

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
SAN LUIS OBISPO

Academic Senate Executive Committee Minutes

January 28, 1975

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m. by Chairman Joe Weatherby.
- II. The minutes of the January 7, 1975, meeting were approved as written.
- III. All members were in attendance. Guests were Barbara Weber and Bill Krupp.
- IV. Business Items

- A. The President's Convocation of January 21, 1975, was made the first item of business. The Chairman reviewed the steps taken in council with the President of the University prior to the convocation, the Chairman's request to Executive Committee members to caucus their Senate colleagues, the development of the Facts and Alternatives Summary prepared in the Senate office (Attachment-1), the President's presentation of the situation and the President's schedule in Sacramento this week.

Discussion commenced with reviews of the caucus opinions from the various Schools (Attachment-2). Opinions were mixed; however, there appeared to be a consensus towards continued, controlled growth. It was M/S (Alberti/Jorgensen) to adopt Resolution #2 with underlined modification (Attachment-3). In discussion of the motion the point was made that the enrollment allocations for 1975-76 have already been reached in some Schools but not in others. A limitation on enrollment under next year's projected 13,800 FTE would result in either retractions of students already admitted or an arbitrary cut-off of non-impacted programs. A generally recognized difficulty was that the implication of any alternative presented could not be predicted with certainty as to negative or positive effects. The general recognition of faculty disruption and hardships created by the lack of space and facilities to support the projected student population was shared by all. It was M/S (Eatough/Andreini) to amend resolution #2 to the effect that "enrollment be limited to that attained by present school quotas for 1975-76 and thereafter limited to a 100 FTE growth for at least two years." The amendment failed 4/7/1. The resolution failed 5/7/0.

It was M/S (Drandell/Sennett) that the informal caucus survey made by members of the Executive Committee be summarized and passed on to President Kennedy. It was M/S (Alberti/Andreini) to amend the motion to add that "the Executive Committee expresses its concern that the faculty as a whole have not been given the supporting factual data upon which to base a decision." The amendment passed 7/5/0. The vote on the motion was 6/6/0 and defeated by the Chair.

It was M/S (Sennett/Eatough) that Alternative III, "Continuing to grow at an already established rate of 13,800 for 1975-76, with approximately 200-300 annual FTE increases until we reach 15,000 in 1979-80 and obtain a minimum of 20 trailers for faculty office spaces as of Fall 1975," be sent to President Kennedy as the consensus of the Executive Committee. The motion passed 7/4/0 with three Senators absent.

- B. Further business was postponed to a special meeting on February 4, 1975.
- V. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

## CAPITAL OUTLAY AND ENROLLMENT

### Facts

1. Cal Poly SLO, due to lack of adequate classroom and faculty office space, has the highest utilization of lecture classroom space and the second highest utilization of laboratory classroom space in the CSUC system.
2. CPSU had an enrollment increase of over 107. in Fall 1974 over Fall 1973 while the CSUC system increased by only 27.
3. Applications for admission for Fall 1975 are running higher than last year.
4. On-campus student housing was 310 spaces below requests for 1974-75 and lack of adequate off campus housing created a major problem in the community and in student morale in Fall 1974. Due to construction costs and a no-growth community attitude the possibilities of construction of additional off-campus housing appears slim.
5. Cal Poly, with 13,500 FTE students continues to operate with a library designed for 6,000 FTE, and a campus existing capacity for 11,011 (Fall 1974).
6. 168 faculty and support staff presently housed in Tenaya will need new office space when the dorm is returned to student use in Fall 1975. The campus has no existing space for conversion and there are no appropriate off-campus facilities available. Many members of the faculty are presently housed in closets and World War II barracks buildings. It is estimated that 210 new office spaces will be needed for Fall 1975 to accommodate staff from Tenaya and new faculty.
7. The Governor's budget has cut out all funds for new facilities for enrollment needs which had as top priority the new Life Sciences Building on this campus. Funds for working plans for the new Faculty Office Building were also eliminated.

Given these facts, the following represents a pro/con comparison of the alternatives presented by President Kennedy at the University Convocation on January 21, 1975.

Alternative I - Hold enrollment at the current level of 13,500 annual average FTE and attempt to obtain permission to continue use of Tenaya for faculty offices until a minimum of two major new buildings are ready for occupancy: Life Sciences and the Faculty Office building.

PRO	CON
A. Keeping Tenaya for office space would solve office problems for next year without bringing temporary trailers on campus.	A. In order to keep Tenaya for office space, approval must be obtained from federal govt. as well as from the Trustees. Tenaya is needed for student housing. Keeping it for office space will continue the housing problem in the community.
B. Holding enrollment would ease tension with the community caused by no-growth sentiment. Present overcrowding problems could be solved before they are increased with additional enrollment.	B. Holding enrollment could be bureaucratic suicide, instigating a steady-state staffing situation prior to reaching projected full enrollment. It might lessen priority of needed buildings in Trustee's budget. It might lead to a decline in applications to Cal Poly, eventually becoming a decrease in enrollment.

Alternative II - Hold enrollment at 13,500 annual average FTE for three years, release Tenaya, and obtain 10 trailers for use until the two new facilities are ready for occupancy, and continuing growth at the planned rate after 1978-79.

PRO	CON
A. Would provide additional needed student housing in dorm, relieving some of the pressure on the community. 10 trailers could be obtained without difficulty from Hayward and provide some of the needed office space.	A. Use of trailers on campus is undesirable both esthetically and practically. What other buildings will be used for office space in addition to 60 spaces provided by trailers? Will creation of other office space lessen case for new office building?
B. Holding enrollment - See I-Pro-B.	B. Holding enrollment - See I-Con-B.

Alternative III - By continuing to grow at the already established rate of 13,800 for 1975-76, with approximately 200-300 annual FTE increases until we reach 15,000 in 1979-80 and obtain a minimum of 20 trailers for faculty office spaces as of Fall 1975.

A. Tenaya would relieve student housing problem somewhat. Private construction of additional off-campus would be encouraged by projected enrollment figures. Trailers will house most of the faculty and little use of other facilities will be necessary.	A. Trailers will be put throughout campus, cluttering the area. It is questionable as to how impermanent these structures are considered.
B. By continuing growth, our case will be better for obtaining new facilities. Our case for completing the campus will be better.	B. Additional growth will exacerbate all existing problems. Tension with the community will increase, the problem of student housing will be multiplied as enrollment increases and off campus facilities do not. Overcrowding of classes will become worse, faculty and student morale will drop.

## RESULTS OF CAUCUS

### SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Majority of School in favor of alternative No. 3. Difference as follows:

Ornamental Horticulture	- 50% for No. 3 50% for No. 2
Natural Resources Management	- 50% for No. 3 50% for No. 1
Agricultural Engineering	- 70% for No. 3 30% for No. 2
Animal Science	- 80% for No. 1 10% for No. 2 10% for No. 3

### SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN - No caucus

<u>SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES</u>	<u>No.1</u>	<u>No. 2</u>	<u>No.3</u>	<u>Other</u>
Political Science	- 1		11	
Economics	- 2		6	1
Business Administration	-	2	17	
Social Science	- 5	1	5	
TOTALS	8	3	39	1

### SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATIVE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

3 Senators favored No. 3  
1 Senator favored No. 1  
3 Senators - not reached

### SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

Majority of School in favor of alternative No. 3, due to the effect of limiting enrollment on projected increase in the School.

### SCHOOL OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION (no caucus)

### SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

Chemistry	- favors limiting enrollment after next year's 13,800 FTE enrollment is reached.
Computer Science	- No. 3
Biological Sciences	- No report
Mathematics	- No report

### PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES

Library	- 50% for No. 3 50% for No. 2
Administration	- No. 3
Audio-Visual	- No. 1
Counseling Center	- No. 1



CAPITAL OUTLAY AND ENROLLMENT

## Resolution #2

- WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, due to lack of adequate classroom and faculty office space, has the highest utilization of lecture classroom space and the second highest utilization of laboratory classroom space in the California State University and College system; and
- WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, had an enrollment increase of over 10% in Fall 1974 over Fall 1973, while the California State University and College system was increasing by only 2%; and
- WHEREAS Applications for admission to California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo for Fall 1975 are running higher at this date than at the same date one year ago; and
- WHEREAS Such conditions of overcrowding on the campus have created a considerable hardship on students and faculty members, allowing no flexibility in scheduling, often requiring students and faculty members to attend classes at 8:00 am on the morning after classes until 10:00 p.m.;  
 . . . . . and
- WHEREAS California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo with 13,500 FTE students continues to operate with a library designed for 6,000 FTE; and
- WHEREAS Many members of the faculty are currently officed in closets and World War II barracks buildings; and
- WHEREAS Student housing on the campus was 310 spaces below requests for 1974-75; and lack of adequate off-campus student housing created a major problem in the community and in student morale in Fall 1974; and very few additional spaces have been constructed during 1974-75; and
- WHEREAS The elimination of the "60/40" ratio for faculty promotions has reduced the motivation to grow in order to generate more promotional opportunities; and
- WHEREAS All of the above conditions exist with the current annual average FTE of 13,500 and would be exacerbated by additional student enrollment at the University, therefore
- BE IT RESOLVED: That the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, acting on behalf of the Senate and after consultation with the larger membership through caucuses of the schools, recommend to the President of the University:
1. That enrollment be increased by 100 FTE per year for at least two years (through 1976-77);
  2. That applications which are denied be accompanied by a letter which indicates that the reasons for denial of admission are not because of academic problems but because of space, lack of building, housing, urging prospective students and their families to appeal through their legislators;
  3. That every effort be extended to insure that Tenaya Hall will continue to be utilized for faculty office space;
  4. That the Trustees, key members of the Legislature, the Department of Finance, and the Governor, be apprised of the space vs. enrollment problems at the University and in the community, and that these state officials be urged to lend support to (a) the reinstatement of Cal Poly's capital outlay needs for 1975-76; and (b) a realistic capital outlay plan which does not demand perpetual future growth in order to justify current building needs.