

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California
ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - MINUTES
Tuesday: January 6, 1987
UU 220 3:00 p.m.

Chair: Lloyd H. Lamouria
Vice Chair: Lynne E. Gamble
Secretary: Raymond D. Terry

I. Call to Order

- A. The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. upon obtaining a quorum.
- B. The minutes of the November 18, 1986 Executive Committee meeting were approved as mailed.
- C. The minutes of the December 2, 1986 Executive Committee meeting were approved subject to the correction of two typographical errors.
- D. The minutes of the Special Executive Committee meeting of December 3, 1986 were approved as mailed.

II. Communications

The Chair directed the Executive Committee's attention to the December 2, 1986 minutes of the President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocations.

III. Reports

A. President: None

B. Academic Affairs Office

- 1. The Chair recognized Malcolm Wilson who presented a comprehensive report on two important activities of his Office:
 - a. The process used for faculty allocations; and
 - b. The process used for the projection of UCJ's for the 1987 - 1988 academic year.
- 2. An important component of the faculty allocation process is the treatment of cooperative education.

According to Item A. 7 of the Appendix distributed at the beginning of the report,

"The Chancellor's Office has agreed to fund Cooperative Education out of the general fund and has increased the budgeted campus FTE allocation for 1987-88 by 100 non-capacity FTE. The funding comes at the average productivity ratio for the campus (235 SCU's/FTEF). Cooperative Education FTE therefore generate 5.9 FTEF for 1987-88. The funding level for Cooperative Education was frozen at the same level as for 1986-87 (5.0 positions). For 1987-88 these positions are not drawn from resources generated by other areas, and Cooperative Education is now a positive net generator of faculty positions. In future years the faculty staffing generation will be determined by the mode and level of the Cooperative Education classes. This will result in more faculty positions for the campus since most of the SCU's will be taught in an upper-division S-36 classification with an adjusted normative ratio of 90."

3. M /S (Botwinn /Crabb): The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate endorses the allocation of 5.0 FTEF to Cooperative Education for 1986/87 with the understanding that this is the final year of subsidy."

The motion was approved unanimously.

4. M /S (Wheeler /Botwin, Crabb, et. al.): The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate endorses the procedures and processes outlined in the document entitled "Initial Release of Faculty 1987-88 Academic Year" which was distributed to the Executive Committee on January 6, 1987.

The motion was approved unanimously.

5. A copy of the text of Malcolm Wilson's Report made to the Academic Senate Executive Committee is attached to these minutes.
6. A copy of the Appendix "Initial Release of Faculty 1987-88 Academic Year" may be obtained at the Academic Senate Office upon request by those who did not receive one at the meeting.

C. Statewide Senators

Reg Gooden and Tim Kersten were absent from the meeting. Joe Weatherby declined to make a report.

IV. Consent Agenda: None

V. Business Items

A. Resolution to Ensure Full Senate Discussion of Resolutions from Standing Committees.

1. This item would require that the Executive Committee agendaize all resolutions (without editing) received from standing committees.
2. The Chair announced that John Rogalla had withdrawn the Resolution.

B. Resolution on Honorary Doctor of Science Degree for Burt Rutan

1. The Chair recognized Bill Forgeng who proposed the Resolution.
2. The Executive Committee agreed by consensus to put the Resolution on the agenda of the January 13 Academic Senate meeting.

C. Resolution on the Allocation of Lottery Funds

1. The Chair asked the Executive Committee's advice as to whether the Cal Poly Academic Senate should be presented with a resolution modeled after the one unanimously adopted by the Academic Senate at CSU, Sacramento.
2. Malcolm Wilson urged support for such action.
3. The Executive Committee agreed by consensus to put such a resolution on the agenda of the January 13, 1987 Academic Senate meeting.
4. Ray Terry requested that the item be placed on the consent agenda of the Jan. 13, 1987 meeting. This was done by consensus.

VI. Discussion Items:

Shall the Academic Senate charge the Status of Women Committee with the responsibility to recommend actions which will promote the employment of women and minorities?

- A. While all who spoke voiced support for the concept of equity, there was much disagreement as to the mechanism for obtaining recommendations as to desirable hiring practices.

- B. Agreement could not be reached as to whether recommendations should be solicited from the Status of Women Committee, an Ad Hoc Committee (including representation from the Status of Women Committee, the Personnel Policies Committee, etc.), or from a Universitywide or Cabinet-level committee.
- C. It was agreed by consensus that the Chair shall visit informally with the Chairs of all standing committees involved, receive recommendations from them as to which course of action to take and to report back to the Executive Committee on his findings at its next meeting.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m..

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
January 6, 1987

TOPIC 1: "Non-Capacity FTE Increase for Cooperative Education

As you are probably aware, we have for the past two years augmented the self-support budget of the campus Cooperative Education program with approximately five full time faculty positions. This augmentation became necessary when the fee structure under extended education proved inadequate to cover the personnel costs to run the program. On August 19, 1986, I sent a request to Dr. Anthony J. Moye, Associate Vice Chancellor, Educational Programs and Resources at the Chancellor's Office requesting that the campus be budgeted for an additional 67 "non-capacity FTE at the S-36 course classification to allow us to put Cooperative Education back into the academic mainstream of the campus without having to pay out of the hides of existing programs during the two-year period before the enrollments in the program started earning resources for the campus. Prior to sending the memorandum, I shared my intent and the reasons for the request with Lloyd as Chair of the Academic Senate.

At the Academic Senate regular meeting of November 4, 1986, a resolution of Cooperative Education Classes was introduced. During discussion of the resolution a number of concerns were raised about the need to explore the whole arena of experiential education and how credit is calculated and given for such learning. It was observed that there is little consistency across the campus in regard to the guidelines for experiential learning activities. I concurred with these comments and observations and strongly supported the concept of a committee to examine the questions raised. On November 18, 1986, Lloyd appointed the Ad Hoc Committee on Experiential Education and charged them with the task of addressing the issues with the goal of resolution in the Senate at its May 26, 1987 meeting. At the time of the discussion in the Senate, it did not seem likely that we were going to get the 67 FTE we requested before such a study could be completed. Indeed, someone asked me what I would do if the augmentation came through. I replied that I would return to the Senate on bended knee to ask them to bear with interim procedures until a studied decision could be reached.

Today I am on bended knee. The Chancellor rounded our request for 67 FTE to 100 (some sort of new math no doubt) and added it to the 1987-88 budget at the campus average productivity ratio of 253. The S-36 classification was approved, but it will be two years before the full S-36 earnings accrue. Meanwhile, the augmentation will yield 5.9 FTE faculty positions for 1987-88 together with the other resources which accompany such positions. If the campus actually teaches 100 FTE in the program, the ultimate yield will be approximately 16.7 FTEF which adds significantly to the flexibility of the campus where faculty positions are concerned. In a few minutes you will see the impact of the 5.9 positions on next year's faculty allocations.

I apologize for the lengthy explanation, but there are a complex series of interactions between this action and the topic of enrollment quotas and faculty allocations. Therefore, I want to be very clear about what is being proposed. Today, I am asking you to support on faith our use of the positions in the manner in which they are presently deployed for Cooperative Education pending the outcome of the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Experiential Education. I would be happy to answer any questions at this point, or if you prefer, I can go on to the next topic which is enrollment quotas and faculty allocation so that you can see where the 5.9 positions for 1987-88 fit into that larger picture -- and ultimately where the approximately 16 position potential fits.

TOPIC 2: Enrollment Quotas/Initial Release of Faculty Positions

The Initial Release of Faculty Positions evolves from the determination of enrollment quotas. Enrollment quotas in turn are heavily influenced by factors such as continuing student rates and extent of tenured faculty positions already committed in the various schools. The latter results from a planning assumption that the campus will avoid the layoff of tenured faculty positions so long as it is possible to do so.

The initial step in the process of establishing enrollment quotas is the projection of continuing students. Data on numbers of Fall Majors, Fall Continuing Students, and Academic Year FTE have been collected by school from 1970 through Fall Quarter 1986. These data were utilized for projection of Fall Continuing Students, and, as we will see later, for projection of Academic Year FTE taught.

To project continuing students, regression equations were developed which related the total enrollment from the previous fall quarter to the number of continuing students in the next fall quarter. For example, the total enrollment in Fall Quarter 1985 was related to the continuing student enrollment in Fall Quarter 1986. The regression equations selected for the schools were those which made sense in terms of the data related and which had the highest correlation coefficients. You might also recall, that Glenn Irvin chaired a special Ad Hoc committee which reviewed these equations with the able assistance of Kent Smith from the Statistics department. Ed Carnegie was the Academic Senate representative on that committee. The report of the Committee is available for your review. The regression equations and the estimated Fall Quarter 1987 continuing student numbers are shown in Table 1.

The continuing student numbers are our givens in the enrollment quota setting process. As you can see from tables 1 and 2, the continuing students account for 12,460 out of the total of 15,825 students (77.8 percent) proposed for Fall 1987. That leaves a margin of only 22.2 percent of the students available for purposes of flexibility in enrollment planning. Even this figure is optimistic since included in that 22.2 percent are 235 "returning undergraduate and graduate students". These are students who were previously enrolled in good standing and who are returning after an absence of more than two consecutive terms. It has been long-standing campus practice to grant such students automatic readmission. If one were to add them to the continuing students, the total would be 12,695 or 80.2 percent of the total. As you can see the flexibility is indeed limited.

In order to understand the way in which the figure of 15,825 students was derived, it is necessary for me to digress a bit to try to explain the kind of delicate balancing act we go through each year to make certain that we achieve the number of students and student mix of majors in our total enrollment which will bring us as close as possible to our budgeted figure of 14,200 FTE as we can get without going too far over or under. This single aspect of the process is probably the least well understood across the campus and yet it probably has the greatest impact on our collective well-being. When we go under budget, providing we don't go too far, we still receive full funding at the 14,200 level. This year we project that - barring impacts of the mid-year reduction - we will come in at 14,170.

If we go over budget we generally receive no additional revenue to compensate for the additional workload. We were in that mode for several years with severe adverse consequences on faculty energies and morale. Hypothetically, if the campus goes more than 2 percent over budget, and if the system is also more than 2 percent over the budget, we would receive extra compensation for those FTE beyond the 2 percent. In practice this seldom happens, and the compensation is far less than for regularly budgeted FTE.

Therefore, we once again use regression equations to try to improve our predictive accuracy. This time we use the equations to predict academic year FTE from fall quarter enrollment (table 3). And, please note, the extra 100 FTE for Cooperative Education doesn't enter into these calculations since they are "non-capacity" and are not part of the regular budget of 14,200 FTE. In order to try to use the most current data and data which reflects any planned changes in enrollment patterns -- for example new degree programs, we make this projection from our earlier projection of fall majors. As you will see from the report of the Ad Hoc committee which studied the process and which came up with the current regression equations, every effort has been made to bring us as close as possible to target. This was accomplished by applying a number of different statistical processes to the actual historical data to find the more accurate predictors.

Table 3 shows the regression equations used and the results achieved. You will see that there are two different totals, a campus total of 15,539 which is derived from a total campus regression equation, and 15,825 which is the sum of the school estimated fall majors and which results in a FTE figure of 14,228. We have derived this figure by dividing the 15,539 by 0.982 which is the factor the Chancellor's Office uses to calculate our AY FTE from our Fall Term actual FTE. There is one element in this process which has so far defied effective prediction. That element is the average unit load students are likely to take any given quarter. As you can see from page 2 of table 2 those figures have been fairly unstable during the past several years. We have projected 13.71 which is high compared to our actual this year, and we have offset that somewhat by using the higher enrollment figure. To take a worst case projection, if we were to actually come in with the 13.68 average units we achieved this year instead of the 13.71 we project for next year, the AY FTE would drop to 14,120.

Finally, we come back to the proposed enrollment targets. By way of summary to date, we have established our projection of continuing students by regression equation, we have established our target total enrollment to achieve the budgeted figure of 14,200 FTE by regression modified by the 0.982 factor used by the Chancellor's Office. These two figures give us our ceiling and our base. To arrive at the numbers of returning undergraduates and graduates, we use estimates based on historical patterns. These numbers are added to the base. Likewise, the numbers of New Grads is estimated from past patterns modified by the school deans to reflect school decisions regarding graduate programs. These numbers are also added to the base. The difference between this expanded base and our ceiling give the number of new students available to distribute among the schools.

undergraduates

The process now gets even more convoluted. It is at this juncture that we have to "jump ahead" as it were to project the impact on staffing of AY FTE projections for the individual schools. The options are limited and the "no win" bottom line in deciding whether or not we can increase the number of students in a school hinges on whether we can give that school the faculty to cover the additional workload without precipitating layoff in the school or schools which have to be reduced to accommodate the shift. As you will see, our present proposal makes some modest adjustments and still subsidizes departments in two schools.

When school total enrollment figures are decided the number of new undergraduates falls out and the process once again has to be examined to consider the consequences of the total number of new undergraduates on the viability of the total degree programs over which that number has to be spread and both the total FTE production of the campus and the ability of the campus to avoid layoff.

Again I apologize for the amount of time this is taking. However, I am determined that there be nothing hidden in the process and that it remain constantly open to improvement. To accomplish these goals I need the support of this critical body in understanding, if not all of the details, at least the premises and processes which are being utilized. Therefore, if I err, I would rather it would be on the side of too much explanation and not too little explanation.

I am blessed with an extremely dedicated staff which annually expends a monumental amount of energy to produce the most accurate, open, and fair process possible. They are ably assisted by the services of the various individuals who serve as the campus Statistician on Loan and I owe it to all of them and to you to hold up my end of the bargain by an accurate portrayal of the process and particularly by identification of those places where my subjective judgments have resulted in adjustments.

If you have any questions about the process thus far I would be happy to try to answer them.

The end product of all this effort is the Initial Release of Faculty for the 1987-88 Academic Year. The process for faculty allocation, including abbreviated versions of that which I just covered with you is detailed in the document labeled APPENDIX. You already have in your possession the tables which go with the appendix.

With your continued indulgence I will walk you quickly through the process and let my timing be guided by your questions.

Pick up here with the appendix of the initial release memorandum.