I. Minutes: Approval of the April 13, 1993 Academic Senate minutes (pp. 3-5).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
Nominations are being received for the position of Academic Senate representative to the Program Review and Improvement Committee for the 1993-1995 term. The representative must be a tenured, full professor. If you are interested in serving in this position, please contact the Academic Senate office (1258).

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair
B. President’s Office
C. Vice President for Academic Affairs’ Office
D. Statewide Senators
E. CFA Campus President
F. ASI Representatives

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Academic Senate Recommendations for Accommodating Immediate Budget Reductions, second reading (pp. 6-7).
B. Report of the Engineering Technology Discontinuance Committee, first reading. [PLEASE BRING YOUR COPY OF THIS REPORT]. (pp. 8-11).
C. Resolution on the Calendaring System—Kennedy, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Calendaring System, first reading [PLEASE BRING YOUR COPY OF THIS REPORT]. (p. 12).
D. Curriculum proposals—Bailey, chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading (to be distributed).
E. GE&B proposal for JOUR 318—Vilkitis, co-chair of the GE&B Committee, first reading (p. 13).
F. GE&B course proposal for PHYS 211, et al.—Vilkitis, co-chair of the GE&B Committee, first reading (p. 14).
G. GE&B course proposal for WS 411—Vilkitis, co-chair of the GE&B Committee, first reading (p. 15).
H. Resolution on Priority Registration—Freberg, chair of the Registration and Scheduling Committee, first reading (pp. 16-17).
I. Resolution on the Program Review and Improvement Committee’s Report and Recommendations for the 1993-1994 Review of Departments—Andrews, co-chair of the Program Review and Improvement Committee, first reading (pp. 18-20).
J. Cal Poly Instructional Computing Strategic Plan—Mueller, chair of the Instructional Advisory Computing Committee, first reading (pp. 21-26).
K. Resolution Establishing an Employee Assistance Program—Beecher, representative to the Substance Abuse Advisory Committee, first reading (pp. 27-39).

continued on page two
L. Resolution on Faculty and Student Awareness of Ethnic Diversity Concerns—Thompson, co-chair of the Student Affairs Committee, first reading (pp. 40-43).
M. Resolution on Evaluation of College Deans or Equivalent Administrators—Terry, chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, first reading (pp. 44-47).
O. Resolution on Vote of Confidence for Administrators—Terry, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, first reading (pp. 48-53).
P. Resolution on Paper Use—Naretto, chair of the Resource Use Committee, first reading (p. 54).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the attached recommendations for accommodating immediate budget reductions; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached recommendations be forwarded to President Baker for his review and consideration.

Proposed By: Academic Senate Executive Committee
March 9, 1993
ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACCOMMODATING IMMEDIATE BUDGET REDUCTIONS

In planning for the expected 1993/94 budget shortfall, a 7.4+ percent overall reduction is anticipated for Cal Poly. In an effort to suggest ways of meeting this challenge, the following recommendations have been adopted by the Academic Senate. In proposing these recommendations, it is the concern of the Academic Senate that all efforts be made to maintain the integrity of classroom instruction at Cal Poly.

These recommendations are in addition to the reductions presently being identified by each divisional area of the university as necessary for meeting that area's portion of the across-the-board cuts.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. Athletics: reduce state funding to Athletics by 50 percent.
2. Transportation Services: reduce state funding to Transportation Services by 100 percent.
3. University Relations and Development: reduce state funding to University Relations and Development by 100 percent.
4. Student Affairs:
   A. more student services to be fee-based;
   B. reduce the number of administrators in Student Affairs;
5. Administration: reduce the number of positions at the director's level and above with the exception of college deans.
6. Computing Services:
   We are concerned with the cost of central computing services provided by Information Services. We request that the IACC and IRMPPC report to the Academic on: (1) what are the essential computing functions on campus; and (2) recommend the most cost-effective ways of delivering those services.
7. Remedial Courses: remedial courses be offered through Extended Education.
8. Faculty Consultation: faculty to be consulted in each college on the question of total personnel costs versus O&E funds.
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS- -93/
RESOLUTION ON
ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY AND ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Executive Committee "recommends to the full Senate the receiving of the [Engineering Technology and Electronic Engineering Technology discontinuance committee] report and the endorsement of recommendation #2 of the committee's report"; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate receive the report of the Engineering Technology and Electronic Engineering Technology discontinuance committee; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse recommendation #2 of the report of the Engineering Technology and Electronic Engineering Technology discontinuance committee as follows:

2. If the Administration chooses not to follow the above recommendation, then it is recommended that it:
   a. Plan an orderly phase-out that allows the present students to take their required technical classes over a period of three years (Fall 1992 through Spring 1995) without undue harassment.
   b. Create a long-range course plan by June 1993 so that ET students can plan for registration.
   c. Allow students to graduate with a program that continues to meet ABET standards.
   d. Assist ET faculty in relocating to other Cal Poly departments where they are qualified to teach.
   e. In case of future program discontinuances, every effort should be made to review the program prior to announcing discontinuation.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
April 27, 1993
EXCERPTS FROM CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN VICE PRESIDENT KOOB AND MEMBERS OF THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING ADDRESSING THE DECISION TO ELIMINATE ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY AND ELECTRONIC ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

4/20/92 Memo from Vice President Koob to SENG Dean, Lee:
"...I am asking you to identify position lines equivalent to $656,300...If funds are available in the 92-93 budget, these dollars will be reallocated to your School in O&E categories.

"Please carry out the appropriate consultation with your School to arrive at a suitable way to achieve this budgeting goal. Based on previous considerations, I am recommending that you achieve the above adjustment by phasing out the Engineering Technology Department. An alternative, consistent with the mission and goals of Cal Poly, is phasing out any other activities throughout the School that are largely vocational in nature...I believe this recommendation is in the best interest of your School in the long term."

4/21/92 Minutes of the Department Heads/Chairs Working Session:
"[Vice President Koob's memo of 4/20/92 was distributed]...After consultation with the Academic Senate and CFA, President Baker and Dr. Koob agreed to focus on vertical cuts now rather than uniform cuts...Dr. Koob's recommendation to phase out the ET Dept was based on previous considerations (last year's 14 member committee, etc.)...Each department...responded they could not think of any alternative. A discussion followed as to how the consultation process within the entire School should occur. It was decided each department head/chair would share Dr. Koob's memorandum with each faculty member and...send a memorandum to the Dean summarizing their department's position/input..."

4/22/92 Memo from Dept Chair Kaliski (EL/EE) to Dean Lee:
"1. The department is not opposed to absorbing selected EET faculty under suitable conditions...
   a. The faculty members in question must be acceptable to the department.
   b. Even in view of the MOU, the seniority of these faculty must not in any way be used to accelerate the potential layoff of our own faculty.
   c. A pro rata portion of student positions from EET...must be transferred over to EL/EE.
   d. ...a pro rata portion of office space, lab space,...must be transferred to our department.

Any decisions reached must be confirmed by a majority vote of the Tenured and Probationary Faculty..."

4/22/93 Memo from Acting Dept Head Murray (MatsEngr) to Dean Lee:
"...After consultation with all of our faculty, including our Department Head, Robert H. Heidersbach, we have concluded that we do not have an alternative to the recommendation of Dr. Koob regarding the phase-out of the ET Department."

4/22/93 Memo from Dept Chair Freeman (IndEngr) to Dean Lee:
"I read the memo from [Koob] to the department...Naturally, there was some surprise, but many of our faculty members were involved in discussions last year about the potential loss of ET...One faculty member...expressed concern that other programs with a learn-by-doing approach could be vulnerable...(Some faculty members expressed to me privately that the faculty in ET were warned about this possibility if they were not able to change quickly to fit the direction the University was moving.) It was generally felt, however, that programs which are professional in nature, such as those emphasizing engineering excellence, will not be in jeopardy...No new alternatives which had not already been discussed at the DH/C meeting were offered."

4/22/93 Memo from Dept Head Mussulman (MechEngr) to Dean Lee:
"...The consensus [of the ME faculty] was that if line positions in the amount of $656,300 are to be cut from the SENG, then it would not now be appropriate to distribute such a large cut across the School. In this sense, the consensus was that the ET Dept has to be phased out."
The main concern of the ME Department faculty is over curricular requirements in the engineering programs. We are concerned that the proposed cut will not leave enough resources to phase out the ET Department and meet student demand for required courses in engineering graphics, which are presently taught by the ET faculty. Graphics courses are very important in the ME curricula, and care must be taken to assure that this cut does not create a new "bottleneck" which impedes students' progress to graduation.

Exception was taken to the implication that the ET curricula are vocation activities. All academic programs serve the dual purpose of education and preparation for professional careers, and this gives any education program a vocational component. If the measure of a program is in the breadth and depth of academic rigor demanded of the students, then there are several Departments on campus which would not be able to match the ET Department....

4/23/92 Memo from Dept Chair Larsen (C/EEEngr) to Dean Lee:
"In our meeting today, the faculty adopted the following motion which provide you with a response of our department:
...we are unable to identify any vocational programs within the SENG, other than those within ET...
...it is important that all other schools and all non-academic programs are seen to suffer similar proportionate cuts.
In the event that some of the funds that we cut are returned to the campus, it is essential that they be returned directly to the Schools in the same proportion."

4/24/92 Memo from Professor Cota (C/EEEngr) to Dean Lee:
"...I support their motion [the department's tenured/tenure-track faculty in C/EEEngr] but I am concerned that it was too non-specific. I offer three comments:
1. ...ET faculty...should have the opportunity to transfer into departments where their expertise can be used.
2. The School of Engineering is one of the most important to the State as it struggles with the economy...If the April 20 cuts are required less should come from the School of Engineering faculty.
3. Reorganization in the administration should be considered."

4/24/92 Memo from Dept Head Davis (ET) to Dean Lee:
"The ET faculty, staff, and students emphatically disagree with R. Koob's recommendation.
The ET program produces an "industry-ready" graduate who fulfills a unique role and is in heavy demand by California Industry...How does a curriculum which requires the use of applied calculus in the majority of its major courses be considered vocational? The idea that the ET program is vocational is absurd and ridiculous! This vocational implication seems to be the only justification given to back his recommendation...
The following alternatives should be seriously considered as viable options in lieu of following Koob's recommendation:
1. The $656,300 targeted by Koob should be uniformly distributed among the SENG departments. Each department's share would be approximately $82,000...If each student was charged a $20 lab fee, then $51,600 would have been generated. The remaining $30,400 needed to complete the budget cut could come from lecturer positions and/or staff positions...
2. If viable justification can be demonstrated [to phase out the ET Department], then the following recommendations should be exercised:
a. To further reduce the ET programs:...Move the ET programs and faculty into other SENG departments. Scale down...through a gradual attrition...
b. To phase out the ET program: Move the ET faculty, tenure rights and security, into other SENG department. Gradual phase-out of the ET program would occur over a three-year period. As the ET courses diminish, faculty loads would be offset with host department courses...
3. ...allowing all faculty a leave of absence without pay during the conference week of Fall quarter...
4. Reduce or eliminate the low-enrollment, high-cost graduate programs.
5. Cut administrative salaries.
6. Substantially reduce administrative positions.
7. Substantially cut or reduce non-academic programs and staff."
4/24/92 Memo from Dept Chair Wheatley (CompSci) to Dean Lee:
"...The Computer Science Department has tried to identify other activities 'that are vocational in nature' that could be cut. Unfortunately, we cannot find one that could effectively replace the specific target, i.e., eliminating ET...

In addition, I felt there was consensus in the department that if there are to be further cuts, they need to be in the nature of vertical cuts rather than any other way...there need to be corresponding cuts in the administration of the university and the schools."

4/24/92 Memo from Dept Chair Sandlin (AeroEngr) to Dean Lee:
"The department is unable to identify other vocational activities within the School that could be phased out. However, the faculty in the department do feel that there are possible areas outside the school where cuts could be made without having the impact on the School that cutting the ET Department would have. An example suggestion is to eliminate 10 units of GE&B from the curriculum. They feel that we are not being given enough information and time to consider alternative cuts."

4/24/92 Minutes of the Dept Heads/Chairs Special Meeting:
"A special DH/C meeting was requested by Davis in order to present the ET Department's alternatives to Dr. Koob's memorandum dated 4/20/92, and to find out the results of each department's consultative input from faculty.

...All seven departments [other than ET] reported their faculty could not come up with any alternatives...of phasing out the ET Department...

After a lengthy discussion, in general, all seven departments, other than the ET Department, are against the uniform cuts proposed by the ET Department. However, the Dean stated that departments heads/chairs can go back to their faculty to discuss the ET Dept's alternatives..."

4/27/92 Memo from SENG Dean Lee to Vice President Koob:
"The following describes how the SENG consulted with the faculty and highlights the results of the faculty consultation.

(1) [description of the consultation given]
(2) The following highlights the results of the faculty consultation.
   i. In general, seven departments support your focus of vertical cuts and cannot find an alternative within the SENG other than your recommendation of phasing out the ET Department...
   ii. The ET Department disagreed and suggested other alternatives...
   iii. The SENG is one of the most important to the State as it struggles with the economy. Our graduates find employment as engineers. If the April 20 cuts are required, less should come from the SENG.
   iv. Reorganizations in the administration should be considered. The number of non-teaching, high level administrators has increased over the years. If the cuts of April 20 are required, a significant amount of the dollars should come from reorganization.
   v. The Engineering faculty members would be interested to learn what other programs on campus will be phased out, especially for being largely vocational.
   vi. If the final decision is to phase out the ET Department, a gradual phasing out of the ET Department with a period longer than one year would be desirable. This will allow most of the present ET students to graduate and give most of the ET faculty the opportunity to find other positions.

In addition, three meetings were held..."
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate receive the "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Calendaring System" and endorse its recommendations.
General Education and Breadth Proposal

1. PROPOSER'S NAME
   Nishan Havandjian & Clay Carter

2. PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT
   Journalism

3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)
   C. 3: (note: submitted first for C.3 consideration and then in late Fall '92 for D consideration; no subsection identified)

4. THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR:
   - New Course
   - Change to an Existing GEB Course
   - Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB

5. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format)
   JOUR 318--MASS MEDIA IN SOCIETY. 4 lecture hours, 4 units.
   An appreciation of the political, economic and cultural impact of newspapers, magazines, radio and television in democratic societies. Role of informed media consumers in shaping media and messages.

6. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS
   Area C subcommittee recommends against JOUR 318 (1/3/92); too much overlap with ENGL/JOUR/SPC 385; contents not focused on arts and literature, but sociological issues; no prerequisites; problems with objective teaching.
   Course proposal revised a bit but again rejected by subcommittee C, 11/30/92; note re: rejections sent by Culver to Navandjian and he resubmits to Area D.
   Course proposal reviewed and rejected by Area D subcommittee (1/21/93) on the grounds that the course did not satisfy the guidelines to be in Area D.

7. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS
   On Jan. 28, the GE&B Committee again reviewed this course and the recommendations of the two area subcommittees. We agree with the subcommittee recommendations that JOUR 318 does not meet the criteria for inclusion into either distribution area; there is too much overlap with existing courses, the course has more of a sociological emphasis, rather than one on humanities (for C) and it does not address the nonwestern component required for (D). There are other problems as well.

8. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION

Academic Programs: 7/18/90
## General Education and Breadth Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. PROPOSER'S NAME</th>
<th>2. PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randy Knight</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)

   B.1.a

4. THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR:
   - [ ] New Course
   - [ ] Change to an Existing GEB Course
   - [ ] Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB

5. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format)

   Delete the B.1.a listing by the catalog course description for: PHYS 211, 212, 243, 301, 302, 303, 310, 315, 317, 323, 341, 342

   See proposal for justification

6. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS

   On 2/19/93, the Area B Subcommittee recommended AGAINST this proposal on the grounds that (1) upper division courses that can be used to satisfy GE&B should appear in the catalog; (2) that consistency in listing courses as meeting GE&B should be followed (so that such courses are similarly designated both in the front of the catalog and in the back under course descriptions); and that (3) some departments specify one GE course rather than others in the same category as best meeting their needs.

7. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS

   Late Winter Quarter, 1993, the GE&B Committee voted to support the recommendation of the Area B Committee—i.e., in opposition to this proposal. We base our recommendation on the grounds stated by the Subcommittee.

8. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION

Academic Programs: 7/18/90
1. PROPOSER'S NAME
   Carolyn Stefanco

2. PROPOSER'S DEPARTMENT
   History

3. SUBMITTED FOR AREA (include section, and subsection if applicable)
   D.4.b.

4. THIS PROPOSAL IS FOR:
   - [X] Existing Course Proposed for Addition to GEB

5. COURSE PREFIX, NUMBER, TITLE, UNITS, DESCRIPTION (follow catalog format)
   WS 411 Women, Race and Class
   Interactive roles of ethnicity, gender and class on the lives of individual women, and society as a whole. Examination of social conditions faced by different groups of contemporary women and the diverse ethnic and class heritages with which they shape their lives. 3 lectures. Prerequisite: WS 301, one course in SOC or WS, upper division standing.

6. SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION AND REMARKS
   Subcommittee D unanimously recommended approval of this course on 2/4/93. This class meets the criteria for inclusion in D. This class addresses human behavior, has a western and nonwestern perspective, and discusses the issues of race, women and class in historical and contemporary contexts.

7. GE & B COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REMARKS
   The GE&B Committee recommended endorsement of the Subcommittee response on 4/14/93. As with the Subcommittee, we are impressed with this class, its broad focus, interdisciplinary orientation, and the fact that it will also (we assume) meet the cultural pluralism requirement.

8. ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION

Academic Programs: 7/18/90
Adopted:

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

AS-93/
RESOLUTION ON
PRIORITY REGISTRATION

Background Statement: The current registration system recognizes the following priorities (using fall quarter enrollment data):

*Note: The only segment affected by this resolution is the "graduating senior" classification in Group II. All other groups will remain the same.

Group I:
- Disabled Students (mandated by law) 500
- Athletes during their quarters of competition/
  other priority students/ET and HE students (campus policy) 350
- New students 3,100
  subtotal 3,950
Group II:
- Graduate students 1,200
- Graduating seniors 2,800
  subtotal 4,000
  total registered prior to alphabetic rotation 7,950
Group III:
- alphabetic rotation of continuing students/former students

GRAND TOTAL 15,700

Current campus policy, as stated in the Schedule of Classes, states that "all students are entitled to TWO terms of priority registration before they graduate." However, once a student qualifies, senior priority is maintained until graduation.

Due to the variability in the way different departments manage senior project, inequities exist across campus in the number of priority quarters available to students. In some programs, students may only qualify for one quarter, whereas six to seven quarters are common in other programs. The equity designed into the alphabetic rotation is compromised when nearly a third of all seats in classes have been committed prior to the start of Group III registration.

Maintaining accurate records of "trigger courses" when curricula change every two years is a cumbersome task for Records personnel. In addition, Records must process a volume of special requests from department heads regarding individual cases. Simplification and automation of the priority system would increase the efficiency of this department. Current technology already in place allows for students to choose to implement priority registration for a particular quarter via CAPTURE. No other administrative processing would be necessary. Campus registration policy is moving toward student responsibility for enrollment. Allowing students to choose their priority quarters is consistent with this trend. Student representatives to the Registration and Scheduling Committee have expressed their support.

In response to these factors, the Academic Senate Instruction Committee and the University Registration and Scheduling Committee respectfully submit the following resolution.
AS- 93/
RESOLUTION ON
PRIORITY REGISTRATION

WHEREAS, Current published policy states that "all students are entitled to TWO terms of priority registration before they graduate;" and

WHEREAS, Students are known to have used "senior priority" for as many as seven quarters; and

WHEREAS, One-quarter to one-third of all resources are committed prior to the opening of the alphabetic rotation during registration; and

WHEREAS, Procedures for qualifying students for "senior priority" are variable and inequitable across the campus; and

WHEREAS, Procedures for accurately qualifying students for senior priority are cumbersome to administer; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That all undergraduate students shall be eligible for a total of three and only three priority quarters, to be chosen by the student after having completed three quarters in residence.

Submitted by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee and the Registration & Scheduling Committee
April 15, 1993
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Executive Committee "endorses the Program Review and Improvement Committee report and concurs with the departments identified therein for review for 1993-1994"; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the attached Program Review and Improvement Committee's Report and Recommendations identifying the departments to be reviewed during the 1993-1994 college year.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee
April 27, 1993
TO: THE ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

FROM: Program Review and Improvement Committee

Subject: Report and Recommendations

The Committee recommends the following departments for review during 1993-94:

- Physical Education
- Ornamental Horticulture
- Biological Sciences
- Dairy Science
- Journalism
- Art and Design
- Agriculture Engineering and AE
- Landscape Architecture
- Industrial Technology
- Industrial Engineering
- Agriculture Education
- Liberal Studies
- UCTE

These departments were identified using a variety of criteria. Some are included because they have programs for which accreditation is possible, but is not being pursued. This is contrary to CSU and University policy.

Others were selected based upon the following "key indicators":

- First-time-freshman SAT
- First-time-freshman reported GPA
- Number of applications
- Number admitted of those that applied
- SCU generated/taught
- SCU/faculty
- Cost per SCU

Indicators considered, but found to be inapplicable were:

- Gender
- Grading distribution
- Diversity
- Time to graduation

The quantitative data used was from Institutional Studies and the financial data came from Associate Vice-president Crabb’s office. All parties undergoing review will have the opportunity to discuss the data with the Review Committee.

The Committee further recommends the selection of new committee members be made in the Winter quarter and the programs selected for review be identified a minimum of two years prior to the year of review.

Some departments/programs selected are currently accredited, but the time for their next review is in the distant future. The Committee was of the opinion the review should be conducted toward
the middle of the accreditation period in such instances.

Finally, others were selected because a similar program had been identified for review next year. Such was the case with education programs.

The Committee recommends, that starting with 1993-94 reviews, the reviews be by departments. This will permit a more comprehensive review and will avoid the problem of allocating direct instructional costs between programs. Further, when more than one degree or program is offered through a department, it would be possible to have a detrimental workload for one program, thus possibly justifying an enhanced budget, while the other program in the department was "fat".

The Committee further recommends accredited programs be reviewed the year following receipt of the accreditation report. The logic to this recommendation is that an outside evaluation of experts in a given field will be of value to the Review Committee in its assessment.

The Committee recommends the following time-schedule for review of accredited departments/programs:

1994/95

Forest Resources Mgt, NRM, and Recreation Administration
Architectural Engineering
Architecture
Civil and Environmental Engineering

1995/96

Interior Design
City & Regional Planning (BS and MS)
Computer Science
Mechanical Engineering
RESOLUTION ON
"CAL POLY INSTRUCTIONAL COMPUTING STRATEGIC PLAN:
A NETWORKED INSTRUCTIONAL ENVIRONMENT"

WHEREAS, The Instructional Advisory Computing Committee (IACC) has been asked to write a strategic plan to address instructional computing and information needs in the future; and

WHEREAS, The IACC has consulted with various interested faculty and staff on the contents of the strategic plan; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse and support, in concept, the IACC "Cal Poly Instructional Computing Strategic Plan: A Networked Instructional Environment."

Proposed by the
Instructional Advisory Computing Committee
April 27, 1993
Cal Poly Instructional Computing Strategic Plan:  
A Networked Instructional Environment

In the next decade, computing technology will provide us with even greater teaching, learning, and research opportunities than it has in the last. For most instructors and students, the computing revolution of the last decade was symbolized by desktop computers: isolated machines loaded with word-processors, spreadsheets, graphics and computation programs. This first revolution is not complete: many of our faculty and students still do not have easy access to such machines, or the opportunity to learn to use them fully.

But the next computer revolution already is underway. Instructional computing in the next decade will be symbolized not by isolated desktop machines, but by communication between those machines, among office and office, classroom and library, teacher and student, the campus and the world. The next revolution will be less about the technology of computation than about access to information, and ways of sharing information. Consequently, the next revolution will involve most members of the University community, not just those who have been the traditional users and beneficiaries of technology.

With planning, Cal Poly can not only participate in the next revolution in instructional computing, but help lead it, to the great advantage of our students and faculty. Our plan centers on four major goals:

GOAL 1: NETWORK. A networked instructional environment, based on universal email, shared information resources, and computerized classrooms.

GOAL 2: ACCESS. Easy access to workstations and networked information services.

GOAL 3: SUPPORT. Institutional support for faculty and student development of computer-based communication skills.

GOAL 4: SIMPLICITY. Simplified interfaces, procedures, and documentation.

We do not envision achieving these goals all at once. Instead, we intend to proceed deliberately, with a careful eye on changes in technology that may change our goals, and on vicissitudes in the economy that enables them. Still, we feel that we must begin proceeding now toward a networked instructional environment if we are to deliver the sort of education our students will need as we move into the next century.

Achieving these goals will require coordinated planning and implementation at the departmental, college and university levels. We envision that Academic Computing Services, subject to review by the Instructional Advisory Computing Committee, will be the entity that coordinates instructional computing planning throughout the University.

Discussion of each of our four goals follows.
GOAL 1: NETWORK. A networked instructional environment, based on universal email, shared information resources, and computerized classrooms.

We intend to work toward a networked instructional environment. In this environment, every instructor and every student, working alone at his or her office desk, or with others in any campus classroom, will have access not only to the powerful tools of the desktop, but also to the networked applications and information resources of the entire campus, and the world beyond.

We envision students and faculty accessing the University's shared resources from network ports distributed throughout campus, in classrooms, laboratories, library facilities, and faculty offices. We envision them accessing shared resources from off-campus sites or residences. We envision every classroom being equipped with a large-screen display system into which instructors can plug their own portable computers, and through which they can display not only prepared lecture materials but also shared information resources.

We envision a University in which all faculty, staff, and students are connected through email. We envision vastly increased use of information services such as Cal Poly Network News (CPNN) and email, both to improve speed and convenience of communication and to save resources now devoted to paper and mail delivery. We envision that most written staff communication (memos, announcements, etc.) will occur electronically. We envision that many of the documents that pass between teachers and students (syllabi, "handouts," even examinations) will become computer-based. We envision instructors recording, calculating, and storing grades, and submitting them to the registrar, through an electronic gradebook that links with enrollment rosters and other pertinent student records.

We envision not only plain-text documents flowing between desktops, but multimedia documents, including color graphics, sophisticated formatting, interactivity, hypertext, animation, sound, and video. We envision instructors and students increasingly competent not only in receiving and reading multimedia and hypertext documents but in producing them.

We envision increasingly more powerful library retrieval capacity, including full text and multimedia retrieval to the individual user's desktop or to classroom display systems, with the ability to search and manipulate retrieved documents. We envision increasing desktop access to international journals, data bases, reference works, and scholarly discussion groups.

Using these electronic resources, we intend to create a new methodology for doing research and for publishing it, for creating and delivering lectures, and for interacting with students, not replacing the techniques of the traditional classroom but enhancing them.
GOAL 2: ACCESS. Easy access to workstations and networked information services.

We envision a campus community in which adequate, connected workstations are accessible to every student, faculty member, and staff member. An adequate workstation is one capable of receiving, processing, and displaying multimedia, including color graphics, sound, and video. Over time, of course, the concept of what is adequate will change. For example, we expect adequate workstations to become increasingly portable.

Faculty should be provided workstations as part of the ordinary instructional equipment they need for their jobs. Students should enter the University with an adequate computer, and with software sufficient for participating in their majors and in the campus electronic community. The policy which requires students to own computers also must include provision for a financial program enabling students to purchase computers.

Connections between faculty and student workstations will depend on the campus network, which will require additional file and application servers, additional storage, and improved performance, if it is to handle both an increased population of users and continually improving quality. Moreover, the physical process of connecting to the network needs to be improved, both from on campus and from off campus. To improve connections on campus, broad band connections must be supplied to faculty offices, most of which have only serial connections now, and to classrooms, most of which are not connected at present, and to many more study sites throughout the campus. To improve connections from off campus, in the short run, more modems should be installed, but in the long run, broad band links through telephone service need to be established.

Computer labs will continue to be a feature of the campus, but their nature will change. Since all students and faculty already will have adequate workstations, computer labs will provide for advanced, specialized, or particularly expensive hardware and software needed for particular disciplines or tasks. Coordination and management of computer labs will increasingly fall under the purview of Academic Computing Services, rather than individual departments or schools, so as to avoid duplication of effort and enhance efficiency of use.
GOAL 3: SUPPORT. Institutional support for faculty and student development of computer-based communication skills.

Part of the revolution we envision entails the installation of hardware and software, but even more of it depends on motivating and training the members of the academic community. We envision that the responsibility for learning and teaching the skills necessary to use the new research, writing, and presentation tools will increasingly be recognized not as the special duties of a few instructors or a few academic departments, but as part of the regular duties of the majority of instructors and of all departments, across the curriculum. We will all be using computerized classrooms; we will all be communicating through email. But most faculty members do not have these skills now, and often the time and effort required by their other professional obligations prevent them from obtaining these skills.

The speed and scope of change in instructional methods promised by the new technology is unprecedented in educational history, and will require unequivocal institutional support. No graduate school yet teaches what we expect our faculty to achieve. For many of our colleagues, the initial learning curve will be dauntingly steep, and advantages of undertaking the task unclear. We cannot expect that faculty will be able to upgrade their instructional computing skills on the scale we envision without institutional assistance—not just through special grants or pilot programs but through regularized, ongoing, easily accessible mechanisms.

To meet the unprecedented need for motivation and training, we envision a clear institutional policy that encourages the individual faculty member to make the required investment of time and effort. This policy should provide incentives for faculty development, including, for example, release time or direct pay to implement training seminars for other faculty, and release time or direct pay to attend such seminars. This policy also should explicitly regard improvement of an instructor's instructional computing skills as useful and appropriate professional development worthy of consideration during the retention, promotion, and tenure process.

Besides providing opportunity for basic training, the university should support innovative, advanced faculty projects —particularly those designed to enhance or improve the utility of new technologies within the teaching, learning, and research processes.
GOAL 4: **SIMPLICITY.** Simplified interfaces, procedures, and documentation.

The system must be simple and easy to use. Students, faculty, and staff should have simple, intuitive, and uniform access to information resources that enhance teaching and learning, research, professional development, and communication. They should have simple, networked tools which allow them to work through the bureaucratic processes of the university, such as registration and grading, with a minimum of frustration.

We recognize that one of the most burdensome impediments to our plan for a networked campus is that not all current systems are "user-friendly," and that the multiplicity of systems now on campus requires users to learn many different interfaces and command sets. To help remove that impediment, we envision a conscious, cooperative effort by administration, staff, and faculty to demystify computer use by discussing it and documenting it in plain English, not in jargon and acronyms. We envision a conscious, continuing effort by Information Systems personnel to simplify and standardize interfaces between people and machines. We envision an explicit policy of procurement and growth which holds consistency and ease of use to be as important as computing power.

To some experienced users this need to simplify language and interface may seem trivial, or of secondary importance, but it is not. Without it our effort to spread the advantages of instructional computing throughout the university will surely fail. Realizing, however, that complex technology will always present some difficulty, we envision a growing role for Academic Computing Services as an expert consultation service for faculty and students.
Adopted:
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Background Statement: From time to time employees experience personal problems that directly, or indirectly, influence their job performance. Experience in both the public and private sectors over the last two generations has demonstrated conclusively that an investment in an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) is a humane and economically effective alternative to either accepting low productivity or pursuing disciplinary action. Several recent studies reveal that educators at all levels are exceptionally vulnerable to disabilities that EAP’s address—specifically, various forms of stress and substance abuse/dependency. Like other educational institutions, Cal Poly employees also experience these difficulties. In response to a survey conducted by the Substance Abuse Advisory Committee during the spring of 1992, 65 percent of the respondents reported knowing someone whose work could be improved by personal assistance. The respondents noted that stress (56 percent) and alcohol (41 percent) were the most frequently cited reasons that assistance was recommended.

AS-93/SAAC
RESOLUTION ON
ESTABLISHING AN EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate acknowledges that Cal Poly’s faculty and staff are the university’s most important asset; and

WHEREAS, Experience in both the private and public sectors demonstrates that it is preferable to assist rather than discipline previously trained and educated employees with stress or substance abuse difficulties; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support the formation of an Employee Assistance Program at Cal Poly; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Employee Assistance Program at Cal Poly be established in conformity with the attached "Proposal for Employee Assistance Program."

Proposed by: The Substance Abuse Advisory Committee
January 5, 1993
PROPOSAL FOR EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

I. STATEMENT OF NEED

Background: From time to time employees experience living problems that directly or indirectly affect their job performance and career development. Cal Poly Employee Assistance is designed to help faculty, staff, and their family members resolve these difficulties in a manner conducive to both a more satisfying personal life and a more productive career. The program provides assistance through consultation and referral activities and is not designed to serve as a counseling service.

Employee participation is voluntary and confidential. Experience demonstrates that once an effective Employee Assistance Program is in place it will be utilized by employees who might have otherwise denied or contested both personal- and career-related difficulties. To understand why this is so, the history and background of current Employee Assistance practices is instructive.

Employee Assistance Programs have their origin in the reaction during the 1940s to the problem of alcoholism in the workplace. These employer-sponsored, occupationally-based programs were influenced by the experience of self-help groups and scientific/academic research dealing with alcoholism. During the 1950s the research led to the recognition of alcoholism as a disease and to the development of medical literature analyzing it as an occupational health problem. Reflecting this increasingly sophisticated understanding of the problem, as well as successful experiences, Employee Assistance became widespread during the 1960s. Over the last two decades Employee Assistance Programs expanded to include not only drug abuse but a wide variety of employee problems once thought to be purely personal. The cumulative experience of the last two generations, then in public as well as private sector organizations, demonstrates that Employee Assistance is an effective alternative to accepting the consequences of maintaining a troubled employee (low productivity, profitability, and morale) or the turmoil and increased costs of termination (recruiting, training, morale building).

Policy Rationale: Hence, from an employer’s perspective, working with an employee through Employee Assistance can be conceptualized as an investment paying dividends in the form of improved quality of work life and job performance. The dividends show up immediately in containment of health care costs and disability expenses, fewer worker’s compensation claims, and higher productivity. Employers have also noticed long-term benefits in the reduction of absenteeism and disciplinary problems, lower turnover rates, and a more positive public image.
Less tangibly, Employee Assistance seems to increase employee motivation, improve morale, and, in general, enhance employee attitudes. Not surprisingly, then, more and more organizations are offering Employee Assistance Programs as part of their general package of employee benefits. Because Employee Assistance also benefits the employee, unions have historically sought to incorporate Employee Assistance into their collective bargaining contracts.

At Cal Poly, Employee Assistance means that the faculty and staff are the university’s most valuable asset and that attainment of its educational goals are dependent on the well-being of all employees. Employee Assistance means that whatever the source of an employee’s personal difficulty, Cal Poly encourages the employee to call or visit the Employee Assistance director and to become an active participant in the resolution of her/his problems. Although it does not provide counseling services, Employee Assistance at Cal Poly can provide consultation and referral services in the following areas:

- Work and personal stress
- Emotional concerns
- Family and relationship difficulties
- Alcohol and drug abuse issues and
- Financial and legal assistance

Employee Assistance is completely confidential, voluntary, and will operate as a separate university unit.

II. COST-BENEFIT

In studies based on an inclusive analysis of productivity, it is estimated that every dollar spent on EAP will save ten dollars in increased productivity. These savings accrue from figures like:

- 40% reduction of absenteeism and tardiness
- 50% reduction in disciplinary actions involving low productivity, missed deadlines, and costly mistakes
- 60% reduction involving chronic health problems, excessive use of sick leave, health and accident benefits
- 50% reduction in grievances involving poor judgment,
- employee/department morale, and other noticeable performance changes

In more narrowly based studies that only included cost savings from hiring, training, and disciplinary costs, the return on investment was about 4 to 1.

Although the cost benefits of EAP are widely accepted, for a variety of reasons, ranging for research design to the extreme diversity in the ways in which EAP’s have been developed and
applied, assigning an exact dollar value to EAP savings is problematic. Developing high quality data for university EAP's is even more difficult. In the first place, the university has been slow in developing programs and those that do exist are of relatively recent vintage. Secondly, cost-benefit analysis of university EAP's is made more difficult by the fact that both the university budget and faculty/staff workload is, compared to private industry, unstructured. Reflecting these problems, the most complete study SAAC could locate, a 35 page analysis of the impact of EAP on the employees of the University of California System, hazarded no guess as to the actual dollars saved.

However, in what appears to be the only published systematic analysis of the cost-effectiveness of a university EAP available a savings ratio of 3:1 was demonstrated. It should be noted that in order to generate hard data, the researcher limited his work to a study of changes in sick-time utilization. A "softer" study recently reported the results of a survey of administrators at 170 California colleges and universities with some form of an EAP. While the respondents were impressionistic rather than concrete, 74 per cent indicated that based on reduced absenteeism and numbers of grievances, EAP's were cost effective.

For these reasons anything like a predictive statement regarding the possible savings due to EAP at Cal Poly would be problematic. However, the best data we have indicates that conditions at Cal Poly replicate conditions elsewhere and that it is, therefore, at


3 Report from the Office of Employee Relations, University of California, Sept 17, 1990. While the report does not include a cost effectiveness analysis, it does shed considerable light on the nature of EAP utilization within a university context. It is especially interested to note that UC held a symposium on Employee Assistance in April of 1990 that received the strong support of the Academic Senate's Committee on Faculty Welfare.

least arguable that savings at Cal Poly will parallel to those experienced in other programs. For instance, the EAP workshop sponsored by the Substance Abuse Advisory Committee last fall was received in a manner that suggested it met a felt need. This impression was confirmed by a follow-up survey conducted at the very end of the academic year. Sixty-five percent of the respondents (departmental chairs/heads and staff supervisors) knew someone whose work could be improved by personal assistance. Stress (56 percent) and alcohol (41 percent) were the most frequently cited reasons assistance was needed. These figures, though unscientific in origin, parallel national findings regarding the influence of stress and substance abuse on the professorate.

Finally, while the emphasis of this report is on the economic aspects of EAP, SAAC has concluded that EAP reflects an important effort to behave in a humane as well as efficient manner in the conduct of employer/employee relations. The committee notes that the qualitative observations from relevant administrators on the three sister CSU campuses that have effective EAP programs support that conclusion.

III. MISSION STATEMENT

The formal mission of the Employee Assistance Program shall be summarized as follows:

The Employee Assistance Program ("EAP") is a Cal Poly effort to maintain and enhance the health, well-being and performance of its employees. In recognition of the reality and impact of human problems in the workplace, the EAP is dedicated to supporting and strengthening the university's educational mission by a variety of appropriate measures including provision of professional help for employees' work-affecting concerns, in a manner stressing prevention, self-initiative, and confidentiality. The EAP addresses this mission through short-term, individual counseling and crisis intervention services, supervisory consultation and training, and through the development and coordination of on-campus wellness programs.

---

IV. PROGRAM STRUCTURE

Confidentiality: Within limits required by law, confidentiality is assured to all employees who use EAP services. Only the EAP director will have access to information provided by an employee. Individual records will be restricted to minimum information required to serve the employee and will be destroyed at termination of the service. The only permanent records will be data collected for statistical use and these will be kept without any individual or identifying references.

No information shared with the EAP director will ever be placed in an employee's personnel file. All record keeping will observe federal regulations on confidentiality of substance abuse records.

Referral: The EAP is designed to encourage employees to make use of its services as they require and at their own volition. The program will also accept referrals of individuals made by their fellow employees, family members, or supervisors. Such referrals shall be received and handled within the context of the professional and ethical standards codified by the Employee Assistance Professional Association (EAPA). In no case will any report to the referral source be made without the express written consent of the employee concerned. The EAP program is totally separate from any personnel process and all who use it, or refer others to it, will be advised and assured of that separation.

Program Oversight: Program oversight shall be by an EAP council. Council members are nominated by appropriate campus entities and appointed by the President. The council will function as the consultative body to the program director and as the policy recommending body for the program. The council does not involve itself in specific cases. Because the council must be comprehensive and collaborative, representatives of the Academic Senate and Staff Council shall meet together to decide its size and breadth. The council shall adopt procedures consistent with its charge and the experience of counterparts on other CSU campuses.

Purpose and Scope of Service: The EAP helps faculty, staff, and administrators deal with personal concerns in the areas of personal problems, family issues, substance abuse, and depression/anxiety. Employees are offered personal assistance by a qualified Employee Assistance professional in a confidential setting. The service is free and open to all employees of Cal Poly, including auxiliary services, and their families. All matters discussed remain confidential as allowed by law unless written authorization is given. Informational programs,
materials, and workshops covering a range of topics and activities related to mental health and substance abuse are offered, as well as training and education of supervisors in the utilization of EAP.

Reporting Relationship: The EAP director reports to the senior vice president. S/he meets regularly with the EAP council (or council executive committee) to formulate policy, administrative procedures, and to evaluate program outcomes.

Budget/Funding: The EAP director's salary will be approximately $43,000 annually plus benefits (exact level depends on qualifications, experience, and funding). The director is supported by a part-time clerical assistant, $10,152 annually plus benefits. The EAP should have an initial operating budget for all purposes of $5,000.00. It is suggested that partial funding come from Foundation and ASI as employees of these areas will also be eligible to participate in the EAP.
ATTACHMENTS
February 19, 1993

Bud Beecher
Department of History
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Dear Dr. Beecher:

This is a response to your request for observations by me as to the value of our campus Employee Assistance Program.

About eight years ago the idea of this program was raised by our Personnel Office, two college deans, and Ms. Beverly Verlinde, a staff member who had been involved as a manager in assistance programs in the private sector.

I must confess that though I liked the idea in principle, I was more than a little skeptical about whether we could make it work—questions of funding, space, personnel, community cooperation, acceptance by our faculty and staff.

At length we decided to give it a try. The Director, Ms. Verlinde, was also her own clerical staff. At first she had an office in a fairly crowded suite which is inimical to the need for privacy and confidentiality intrinsic to this kind of operation.

Today the program is one of the best parts of my legacy to the campus as I retire after 33 years as a faculty member, fourteen of which I have been Associate Vice President for Faculty and Staff Affairs.

We have been able to provide an office consisting of a reception area, a private office for the Director, and a fairly capacious meeting room. It is in a relatively secluded area of campus where "clients" can come and go with a minimum of "exposure." This semester the Director (who is full-time) has one full-time staff member. We are unquestionably fortunate in the person of our Director, and without doubt our success is due in no small part to her skills, energy level, and commitment.
To: Bud Beecher
Re: Employee Assistance Program
February 19, 1993

We have tried hard, and successfully I think, to maintain a focus in the program. It is easy for such an office to become embroiled in all kinds of social initiatives. We have stressed consultation and referral centered on personal problems which clearly affect or could affect employee performance. This is not a counseling function; it concentrates on analysis and referral. Substance abuse is a major arena of activity, but the office also deals with emotional problems caused by grieving, marital problems, aged parent care, difficulties with children. Our Director tries to analyze problems and refer employees to resources available in the community.

The function has been very well received. I am constantly receiving praise for the program and our Director from faculty, staff, and management. She is good with people and has established herself as a respected member of the health care community in our town and county. The program has received both national and international recognition.

The program has an interesting dual function. One aspect is self-referral--the voluntary contact which employees initiate when they feel they need help with a problem which is really or potentially impacting work performance. The other aspect is supervisor-referral. When there is a performance problem which a supervisor has reason to believe is rooted in personal difficulties, an informal referral may be made. But it may also be or become a formal referral, a copy of which goes into the personnel file. The availing oneself of help and degree of progress in dealing with performance problems often become a factor in "progressive discipline." Our managers and supervisors have learned pretty well how to separate their functions from those of the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) and yet derive the mutual advantages of both. The services of the office are continually being sought by our academic and non-academic managers, not just by employees on their own initiative.

The Director works under my general supervision; we have weekly staff meetings one-on-one.

She also offers many workshops on supervisory and peer assistance with personal problems causing trouble in the workplace. These range from such things as premenstrual syndrome to layoff anxiety. It is difficult to quantify the results. I am certain the program has literally saved some lives and some careers. We constantly get anecdotal evidence of better attendance, increased punctuality, increased comfort on the job. In both tangible and intangible ways there are greater productivity and improved general morale as the result
of this program. It is in my opinion worth far more in increased productivity than the cost of the operation. It is an integral part of enlightened personnel management.

As I said earlier, I was skeptical about the program at the beginning, in part because I am myself a very private person and tend to have a jaundiced view of what may appear to be "do-gooder" projects which mix business and personal matters. But I have moved from skeptic to believer. Properly managed, such a program is cost-effective, and it need not disjunctively intermeddle privacy and employment.

Sincerely yours,

Charles C. Adams
Associate Vice President for
Faculty and Staff Affairs
January 26, 1993

Dr. Bud Beecher, Professor
History Department
Cal Poly, S.L.O.
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Dear Dr. Beecher:

I am writing this note in response to your inquiry regarding the status of our Employee Assistance Program (EAP) in these challenging budgetary times. I understand you are part of a committee that is exploring the feasibility of developing an EAP on your campus. It is my pleasure to commend and encourage you in that process, since it is my belief that a viable EAP is essential to any campus employee support program — especially in these trying times.

The Employee Assistance Program at CSU, Fresno began in 1984 at the initiative of a core group of faculty members, concerned with creating a vehicle to address substance abuse problems and a variety of other work-impacting personal problems experienced by our faculty and staff. In its eight plus years of existence, our EAP has enjoyed wide support by the campus community as evidenced by usage rates consistently exceeding industry norms, and by the confidence placed in EAP consultation by both union and management for an expanding range of people problems.

In the 1991-92 school year, EAP services were reduced to half-time due to financial exigencies the university was experiencing. In the course of the year, however, the President's Task Force on Budget and Fiscal Planning recommended that in view of impending lay-offs and other organizational turmoil facing the community, the EAP will be restored to full-time status for 1992-93. The President implemented this recommendation, the only one of some 87 total, involving increased expenditure. In addition, Dr. John Franz, the EAP's Director was asked to lead the campus Task Force on Employee Support during the current year, a group which has sponsored a variety of workshops and support services for both laid-off and surviving employees. More recently he consulted with the President and me regarding supportive services that must be in place in the event of another layoff.

In sum, it is our view that based on our experience, university EAP programs play an important role in maintaining a sense of community — a critical need in tough times — by addressing employee problems in an effective, cost beneficial and human manner. I trust these comments will be useful in your deliberations. Please feel free to contact me at (209) 278-2364 (E-mail address: AA03741@CSUFresno.edu).

Take care.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Arthur V.N. Wint, J.D.
Executive Assistant to the President
Director, Human Resources

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the attached report and recommendations entitled "A RECOMMENDATION TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE ON FACULTY AND STUDENT AWARENESS OF ETHNIC DIVERSITY CONCERNS FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE"; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached report and recommendations entitled "A RECOMMENDATION TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE ON FACULTY AND STUDENT AWARENESS OF ETHNIC DIVERSITY CONCERNS FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE" be forwarded to President Baker for his consideration and implementation.

Proposed By: The Academic Senate Student Affairs Committee
May 11, 1993
A Recommendation to the Academic Senate on Faculty and Student Awareness of Ethnic Diversity Concerns from the Student Affairs Committee

President Baker announced at Fall Conference that the issue of educational equity and cultural diversity will be the top priority of his Administration this year. In a related action, the Academic Senate passed a resolution last year to address concerns over ethnic diversity (AS-369-91/EX). To this end, the Academic Senate requested that the Student Affairs Committee study ways and means of promoting ethnic and cultural diversity among the student body and faculty and make appropriate recommendations. This issue has been investigated during the 92/93 Academic Year. The conclusions of the committee are summarized in the following recommendations to the Academic Senate.

Background

The resolution of the Academic Senate identified six areas of concerns:

1. "the low graduation rate of ethnic minorities
2. the need to increase the number of underrepresented students
3. the need to create ways to retain underrepresented students
4. a need to increase the number of underrepresented faculty
5. the need for curriculum changes to reflect ethnic diversity; and
6. the need for faculty cultural sensitivity."

Many of these issues have been addressed by the university Educational Equity Committee in their report "Education of the Cal Poly Community of Cultural and Gender Issues." They outline existing campus programs aimed at educational equity and recommend strategies to improve respect for ethnicity. The Student Affairs Committee strongly agrees with their conclusions, especially those pertaining to administrative leadership and fiscal support to ensure measurable change.

Though each of the six areas is important, the Student Affairs Committee felt that some of these concerns are problems of a structural nature in society and the local
community. For instance, the unalterable fact that San Luis Obispo is so overwhelmingly European-American and affluent creates a foreign atmosphere for some ethnic groups. Additionally, our ability to recruit underrepresented faculty is very limited given the budgets and competition for a very small pool of candidates in many specializations. The Committee felt that the University should focus its earliest efforts on the current faculty and classroom environment.

We believe that the role of faculty as instruments of change cannot be underestimated. They are most influential as role models and the foundation on which all other areas of concern (items 1-5) rest in some way. To quote from the Educational Equity Committee report, "... developing a sensitive and collegial community that is knowledgeable, respectful and appreciative of differences among cultural and gender groups is crucial to the ultimate success of all Educational Equity goals and objectives." Significant strides have been made raising awareness of gender-based issues, however, there is inadequate faculty awareness of problems involving student diversity. Recent ethnic harassment incidents on the Cal Poly campus have underscored this view and heightened the urgency for action. Incidents have involved both students and faculty.

In one widely known case, a black female was approached by a group of white students in a classroom context and threatened with abusive racial remarks and told that "her type" do not belong at Cal Poly. Fear combined with the night class environment drove the woman to drop the class and seriously consider leaving Cal Poly. This incident occurred at the end of a class where the instructor had begun with a brief class discussion of the significance of Martin Luther King Day at which he was booed. Although the instructor responded forcefully to overcome the outburst, the instructor was dismayed and uncertain as to the appropriate ways in which to deal with such blatant and reprehensible behavior.

A prevailing attitude exists that such overt expressions of prejudice do not occur at Cal Poly. Complacency is tantamount to approval. An immediate and forceful response by the Administration and faculty is necessary. Faculty must be made aware of the seriousness of this issue and armed with means for creating an environment that maximizes the chances of success for all students.
**Recommendation**

The committee recommends that

1. President Baker appoint a Diversity Awareness coordinator who will develop programs designed to heighten faculty understanding of multicultural situations that occur in a learning environment. This should include a survey to determine the causes of retention problems among underrepresented groups.

2. The coordinator will cooperate with the deans to conduct semi-annual workshops during which faculty are provided with the necessary knowledge and skills to serve an increasingly diverse student body.

3. Possible formats for such a Diversity Awareness program include live staged situations in which students from various ethnic backgrounds participate. The proposed staged situations might include examples of both successful and unsuccessful interaction between students and faculty.

4. The faculty be fully informed by competent authorities as to what their prerogatives are in maintaining a classroom atmosphere in which cultural differences are respected by all students.

5. The university provide the needed funds to successfully implement the proposed Diversity Awareness program.

6. The university institute a Diversity Awareness program for incoming students. Planned activities in association with WOW might be an appropriate vehicle for the proposed program.

Concurrent with increased faculty and student awareness of diversity, the committee recommends that the university expand its efforts to improve recruitment and retention of underrepresented students through programs such as MESA and START.
WHEREAS, the dean/equivalent administrator has primary responsibility for leadership of the college/equivalent academic unit in the allocation and utilization of financial resources, quality of academic programs, admission and dismissal of students, appointment, retention, tenure and promotion action, long-range direction of the college/equivalent academic unit, development of external financial resources and the representation of the college/equivalent academic unit both internal to the university and to external constituents; and

WHEREAS, the faculty of a college/equivalent academic unit are directly affected by the dean/equivalent administrator's performance in meeting these responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, the dean/equivalent administrator's evaluation by the faculty is utilized for the purpose of providing evaluative information to the dean/equivalent administrator and the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and

WHEREAS, each probationary and tenured faculty member, regardless of time base, including those persons in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP), has a professional responsibility to complete the evaluation form in order to provide useful and timely input to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and

WHEREAS, the Vice President for Academic Affairs evaluates the deans/equivalent administrators every three years; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: that the attached evaluation form be adopted for use by the faculty in evaluating the dean/equivalent administrator of each college/equivalent academic unit annually; and, be it further

Adopted:

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

AS-93/PPC
RESOLUTION ON
EVALUATION OF COLLEGE DEANS OR EQU相当 ADMINISTRATORS
RESOLVED: That the Library may develop an evaluation form appropriate for its use subject to the approval of the Academic Senate and the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend that said evaluation results be a major part of the Vice President for Academic Affairs' evaluative consideration of each dean/equivalent administrator; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Vice President for Academic Affairs report to each college/equivalent academic unit's faculty the number and percentage of faculty in that college/equivalent academic unit that responded to the dean/equivalent administrator's evaluation and that a summary of the evaluation results be placed in the dean/equivalent administrator's personnel file.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
ANNUAL EVALUATION OF COLLEGE DEANS and EQUIVALENT ADMINISTRATORS

Faculty completion of this evaluation form is of utmost importance if it is to be given serious consideration by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in his evaluation of the dean/equivalent administrator. Good performance should be recognized and inadequate performance should be identified.

DEAN/EQUIVALENT ADMINISTRATOR: _______________________

Please rate your dean/equivalent administrator's performance this academic year, using the scales provided for each item. Respond on the enclosed scantron form.

Scale: Outstanding = A,  Good = B,  Fair = C,  Poor = D

1. Engages in effective strategic planning
2. Promotes improvements in goals, objectives, policies and procedures
3. Supports and recognizes professional development and accomplishments of faculty
4. Recognizes and rewards faculty service
5. Recognizes and rewards excellence in teaching
6. Recognizes and rewards effective student advising
7. Effectively advocates college/equivalent academic unit's positions and concerns to the university administration
8. Encourages and supports affirmative action and cultural diversity in recruiting and retention of high quality faculty, staff, and students
9. Demonstrates sensitivity to student needs in a multi-cultural educational environment
10. Fosters effective communications with alumni and community
11. Administers established policy fairly
12. Adequately explains decisions which reverse or modify established college/department policy
13. Makes reasoned decisions in a timely manner
14. Plans and allocates budget resources openly and fairly
15. Provides faculty with periodic (at least annually) reports of the allocations and uses of funds
16. Actively seeks supplemental financial support for new and existing programs
17. Manages personnel relations effectively
18. Handles conflicts and differences diplomatically and effectively
19. Communicates effectively
20. Solicits input and consults with faculty when appropriate
21. Is willing to consider alternative points of view
22. Provides opportunities to make her/himself available to the faculty
23. How do you rate the dean/equivalent administrator overall
Please provide written comment in response to the following:

24a. Please describe any actions by your dean/equivalent administrator that you have been especially pleased with during the year:

24b. Please describe any actions by your dean/equivalent administrator that you have been especially displeased with during the year:

25. What suggestions do you have for how your dean/equivalent administrator could improve her/his functioning:
Adopted:

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

AS- -93/
RESOLUTION ON
VOTE OF CONFIDENCE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

WHEREAS, At the present time there is no formal process for a Vote of Confidence for administrators at Cal Poly, and

WHEREAS, Such a process is appropriate for a university; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the following procedure be adopted by the Academic Senate:

PROCEDURE FOR VOTE OF CONFIDENCE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

1. If a Vote of Confidence for any administrator is to take place it should not be a regular periodic event but should be considered an extraordinary measure.

2. Campus-wide official petition forms will be created for the administration of a Vote of Confidence. The forms shall include spaces for printed names, signatures, and employee identification numbers.

3. It will be left to each department to establish its own policy about a Vote of Confidence for its chair/head.

4. The following procedure will be followed for college deans:

   4.1 A petition signed by at least 25 percent of a college’s tenured and tenure-track faculty is presented to the college caucus chair. Simultaneously, a notification of the petition is presented to the Chair of the Academic Senate.

   4.2 Upon receipt of the petition, the caucus chair shall present it to the Chair of the Academic Senate in a timely manner.

   4.3 Within five (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter), from the date the petition was presented to the college caucus chair, the Chair of the Academic Senate and the caucus chair will verify with the assistance of the Faculty Affairs Office that the
people who signed the petition constitute at least 25 percent of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the college.

4.4 The names of the people who signed the petition will be kept confidential by those who have access to it. The petition will be destroyed after the Vote of Confidence is conducted.

4.5 Within ten (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date of the petition verification, the Chair of the college caucus shall hold an open forum of tenured and tenure-track faculty for the purpose of allowing the dean to respond to the petition.

4.6 The Academic Senate Elections Committee shall conduct the Vote of Confidence within five (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date of the open forum. Those eligible to vote shall consist of the college's tenured and tenure-track faculty.

4.7 The results of the Vote of Confidence for a college dean will be distributed by the Chair of the Academic Senate to the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the dean, and the faculty of the college.

5. The following procedure will be followed for the President and vice presidents:

5.1 The process to administer a Vote of Confidence for the President or vice presidents can be initiated by one of the following two alternatives:

5.1.1 Alternative 1: A petition, signed by at least 10 percent of the constituency who are represented by the Academic Senate, is presented to the Chair of the Academic Senate.

5.1.1.1 The Chair of the Academic Senate presents the petition to the Academic Senate Executive Committee after the petition was handed to the Chair.

5.1.1.2 The Academic Senate Executive Committee will verify with the assistance of the Faculty Affairs Office that the people who signed the petition constitute at least 10 percent of the constituency represented by the Academic Senate.
5.1.1.3 The names of the people who signed the petition will be kept confidential by those who have access to it. The petition will be destroyed after the Vote of Confidence is conducted.

5.1.1.4 Within ten (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date the petition was presented to the Academic Senate Executive Committee, the Chair of the Academic Senate shall hold an open forum of the Academic Senate constituency for the purpose of allowing the President/Vice President to respond to the petition.

5.1.1.5 The Academic Senate Elections Committee shall conduct the Vote of Confidence within five (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date of the open forum. Those eligible to vote shall consist of the voting membership of the General Faculty as defined in Article I of the Constitution of the Faculty.

5.1.2 Alternative 2: A motion to administer a Vote of Confidence for the President or vice presidents is passed by the Academic Senate by simple majority.

5.1.2.1 Within ten (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date the Academic Senate passed the resolution to conduct a Vote of Confidence, the Chair of the Academic Senate shall hold an open forum of the Academic Senate constituency for the purpose of allowing the President/Vice President to respond to the vote.

5.2 The Academic Senate Elections Committee shall conduct the Vote of Confidence within five (academic year) working days (excluding summer quarter) from the date of the open forum. Those eligible to vote shall consist of the voting membership of the General Faculty as defined in Article I of the Constitution of the Faculty.

5.3 The results of the Vote of Confidence for the President or vice presidents will be distributed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee to the President, the vice presidents, the college deans, all personnel
represented by the Academic Senate, and the Chancellor of The California State University system.

5.4 In the case of exceptional circumstances, the Academic Senate Executive Committee may modify the timelines, but not the procedures, provided in this document.

5.5 The Academic Senate Executive Committee may by a two-thirds vote enlarge upon the list of administrators affected by this resolution.

Proposed By: The Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
VOTE OF CONFIDENCE PETITION

I, the undersigned, request that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate initiate the procedure for a Vote of Confidence for ________________, ________________ as stated in C.A.M. ________________. It is understood that the names of all of the petitioners will be confidential.

PRINT NAME   SIGNATURE   FACULTY I.D. #
(Social Security No.)

________________________________________________________________________
* Academic Senate Executive Committee only:
* valid signature: _________ verified by: _________

________________________________________________________________________
VOTE OF CONFIDENCE PETITION

We, the undersigned, request that the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate initiate the procedure for a Vote of Confidence for______________________,_________________________ as stated in C.A.M._________. It is understood that the names of all of the undersigned will be confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINT NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>FACULTY I.D.#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Academic Senate Executive Committee only: *
* total valid signatures: _______ verified by: _______ *
WHEREAS, The need for reducing the amount of paper used is well-established; and
WHEREAS, The need for recycling the maximum amount of paper which is used is also well-established; and
WHEREAS, Certain types of recyclable paper bring a higher price than other types and is thus more in demand; therefore, be it
RESOLVED: That the following guidelines be instituted across the campus:

1. That those distributing reports and other publications consider ways for reducing the number of copies disseminated (e.g., having a single copy placed on reserve in each department and having the department chair/head decide whether printing other copies is warranted);
2. That both sides of a sheet of paper be used when reports and other publications run two or more sides;
3. That university personnel consider using paper smaller than 8-1/2 x 11 where the information can be conveyed in a lesser space;
4. That the university gradually increase the use of electronic mail;
5. That recycled paper be purchased (and used) when feasible;
6. That the university generally refrain from using non-recyclable paper; and
7. That white paper which is more highly valued by recyclers be given preference by users over colored paper.

Proposed By: The Resource Use Committee
May 11, 1993
## SUMMARY OF PSYCHOLOGY MAJOR AND HD MAJOR PROPOSAL

### COMPARISON OF THE OLD AND NEW PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OLD PROGRAM (92-94)</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(295 in Psy, 90 in HD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(18+Psy,3+ in HD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units in core</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63 Psy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59 HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units Required</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Units in Concentrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>OLD Program</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>36(27*)</td>
<td>37(18*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Family Psychology</td>
<td>37(22*)</td>
<td>37(14*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Social Psychology</td>
<td>35(23*)</td>
<td>37(20*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In HD Major**

- 59 in core, 21 in support, 12 in Advisor Approved Electives
- 23 in Elective Units

* Number of units that must be Psychology or Human Development courses
## Corrected Summary of WTU Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>WTUs:</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD 102</td>
<td>Only for HD major</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>- 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 128</td>
<td>Lec to Act</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>- 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 130</td>
<td>Optional in PSY major</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>- 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 203</td>
<td>Only for HD major</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>- 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 296</td>
<td>Dropped</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>- 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 298</td>
<td>Dropped</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>- 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 209</td>
<td>Only for HD major</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>- 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 306</td>
<td>Only for HD major</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>- 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 308</td>
<td>Optional in HD major</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 351</td>
<td>Changed to PSY 380</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 421</td>
<td>Changed to PSY 419, 420, 421</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>- 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 461, 462</td>
<td>Only for HD major</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>- 60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 463</td>
<td>Dropped</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>- 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 464</td>
<td>Dropped</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 252</td>
<td>Drop from HD major (6 to 5 sections) and unit increase</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 254</td>
<td>Drop from HD major (3 to 2 sections) and unit increase</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 256</td>
<td>New course for PSY major</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>+ 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 304</td>
<td>Required in PSY major</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>+ 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 329</td>
<td>Drop from HD major (4 to 3 sections) and unit increase</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>+ 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 380</td>
<td>Revision of HD 351</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>+ 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 405</td>
<td>Drop from HD major</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 419</td>
<td>New version of HD 421</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>+ 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 420</td>
<td>New version of HD 421</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>+ 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 421</td>
<td>New version of HD 421</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>+ 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 457</td>
<td>New course for PSY major</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>+ 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 458</td>
<td>Drop from HD major</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 461</td>
<td>New course for PSY major</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>+ 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 462</td>
<td>New course for PSY major</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>+ 60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Annual WTU Net Change**

- 24.7
### STAFFING THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Students = 90 (20-30 per year)

Required courses for one year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Units/year</th>
<th>HD Faculty</th>
<th>Non-HD Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD 102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 128</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 130</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (Christenson)(3 units x 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 209</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 211</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 230</td>
<td>8 (4 units x 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 306</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Englund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 311</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Englund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy 323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>psychology faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 324</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 401</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 330/430</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>psych fac could share here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 461/462</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>psych fac could share here</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 112

**TOTAL AVAILABLE** 108 (3 X 36 WTU per year).

This program could be staffed by three Human Development faculty members with some input from other members of the department (as indicated). Because many of the faculty in PSY can also assist in internships and senior projects, the overload of 3 or 4 WTU’s in that area could easily be accommodated.

IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT THESE COURSES ARE ALREADY BEING TAUGHT, AND THE PROGRAM IS CURRENTLY STAFFED.
To: Jack Wilson, Chair  
Academic Senate  

From: E. J. Carnegie, Chair  
Academic Senate Budget Committee  

Subject: Budget Implications from the PSY/HD Proposal

The summary of WTU changes cannot be substantiated. A course that is changed to an elective only does not mean that it will not be offered. If a course is not required by any major and will not be offered then it would seem appropriate to drop the course from the catalog. Some courses that are scheduled for unit changes were not included in the analysis. The actual class load for this year and last year were used as a base for most of the calculations. It would seem reasonable if two classes serving the same student population and having the same course classification would require the same WTUs to teach. That assumption was also used to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Major Changes</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD102</td>
<td>M for HD only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD128</td>
<td>Lec to Act</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD130</td>
<td>Psy Opt in PSY</td>
<td>4 act</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD209</td>
<td>HD Major was 299</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD296</td>
<td>Elective only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD298</td>
<td>Elective only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD306</td>
<td>HD Major</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD308</td>
<td>HD Option</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD351</td>
<td>Changed to PSY380</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD421</td>
<td>Changed to PSY419,420,421</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(12.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD461,462</td>
<td>HD Major, Change in units</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(60.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD463</td>
<td>Drop 4 sec last year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD464</td>
<td>Drop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY252</td>
<td>PSY Major Add unit, was 402</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY254</td>
<td>PSY Major Add unit, was 253</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY256</td>
<td>New course same load as 252</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY304</td>
<td>PSY Major</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY329</td>
<td>PSY Majors only +1 lec, +1 act</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY380</td>
<td>Changed HD351</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY405</td>
<td>PSY Major</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY419</td>
<td>old HD 421</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY420</td>
<td>old HD 421</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY421</td>
<td>old HD 421</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY457</td>
<td>PSY Major</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY458</td>
<td>PSY Major</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY461</td>
<td>PSY Major</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY462</td>
<td>PSY Major</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Change (3.8)
calculate the net change in WTUs. In some cases the assumption used by PSY/HD to analyze WTU didn't take into account the actual class size as reflected on SIS screen 127.

The net affect in WTU for the proposed change would result in an decreased load of about 4 WTU per year. This in itself is no problem but when it is coupled with the loss of one faculty member which will not be replaced it is a problem.

The proposal for a degree in Human Development indicated that only 4 faculty members will be used to carry the load. There are about 34 different HD classes some of which are service classes with multiple course section requirements that need to be offered every quarter. One class alone HD 130 with four activity periods will require one full time faculty member. That leaves three faculty members to cover the rest of the classes. This is not reasonable.
PLEASE REPLACE THE RESOLUTION OF THE SAME TITLE ON PAGES 16 AND 17 OF YOUR MAY 18, 1993 AGENDA WITH THIS RESOLUTION.

Adopted:

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

AS--93/
RESOLUTION ON
PRIORITY REGISTRATION

Background Statement: The current registration system recognizes the following priorities (using fall quarter enrollment data):

*Note: The only segment affected by this resolution is the "graduating senior" classification in Group II. All other groups will remain the same.

Group I:
- Disabled Students (mandated by law): 500
- Athletes during their quarters of competition/ other priority students/ ET and HE students (campus policy): 350
- New Students (Fall Quarter is very high relative to other quarters): 3,100
  subtotal: 3,950

Group II:
- Graduate Students: 1,200
- Graduating Seniors: 2,800
  subtotal: 4,000
  total registered prior to alphabet rotation: 7,950

Group III:
- Alphabetic rotation of continuing students/former students: 7,750

GRAND TOTAL: 15,700

Current campus policy, as stated in the Schedule of Classes, states that "all students are entitled to TWO terms of priority registration before they graduate." However, once a student qualifies, senior priority is maintained until graduation.

Due to the variability in the way different departments manage senior project, inequities exist across campus in the number of priority quarters available to students. In some programs, students may only qualify for one quarter, whereas six to seven quarters are common in other programs. The equity designed into the alphabetic rotation is compromised when nearly a third of all seats in classes have been committed prior to the start of Group III registration.

Maintaining accurate records of "trigger courses" when curricula change every two years is a cumbersome task for Records personnel. In addition, Records must process a volume of special requests from department heads regarding individual cases. Simplification and automation of the priority system would increase the efficiency of this department. Current technology already in place allows for students to choose to implement priority registration for a particular quarter via CAPTURE. No other administrative processing would be necessary. Campus registration policy is moving toward student responsibility for enrollment. Allowing students to choose their priority quarters is consistent with this trend. Student representatives to the Registration and Scheduling Committee have expressed their support.

In response to these factors, the Academic Senate Instruction Committee and the University Registration and Scheduling Committee respectfully submit the following resolution.
WHEREAS, Current published policy states that "all students are entitled to TWO terms of priority registration before they graduate;" and

WHEREAS, Students are known to have used "senior priority" for as many as seven quarters; and

WHEREAS, One-quarter to one-third of all resources are committed prior to the opening of the alphabetic rotation during registration; and

WHEREAS, Procedures for qualifying students for "senior priority" are variable and inequitable across campus; and

WHEREAS, Procedures for accurately qualifying students for senior priority are cumbersome to administer; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the current practice of awarding senior priority to students with 135 units plus enrollment in a trigger course be discontinued; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the new order of registration be as follows:

Group I:
Disabled Students
Athletes during their quarters of competition/other priority students/ET and HE students
New Students

Group II:
Graduate Students
Undergraduate students choosing a priority quarter

Group III:
Alphabetic rotation of continuing/former students

and, be it further

RESOLVED: That all students in the new Group III shall be eligible for a total of three and only three priority quarters, to be chosen by the student after having completed three quarters in residence; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the administration shall be directed to implement this resolution no earlier than Winter Quarter 1994.

Submitted by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee and the Registration and Scheduling Committee
April 15, 1993
To: Academic Senate
From: Jack Wilson

Subject: BACKGROUND ON BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

May 13, 1993

At my urging the executive committee made the decision in late November to study the university budget. This was the first time that a faculty group undertook the task of studying and analyzing the entire university budget in some depth. The rationale behind involving faculty in studying that 45% of the total university budget which is not directly related to instruction is obvious. There has been an effective 20% reduction in the university’s budget over the past two years. Full time faculty positions have been reduced by 17.8% since the fall of 1990. Faculty in many departments are teaching greater numbers of students than ever before in order to accommodate backlogged student demand.

There were 8 meetings, each of approximately two hours in length, during which the budget of a particular entity, Business Affairs and Information Systems for example, was presented by the appropriate administrator(s) and then followed by questions and discussion. Prior to each meeting each member of the committee was furnished with a package of charts, tables, etc which were used to explain the budget.

Thus there was much, much effort required by the committee members as they listened to presentations, poured over tables and charts and tried to make sense of the complex budget. For example this is the first year of dollar based budgeting. Thus past year’s budgets of colleges, or for that matter any entity, cannot be determined with a great degree of accuracy.

At the last meeting on budget of the committee, and again at my urging, the committee drafted a list of recommendations. It had been my intention to discuss these recommendations with the entities involved before submitting them to the senate. However since PACBRA was beginning to meet to discuss budget recommendations to the president, I made the decision to go directly to the senate with the recommendations and let the arguments take place there. These recommendations were not made frivolously. Had I given the process more time before coming to the senate with the recommendations, most of the difficulties arising from these recommendations could have been avoided.

Following are comments and information pertaining to some of those recommendations which I promised to supply.

RECOMMENDATION FOR A REDUCTION OF 50% IN STATE SUPPORT OF ATHLETICS

Total Income for Athletics and Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund (state)</td>
<td>$1,193,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA Subsidy (students)</td>
<td>$1,143,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations1</td>
<td>$161,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Revenue</td>
<td>$203,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Scholarship Fee Subsidy</td>
<td>$209,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Poly Foundation(scholarships)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,062,098</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Donations include all externally fund-raised dollars - Mustang Boosters, sport-specific fundraising, etc.

Attachment A provides basic budget information for Athletics. The General Fund represents 38.9% of the 1992/93 Athletics budget. All of that is now budgeted for coaches salaries and benefits. The General Fund contribution to athletics was projected to decrease from its present amount to $1,097,890 by 1995/96. That
represents an 8% decrease, however, the athletics advisory board has recommended a 10% reduction in state support for next year.

The student fee contribution to athletics is projected to increase from $1,143,941 in 1992/93 to $2,431,000 in 1995/96.

Program revenue from football was $85,000 for 1992/93. Expenses totaled $758,054. 94% of Division I-AA football programs run annual deficits averaging $535,000. Almost half of division I-A football programs run annual deficits on the average of $638,000.

A little history may be in order. The Academic Planning Committee recommended in the spring of 1991 a 50% reduction in state support for Athletics. Last spring, 1992, the Academic Senate voted 34 to 9 to reduce state funding to Athletics by 100%.

RECOMMENDATION TO REDUCE STATE FUNDING FOR TRANSPORTATION SERVICES BY 25%

Transportation services is responsible for servicing all vehicles on campus. This includes vehicles for plant operations, the College farm and other vehicles belonging to the colleges. Frank Levens has stated that the cost of renting vehicles for traveling off campus exceeds the cost involved with Transportation Services providing that present service.

RECOMMENDATION TO REDUCE BY 100% STATE SUPPORT OF UNIVERSITY RELATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT

Attachment B gives the University Relations and Development Institutional Development Plan.

Attachment C gives Private Support Summaries and Projections. Note that unrestricted gifts are the only source of budget from gifts for operation of University Relations and Development (URD). Of the $629,276 unrestricted gifts for 1992/93, $430,000 is budgeted for support of URD. $80,000 is budgeted for college development officers in Agriculture, Architecture and Engineering, $27,743 for Academic Affairs and $91,533 for the President's Fund ($17,000 of which goes to program administrators). The table below shows the budget (what it costs and is projected to cost to operate URD) and sources for URD as well as the projected unrestricted gifts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>571,142</td>
<td>596,100</td>
<td>625,919</td>
<td>627,215</td>
<td>690,076</td>
<td>724,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>759,577</td>
<td>715,088</td>
<td>816,744</td>
<td>902,760</td>
<td>997,405</td>
<td>1,047,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>539,500</td>
<td>640,000</td>
<td>647,843</td>
<td>699,813</td>
<td>699,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Revenues</td>
<td>280,015</td>
<td>279,662</td>
<td>302,465</td>
<td>327,158</td>
<td>372,199</td>
<td>404,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36,883</td>
<td>11,305</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,967,195</td>
<td>2,020,859</td>
<td>2,321,511</td>
<td>2,538,438</td>
<td>2,707,523</td>
<td>2,876,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Gifts</td>
<td>546,415</td>
<td>583,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>840,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The concern of the executive committee is that the general fund contribution is going to have to play an increasing role in funding URD at a time when state funding for higher education is decreasing and may continue to decrease. Projections also indicate that the difference between unrestricted gifts, the only type of gift available to fund URD’s budget, and the amount of those gifts going towards funding URD is going to increase substantially.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS

Late last summer I requested from the administration a history of the number of management employees. At a recent meeting of PACBRA (President’s Advisory Committee on Budget and Resource Allocations) Jim Conway made the same request. Thus the information below was provided to us about three weeks ago and long after the executive committee made it recommendations on budget.

The Management Personnel Plan (MPP) has four levels. Those levels and salary ranges are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator I</td>
<td>$15,000-30,000</td>
<td>$19,104-46,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator II</td>
<td>$25,000-45,000</td>
<td>$31,824-67,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator III</td>
<td>$30,000-60,000</td>
<td>$38,208-90,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator IV</td>
<td>$40,000-75,000</td>
<td>$50,916-113,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1984 was the first year that the MPP plan was in effect. There were 124 people covered by MPP that year. The number decreased gradually to about 110 in 1987/88. Then it increased to about 115 in 1988/89. From that point on the number decreased gradually to 108 in 1991/92 and then to 88 in 1992/93.

The number of people at level IV has remained essentially constant since 1984/85. There are 15 people at that level in 1992/93. Plans are to downgrade two of those positions for 1993/94.

The number of people at level III has decreased from 44 in 1994/85 to 41 in 1992/93.

The number of people in the MPP plan at levels I and II have decreased from 36 and 30, respectively, in 1984/85 to 21 and 11, respectively, in 1992/93.

The recommendation to reduce the number of management people in Student Affairs was influenced by the decision of the administration to hire a second Associate Vice President for Student Affairs last spring in the face of decisions to defund instructional programs. This is no reflection on the person who was hired to fill that position. That person has done an excellent job in a highly professional manner.

RECOMMENDATION TO REQUIRE REMEDIAL COURSES TO BE OFFERED THROUGH EXTENDED EDUCATION

The following information was furnished by Art DeKleine and John Harrington.

Remedial mathematics courses are taught by an instructor teaching 15 WTU’s per quarter. The load in remedial math is handled by one person and is equivalent to 1 full time equivalent instructor (FTEF) for each of three quarters.
Remedial English courses are of two types. They are English as a second language and basic English grammar. Approximately four to five sections are taught each quarter and require approximately 1 FTEF position per quarter. Many of the people taking remedial English courses are underrepresented minorities.

Remedial work is a major load in the CSU. Cal Poly has one of the smallest, if not the smallest, percentage of its students requiring remedial work in the CSU. The legislature is looking at ways for remedial learning required by CSU and UC students to be handled so that it does not impact the budgets of those systems.

RECOMMENDATION ON INFORMATION SYSTEMS

The impetus for this recommendation arose from the fact that the cost of the campus main frame computer, the IBM 3090, is a major cost for information systems. Two more payments are required on the 3090. They are $650,000 in 1993/94 and $1,200,000 in 1994/95. Service contracts add another $150,000 per year to the cost of the 3090 and approximately 20 programmers are required for it. Computer costs have decreased dramatically over the past five years. Today a computer with the same computing power as the 3090 would have a total cost of somewhere in the range from $250,000 to $500,000. Its service contract would be much less. In addition a substantial reduction in the number of programmers could be achieved due to the much simpler operating systems used by most computers today.

The information revolution, made possible by high speed computers and networks able to transmit huge amounts of information in a matter of milliseconds, has profound implications for any institution from a budgetary point of view. It will not come inexpensively. The committee felt that given the current and future budget outlook for higher education in California, this campus must carefully consider how to spend its precious dollars in this area.
## CAL POLY SLO ATHLETICS - FY 1992/93 BUDGET PROJECTIONS

### EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports Information</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Scholarships</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Administration</td>
<td>$395,624</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$57,725</td>
<td>$453,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Contingency</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Administration</td>
<td>$337,546</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td>$368,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>$99,370</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$29,550</td>
<td>$158,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball - M</td>
<td>$150,360</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$53,100</td>
<td>$238,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball - W</td>
<td>$135,491</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$29,916</td>
<td>$290,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Country - M/W</td>
<td>$262,334</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$203,720</td>
<td>$758,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer - M</td>
<td>$33,562</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$51,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer - W</td>
<td>$25,833</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
<td>$39,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>$52,548</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$14,165</td>
<td>$85,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming - M</td>
<td>$35,599</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$43,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming - W</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis - M</td>
<td>$27,852</td>
<td>$9,250</td>
<td>$9,350</td>
<td>$46,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis - W</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,250</td>
<td>$9,350</td>
<td>$18,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track &amp; Field - M/W</td>
<td>$163,717</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$56,500</td>
<td>$285,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball - W</td>
<td>$123,670</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$49,376</td>
<td>$219,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>$79,370</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$25,888</td>
<td>$147,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING</strong></td>
<td>$1,702,856</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$715,575</td>
<td>$2,818,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Debt Payback</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA Debt Payback</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,062,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

| General Fund Allocation | $1,193,359 |
| IRA Subsidy (A) | $1,143,941 |
| Donations (B) | $161,559 |
| Program Revenue | $203,816 |
| Student Scholarship Fee Subsidy (C) | $209,424 |
| Cal Poly Foundation - Scholarships | $150,000 |
| **TOTAL INCOME** | $3,862,898 |

(A) - IRA Subsidy is based on $13 fee x 22,085 Students (Summer '92/Pall '92) = $287,105, plus $19 fee x 30,271 students (Winter '93/Spring '93) = $575,149, in addition to $281,687 Initial subsidy, for a total of $1,143,941 in collected fees for AY 1992/93.

(B) - Donations include all externally fund-raised dollars - Mustang Boosters, sport-specific fundraising, and new expanded development efforts.

(C) - Student Scholarship Fee Subsidy reflects latest enrollment figures for AY 1992/93: 52,356 students x $4 fee = $209,424

### CHALLENGE POSITIONS - see Attachment B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Scholarships</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-Athlete Support</td>
<td>$32,814</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Administration</td>
<td>$10,055</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Staff</td>
<td>$15,018</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Challenge Positions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Challenge Positions will be phased in no earlier than the indicated start date and only after donation budget and Athletic Development operating expenses and Challenge Position expenses have been realized.
UNIVERSITY RELATIONS & DEVELOPMENT
CAL POLY SAN LUIS OBISPO

INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT PLAN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Fund raising results during the 1991-92 fiscal year registered several all time high
codes, including alumni contributions and participation, cash contributions, parent
contributions, and total number of gifts received. Total gifts of $10,479,929 were the
second highest amount recorded with the highest being $10,494,318 received in 1989-90.

A five-year plan for institutional advancement has been completed and initiated in 1992-93
with the goal of increasing private support to a level of $17.5 million by 1997-98. Full-time
development programs are being added this year in Architecture, Agriculture, and
Engineering with emphasis given to increasing major gift support.

The mission of institutional advancement programs at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo is to
assist the University in achieving its educational mission by creating a favorable climate
in which private funds can be raised, by motivating internal units to raise funds and by
generating gifts through direct solicitation.

The purposes for which private funds are solicited are annual contributions, capital gifts,
and deferred gifts. The thrust of the fund raising program is one of decentralized
execution and centralized coordination. The development program has the full support
of the University and the Foundation with direct participation by the President, Vice
Presidents, Deans, and Department Heads, as well as the Executive Director of the Cal
Poly Foundation and his Associate, in the planning and solicitation process.

Cal Poly has been successful in generating support from the corporate sector, due to the
direct contact by the President, Deans and Department Heads with key leaders in
business and industry. An extensive and aggressive phone and mail solicitation program
has been responsible for the growth in annual support. Additional staff time has been
devoted to the planned giving program and the dividends are beginning to show in those
results.

Development programs have had a steady growth in the number and quality of programs
in fund raising, alumni relations, and communications and special events. Over the past
ten years, the total number of gifts processed has increased from 1,806 to 22,548, total
cash gifts received have increased from $1,170,592 to $6,313,690.

There is a growing need to provide additional services, training and resources to each
of the colleges as they develop their constituencies and their fund raising capabilities and
as we plan for a major University-wide capital campaign which will culminate with the
Centennial Celebration of the University in 2001.
## CAL POLY PRIVATE SUPPORT SUMMARIES AND PROJECTIONS

### CASH, IN-KIND AND TOTAL GIFTS - 1985-86 THROUGH 1996-97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Cash Gifts</th>
<th>In-Kind Gifts</th>
<th>Total Gifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>$2,162,559</td>
<td>$2,811,554</td>
<td>$4,974,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>$3,451,400</td>
<td>$3,973,769</td>
<td>$7,425,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>$2,454,416</td>
<td>$3,089,918</td>
<td>$5,544,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>$3,086,996</td>
<td>$4,783,470</td>
<td>$7,870,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>$3,948,746</td>
<td>$6,545,572</td>
<td>$10,494,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>$3,342,081</td>
<td>$2,041,750</td>
<td>$5,383,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>$5,222,389</td>
<td>$4,296,346</td>
<td>$9,518,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93**</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94**</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95**</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
<td>$15,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96**</td>
<td>$11,800,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$17,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97**</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$21,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GIVING BY PURPOSE - 1985-86 THROUGH 1996-97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Restricted (Cash)</th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Endowments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>$1,878,529</td>
<td>$155,466</td>
<td>$131,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>$2,232,185</td>
<td>$201,447</td>
<td>$1,001,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>$1,932,302</td>
<td>$292,990</td>
<td>$234,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>$1,744,135</td>
<td>$372,854</td>
<td>$935,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>$2,481,348</td>
<td>$434,642</td>
<td>$1,032,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>$2,528,098</td>
<td>$494,750</td>
<td>$829,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>$2,176,852</td>
<td>$546,415</td>
<td>$1,505,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93**</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$583,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94**</td>
<td>$4,300,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95**</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$840,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96**</td>
<td>$5,800,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97**</td>
<td>$6,800,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected**
STUDENT CONSIDERATIONS FOR CAL POLY CALENDAR CHANGE

When would a calendar change take place?

IF there is a decision to change the academic calendar, a transition period of several years would be required to review and revise curriculum and provide adequate advising and communication to students.

Would I lose any coursework credit if a calendar change is made?

No, you should know well in advance of a calendar change, and all credits earned will be converted to the new system. You will receive credit for all courses taken on the quarter system and for completion of requirements that existed in the quarter system.

Will I be disadvantaged?

Every effort will be made to provide communication and advising tools to students and advisors so that they will have options. Generally, it would not change your timetable to graduation.

Why is the calendar system being reviewed?

In these fiscally demanding times, improved utilization of resources including, but not limited to, academic curriculum, programmatic and administrative requirements, workload, and meeting student needs is a University goal. The calendar system is one system that impacts all these areas.

Are students involved in the decision-making and implementation process?

Yes, a student representative was a member of Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Calendar Systems. Student input through ASI review will be incorporated before the report and recommendations are forwarded for President Baker's consideration. IF a decision is made to change the calendar system, students will be involved on every implementation and transition team/task force.

Will a calendar change result in fee increases?

No, the total amount of fees for 2 semesters would be equal to that for 3 quarters. You would be required to make two payments in a semester plan and three in a quarter plan. The current option of making partial or installment payments would most likely be continued.

What are the advantages of the different systems?

The chart on the following page attempts to outline some of the advantages of each system. As you see, each calendar system displays unique strengths and advantages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Trimester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fast-pace - requires time management skills, highly structured and intense environment, less boredom.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less hectic, opportunity for more faculty interaction and out-of-class activities, more control of own time.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If unsatisfactory course/term or unforeseen circumstances, term provides for easier recovery because it’s only 1/3 of academic year.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s a better chance of “catching up,” overcoming time loss due to absence, and improving grades during the longer term.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for more flexibility and variety in courses due to number of courses in program.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time to absorb material in greater depth and participate in group/independent projects and devote more time to studio/labs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer textbooks purchased, since there is a smaller number of courses in each program.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to balance many roles.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet more students through greater number of classes.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time to interact with other students in same class.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come back to new classes after spring break.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better balance between fall and spring academic loads (50% before and 50% after holiday break).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Calendar Advantages, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Trimester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offers equally distributed terms, including summer.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for holiday/seasonal employment.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available earlier for summer jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer breaks between terms for working/projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer registration and scheduling cycles.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share similar schedules with majority of transfer institutions and breaks at other schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Patrice Engle, Head
    Psychology & Human Development

Subj: Corrections to Budget Committee's WTU Estimates

The memo of May 7, 1993 from E.J. Carnegie regarding budget implications of the Psychology & Human Development curriculum proposal is in error on several points:

1. A reduction of sections for HD 203 was not included.
2. HD 296 will be dropped, resulting in a 6.0 reduction.
3. HD 298 will be dropped, resulting in a 6.0 reduction.
4. The reduction in sections for PSY 252 was not included.
5. The reduction in sections for PSY 254 was not included.
6. The number of sections for PSY 457 was over-estimated.

A corrected summary of WTU changes would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>WTUs: Old</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD 102</td>
<td>Only for HD major</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>- 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 128</td>
<td>Lec to Act</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>- 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 130</td>
<td>Optional in PSY major</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>- 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 203</td>
<td>Only for HD major</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>- 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 296</td>
<td>Dropped</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>- 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 298</td>
<td>Dropped</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>- 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 209</td>
<td>Only for HD major</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>- 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 306</td>
<td>Only for HD major</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>- 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 308</td>
<td>Optional in HD major</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 351</td>
<td>Changed to PSY 380</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 421</td>
<td>Changed to PSY 419, 420, 421</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>- 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 461, 462</td>
<td>Only for HD major</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>- 60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 463</td>
<td>Dropped</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>- 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 464</td>
<td>Dropped</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 252</td>
<td>Drop from HD major (6 to 5 sections) and unit increase</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 254</td>
<td>Drop from HD major (3 to 2 sections) and unit increase</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 256</td>
<td>New course for PSY major</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>+ 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 304</td>
<td>Required in PSY major</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>+ 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 329</td>
<td>Drop from HD major (4 to 3 sections) and unit increase</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>+ 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 380</td>
<td>Revision of HD 351</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>+ 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 405</td>
<td>Drop from HD major</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 419</td>
<td>New version of HD 421</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>+ 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 420</td>
<td>New version of HD 421</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>+ 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 421</td>
<td>New version of HD 421</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>+ 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 457</td>
<td>New course for PSY major</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>+ 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 458</td>
<td>Drop from HD major</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 461</td>
<td>New course for PSY major</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>+ 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 462</td>
<td>New course for PSY major</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>+ 60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Annual WTU Net Change - 24.7
PLEASE REPLACE THE RESOLUTION OF THE SAME TITLE ON PAGE 12 OF YOUR MAY 18, 1993 AGENDA WITH THIS RESOLUTION.

Adopted:

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

AS- -93/
RESOLUTION ON
THE CALENDARING SYSTEM

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate receive the "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Calendaring System" and forward the Academic Senate recommendations to the President.

Proposed By: Academic Senate Executive Committee
May 11, 1993