

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Minutes of the ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Tuesday, April 18, 1995

UU 220 3:10-5:00 pm

Preparatory: The meeting was opened at 3:10 pm.

Members present: President Baker, Bertozzi, Brown, Dana, Gooden, Greenwald, Hale, Hannings, Kersten, Koob, Lewis, Lutrin, Wilson

- I. Discussion: This meeting was called to explore the Cal Poly Plan. Therefore, there were no minutes to review, communications, announcements, reports or consent agenda items.

President Baker gave a brief overview of the Cal Poly Plan, entertained questions and requested assistance in keeping the faculty apprised of the Plan's development. He noted that he has already met with Vice President Gonzalez and ASI leaders and agreed that a questionnaire administered next fall to ascertain those things that students would like to get accomplished and their priorities. He also has met with the College of Science and Math and will be meeting with the other colleges as well.

Following are some points and questions which surfaced during the discussion:

- Wilson noted the essential nature of communicating with the faculty about the Plan soon.
- Gooden: How will we proceed on getting approval of the plan? Vice President Koob responded that spring will be spent clarifying the notions and questions and defining the skeleton of the plan and of the process that will be used to develop details. The goal is to complete the Plan by the end of Fall term, 1995. If Cal Poly has to go to the Legislature to get the plan approved, this will occur in January. Alternatively, the Board of Trustees could choose to delegate authorities to Cal Poly, we may not have to go to the Legislature. President Baker noted that the idea for this second alternative came from the Chancellor's Office.
- Koob: We are looking for more flexibility and for new money.
- Hannings: Could the Chancellor give us authority to set our own fees? Baker responded that the Chancellor's staff feel that it is likely that we do not need approval of the Legislature to institute a fee on our campus only.
- Lewis asked whether new funding might result in loss of some funding the university already receives. Baker responded that there always is a risk that existing funding could be cut if we are given additional monies in some special way.
- Greenwald expressed concern that efforts to find ways to measure "productivity, quality and accountability" result in using measurements that are very simplistic like those coming out of Texas. Baker responded that we will have to figure out ways to measure "value added" to students as a result of attending Cal Poly. We have to define productivity for ourselves before someone does it for us. We should be asking departments how much time they are providing to faculty for professional development. The high level of current student contact results in less time for professional development.
- As we make these changes we need to keep referring back to the Strategic Plan.
- Koob: We do not want to give up learn by doing. We also want to be "economically

egalitarian" and academically "elite;" that is, to provide higher quality at a lower price.

- Baker: We will not be skimming the undergraduate program to support doctoral programs, etc.
- Wilson: Where are these college graduates going to find jobs? This is a major hurdle. We no longer have an economy that supports our efforts. Baker responded that the trend in California is quite different from the rest of the nation.
- Koob cited Minnesota as a model of a system which provides for access to higher education by offering good financial aid programs while charging a level of tuition needed to support the academic programs.
- Gooden: Has anybody compared the number of students needing remediation in the CSU with that in the UC system? This could impact how we would be able to use the UC as a model. Baker disagreed with the idea that Cal Poly has a remedial problem and noted that the problems we do have emanate from English as a second language. Koob responded that Cal Poly's average SAT score falls in the mid-range of the SATs at the UC campuses which is not true for the CSU as a whole. Baker noted that in the Colleges of Architecture, Engineering and Liberal Arts, Cal Poly is accepting students in the top 10% of the state.
- Greenwald: What do you see as the timeframe for putting the plan together and who will determine what quality is? Baker responded that details will be developed over the next three to five years. Student Affairs also will participate in defining quality.
- Hampsey: Quality should proceed productivity. What are we willing to put on the table? How far are we willing to go?
- Bertozzi: Specifics are going to be very important to creating informed discussion.
- Kersten: We need to develop structures for the discussion to come. Could we get some kind of taxonomy of issues that we can also work on?
- Bertozzi: Are you saying that there is a reasonable probability that we would increase size by several thousand students with the funding level needed to support a laboratory-based program?
- What is the difference between the charter effort and the Cal Poly Plan? Baker noted that he had no interest in the charter if we couldn't get differential funding. The Plan comes at it from a point of view of what we want to achieve and what are the barriers to achieving these things. The Plan is quite similar to the charter vision, however.
- Koob outlined the following steps that need to be taken: (1.) Put together a taxonomy of issues. (2.) Find out which of them that everyone agrees on. (3.) Find the metronics for measurement related to those issues.

II. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

Submitted by



Sam Lutrin, Secretary, Academic Senate