

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

Executive Committee Agenda
Tuesday, February 16, 1988
 UU 220 3:00-5:00 p.m.

<u>Member:</u>	<u>Dept:</u>	<u>Member:</u>	<u>Dept:</u>
Andrews, Charles	Acctg	Lamouria, Lloyd H.	AgEngr
Baldwin, Marylud	Educ	Lutrin, Sam	StLf&Acts
Borland, James	ConstMgt	Peck, Roxy	Stat
Burgunder, Lee	BusAdm	Sharp, Harry	SpCom
Crabb, A. Charles (CH)	CropSci	Terry, Raymond	Math
Forgeng, William	MetEngr	Weatherby, Joseph	PoliSci
Gooden, Reg	PoliSci	Wilson, Malcolm	VPAA
Hellyer, George	AgMgt	Copies: Warren J. Baker	
Kersten, Timothy	Econ	Glenn Irvin	
		Howard West	

- I. Minutes:
 - Approval of the February 2, 1988 Executive Committee Minutes (pp. 2-4)
- II. Communications:
- III. Reports:
 - A. President
 - B. Academic Affairs Office
 - C. Statewide Senators
 - D. Academic Senate Chair - Status of the Child Care Advisory Committee
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- V. Business Items:
 - A. Draft Resolution on Enrollment Growth to 15,000 FTE and Beyond-Dalton, Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee (pp. 5-18).
 - B. Nominations needed for the following committees: Affirmative Action...Review Committee and the Child Care Advisory Committee.
- VI. Discussion Item:
 - A. Incorporation of statewide Academic Senate items and campus agenda items.
 - B. Humboldt CFA Resolution Regarding Scheduling of CFA State Board and Committee Meetings (pp. 19-20).
- VII. Adjournment:

*2.2.88
minutes
removed*

DRAFT

RESOLUTION ON

ENROLLMENT GROWTH TO 15,000 FTE AND BEYOND

Background

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 information available to the Long Range Planning Committee. In addition, a complete set of the reports used and background papers prepared by the committee is on file in the Academic Senate Office.

The following resolution is presented in five parts: demography and educational equity, composition of the student body, program characteristics, growth to 15,000 FTE, and extent and phasing of growth beyond 15,000 FTE. Both the reasoning (WHEREAS clauses) and the implications (RESOLVED clauses) are grouped according to aid discussion. However, it must be stressed that the five parts together constitute one Resolution regarding enrollment growth. In other words, the reasoning is cumulative so that the clauses pertaining to educational equity and composition of the student body apply to program characteristics, and all of these apply to both potential levels of growth (to 15,000 and beyond 15,000 FTE).

Demography and Educational Equity, discussed and approved in committee 1/28/88:

WHEREAS 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; and

WHEREAS The concept of educational equity requires that Cal Poly increase its proportion of under-represented students; and

WHEREAS Enrollment trends show a decrease in the average student load as well as an increase in the number of terms required to complete a degree;

THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly designate any increase in enrollment to qualified under-represented students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly support, expand or create the following kinds of programs to draw

and retain more ethnic minority students (especially, Black and Latino): (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 procedures for changing majors and financial aid; and be it further

RESOLVED: 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.

Composition of the Student Body, for further committee discussion, 2/11/88:

WHEREAS The Master Plan Renewed calls for the composition of CSU enrollment to consist of at least 60 percent transfer students and, at most, 40 percent first-time freshmen; and

WHEREAS Cal Poly typically admits between 54 and 60 percent transfer students over the academic year (although the Fall Quarter percentage is almost the reverse, ranging from 42 to 49 percent transfer students); and

WHEREAS Cal Poly admits more transfer students to some schools than to others; and

WHEREAS The Cal Poly mission emphasizes undergraduate education, but recognizes the importance of graduate programs "to enrich . . . the undergraduate experience;" and

WHEREAS Graduates students currently constitute less than 10 percent of all Cal Poly students;

THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED: That schools or programs which admit considerably less than 55-60 percent transfer students consider redesigning their curricula (especially pre-requisites and sequencing of courses) so as to encourage appropriate preparation at community colleges and facilitate the admission of more transfer students; and be it further

RESOLVED: 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; and be it further

RESOLVED: 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.

Program characteristics, discussed in committee, 1/28/88; approved in committee, 2/4/88:

WHEREAS Recent employment trends and projections for the future show that not all currently impacted programs will continue to be in high demand; and

WHEREAS The Cal Poly mission statement emphasizes polytechnic education and the application of scientific knowledge to contemporary problems; and

WHEREAS There are opportunities for an interdisciplinary approach to instruction between schools to take advantage of the polytechnic character of Cal Poly;

THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED: That enrollment increases should not occur in programs which are impacted at Cal Poly but not elsewhere in the CSU system; and be it further

RESOLVED: That enrollment increases in programs at Cal Poly which are also impacted throughout the CSU system only be considered when there is a demonstrated demand for employment in that field continuing to and beyond the year 2000; and be it further

RESOLVED: That all future academic programs (especially in the liberal arts) attempt to embody the special polytechnic character of Cal Poly.

Growth to 15,000 FTE, discussed in committee, 1/28/88; approved in committee, 2/4/88:

WHEREAS A number of new programs which would generate about 464 students (about 420 FTE based on current student loads) have been approved but not implemented; and

WHEREAS The number of high school graduates in California is expected to reach a low point in 1990 and then begin to increase again; and

WHEREAS Some facilities, such as the Recreation Center, Dairy Science Instruction Center, addition to Business Administration and Education, remodeling of Engineering East, 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 funding as part of a state-wide bond issue;

WHEREAS Other facilities, such as the university union, administration building, library, outdoor recreation space, student services (even after the new Student Services Building is completed), and faculty offices (even after the approved 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; and

WHEREAS 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;

THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED: The first phase of growth toward 15,000 FTE accommodate programs which have been approved but not yet implemented; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly consider entering this 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; and be it further

RESOLVED: 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 (especially in non-instructional space).

Extent and phasing of growth beyond 15,000 FTE, for committee discussion, 2/11/88:

WHEREAS The number of high school graduates in California is expected to increase steadily after 1990 (at about 3.7 percent per year); and

WHEREAS Cal Poly's polytechnic emphasis is especially suited to prepare students for future jobs in the state; and

WHEREAS Some growth in enrollment can create opportunities for educational diversity; and

WHEREAS Some growth in enrollment can create opportunities for new faculty positions in departments which do not expect to experience any turnover; and

WHEREAS Some growth in enrollment can bring new resources to the University; and

WHEREAS The campus infrastructure (utility systems) have excess capacity; and

WHEREAS Cal Poly's campus has a limited amount of space remaining to construct buildings within a 10-minute walking radius; and

WHEREAS New structures increase the density of development and supplant open space on the

campus; and

WHEREAS Students rate the geographic setting and appearance of the campus second only to its academic reputation as reasons for selecting Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS 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; and

WHEREAS 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; and

WHEREAS Population in San Luis Obispo County is expected to grow at about 2.3 percent per year through the year 2000; and

WHEREAS 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; and

WHEREAS 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;"

THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly consider a modest expansion in enrollment beyond the 15,000 FTE in the current Master Plan for Higher Education; and be it further

RESOLVED: That such growth should be no more than commensurate with, rather than exceed, the general rate of population growth in the area; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the first phase of growth beyond 15,000 FTE be considered no sooner than two-three years after enrollment reaches 15,000 FTE; and be it further

RESOLVED: That such growth occur in increments, whereby two-three years of growth are followed by two-three years of stabilization to permit time for catching up and for assessment of the impacts of growth before considering a new phase; and be it further

RESOLVED: 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; and be it further

RESOLVED: 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; and be it further

RESOLVED: 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; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly consider reducing its impact on housing and traffic congestion by adding residential facilities on campus and establishing a policy of requiring on-campus residence for first-time freshmen; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly create more incentives to encourage commuting by means other than the automobile; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly assign a full-time professional staff position to campus planning to coordinate a comprehensive plan for the modest level of growth contemplated in this resolution, covering demographic projections, composition of the student body, program addition and expansion, facility location and timing, and community impact.

Long Range Planning Committee
Summary of Information Used in Preparing
Resolution 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.

Demography and Educational Equity

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.
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. Attaining educational equity requires extraordinary efforts by colleges and universities and special attention to high school preparation and recruiting.

Composition of the Student Body

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 that this is only true of Fall Quarter. 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!

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 transfer 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.

The role of graduate education has received less attention. While acceptable according to the Cal Poly mission, graduate programs are small 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.)

Program Characteristics

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. 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.

Growth to 15,000 FTE

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 and 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.

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.

Attachments

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

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

References

from

Cal Poly 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 concurred with 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."

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.



RECEIVED

JAN 28 1988

ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAMS

HUMBOLDT CALIFORNIA FACULTY ASSOCIATION

MSU Chapter
Executive Committee

Jim Deroen
President & State CFA Board
(Philosophy)

Marshall Thobaben
Vice President
(Nursing)

Michael Goodman
Treasurer
(Philosophy)

Dennis Anderson
Secretary
(Biology)

Peter Coyne
Past President & Grievances
(Speech Communication)

Judy Little
Lecturer Track Bargaining Chair
(Women's Studies)

Milt Dopkin
Tenure Track Bargaining Chair
(Speech Communication)

Lori Dengler
Representative at Large
(Geology)

Walt LaDue
Representative at Large
(Speech and Hearing)

Bill She
Representative at Large
(Forestry)

Pat Tam
Representative at Large
(Physics)

Dwight Zulaut
Representative at Large
(Business Administration)

Milt Boyd
Political Action Chair
(Biology)

Simon Green
University Finance Comm. Rep.
(History)

Mark Shaffer
Central Labor Council Delegate
(Foreign Languages)

Herschel Macik
State Assembly & Comm. Chair
(Speech Communication)

AAUP
CTA/NEA
CSEA/SEIU

CFA Office: 36-B Campus Apartments
CFA Phone: 822-6510 (messages)

December 7, 1987

TO: CFA State Board Members
CSU Campus Presidents

FROM: Milt Boyd
President, Humboldt State CFA

RE: Resolution Regarding Scheduling of
CFA State Board and Committee Meetings

Below please find a resolution presented to and passed unanimously by the Executive Board of the Humboldt State Chapter of the California Faculty Association.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS there are no bylaws or constitutional provisions that make serving on state committees or the CFA Board conditional on being able to attend meetings on a week day when faculty are normally teaching;

WHEREAS holding meetings on week days when faculty cannot attend because of teaching assignments either constitutes a de facto disenfranchisement of a committee or CFA Board member, or discourages individuals who teach on week days from running for office;

WHEREAS in the past and in the future committee meetings/CFA Board meetings have been or are being scheduled at times that require members to cancel classes, not attend meetings, or miss large segments of meetings;

WHEREAS CFA staff are paid salaries commensurate with work on non-week days;

xc - Jan Puffer
G. Davis

WHEREAS CFA officers are given released time;

WHEREAS the other committee members and Board members are volunteers in terms of time;

BE IT RESOLVED that no CFA Board or state committee meetings be held on week days at times that cause faculty to miss such meetings or parts of such meetings or cause undue hardship in the case of class coverage or cancellation

PASSED: Unanimous

MJB:pt

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 information available to 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 presented in five parts: demography and educational equity, composition of the student body, program characteristics, growth to 15,000 FTE, and extent and phasing of growth beyond 15,000 FTE. Both the reasoning (WHEREAS clauses) and the implications (RESOLVED clauses) are grouped accordingly to aid discussion. However, it must be stressed that the five parts together constitute one Resolution regarding enrollment growth. In other words, the reasoning is cumulative so that the clauses pertaining to educational equity and composition of the student body apply to program characteristics, and all of these apply to both potential levels of growth (to 15,000 and beyond 15,000 FTE).

AS-____-88/____

**RESOLUTION ON
ENROLLMENT GROWTH TO 15,000 FTE AND BEYOND**

Demography and Educational Equity:

WHEREAS 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; and

WHEREAS The concept of educational equity requires that Cal Poly increase its proportion of under-represented students; and

WHEREAS Enrollment trends show a decrease in the average student load as well as an increase in the number of terms required to complete a degree;

THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly designate any increase in enrollment to qualified under-represented students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly support, expand or create the following kinds of programs to draw and retain more ethnic minority students (especially, Black and Latino): (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 procedures for changing majors and financial aid; and be it further

RESOLVED: 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.

Composition of the Student Body:

WHEREAS The Master Plan Renewed calls for the composition of CSU enrollment to consist of at least 60 percent transfer students and, at most, 40 percent first-time freshmen; and

WHEREAS Cal Poly typically admits between 54 and 60 percent transfer students over the academic year (although the Fall Quarter percentage is almost the reverse, ranging from 42 to 49 percent transfer students); and

WHEREAS Cal Poly admits more transfer students to some schools than to others; and

WHEREAS The Cal Poly mission emphasizes undergraduate education, but recognizes the importance of graduate programs "to enrich . . . the undergraduate experience;" and

WHEREAS Graduates students currently constitute less than 10 percent of all Cal Poly students;

THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED: That schools or programs which admit less than 55-60 percent transfer 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; and be it further

RESOLVED: 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; and be it further

RESOLVED: 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.

Program characteristics, discussed in committee:

WHEREAS Recent employment trends and projections for the future show that not all currently impacted programs will continue to be in high demand; and

WHEREAS The Cal Poly mission statement emphasizes polytechnic education and the application of scientific knowledge to contemporary problems; and

WHEREAS There are opportunities for an interdisciplinary approach to instruction between schools to take advantage of the polytechnic character of Cal Poly;

THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED: That enrollment increases should not occur in programs which are impacted at Cal Poly but not elsewhere in the CSU system; and be it further

RESOLVED: That enrollment increases in programs at Cal Poly which are also impacted throughout the CSU system only be considered when there is a demonstrated demand for employment in that field continuing to and beyond the year 2000; and be it further

RESOLVED: That all future academic programs (especially in the liberal arts) attempt to embody the special polytechnic character of Cal Poly.

Growth to 15,000 FTE:

WHEREAS A number of new programs which would generate about 464 students (about 420 FTE based on current student loads) have been approved but not implemented; and

WHEREAS The number of high school graduates in California is expected to reach a low point in 1990 and then begin to increase again; and

WHEREAS Some facilities, such as the Recreation CentR, 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;

WHEREAS Other facilities, such as the university union, administration building, 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; and

WHEREAS 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;

THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED: The first phase of growth toward 15,000 FTE accommodate programs which have been approved but not yet implemented; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly consider entering this 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; and be it further

RESOLVED: 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 (especially in non-instructional space).

Extent and phasing of growth beyond 15,000 FTE:

- WHEREAS The number of high school graduates in California is expected to increase steadily after 1990 (at about 3.7 percent per year); and
- WHEREAS Cal Poly's polytechnic emphasis is especially suited to prepare students for future jobs in the state; and
- WHEREAS Some growth in enrollment can create opportunities for educational diversity; and
- WHEREAS Some growth in enrollment can create opportunities for new faculty positions in departments which do not expect to experience any turnover; and
- WHEREAS Some growth in enrollment can bring new resources to the University; and
- WHEREAS The campus infrastructure (utility systems) have excess capacity (the most limiting of which are sewage transmission lines); and
- WHEREAS Cal Poly's campus has a limited amount of space remaining to construct buildings within a 10-minute walking radius; and
- WHEREAS New structures increase the density of development and supplant open space on the campus; and
- WHEREAS Students rate the geographic setting and appearance of the campus second only to its academic reputation as reasons for selecting Cal Poly; and
- WHEREAS Vehicular ingress and egress from Cal Poly is already inadequate (especially in the event of any areawide emergency); and
- WHEREAS 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; and
- WHEREAS 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; and
- WHEREAS Population in San Luis Obispo County is expected to grow at about 2.3 percent per year through the year 2000; and
- WHEREAS 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; and
- WHEREAS 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;"

THEREFORE BE IT

- RESOLVED: That Cal Poly consider a modest expansion in enrollment beyond the 15,000 FTE in the current Master Plan for Higher Education; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That such growth must fit within the parameters of community growth policies and constraints; and be it further ✓
- RESOLVED: 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; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That such growth occur in increments, whereby two to three years of growth 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; and be it further
- RESOLVED: 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; and be it further
- RESOLVED: 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; and be it further
- RESOLVED: 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; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That Cal Poly consider reducing its impact on housing and traffic congestion by adding residential facilities on campus (including necessary infrastructure and supporting services) and establishing a policy of requiring on-campus residence for first-time freshmen; and be it further ✓
- RESOLVED: 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; and be it further ✓
- RESOLVED: That Cal Poly assign a full-time professional staff position to campus planning to coordinate a comprehensive plan for the modest level of growth contemplated in this resolution, covering demographic projections, composition of the student body, program addition and expansion, facility location and timing, and community impact.

Proposed By;
 Academic Senate Long-Range
 Planning Committee
 February 11, 1988

Academic Senate
Long-Range Planning Committee

February 11, 1988

Summary of Information and Issues Regarding
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.

Demography and Educational Equity

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.
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. Attaining educational equity requires extraordinary efforts by colleges and universities and special attention to high school preparation and recruiting.

Composition of the Student Body

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. 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!

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 transfer 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.

The role of graduate education has received less attention. While acceptable according to the Cal Poly mission, graduate programs are small 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.)

Program Characteristics

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.

Growth to 15,000 FTE

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.

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.

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.

77th - 2/16/88 Ev Com
Chair 2/11/88

State of California

Academic Senate Office
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
805/756-1258

MEMORANDUM

To: Charlie Crabb, Chair
Academic Senate/Executive Committee

From: Jim Conway, Chair ^{ACS}
Academic Senate ^{Budget} Committee

Subject: Faculty Position Control Report

Date: February 10, 1988

Copies: ASBC Members

The Budget Committee has unanimously voted to forward the attached report to you for the following actions. The report should be distributed to all members of the Academic Senate and should be placed on the next Senate agenda as a report item. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Attachment

this will
be an add-on
agenda
for
item, 88.
Feb 16

REPORT ON FACULTY POSITION CONTROL
Submitted by the Academic Senate Budget Committee

INTRODUCTION

For some weeks now the Academic Senate Budget Committee has been considering the issue of faculty position control for Summer Quarter as well as the rest of the academic year. Our consideration of the issue became more focused when the Personnel Policies Committee submitted their Emergency Resolution on Summer Quarter Funding. Our committee took a position in opposition to the resolution and was in the midst of attempting to develop an alternative resolution, when the resolution was withdrawn from consideration. Just because the issue was withdrawn does not mean that the university no longer faces a problem in dealing with faculty position control for Summer Quarter and beyond. Some form of dollar control of faculty positions seems inevitable.

The university wishes to maintain a quality educational program for the Summer Quarter as well as the regular academic year. The university has gone on record arguing the necessity of maintaining Summer Quarter as a fully funded state supported academic term. Some of the reasons for this position include:

1. Student demand
2. Enhanced progress toward graduation
3. The impacted nature of the campus
4. Overutilization of facilities
5. The use of Summer Quarter as a recruitment tool for faculty hires

The Vice President for Academic Affairs office is currently surveying departments to see how much of a deficit will be created, if any, by currently proposed Summer Quarter staffing. Once the amount of the deficit, if any, is determined, then measures to meet the revenue shortfall will have to be addressed. The Budget Committee believes that some guidelines should be proposed for dealing with this potential summer

shortfall, as well as dealing with faculty position control for the academic year(s) to come.

THE CURRENT PROBLEM

There was a substantial faculty salary deficit for 1986-87, which meant that \$483,000 had to be transferred from other budget categories including replacement equipment to cover the shortfall. Of the total amount, \$180,000 could be attributed to Summer Quarter. A similar deficit could occur in 1987-88.

CAUSES OF THE PROBLEM

Because the university is put in a position where it must hire new and leave replacement faculty positions at a higher rank than Assistant Professor Step 8, and must hire Summer Quarter faculty members at a higher level than Associate Professor Step 12, a deficit is created in faculty salaries. Some of the reasons why this deficit occurs include:

1. The maturing of the faculty in rank at Cal Poly
2. The higher proportion of faculty in DMD (Designated Market Disciplines) positions at Cal Poly. (This problem is addressed in the 1988-89 budget cycle.)
3. The lack of an available pool of lecturers in the community surrounding Cal Poly in many disciplines to cover summer teaching positions and leave replacements
4. Due to market conditions, a similar problem is also created by initial hires and leave replacements being hired at levels above state funding formula

The university has also been facing other fiscal restraints which have exacerbated the problem. In recent years the university has lost much of its ability to reallocate resources internally to meet actual and de facto budget cutbacks/shortfalls. Some of the causes of this situation include the following:

1. In 1986-87 meeting a midyear deficit reduction plan, with Cal Poly's total equaling \$393,054
2. 1987-88 reallocation of campus budgets to fund the nonfaculty MSA's (Merit Salary Adjustments) in the amount of \$450,000

3. Meeting increased commitments to the OASIS Project to upgrade our inadequate Student Information System
4. Increasing contingency fund balance to help meet shortfalls in other budget areas including enrollment mix changes from part-time to full-time students leading to a revenue shortfall in 1987-88

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the belief of the Budget Committee that any internal budgetary solution to this externally caused problem sends the wrong kind of message to the Chancellor's Office, the Department of Finance, and the State Legislature by setting a precedent in dealing with budget cutbacks/shortfalls.

External - Long-term Solution to the Problem

1. The university should contact the Chancellor's Office, the Department of Finance, and the State Legislature and request additional funding for Summer Quarter 1988, and ask that the formula for determining Summer Quarter faculty positions and academic year new hires and leave replacements at Cal Poly be made reflective of actual experience or on the basis of average rank of faculty at Cal Poly.
2. The university should support an increase in faculty positions based upon 100% of Mode and Level funding instead of the current 92%.
3. The university should support State and Chancellor's Office funding of nonfaculty MSA's.

Internal - Guidelines for Dealing with the Problem

If an internal campus solution of the problem is required after exhausting all other alternatives, then the following guidelines should be applied.

1. In the development of any plan related to faculty position control, full consultation between the administration, faculty, and students will occur.
2. Whatever plan is approved should be applied equally to each of the seven instructional schools.

3. If the proposed plan involves a change in working conditions over past practice, then those changes must be negotiated with the Unit Three bargaining agent, the California Faculty Association.
4. Any plan proposed and later adopted should not indicate that an increased workload is acceptable to the faculty.
5. Prior to any proposed plan development, a full accounting of how these deficits have been met in the past needs to be provided by the administration along with documentation that leave replacement and Summer Quarter hires are the main cause of the budget deficit/shortfall. Also the results of the Vice President for Academic Affairs office's survey on the Summer Quarter situation needs to be distributed to the academic community in a timely fashion.
6. That before any proposed solution is adopted, all budgets including soft money budgets (Foundation, Annual Giving Fund, etc.) be reviewed to see if other funding sources are available to assist faculty salary deficits. A fee increase for students attending Summer Quarter should also be studied as a possible alternative.
7. Any budget adjustments related to funding Summer Quarter positions or leave replacements should be spread across the entire university rather than being taken from only one funding source.

CONCLUSION

The Budget Committee will continue to study this issue, and will attempt to absorb any new information that sheds light on the situation. The Budget Committee welcomes your comments and input concerning any additional guidelines that should be considered. Time is needed to study all the ramifications of this issue before coming forward with a resolution that proposes a specific solution to this complex problem.