

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California  
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES

Tuesday, February 23, 1988  
Staff Dining Room B 3:00 p.m.

I. Preparatory:

- A. The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.
- B. The minutes of the February 9, 1988 meeting were approved as submitted.

II. Communications:

- A. The chair noted the growing list of materials available for reading in the Senate office. New materials include Guidelines for Lottery Funding and the California Postsecondary Education Commission's document of Size, Growth and Cost of Administration at the California State University.
- B. President Baker has approved the following Senate resolutions:
  - AS-266-88 Resolution on Miscellaneous Catalog Changes
  - AS-267-88 REsolution on GE&B Course Proposals for TH210X and TH328X
  - AS-269-88 Resolution on the Foundation Election Process
- C. The chair noted the memo from Malcolm Wilson on Lottery Funding. This was distributed to the deans. Senators may want to bring this information to the attention of faculty in their departments.
- D. The chair noted a memo from Naples to campus presidents regarding the administrative fellows program.
- E. The chair also noted a memo from West regarding Proposals for Academic Computing Enhancement Institute Project Funding. Senators should inform faculty regarding this potential source of funding.

III. Reports:

- A. President: none.
- B. Academic Affairs: none.
- C. Statewide Senators:

Weatherby reported that an article appeared in the paper about freeze on international programs. However, the Chancellor office says that there is not a freeze, but that no new programs will be approved in the next 45 days. During that time criteria for approval of new programs will be reviewed.

Gooden reported that the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on GE and Academic Affairs met this week. They are still working on the issue of a transfer curriculum. Information from this committee is being supplied to the local GE&B Committee.

- D. Senate Chair: The chair reported that he spent some time in Sacramento last week attending meetings on the issue of a transfer curriculum. There seem to be large differences in how the individual campuses are reacting to the proposal for a transfer curriculum. The chair also reported that Dean Ericson (SLA) has submitted his resignation effective Sept. 1, 1988.

IV. Consent Agenda: none.

Business Items:

- A. Resolution on Indirect Costs Utilization: Cam 543, Second Reading.  
M/S (Dana, Botwin) to adopt the resolution.  
Lucas gave some explanations as to why the numbers in the diagram attached to the resolution don't add up. There is one typographical error---at the bottom of Exhibit B the last number should be 323 (not 646). Also, there are some extra dollars from fixed price contract reserves that are inserted into the distribution process midstream. This usually amounts to under \$5000 a year.  
There was no discussion. The resolution passed.
- B. GE&B Course Proposal for PSY 494, Second Reading  
M/S (Botwin, Lewis) to approve the recommendation of the GE&B Committee.  
There was no discussion. The motion passed.
- C. Resolution on Enrollment Growth to 15,000 FTE and Beyond, 1st Reading  
This resolution represents the work of the Long Range Planning Committee on the issue of growth. They have considered growth in two phases, to 15,000 and beyond 15,000.  
Dalton noted the supplement with some changes the committee made in response to the Executive Committee's comments on the original draft of the resolution. She commended the work of the committee. She indicated that this is a complicated resolution. The committee felt that some growth was both natural and desirable for Cal Poly. They looked at internal and external factors that contribute either pressure for growth or limitations to growth. They considered demographic factors, state expectations regarding transfer enrollment and support of the community college system, and what kinds of growth are appropriate given Cal Poly's mission statement.  
15,000 is the current master plan figure for Cal Poly, and physical facilities are in the works to accommodate this growth. Programs have already been approved (as referenced in the addendum to the resolution distributed at the meeting) that would take up half of the growth to 15,000.  
Beyond 15,000 FTE, there are constraints and limitations on growth. Many of these are external, such as traffic problems, community growth policies, lack of housing, etc. The committee's conclusions were that a modest level of growth should occur. They didn't want to propose an ultimate number on the size because of the external limitations.  
The last part of the resolutions deals with follow up work that still needs to be done.  
A summary of the discussion of these issues follows.
- Weatherby: He feels that the business minor number may be too high. He also questions the compatibility of emphasis of growth in the numbers of under represented students and the targeted growth in technical areas. Recent growth at Pomona has not been in technical areas.
- Dana: He feels that state needs and local needs are different. The state needs in technical areas are growing. He also noted that the Master Plan says 60% of our students should be upper division and 40% lower division. It does not say that 60% of admissions should be transfer students.

Murphy (Paul): He praised the committee for the emphasis placed on educational equity issues. He also indicated that he will propose some changes to the resolution at the second reading. His changes would be in the resolved parts of the resolution segment titled Program Characteristics. He felt that the first resolved would be impossible to implement and that the second resolved was meaningless, and should be eliminated.

Dalton: She responded to Murphy's comments, saying that the committee wanted to give some guidance in terms of which programs should grow. They tried to tie this to the campus mission statement.

Burgunder: He indicated that he had difficulties with the same resolved parts as Murphy. He would hate to see growth limited in programs that are impacted at Cal Poly but not at other campuses.

Murphy (Paul): He indicated that the form of the resolution is unwieldy. In the future he would hope that a committee report would be organized with a background statement, followed by recommendations and the rationale for the recommendations.

Reiner: He indicated that the priority on affirmative action might be incompatible with the programs slated for growth. Maybe we should grow in areas that would attract minority students.

Kingsbury: She indicated that most jobs in the future will be in service oriented areas. This is where minorities and women might be interested in applying. We may have a problem with respect to educational equity now because we are an engineering school.

Murphy (James): He spoke in favor of keeping Cal Poly a polytechnic campus. He also emphasized the need for additional facilities to proceed growth.

Dana: He supported keeping the campus polytechnic in orientation. He also indicated that the job projections that indicate most jobs will be in service areas include technical as well as social service type jobs. He also indicated that educational equity involves bringing minorities and women into areas where they are under represented, not just expanding programs where there are already a larger number of minority students.

Monroe: He supported the emphasis on keeping Cal Poly polytechnic in emphasis. He also saw some conflict between state and national missions. His department has no problem recruiting minority students from out of state.

Kersten: He commended the committee on its work. He indicated some concerns about the organization of the document. It is really a series of resolutions. He would favor separation of items into separate resolutions in order that faculty be able to express their opinions on each of these issues. He also felt that state needs are important, but that they shouldn't over ride local and campus opinions and concerns.

Weber: She felt that the resolution was an interesting document and showed a lot of work. However, she would support a change of format. She suggested that maybe action should be delayed until the format could be changed. She also supported the idea that Cal Poly should retain its technical orientation.

Zeuschner: He suggested that a revised format could address some philosophical issues, such as: Do we want growth and do we want to remain a technical campus?

ers: He fails to see how we can support increases in certain programs when we don't know what employment opportunities are. He also thinks that growth to 15,000 is small and probably won't affect polytechnic nature of the campus substantially.

Gooden: He stated that educational equity outreach programs need to be supported by funds. This may require supplemental support, financial aid, etc. The state needs to determine if this is be ooeconomical than, for example, developing engineering programs at other campuses.

Cummins: He indicated that some programs don't have equity problems--the restriction of growth to minorities and women may be unreasonable for these programs.

Botwin: He feels that we don't adequately support the 14,300 students currently on campus, and doesn't see why we should grow.

Lewis: He stated that the question before the Senate is whether or not to endorse the report and not to set admissions policy. He also complimented the committee on their work.

Weatherby: He pointed out that educational equity doesn't mean more minority history majors. To achieve equity we must introduce minorities into areas where they are under represented.

Kingsbury: She felt that outreach is important, and should extend to the high schools in order to inform students of the career options available.

Reiner: He feels that any major can belong at a technical school as long as it respects the campus orientation and traditions.

ead: He sees a need to maintain the quality of education at Cal Poly, and thinks that we should restate our support for this.

D. Resolution on Report on Faculty Position Control, First Reading  
This report is the work of the Budget Committee. The resolution endorses the report.

Jim Conway indicated that the Budget Committee came forward with the report for the information of the Senate. It includes some recommendations and general guidelines. He stated that the committee still needs more information in order to make final recommendations, and this report represents an interim proposal.

VII. Adjournment: the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.