepare a comprehensive plan, in consultation with the Academic Senate, covering demographic projections, composition of the student body, program addition and expansion, facility location and timing, and community impact to determine whether and how Cal Poly could accommodate an increase in enrollment to a range of 16,600 to 17,400 FTE over the next fifteen years, as specified in the attached report prepared by the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Long-Range
Planning Committee
February 16, 1988
Revised: February 23, 1988
Revised: March 8, 1988

John - Exec 7.16.96

From: DV076 --CALPOLY
Date: 10 Jul 96 15:06:29 PDT
Subject: Uncl: Cal Poly Plan

Date and time 07/10/96 15:06:23

From: Dan Howard-Greene, Exec. Asst. to the President

President Baker called from the airport this afternoon and asked me to pass along to you a report about the Board of Trustees discussion of the Cal Poly Plan this morning.

Chancellor Munitz, President Baker and ASI President, Steve McShane, all spoke about the Plan at the BOT meeting. The members of the Board responded very positively, and expressed both support and accolades for the work that has been done on the Plan by all the Cal Poly constituencies. Chancellor Munitz indicated in his remarks that he had not expected Cal Poly to have progressed this far this quickly. The Lieutenant Governor was present at the meeting and spoke in support of the Cal Poly Plan, emphasizing his particular enthusiasm for its focus on accountability. He also noted that Cal Poly students' willingness to support the Plan through a supplemental fee gives the University significant moral leverage in seeking expanded support from the private sector.

President Baker asked me to express his thanks and appreciation to you all for your hard work and commitment to the Cal Poly Plan. He looks forward to working with you, and with the University community, as we continue to work toward a detailed agreement about the Plan with the Chancellor.

CAL POLY PLAN

PHASE ONE REPORT TO THE CHANCELLOR

June 1996

Central Features of the Cal Poly Plan

The Cal Poly Plan offers a model for how the State of California can meet future demand for public higher education from its citizens in a time of dramatic enrollment growth, rising public expectations for quality and efficiency, and limited public resources. Through the Plan, Cal Poly will seek ways to decrease student time to degree, increase student learning, enhance the productivity of faculty and staff, promote the more effective use of fixed resources, and implement comprehensive assessment and accountability procedures. The Plan will support new ways of educating and supporting students, including creative approaches to teaching and learning and their measurement, curriculum design and scheduling, and the application of information technology to instruction. These efforts require multi-year investments in human resources (professional development for faculty and staff) as well as in equipment. Cal Poly's proposed campus academic fee is designed to support these improvements.

The four goals of the Cal Poly Plan all contribute to the end of improving the quality, effectiveness, efficiency, and accessibility of higher education. The following examples illustrate how innovative approaches (noted in *italics*) complement other more traditional means to increase the University's effectiveness and are potentially transferable quality and productivity improvements:

Institutional Productivity

Greater efficiency in the use of physical resources and fixed costs: Expansion of summer quarter, with an eye toward a year-round calendar is one example of using fixed costs and fixed capital assets to educate additional students. Other means include scheduling efficiencies and *reconfiguring academic space* to meet the needs of new teaching and learning models. Investments in *studio laboratory classrooms* and advanced computing equipment will contribute toward this objective.

Greater productivity in support and administrative services: *Re-engineering administrative processes, using information technology where appropriate*, will enable the University to serve present and future students more effectively. Other efforts include an explicit *customer-orientation for administrative and support services*, and identification of appropriate *accountability measures to judge the quality and efficiency* in the delivery of such services. The proposed automated degree audit system will improve administrative processes to benefit students.

Student Learning and Progress

Improvements in access to classes, academic advising, and other measures to assure timely progress to degree completion: Student progress can be improved in a variety of ways:

Encourage optimal loads -- *Curriculum streamlining* (total units, prerequisites, flexible requirements);
 Improve scheduling -- Across day and week to meet student needs; *Implementation of 4-unit module*;
 Reduce bottlenecks -- Additional sections of high-demand classes; Advising; *Curriculum streamlining*;
 Reduce unnecessary courses -- Orientation; Advising; Curriculum simplification; General Education and Breadth; Major changes; Course substitutions; Articulation; Transfer student evaluation; *Automated degree audit*;
 Facilitate degree completion -- Senior evaluations; Senior project monitoring; *Senior project labs*;
 Use fixed resources more efficiently -- Summer quarter; Year-round operations; *Classroom and laboratory reconfiguration*;
 Reduce time to degree -- *Published mutual expectations*;
 Make student learning less dependent on time, place, and seat time in a classroom -- Advanced placement; Supervised independent study; Curriculum and course redesign; *Distance learning*; *Electronic interaction among students and between students and faculty*.

Improvements in access to classes, academic advising, and other measures to assure academic success: Student learning can be enhanced by several means:

Assure quality and currency -- *Clear learning outcomes*;
 Improve quality and academic success -- Improved teaching effectiveness; *Technology-mediated instruction, including World Wide Web applications*;
 Increase academic success rates -- *Shadow classes*, supplemental instruction, advising, and other academic support services.

Moderate increase in enrollment during the academic year, to return to Master Plan capacity of 15,000 full-time equivalent students during the academic year. In addition to summer expansion, an increase will enable Cal Poly to meet the needs of more students without over-extending its physical resources. In the future, Cal Poly will focus enrollment growth in high demand programs not generally available at other public universities in California.

Educational Quality

Preparation of graduates with state-of-the-art knowledge and competencies needed for life and work in the twenty-first century: At Cal Poly the quality of education is ultimately judged by our graduates, and perceptions of them by their employers, graduate programs, and civic communities. As we move toward the twenty-first century, the University will find *new ways to reinforce its hallmark "learn by doing" approach* to education emphasizing laboratory activities, projects, field experience, and *service learning*.

Accountability and Assessment

Development of measures of accountability and procedures for assessment that demonstrate the stewardship of the University to both internal and external constituents: Baseline data, performance expectations, and *assessment plans that provide qualitative as well as numeric information* are

central to being able to demonstrate improvements in productivity, student progress, and educational quality. The University will use both statistical records and survey research to assess students' education and satisfaction with it, including surveys of students, alumni and employers. For example, the University is developing a *sophisticated student cohort analysis* in order to measure retention and graduation rates as well as time to degree.

Three other principles of the Cal Poly Plan also make innovative contributions toward improving the quality and accessibility of higher education:

Partnership and Shared Responsibility

Finance and Investment: Early in the planning process Cal Poly identified the following partners in financing higher education:

- The CSU will support the Cal Poly Plan by guaranteeing that State appropriations and State University Fees allocated for enrollment growth or quality enhancement will not fall below system-wide averages as a result of the Cal Poly Plan;
- The University will reallocate some State General Fund revenues and State University Fees, and develop operational efficiencies in support of the Plan; Specifically, during the first year, the University has committed to reallocate internal resources in order to expand Library services;
- Friends and patrons of Cal Poly will be asked to contribute to Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals, including support for need-based scholarships, and industry donations and discounts for instructional technology and equipment; and
- Students and their families will support a campus academic fee for Cal Poly Plan projects and activities that directly benefit student learning and progress. (The attached Four-Year Budget Summary shows proposed revenues and expenditures.)

Affordability: The Plan recognizes the need to assure the affordability of higher education. Reducing the time to degree by one academic quarter will save a student more than the cumulative cost of the campus academic fee over four years because that student will not have to pay fees nor living expenses for that additional study time. Additionally, by waiving the campus academic fee for needy students during summer quarter, the University can encourage year-round attendance.

Financial Aid: Further, the Cal Poly Plan provides for additional financial support for needy students to maintain access to higher education. The campus academic fee includes a financial aid set aside. This contribution from the campus academic fee will provide sufficient funding to cover the cost of the fee increase for all students demonstrating full financial need.

In addition, the campus will provide assistance by employing needy students in projects that support Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals. The University will do this by supplementing the Federal Work Study Program with Cal Poly Plan revenues for projects that meet Cal Poly Plan purposes and goals. Further, the campus will increase need-based scholarships from private donors.

Innovation is involved in using these financial aid resources to design a *new financial aid program that better meets the student profile at Cal Poly*. Currently, most Federal and State student aid awards are governed by regulations that allow little flexibility to meet the needs of a particular campus. Cal Poly seeks the authority to retain and redirect its share of the state instructional fee revenue and base funding currently designated for use in the State University Grant program.

The University will combine these funds with the financial aid set aside from the campus academic fee and new private contributions to establish the *Cal Poly Grant* program. This program, in addition to offsetting the campus academic fee for students in need of financial assistance, will be incorporated into a new overall aid initiative to facilitate student progress toward degree completion. Under this program, entering aid recipients will be given a four-year conditional guarantee that their level of assistance will remain at or above the initial year's allocation. (Upper division transfer students will be given a two-year conditional guarantee.) This commitment will be conditional only upon continued funding of the aid sources, the student's annual application, the demonstration of a consistent level of financial need, and the student's satisfactory completion of a prescribed number of units each year toward the degree objective. Such a program would reduce the uncertainty associated with annual funding decision, especially when delayed by external agencies, and contribute to a timely completion of a student's academic program.

Expenditure Plan for Investments

Direct, Visible Benefit to Students: A paramount principle of the Cal Poly Plan is that all projects and activities funded by the campus academic fee must make a demonstrable difference toward student progress and educational quality.

RFP: The University adopted a Request for Proposal process to allocate Year One revenues. This procedure was designed to ensure that Cal Poly Plan fee revenues would be allocated based on the purposes and goals of the Cal Poly Plan and to encourage the best thinking campus-wide. As Cal Poly Plan fee revenues are *supplemental, campus-generated resources, they will not be allocated by existing procedures and/or formulae for allocating past General Fund revenues*.

Joint Governance and Constituency Consultation

Steering Committee: The Cal Poly Plan is based on a *consensual process integrating campus consultation with the management structure* of the University. The deans and vice-presidents consider university-wide issues as well as implications for their colleges or divisions. The Steering Committee represents campus constituency groups -- Associated Students, Inc. (ASI), Academic Senate, Staff Council, Labor Council. The ASI representatives exercised *de facto* veto power during discussions of the proposed campus academic fee and priorities for Cal Poly Plan expenditures.

Planning Process: The Plan builds on the University's Strategic Plan and concurrent committee work, and is based on extensive consultation with constituencies through focus groups, forums, and survey research.

**CAL POLY PLAN
Four-Year Budget Summary**

Fiscal Year	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
-------------	---------	---------	---------	-----------

Revenue Projections

Campus Academic Fee/Student for Academic Year	\$135	\$279	\$360	\$360
Campus Academic Fee Revenues	\$2,130,000	\$4,300,000	\$5,585,000	\$5,625,000

Expenditure Priorities

Financial Aid

Financial Aid Obligation (@ 1/3 of Campus Academic Fee)	\$710,000	\$1,433,333	\$1,861,667	\$1,875,000
Set Aside/Student for Academic Year	\$15	\$69	\$90	\$90
Contribution from Set Aside	\$236,667	\$1,063,441	\$1,396,250	\$1,406,250
Additional Campus Academic Fee Contribution	\$93,333			
Contribution from Expanded Work Study Program*	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$300,000	\$300,000
Contribution from other University resources, including private scholarship funds	\$130,000	\$120,000	\$165,000	\$170,000

* Note: Phase One Investments incorporate \$200,000 for Work Study Student Assistants.
The remaining \$50,000 for Work Study will be contributed from other University resources.

Investments	Year One Expenditure Plan	Tentative Future Priorities		
Advanced Instructional Technology and Equipment	\$800,000	\$925,000	\$930,000	\$935,000
Instructional Programs, including advising, course scheduling, curriculum restructuring, and teaching effectiveness, aimed at student learning and progress**	\$1,000,000	\$925,000	\$930,000	\$935,000
Career Services and Advising**		\$460,000	\$465,000	\$470,000
Faculty Positions to Support Cal Poly Plan Purposes and Goals: student progress, productivity, curricular change, innovative teaching and learning models		\$925,000	\$1,860,000	\$1,875,000
Sum of Cal Poly Plan Investments from Campus Academic Fee	\$1,800,000	\$3,235,000	\$4,185,000	\$4,215,000
Internal reallocation to expand Library services	\$150,000	\$250,000	\$350,000	\$450,000

** Note: Beginning in Year Two, career services, academic advising and assistance are designated as a separate category from instructional programs.

**Cal Poly
Enrollment History and Projections, 1990-91 through 2001-02**

Table 1-1

		Enrollment History						Enrollment Projections								
Fiscal Year (College Year)		1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96		1996-97			1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	2000-01	2001-02
Enrollment Assumptions and Projections		actual enrollment, peak year	actual enrollment	actual enrollment	actual enrollment, lowest recent year	actual enrollment	target	actual enrollment	early target (growth of 275 CY FTES)*	4/22/96 projections (high end)*	7/11/96 projections based on 1996 winter, spring & summer to date*	calculations from 7/11/96 projections for 1996-97**				
Full-time Equivalent Students (FTES)																
AY FTES		15,484	15,209	14,109	13,418	13,760	14,089	14,456	14,339	14,559	14,652	14,799	14,947	15,000	15,054	15,108
Net change in AY FTES			-274	-1,100	-691	342		696	250	103	196	147	148	54	54	54
Percentage change, AY FTES*			-1.8%	-7.2%	-4.9%	2.5%		5.1%	1.8%	0.7%	1.4%	1.0%	1.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
AY course load		13.45	13.42	13.56	13.46	13.70	13.56	13.81	13.75	13.76	13.80	13.85	13.90	13.95	14.00	14.05
Summer FTES (annualized)		1,408	1,295	1,104	805	647	700	646	725	725	677	711	747	821	904	994
Net change in Summer FTES			-114	-191	-299	-158		-1	25	79	31	34	36	75	82	90
Percentage change, Summer FTES*			-8.1%	-14.8%	-27.1%	-19.6%		-0.2%	3.6%	12.2%	4.9%	5.0%	5.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%
Summer course load		9.80	9.64	9.34	8.78	8.62	8.62	8.69	8.70	8.70	8.84	8.89	8.94	8.99	9.04	9.09
CY FTES		16,892	16,504	15,213	14,223	14,407	14,789	15,102	15,064	15,284	15,329	15,510	15,693	15,822	15,958	16,102
Net change in CY FTES			-388	-1,291	-990	184		695	275	182	227	180	184	128	136	144
Percentage change, CY FTES*			-2.3%	-7.8%	-6.5%	1.3%		4.8%	1.9%	1.2%	1.5%	1.2%	1.2%	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%
Head Count (HC)																
AY Head Count (average)		17,268	16,998	15,609	14,955	15,062	15,583	15,703	15,643	15,876	15,924	16,027	16,129	16,129	16,129	16,129
Summer Head Count (not annualized)		6,464	6,043	5,320	4,125	3,377	3,654	3,345	3,750	3,750	3,447	3,599	3,758	4,111	4,497	4,919
CY Head Count (average)		19,423	19,013	17,382	16,330	16,188	16,801	16,818	16,893	17,126	17,073	17,227	17,382	17,500	17,628	17,769
Fall Head Count		17,758	17,573	16,377	15,447	15,440	16,050	16,023	16,126	16,400	16,450	16,557	16,663	16,663	16,663	16,663
Notes:		Numbers in italics represent actual enrollments.														
* Percentage changes for 1996-97 calculated as follows: change from 1995-96 target to early target for 1996-97; change from 1995-96 actual to 4/22 and 7/11 projections for 1996-97.																
** AY enrollment growth past 1999-2000 contingent on capital outlay. Thus, projections past 1999-2000 show AY FTES growth associated solely with increasing course load.																
Source: Past data: Institutional Studies, Fact Book, 1994-95, and Quarterly Internal Enrollment Reports.																

Chart 1-1

Cal Poly
Enrollment History and Projections, Full-Time Equivalent Students, 1990-91 through 2001-02

