

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

FILE COPY

Executive Committee
Academic Senate Agenda
Tuesday, October 31, 1989
UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Dept</u>
Andrews, Charles	Acctg	Murphy, James (C)	IndTech
Borland, James	ConstMgt	Murphy, Paul	Math
Boynton, William	Acctg	Smith, Terry	SoilSci
Dobb, Linda	Library	Vilkitis, James (Secty)	NRM
Freberg, Laura	Psy/HD	Weatherby, Joseph	PoliSci
Gooden, Reg	PoliSci	Wilson, Malcolm	VPAA
Kersten, Timothy	Economics	Zeuschner, Raymond	SpCom
Lutrin, Sam (VC)	StLf&Actvs	Copies: Warren Baker	
Moustafa, Safwat	MechEngr	William Rife	
		Howard West	

- I. Minutes: Approval of the October 10, 1989 Executive Committee minutes (pp. 2-6). *10.10.89 minutes removed*
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
- III. Reports:
- A. President's Office
 - B. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
 - C. Statewide Senators
 - D. Chuck Hagen, Chair of the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee
 - E. Safwat Moustafa, Chair of the Academic Senate Research Committee
 - F. Ray Terry, Chair of the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Item(s):
- A. Resolution on Grade Frequency Distribution Reports-Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee (p. 7).
 - B. Resolution on Enrollment Growth-Hagen, Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee (pp. 8-23).
 - C. Vacancies:
 - 1. Academic Senate representative for part-time faculty - JAMES HOWLAND
 - 2. Union Executive Committee (UEC) vacancy (replacement for Lynne Gamble)
 - 3. Committee vacancies:
 - SAGR Fairness Board (replacement for Wheatley)
 - SAED Fairness Board (replacement for Hatcher), Instruction, Status of Women
 - SBUS Student Affairs
 - SLA Fairness Board - FRED O'TOOLE
 - Senate vacancy (replacement for Simmons) - GAYE BENSON
 - SSM Status of Women
- VI. Discussion Item(s):
Multiple Criteria Admissions Process (materials to be distributed).
- VII. Adjournment:

Adopted:

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

Background Statement: For over ten years the university has provided instructional departments with a comparative grade frequency distribution report for the several schools and for the university as a whole. This year such comparative data was unavailable because programming for the report on the new computer system had not been done.

AS- -89/
RESOLUTION ON
GRADE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION REPORTS

- WHEREAS, Department leaders need to know how an individual faculty member's grading pattern compares not only to the average grading pattern in his/her department but also to that of the school and the university as a whole; and
- WHEREAS, Many faculty members would profit from having such comparative data; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the university undertake such programming as is necessary to provide the comparative data on a school-by-school basis and for the university as a whole; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the university provide the data so obtained to each dean and department leader; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That each department leader provide this information to his/her faculty on a yearly basis.

Instruction Committee
October 6, 1989
Approved: 7-0-0

Adopted:

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

AS- -89/
RESOLUTION ON
ENROLLMENT GROWTH

- WHEREAS, The California State University Board of Trustees is considering a growth plan for 1990-2005 which calls for an enrollment ceiling at Cal Poly of 20,000 academic year FTE; and
- WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Academic Senate resolved in March, 1988, "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" (Academic Senate Resolution AS-279-88/LRPC); and
- WHEREAS, Cal Poly's campus facilities are not yet at the level needed for 15,000 FTE; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED: That the second and third Resolved clauses of Academic Senate Resolution AS-279-88/LRPC (attached) be carried out; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That, despite the upward adjustment of the enrollment ceiling to 20,000 FTE, the enrollment target for the 2005-2006 academic year shall not exceed 17,400 FTE; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That consideration of enrollment growth beyond 17,400 FTE or beyond the 2005-2006 academic year shall be referred to the appropriate consultative bodies.

Proposed By:
Academic Senate Long-
Range Planning Committee
Date: October 17, 1989

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

Academic Senate
Long-Range Planning Committee

Report on

ENROLLMENT GROWTH TO 15,000 FTE AND BEYOND

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

The report and recommendations are based on the following premises:

1. Some growth in enrollment is appropriate to Cal Poly, but the numbers depend upon the nature of the growth that would occur. In other words, growth cannot be thought of as simply expanding what we currently have. Instead, the Committee sought to consider the *conditions* under which Cal Poly could grow.
2. Enrollment growth at Cal Poly should respond to external demographic changes and pressures that affect higher education, especially in California.
3. Enrollment growth at Cal Poly must also recognize state expectations regarding CSU schools, particularly with respect to the enrollment of transfer students and support for the Community College system.
4. Plans for enrollment growth at Cal Poly should acknowledge Cal Poly's special role as a polytechnic university and the adopted mission statement of the University.
5. The conditions necessary to accommodate programmatic growth to 15,000 FTE include the provision of non-instructional facilities and services as well as instructional facilities and staff. (This basically reinforces and further specifies AS-220-86/LRPC.)
6. Finally, the conditions necessary to consider any programmatic growth beyond 15,000 FTE involve a rate of growth which is sensitive to Cal Poly's impact on surrounding communities; a rate of growth that could be assessed in stages; and a total amount of growth that could be handled by the campus. The Committee was reluctant to indicate a maximum number for future enrollment, because it will take further study to determine how well the conditions for growth beyond 15,000 can be satisfied. To assure that the conditions which must be met in order to accommodate growth would not be overshadowed by the number itself, the Committee was willing to refer only to a range, with the understanding that it must be tied to a

plan that would show how the list of conditions in the recommendations which follow could be met.

I. Demography and Educational Equity

A. Discussion and Findings

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

1. The absolute number of high school graduates is currently declining, but will turn around (in California in 1990);
2. College students are becoming older, on average, and less-likely to enroll full-time and/or complete a degree within 4-5 years. At Cal Poly this decrease in the average student load means that the total number of students enrolled is about 10 percent more than the FTE they generate (i.e., it takes about 15,620 students to generate 14,200 FTE);
3. The increasing non-white population in California is not being reflected to the same extent in college enrollments. (Asians participate at a higher rate; Blacks and Latinos at a lower rate than whites.) Cal Poly enrolls even fewer non-white students than most other CSU schools;
4. Ethnic groups vary significantly according to their choice of major or occupation and their college preferences;
5. Overall, the changing demography in California means that Cal Poly will not be able to continue to draw so many of its students from its traditional pool of predominantly white applicants;
6. The concept of educational equity requires that Cal Poly increase its proportion of under-represented students; yet attaining educational equity requires extraordinary efforts by colleges and universities and special attention to high school preparation and recruiting.

B. Recommendations

1. That any increase in enrollment at Cal Poly take account of the beneficial effects of diversity which might arise from the admission of CSU qualified under-represented students and be consistent with educational equity plans already approved by the schools and the University;
2. That Cal Poly support, expand or create the following kinds of programs (with

sufficient funding) to draw and retain more ethnic minority students: (1) To increase eligibility and recruitment through high school counseling, and "feeder" or "farm" programs at specified community colleges for certain majors to effectively guarantee transfer to Cal Poly as juniors; (2) To increase community support through residential choice on and off campus, and appropriate social opportunities; (3) To increase retention through faculty and staff models and mentors, academic advising and personal counseling, easing procedure for changing majors and providing students with financial aid;

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

II. Composition of the Student Body

A. Discussion and Findings

The committee found a need for clarification of the current percentages of undergraduate transfers vs. first-time freshmen. While common knowledge holds that Cal Poly's enrollment represents the reverse of the CSU system in general, the committee found that this is *only true of Fall Quarter* (which ranges from 42 to 49 percent transfer students). Indeed, data for enrollment across the entire academic year revealed that the percentage of undergraduate transfers has ranged in recent years between 54 and 60 percent -- not far off the state mandate of a minimum of 60 percent.

Further, the Master Plan Renewed calls for four-year institutions to "maintain lower-division enrollment systemwide at no more than 40 percent of total undergraduate enrollment" (p. 15). For Fall Quarter 1987 enrollment at Cal Poly consisted of 36.2 percent freshmen and sophomores and 63.8 percent upper division students. The only school which enrolled more than 40 percent in the lower division was Science and Math (at 46.7%).

Discussion of any need to increase the relative percentages of undergraduate transfer students vs. first-time freshmen reflects countervailing forces at Cal Poly.

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

On the other hand, Cal Poly's practice of requiring students to declare a major upon admission as freshmen means that most majors are designed for a four-five year sequence. Further, many of

the polytechnic majors require careful course sequencing to ensure that students have completed pre-requisites before entering advanced courses. Such sequencing has been difficult to coordinate with community colleges, especially in specialized fields where the community colleges cannot reasonably be expected to provide all of the necessary pre-requisites to allow students to transfer to Cal Poly as juniors.

A further complication at Cal Poly is that many students who may be considered upper division students based on accumulated quarter units have not completed their lower division General Education and Breadth courses either prior to entering Cal Poly nor during their first two years at Cal Poly (if they enter as first-time freshmen).

The role of graduate education has received less attention. While acceptable according to the Cal Poly mission, "to enrich . . . the undergraduate experience," graduate programs are small (currently constituting less than 10 percent of all Cal Poly students) and unevenly distributed in the University. (For example, they range from only 2.5 percent in liberal arts to nearly 19 percent in Professional Studies and Education.)

The mission statement does not address Cal Poly's relative responsibility to education in the state versus a more local population. Cal Poly occupies a unique position in the CSU system as a university with nationwide, even worldwide, recognition in some fields. Yet, there is a demand from students who graduate from high school and attend community colleges in the Central Coast region to attend Cal Poly.

B. Recommendations

1. That schools or programs which enroll less than 60 percent upper division students attempt to redesign their curricula (especially pre-requisites and sequencing of courses) to articulate with appropriate preparation at community colleges so as to facilitate the admission of more transfer students;
2. That graduate programs be allowed to expand and new graduate programs be added that fit the polytechnic character of Cal Poly and support existing undergraduate programs;
3. That Cal Poly provide support services appropriate to the educational, financial and social needs of graduate students to the extent that they differ from undergraduates;
4. That Cal Poly continue to give some admission priority to the student population from the Central Coast.

III. Program Characteristics

A. Discussion and Findings

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

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

Key findings include the following:

1. Recent employment trends and projections for the future show that not all currently impacted programs will continue to be in high demand;
2. The Cal Poly mission statement emphasizes polytechnic education and the application of scientific knowledge to contemporary problems;
3. There are opportunities for an interdisciplinary approach to instruction between schools to take advantage of the polytechnic character of Cal Poly.

B. Recommendations

That enrollment increases in programs at Cal Poly be considered when there is a demonstrated demand for employment in that field continuing to and beyond the year 2000.

IV. Growth to 15,000 FTE

A. Discussion and Findings

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

Facility planning has proceeded accordingly with recent approval by the CSU trustees of key instructional facilities. However, the committee found no assurance that non-instructional facilities and support services would keep pace with the instructional facilities. For example, both the Administration Building and University Union were built for fewer than the current number of students (13,000 and 12,000 respectively). Also, certain computing services and the library budget for periodicals and new acquisitions are insufficient to support current

enrollment. Further, outdoor recreation space is at a premium and students lack indoor space for studying and socializing. On the other hand, parking is more than sufficient -- complaints stem from inconvenience rather than lack of space.

Key findings include the following:

1. A number of new programs which would generate additional FTE have been approved but not implemented;
2. The number of high school graduates in California is expected to reach a low point in 1990 and then begin to increase again;
3. Some facilities, such as the Recreation Center, Dairy Science Instruction Center, addition to Business Administration and Education, and new Faculty Office Building, designed to meet current deficits and/or to support enrollment growth to 15,000 have been approved by the Trustees, but remain subject to continued funding as part of a state-wide bond issue;
4. Other facilities, such as the University Union, Administration Building, Kennedy Library, outdoor recreation space, and student services (even after the new Student Services Building is completed) are inadequate to meet current enrollment levels and/or are inadequate to support an increase to 15,000 FTE, and no specific plans have been approved to expand them;
5. Academic Senate Resolution AS-220-86/LRPC (approved by the President, July 23, 1986) states that facility deficits must be met before any enrollment expansion be considered.

B. Recommendations

1. That the first phase of growth toward 15,000 FTE accommodate programs which have been approved but not yet implemented;
2. That Cal Poly enter the first phase of growth in enrollment toward 15,000 FTE no sooner than the 1991-1992 academic year to allow time for recruiting and counseling efforts to reach students who will be at the forefront of the new increase in high school graduates;
3. That Cal Poly consider entering a second phase of growth toward 15,000 after the approved facilities have been completed and funds have been approved to alleviate other shortages (including non-instructional facilities and services).

V. Extent and Phasing of Growth Beyond 15,000 FTE

Growth beyond 15,000 is complicated by many factors. A state-wide increase in high school graduates after 1990 creates a need for additional capacity in the CSU system. Indeed, some enrollment growth can be beneficial to individual schools. Increases in enrollment can bring

more resources to the University and permit program expansion or addition without jeopardizing existing programs. Further, departments which have been unable to hire any new faculty because of lack of turnover would benefit from an increase in enrollment that would generate new tenure-track positions.

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

Key findings include the following:

1. The number of high school graduates in California is expected to increase steadily after 1990 (at about 3.7 percent per year);
2. Cal Poly's polytechnic emphasis is especially suited to prepare students for future jobs in the state;
3. Some growth in enrollment can create opportunities for educational diversity;
4. Some growth in enrollment can create opportunities for new faculty positions in departments which do not expect to experience any turnover;
5. Some growth in enrollment can bring new resources to the University;
6. The campus infrastructure (utility systems) have excess capacity (the most limiting of which are sewage transmission lines);
7. Cal Poly's campus has a limited amount of space remaining to construct buildings within a 10-minute walking radius;
8. New structures increase the density of development and supplant open space on the campus; whereas development in the surrounding area places prime agricultural land at risk;
9. Students rate the geographic setting and appearance of the campus second only to its academic reputation as reasons for selecting Cal Poly;

10. Vehicular ingress and egress from Cal Poly is already inadequate (especially in the event of any areawide emergency);
11. Cal Poly has a significant impact on overall population growth, housing and traffic congestion in the surrounding community, at the same time as it contributes to the area's economy;
12. The growth of the City of San Luis Obispo and surrounding communities is constrained by limitations on water supply, sewage treatment capacity, and buildable land;
13. Population in San Luis Obispo County is expected to grow at about 2.3 percent per year through the year 2000;
14. The communities in San Luis Obispo County which have the greatest capacities for growth are in the southern and northern parts of the County, farthest removed from Cal Poly and least well-served by public transportation;
15. Academic Senate Resolution AS-220-86/LRPC (Approved by the President, July 23, 1986) states that "expansion should only occur after a detailed expansion plan is developed."

B. Recommendations

1. That Cal Poly consider a modest expansion in enrollment beyond the 15,000 FTE in the current Master Plan for Higher Education;
2. That such growth must fit within the parameters of community growth policies and constraints;
3. That the first phase of growth beyond 15,000 FTE be considered no sooner than two to three years after enrollment reaches 15,000 FTE;
4. That such growth occur in increments, whereby two to three years of growth (of 400 FTE per year) are followed by two to three years of stabilization to permit time for catching up and for assessment of the impacts of growth before considering a new phase;
5. That Cal Poly consider each new phase of growth after facilities have been completed and funds have been approved to alleviate any shortages in instructional space, non-instructional space, and supporting services;
6. That Cal Poly maintain its visual image of smallness and rural setting, by limiting the size (height and bulk) of new structures, by sensitive placement and landscaping of new buildings, by preserving open space within the campus, and by maintaining open land around the campus;

7. That any growth which required the conversion of University agriculture land from its present use be done so after consultation and adherence to University land use policy recommendations;
8. That Cal Poly maintain its ambience of smallness and intimacy by retaining small class sizes, early affiliation of students with a specific program or department, participation in student activities and access to student services;
9. That Cal Poly consider reducing its impact on community housing and traffic congestion by adding an attractive variety of residential facilities on campus (including necessary infrastructure and supporting services);
10. That Cal Poly consider limiting vehicular access to the campus; create more incentives to encourage commuting by means other than the automobile; and provide more facilities for non-auto-users;
11. That Cal Poly assign a full-time professional staff position to campus planning to work with the Academic Senate Long-Range Planning Committee and coordinate a comprehensive plan, 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 over the next fifteen years.

Attachments

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

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

References

Selected Excerpts
from
California Polytechnic State University Academic Senate Resolution on
"Revised Enrollment Recommendations"
AS-220-86/LRPC
(approved by President Baker, July 23, 1986)

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

Data for 1985-1986 showed that Cal Poly only had sufficient facilities to support an enrollment of 11,900 FTE (or a facility deficit of 2300 FTE). "This would suggest that any increase in enrollment beyond our authorized 14,200 should only occur when currently planned physical plant expansion projects are completed in 1990-91. . . ."

The Senate approved the Long-Range Planning Committee recommendation that the following issues must be addressed before an increase of 800 FTE could be supported: "(1) How will these additional 800 students be distributed among new and existing programs: (2) How and when will the whole range of additional staff and facilities be added to handle these new students? . . . [A]ny such expansion should only occur after a detailed expansion plan is developed. Such a plan would address the number and timing of new students, their level (freshman, transfer, or graduate) and their school or area. It would also address the timing and location of facilities to serve these students. Such facilities would include not only classrooms and laboratories, but also faculty offices (at least 50 at present student-teacher ratio on campus), parking, recreation (land and facilities), housing and support staff. . . . [S]uch facilities should be in place before students."

Academic Senate
Long-Range Planning Committee, 1987-1988

List of Working Papers on Enrollment Growth to 15,000 FTE and Beyond
(Complete set on file in Academic Senate office)

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

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

References

- Academic Senate. AS-22-86/LRPC, Revised Enrollment Recommendations. San Luis Obispo: California Polytechnic State University; May 1986.
- Baker, Warren J. (President). Cal Poly and California in the Next Decade. San Luis Obispo; October 10, 1985.
- California Engineering Foundation. California Master Plan for Economic Development and Competitiveness.
- California Polytechnic State University. Mission Statement. San Luis Obispo.
- California Department of Finance, Population Research Unit. Sacramento, CA; 1987.
- California State University. Student Needs and Priorities Survey.
- Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education. Sacramento, CA; July 1987.
- Doyle, Elaine (Institutional Studies). Annual Report on Enrollment Trends and Student Characteristics. San Luis Obispo: California Polytechnic State University; February 1987.
- Dunigan, L. H. (Director of Institutional Research). Selected Statistical Data on Enrollment Trends and Student Characteristics. San Luis Obispo: California Polytechnic State University; November 10, 1983.

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

Enrollment Planning Data: Summary Package. San Luis Obispo:
California Polytechnic State University; 1987.

Equinoa, Richard. Employment Projections and Trends: A
Brief Summary. San Luis Obispo: California Polytechnic
State University; December 6, 1984.

High School Graduate Pool to Change Dramatically by 1994.
Activity; May 1986; 24(2): 1-2.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. California: The State and Its
Educational System. Washington, D.C.: Institute for
Educational Leadership; 1986.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. Seminar with Deans' Council and
Long-Range Planning Committee. San Luis Obispo: California
Polytechnic State University; January 7, 1988.

Mark, Walter R. (Institutional Studies). Quarterly Internal
Report on Enrollment -- Fall 1987. San Luis Obispo:
California Polytechnic State University; November 3, 1987.

Walters, Dan. The New California: Facing the 21st Century.
Sacramento: California Journal Press; 1986.

MCA II

General Overview

Multiple Criteria Admission Program for 1990-1991

Cal Poly's admission process has been undergoing some streamlining and simplification, inspired in part by the removal of the old CYBER computer on which admission processing was done for several years, and in part by the opportunities afforded us by the new OASIS system.

The old MCA allowed academic departments to determine which courses they preferred a student to have, and to determine the number of points (within prescribed limits) they would allot for each subject area, grade points and test scores, and extracurricular activities. As a result, we had approximately 35 different admission schemes, which in some cases allowed a department to profile precisely what kind of student they would get, but in all cases was hard to explain to prospective students, parents and counselors, and was difficult to defend to rejected applicants.

While we were using our own MCA, the Cal State University system was tightening up the academic standards for prospective students and, in essence, coming into line with what Cal Poly had been doing for years. Faced with that fact, it no longer seems necessary to put our applicants through such a complex, time-consuming selection process. So Cal Poly now has one set of selection criteria for freshmen and one for transfers. Each set has three sections: coursework, GPA or GPA/test scores, and extra-curricular activities. Following is a brief description of the criteria for each level:

Freshmen

Section I asks for the CSU college preparatory subject requirements, and grades earned in required coursework. Requirements include: eight semesters of English, six semesters of math, four of foreign language (same language all four semesters), two semesters of U.S. history and government, two semesters of lab science, two semesters of visual and performing arts, and six semesters of electives which include courses from the above six categories over and above the required semester minimum in each area as well as social science and agriculture courses. Bonus points will be awarded for designated honors courses. Bonus points will also be awarded for courses taken in the seven subject areas beyond the required minimum.

Points for coursework will be awarded roughly as follows:

<u>Semester grade (reg)</u>	<u>Points</u>	<u>Semester grade (honors)</u>	<u>Points</u>
A	30	A	45
B	24	B	36
C	10	C	15

The student will earn 600 points for each subject area in which he/she completes all required semesters; points will be deducted from the 600 for any subject area left incomplete. If all subject areas are completed, the student will be given a point bonus.

Section II collects grade point average and test scores. Either SAT or ACT scores will be used. Points will be awarded as follows:

$\text{GPA} \times 2 = n \times 320 = \text{awarded points}$

Test score = SAT value (ACT scores will be converted to SAT equivalent)

Section III

Extracurricular activities will garner a maximum of 500 points for a mythical student who works 30 hours a week in a career-related job and spends 30 hours a week in a leadership position in extracurricular activities. Most students won't come close to this.

Transfers

Section I collects units and grades in the lower division general education courses and major related courses. (Bonus points will be awarded for courses fulfilling the general education requirements.) Calculus and calculus-based physics will be awarded points beyond the other classes.

Course line GPA \times semester unit value = GPA weighted unit
 $\text{GPA WU} \times 20 (40) = \text{points}$

Section II collects the overall college grade point average.
 $\text{GPA} \times 2 = n \times 1400 = \text{points}$

Section III collects extra-curricular information in the same way as for freshmen.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-1893-89/AA
October 26-27, 1989

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY GROWTH PLAN, 1990-2005

- WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees adopted the CSU Growth Plan, 1990-2005, as a priority study topic at its July 1988 meeting, in response to 1988-89 budget language requesting the three public segments and the California Postsecondary Education Commission to conduct long-range growth plans; and
- WHEREAS, The Chancellor assigned primary responsibility for accomplishing the growth plan to the Vice Chancellor, University Affairs; and
- WHEREAS, The Chancellor has submitted a CSU Growth Plan, 1990-2005, to the Board of Trustees as an agenda item for the Board's October 31 meeting; and
- WHEREAS, The Plan projects increased enrollment of 180,000 students by the year 2005 and recommends several means of accommodating this growth, including establishment of five new campuses, full utilization and expansion of existing campus capacity, expansion of off-campus centers, provision of programs to increase participation of underrepresented minority groups, and support for programs on selected campuses to use the summer term as an alternative to providing additional physical capacity; and
- WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees will consider a resolution on October 31 to advise the Governor, Legislature, and California Postsecondary Education Commission of projections and recommendations of the Plan, and to request the Chancellor to begin developing procedures for studying and implementing recommendations of the Plan; and
- WHEREAS, The proposed Board of Trustees' resolution includes the statement, "The recommendations will be developed individually and subject to collective bargaining and campus or systemwide consultation, as appropriate;" and

(OVER)

WHEREAS, The Growth Plan has not been distributed for campus or systemwide consultation, and will be considered by the Trustees in the absence of such consultation; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University regard as completely inadequate the process by which the Growth Plan has been developed and is proposed to be enacted, failing as it does to meet even the minimal expected level of consultation; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University request the Board of Trustees of the California State University not to forward the Growth Plan to the Governor, Legislature, and California Postsecondary Education Commission, until proper consultation has taken place on the campuses with students and faculty and where appropriate with other concerned constituencies.

APPROVED WITHOUT DISSENT

OCTOBER 27, 1989

NOTE: LANGUAGE FOR AS-1893/89/AA, SUBJECT TO
REVISION, UPON VERIFICATION OF ACTUAL
TAPED TRANSCRIPT OF THE 10/27/89
MEETING.

Final EK 10.31.89

State of California


California Polytechnic State University
San Jose Campus, California 95007

Memorandum

To : Mathematics Faculty

Date : August 15, 1989

Copies:

From : 
Thomas E. Hale, Chair
Mathematics Department

Subject: Grade Frequency Distribution Report

During the past summer months we have computed your grade frequency distribution for the period of Fall, Winter and Spring Quarters of 1988-89 from our grade sheets. Your grade frequency distribution is shown below for your information. Attached is the percentage distribution of the grades given by the Mathematics Faculty for each individual course. This year we are unable to provide the comparative data for the entire Mathematics Department faculty, the School of Science and Mathematics, and the University because programming for this report on the new system has not been done.

We have requested that the Grade Frequency Distribution Reports be programmed into the new system soon so that we will be able to give you a full comparative report again next year.

GRADE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION 1988-89

	A	B	C	D	F/U	W
<i>INSTRUCTOR</i>	9.8	29.5	40.1	9.0	6.6	4.7
Mathematics Department *	16.0	24.3	29.0	11.5	14.1	4.9
School of Science & Mathematics	Not available for 1988-89.					
University	Not available for 1988-89.					

For Comparison

1987-88

<i>INSTRUCTOR</i>	19.3	43.6	23.9	5.8	2.1	5.0
Mathematics Department	14.8	23.3	28.2	11.9	13.3	5.0
School of Science & Mathematics	15.0	25.4	30.4	10.4	9.5	3.6
University	23.1	29.4	20.7	5.1	4.3	2.1

These percentages do not reflect credit given for: I, AU, SP, CR/NC.
* Computed from grade sheet totals this year.