I. **Minutes**: November 9, 2021 and November 30, 2021 (pp. 2-5)

II. **Communication(s) and Announcement(s)**:

III. **Reports**:
   A. Academic Senate Chair:
   B. Provost: None
   C. Vice President for Student Affairs: (p. 6)
   D. Statewide Senate: None
   E. CFA: (p. 7)
   F. ASI: (p. 8)

IV. **Consent Agenda**:
   A. Agenda items approved by consent (pp. 9-10)
      1. GRC 377 Pulled from the agenda, all other items approved by consent

V. **Special Reports**:
   A. **[TIME CERTAIN 3:30 P.M] CBF Presentation**: President Jeffery Armstrong and Provost Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore
   B. **Part Time Faculty Questionnaire Written Report**: Samuel Shalhoub, Academic Senate Part Time Representative (pp. 11-15)

VI. **Business Items**:
   A. **Resolution on Revisions to University Faculty Personnel Policies 12.2: Office Hours**: Ken Brown, Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee Chair (pp. 16-25)
   B. **Resolution on Revising the College Based Fee Structure at Cal Poly**: Steve Rein, Academic Senate Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee Chair (pp. 26-65)

VII. **Discussion Item(s)**:

VIII. **Adjournment**
Minutes: M/S/P to approve the minutes from October 19, 2021.

Communication(s) and Announcement(s): None.

Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: Senate Chair, Thomas Gutierrez, asked Senators to answer a poll for winter modality preferences to determine how meetings will be held next quarter.
B. President’s Office: None
C. Provost: None
D. Vice President for Student Affairs: Vice President Keith Humphrey, announced that Fall Commencement will be one ceremony held outside at Spanos Stadium. The following day will be the celebration of the Class of 2020, also held at Spanos stadium. Vice President Humphrey also shared upcoming campus events such as the State of Indigeneity and a breakfast for veterans and veteran family members.
E. Statewide Senate: Gary Laver, Statewide Senate representative, updated the Senate on the discussions of the Committee of the Whole and Chair Collins’ Report. The Committee of the Whole notably discussed the speed of campus repopulation and the impact of COVID-19 on graduate students. Chair Collins’ report included the Statewide Senate’s response to the passage of AB928, a bill that creates a singular GE pathway for transfer students at their community colleges, He also gave updates to the yearly budget as well as a summary of other Statewide Senate business. Senator Laver’s notes can be found here: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/ASCSU%20Nov21%20Plenary%20notes.pdf
F. CFA: Lewis Call, CFA representative, updated the Senate on the mediation process; it is not going as well as hoped with many CFA proposals rejected. If mediation fails, what follows is fact finding. Senator Call also updated the Senate of a large in person CFA rally in support of the CFA proposal. This rally was also broadcast online.
   1. CFA SLO has circulated a petition calling on President Armstrong to tell Chancellor Castro to settle a fair contract for faculty. As of November 2, over 340 Cal Poly faculty, staff, students and community members had signed the petition. All Cal Poly faculty and their allies are encouraged to sign the petition, using this link: https://actionnetwork.org/petitions/president-armstrong-tell-chancellor-castro-to-settle-a-fair-contract-now?source=direct_link&
G. ASI: None

Consent Agenda:
A. All agenda items approved by consent. For a list of these items: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/sa110921.pdf

Special Reports:
A. Registrar’s Report: Cem Sunata, Registrar, gave a slide presentation regarding the Registrar’s Report. These slides can be found here: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/Office%20of%20the%20Registrar%202020-21%20Report.pdf
B. Updated Multi-Factor Authentication Written Report: Doug Lomsdalen
   1. Email forwarding
      In preparation for a winter 2022 policy change, restricting the forwarding of Cal Poly email to a personal email account, ITS recommends removing email address forwarding now to improve the security of your inbox. When your messages are forwarded, they bypass the protections in place for Cal Poly’s email service, making you more vulnerable to malicious scams. Cal Poly faculty and staff are frequent targets...
of sophisticated scam messages, often appearing to be sent from a colleague, so it’s more important than ever to be vigilant. If you currently have automatic forwarding set up on your email account and would like to remove it, visit our self-help article for step-by-step instructions.

### VI. Business Items:

A. **Resolution on Discontinuation of MS in Business and Technology**: Stern Neill, Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, brought forward a resolution to discontinue the MS in Business and Technology program in second reading. This program has been suspended for the past nine years with no students during that time. **M/S/P to approve the Resolution on Discontinuation of MS in Business and Technology.**

B. **Resolution on General Education and Languages Other Than English**: Gary Laver, Chair, Academic Senate General Education Governance Board, and Dr. Rachel Fernflores reintroduced a resolution to restore courses not in English for lower division Area C courses in first reading. They updated the Senate on changes they had made, including removing a clauses that involved department chairs meeting on an ongoing basis and updating the new name for Writing and Learning Initiatives Office. **M/S/P to move to second reading. M/S/P to approve the Resolution on General Education and Languages Other Than English.**

C. **Resolution to Include Caste Identity in Cal Poly’s Non-Discrimination Policy**: Marilyn Tseng, Academic Senate Diversity Committee Chair and Manmit Singh introduced a resolution in first reading to include caste identity in Cal Poly’s non-discrimination policy and calls on the chancellor to explicitly add caste to the CSU wide non-discrimination policy. Suggestions included making language stronger, aligning the title of the resolution more so with the direct ask of the resolution, and naming the specific policies this statement could be added. **This resolution will return in first reading at the next Academic Senate.**

### VII. Discussion Item(s):

### VIII. Adjournment:

Meeting adjourned at 4:37 pm.

Minutes submitted by:

Amelia Solis Macias

Amelia Solis Macias
I. Minutes: None

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Senate Chair, Dr. Thomas Gutierrez, announced that this would be the final Academic Senate meeting of the year and thanked the Senate for their work.

III. Reports
A. Academic Senate Chair: None.
B. President’s Office: Jessica Darin, on behalf of the President’s Office gave the Senate updates on renovations, holiday events, and commencement. Thanks to the contributions of an anonymous donor, the renovations of the exterior of the Alumni house are completed; renovations will now move onto phase two which move into the interior. The Faculty and Staff holiday party will be held Dec. 1, 2021; this event will be in support of the Basic Needs Initiative so guests are asked to bring donations such as gift cards. Fall Commencement will be held Saturday, December 11 and the Commencement celebration of the Class 2020 will be held the following day. COVID testing will be moving from UU220 to UU221. Lastly, Cal Poly was also recognized as the US Master’s level university that sent most students abroad for the year.
C. Provost: Provost, Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore, announced that Dr. Rachel Fernflores will be the Director of Semester Conversion with the assistance of Dr. Aaron Keen. They will be researching best practices to move forward and collaborating with Academic Senate and its committees. They can be contacted at the email semester-conversion@calpoly.edu. Cal Poly is also working on compiling a list of degree programs that need to be reviewed for the WASC Distanced Learning Report. This is being done by the office of Academic Programs and Planning with the Office of the Registrar. Additionally, 75 faculty members from all six colleges completed a course of effective instruction.
D. Vice President for Student Affairs: Vice President Keith Humphrey, announced that 850 students are planning on participating in Fall Commencement and 1400 alumni would be returning for the Class of 2020 commencement. The Vice President also shared that after two days of COVID testing, Cal Poly has only had two presumed positives. There will also be a lighting of the Menorah at the UU. The Vice President also answered questions from the Senators: for graduation, vaccinations and masks will not be required due to this being an outdoor event, current students must utilize their campus pass app, and Cal Poly is managing how many guests students can bring to keep the events below the state’s megaevent designation.
E. Statewide Senate: None.
F. CFA: Lewis Call, CFA representative, announced that Cal Poly’s petition to President Armstrong requesting him to support CFA demands has collected 663 signatures. However, while there has been some movement and bargaining is ongoing, negotiations are still technically at an impasse with CFA prepared to move to fact finding. Senator Call shared that they are unlikely to strike but are still willing.
G. ASI: None.

IV. Special Written Reports:
A. University Advising Written Update: Beth Merritt Miller submitted a written report on the University Advising Report. This can be found here: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/sa113021.pdf
B. Inclusive Excellence Update: Denise Isom, Interim Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer gave a presentation on the Office of University Diversity and Inclusion’s initiatives and progress of the past
V. Consent Agenda:
For items approved by consent please consult the agenda: https://content-calpoly.edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/sa113021.pdf

VI. Business Items:
A. Resolution to Include Caste Identity in Cal Poly’s Non-Discrimination Policy: Marilyn Tseng, Academic Senate Diversity Committee Chair and Manmit Singh, returned the resolution to include caste in Cal Poly’s Non-Discrimination Policy in first reading to the Senate with changes that reflect CSU policy and speaks to a broader policy beyond Cal Poly. M/S/P to move this resolution into second reading. M/S/P to adopt the Resolution to Include Caste Identity in Cal Poly’s Non-Discrimination Policy.

VIII. Discussion Item(s): None.

IX. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 4:17 pm.

Minutes submitted by:
Amelia Solis Macias
Amelia Solis Macias
Student Affairs
Report to Academic Senate
January 11, 2022
Prepared January 9, 2022

- Thank you to all the faculty who participated in both commencement ceremonies that were held in December. We anticipate this being the model for the ceremonies moving forward.
- Student Affairs wants to extend its appreciation to all faculty who have accommodated students who are unable to be in class due to illness. Your responsiveness has helped make a stressful situation for students, easier for students to manage.
- As the current surge of COVID-19 is placing a strain on our local health care systems, we are experiencing the same strain at Campus Health and Wellbeing. CHW is not able to provide doctor’s notes verifying illness at this time and we want to remind faculty that students should not be asked to provide medical information to participate in class. Please continue to use the digital campus pass to verify a student’s eligibility to participate in class or conversely their inability to participate in in-person learning.
CFA Report to the Academic Senate 01/11/2022

CFA has reached a Tentative Agreement (TA) with the CSU for a new Collective Bargaining Agreement for faculty. The CSU Board of Trustees is expected to ratify the TA at an upcoming meeting. CFA will be conducting a contract ratification vote soon, probably during Cal Poly's Winter Quarter. Only CFA members can participate in the ratification vote. Faculty who are not yet CFA members are encouraged to join the union and participate in the vote.

The TA provides substantial increases in faculty compensation, including:

*A COVID Service Award (a one-time payment) in the amount of $3500 for each full-time faculty member, prorated by time base for part-time faculty.

*A 4% General Salary Increase (GSI) for academic year 2021-22, retroactive to July 1, 2021.

*A 4% GSI for AY 2022-23.

*Two 2.65% Service Salary Increases (SSIs, or step increases) for eligible faculty, one in AY 2021-22 and one in AY 2023-24.

*A 2.65% Post Promotion Increase (PPI) in AY 2022-23 for full Professors, Range D lecturers, and equivalent coaches, counselors, and librarians who have no further SSI eligibility in their current salary ranges.

*Expanded range elevation eligibility for lecturers (and other faculty on temporary contracts) who have at least six years of full-time equivalent service.

The TA also adds a number of important faculty rights in non-salary areas, including:

*interview rights for lecturers who apply for tenure-track positions on their campuses

*the right for faculty to address and rebut bias in student evaluations

*the right for librarians and counselors to work remotely

*multi-year appointments for coaches
ASI Report to the Academic Senate – January 11, 2022

The ASI board of directors has begun to draft their formal opinion (resolution) on the CBF increase. Additionally, all meetings have been moved to a virtual format given the increases in case numbers. Outside of student government, our managed facilities are being hit rather hard with staff shortages due to COVID, this could cause closures or adjustments in hours in the coming weeks.

Student concerns continue to remain high regarding COVID-19 policy. Many students have reported being penalized students due to COVID-19 related absences. ASI has started collecting anecdotes and feedback from students in this spreadsheet.

Moreover, we’ve received several letters from students who are distressed and very upset regarding the current campus situation and COVID-19 policies.
2022-23 CATALOG REVIEW: Following the practice implemented in previous years, summaries of all course or catalog proposals sent by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to the Senate for consideration are posted on the web. Every senator is expected to review these proposals as well as the accompanying recommendations of the Curriculum Committee.

2022-23 catalog proposals submitted by the following departments/programs and identified in their respective college summary in the Curriculum Handbook:

**College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences**
Agribusiness Department
Agricultural Education & Communication Department
Animal Science Department
Experience Industry Management Department
Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences Department

**College of Architecture and Environmental Design**
Architectural Engineering Department
Landscape Architecture Department

**College of Engineering**
Aerospace Engineering Department
Computer Engineering Department
Computer Science and Software Engineering - CSC 304: Software Engineering without Programming
Electrical Engineering Department

**College of Liberal Arts**
Art & Design Department
Graphic Communication Department
History Department
Interdisciplinary Studies in the Liberal Arts Program Department
Journalism Department
Music Department
Psychology and Child Development Department
Social Sciences Department
Theatre & Dance Department
Women's and Gender Studies Department
World Languages and Cultures Department

**College of Science and Mathematics**
Liberal Studies Department
Statistics Department
School of Education
University Honors Program

To view a college summary, go to the online Curriculum Handbook. Click on Status of Proposals, scroll to 2022-23 Catalog Proposals - College Summaries’ section, select the link for the appropriate college.

To view the proposal for a course or program, go to My Cal Poly Portal - Academics tab - Curriculum Management portlet. Select the Course Inventory Management link to search for a course; select the Program Management link to search for a program.

Issues, concerns, and questions regarding a curriculum proposal should be directed to Greg Bohr, chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee. If the concern is strong enough, any senator may request an item to be removed from the Consent Agenda by January 4, 2022.

Pursuant to the curriculum appeals process adopted by the Academic Senate on May 4, 2010, "Items removed from the Consent Agenda will be placed on the Senate agenda as discussion items. The Senate Chair (or designee) will invite representatives from the concerned departments and the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee to be present at the meetings where pulled proposals will be discussed. Following discussion in the Senate, the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee will make the final decision to approve, disapprove, or return the items to committee (at any level) for further development. Items not removed from the Consent Agenda are considered approved on the meeting date of the Consent Agenda."
P/T Representative  
Report to Academic Senate  
January 11, 2022  
Prepared January 3 in advance of meeting

The following collection of responses is based on a survey of Part-Time employees conducted between 10/13/2021 to 11/08/2021 by the Part Time Representative, Academic Senator Samuel Shalhoub.

This survey contained two questions, which are as follows:

1. How are you feeling, in general, with regard to campus repopulation and the return to majority in-person instruction after the initial pandemic induced campus closure.

and;

2. Specifically, are you in support of, in opposition, or indifferent to transitioning to a Semester system by AY2025-2026.

The responses to these questions have been organized below into categories that reflect the overall tone of the submitted response. They have been ordered such that the more verbose responses appear earlier, and the less verbose appear later.

Summary of data for question #1.

13 of 21 respondents are positive about campus repopulation.

5 of 21 respondents are neutral about campus repopulation.

3 of 21 respondents are negative about campus population.

Summary of data for question #2.

4 of 21 respondents are in support of the transition to a semester system.

7 of 21 respondents are indifferent to the transition to a semester system.

10 of 21 respondents are opposed to the transition to a semester system.

Conclusion of data:
For the most part P/T employees were comfortable with campus repopulation during fall quarter 2021. However, in regard to transitioning to a semester system, P/T faculty are generally more opposed, citing concerns related to work-time and compensation.
1.) Part-time Employee response regarding campus repopulation:

Positive about repopulation

The transition went much more smoothly & seamlessly than I anticipated. I'd like to see a more controlled use of campus passes (not allowing students on the campus at all without their pass) AND that students/staff have to provide verification of vaccination, rather than self-attestation. So far, students have complied with the mask mandate & share the feelings of excitement & anxiety with the return to campus.

I think the transition has gone as good as can be expected. It would be nice if the university held students more accountable for reporting their status. It is too easy for students to lie about their status.

Feeling great about the return to campus. It seems to be hard on students to have a mix of online and in-person classes, but I do appreciate the flexibility for faculty.

I feel okay about it, mostly because I was able to be vaccinated, the administration required vaccination for all students, and I was able to modify my teaching format.

Feeling good. I'm pleased with the high % of students that are vaccinated and how well mask usage by students is being enforced inside.

I'm ok with it. I'll miss working from home, but I also miss the campus. I have zoom and covid fatigue. I want normalcy.

I feel positive about this return. I'm eager to get back into the classroom and my students are, as well.

I think the students are doing much better for it. I am happy with it overall.

I am happy to be back in person!

Happy with being back.

Good.

Good.

Fine.

Neutral/mild concerns about repopulation
I have mixed feelings. I am teaching 4 in-person classes and I continuously worry about Covid-19. Many students are frequently absent because they are getting colds and stay home awaiting a negative Covid test. But they have been respectful about my checking their green passes and wearing masks properly.

I am teaching my big class (120 students) online still; I don't know what the plan is for Winter. I am teaching a seminar in person (20 students) and feel good about it. However since my office is in a cubicle shared space with 15 other lecturers I worry about the air quality in our office esp with Covid.

It seemed odd at first to be around so many people, but it's getting more 'normal' feeling. I have heard that not all faculty are asking for daily passes, which is regrettable.

I'm nervous. Some students aren't properly wearing their masks and I feel like the mask police. Teaching in a mask is a challenge.

Not on campus yet as my class size is too big to properly conduct in person safely.

**Negative/major concerns about repopulation**

I do not feel safe returning to campus in the winter (I have a toddler and newborn and am currently on maternity leave). I asked my department to teach online and was only granted the hybrid option. I am not looking forward to going back to teach in person, as much as I miss the students.

At higher risk than majority of population. The majority of Public Companies delayed in-person until start of next year due to the Delta variant. I feel the school Administration put politics ahead of the welfare of its staff. This has cost lives.

It has been very badly managed, top-down with no consultation with faculty and little to no attention or caring about our health.
2.) Part-time Employee response regarding transition to semester system:

**In Support**

The short-term transition will be painful, but having taught in both the semester system and quarters, I am entirely in favor of switching to semesters.

While I am in support of this transition, there is so much work to be done that knowing the logistics sooner rather than later are IMPERATIVE!

I am in support.

SUPPORT.

**Indifferent**

I am indifferent bordering on opposed. I mainly have concerns/questions about changed teaching loads, modifying existing courses to fit the new model, and beginning the year sooner. I think I’d need to know more about how it will work before I could say I'm supporting or opposing. Will it mean more, less, or the same amount of teaching for lecturers?

I am indifferent. However, after the many changes to curriculum/instruction made over the past year and a half, the work it will take to change to a different system seems daunting. Will there be compensation? How will this affect pay? How will it impact the percentage scale/3-year appointments, etc.?

It seems inevitable. If it happens in 2025 or 2035, it makes no difference to me. Revising all my class will initially be a pain, but my students' papers will improve if they have more time in the oven.

Think the goal is worthwhile. I am very concerned with the transition process and how much support we instructors will get in translating the course material from quarters to semesters.

It seems inevitable.

Indifferent.

Opposed

I'm in opposition. I'm concerned about how this could undermine successful academic programs that have flourished under the quarter system. Also, some of our closest competitors in
recruiting students (UC Santa Barbara and UCLA) are on quarters. I'm also concerned with the possibility of raising teaching loads and/or increasing the number of students we teach during the AY. It seems the CSU administration is doing this to make bookkeeping more convenient for them. Cal Poly is a successful member of the CSU, with high graduation rates. Why fix what's not broken? Why break something working well?

I am in opposition, simply because I am used to the quarter system and my courses are all set up for a quarter system. It would require a lot of uncompensated time/effort to restructure my courses to a semester format. That being said, it does make sense that Cal Poly be aligned with the rest of the CSU.

In strong opposition. I am seriously concerned about the workload and from talking to students and colleagues alike, no one seems in favor. Why do we need to accept more top-down impositions?

Not in support. Transition take work, and it'll be possibly less money.

Opposed to semester system - quarter systems works fantastically

In opposition.

Opposition.

Opposition.

Opposition.
RESOLUTION ON REVISIONS TO UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
12.2: OFFICE HOURS

Impact on Existing Policy: The policy enacted by this resolution revises UFPP 12.2 which was enacted by AS-886-20. Further details about its impact on existing policy is described in the attached report.¹

WHEREAS, Office hour policies should be flexible to accommodate for varying needs of instructors and differences in the ways faculty interact with students in various instructional settings across the university; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s office hour policy was updated for Fall 2020 including limitations on use of synchronous online office hours for instructors with in-person instructional assignments; and

WHEREAS, From Spring 2020 through Spring 2021 as Cal Poly conducted most student interaction online, faculty and students became familiar with the use of synchronous online teleconferencing software such as Zoom for conducting office hours; and

WHEREAS, After Cal Poly returned to in-person instruction, faculty and students have found Zoom to be an effective means to conduct synchronous online office hours as an alternative to or alongside in-person office hours; and

WHEREAS, Some provisions of the current office hour policy that are left to colleges, such as office hour requirements for department chairs and heads, have not yet been incorporated into some college personnel policy documents; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The university office hour policy as contained in the attached report “Revision to UFPP 12.2: Office Hours” be enacted for Fall 2022, and be it further
RESOLVED: Colleges revise chapter 12 of their personnel policy documents by Fall 2022 to include the mandated college-level office hour policies as indicated in UFPP 12.2.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: January 4, 2022

---

1 (1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards. 
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions. 
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is proposing a modification to university office hour policy that enables synchronous online hours to satisfy office hour obligations.

BACKGROUND: The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies including consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and clear identification of which policy documents have been superseded by a proposed change. Using this process, FAC updates UFPP on an as-needed basis.

In Winter 2020 the Academic Senate updated Cal Poly’s office hour policy for the first time since 1983. The new policy was comprehensive and reflected the emerging use of online teleconferencing software as a means of conducting office hours. The new policy tied office hour modalities to instructional modalities and limited faculty to one virtual office hours when their instructional assignment was entirely in-person. By the end of Winter 2020, and ahead of the initial application of the new office hour policy the need to shift to virtual instruction and office hours in response to COVID-19 had taken hold. In Spring 2021 FAC members discussed the limitation of virtual office hours in the new office hours policies in light of the forced need for virtual office hours. These discussions along with feedback from others that we should rethink the limitation on virtual office hours informed the proposed revisions to our university office hour policy.

Summary of revisions to UFPP 12.2: Office Hours

The proposed revision to the university office hour policy focuses on **12.2.10: Mode of office hours**, revising it to align the mode of office hours to the needs of the students served by the office hours, and defining acceptable modes of office hours as in-person or by synchronous online communication such as Zoom.

The revisions also clarify the standard location for in-person office hours as in the faculty member’s office. Changes to standard office hour locations, or any rescheduling should be expressed in a timely manner to the students affected by the change. Any further allowances or limitations on the use of another location for office hours would need to be addressed in college or department policies.

All restrictions on synchronous online office hours are removed from the policy. One other revision to 12.2.5 is in the interest of clarity. Everything else in the university office hour policy remains as it was in the version passed by the Senate in Winter 2020, which can be found in the current academic year’s version of UFPP on the Academic Personnel website.

Impact on Existing Policy

The revised policy text for UFPP 12.2 supersedes its prior version. All other college and department office hour policies *inconsistent* with the proposed university policy need to be revised to conform with

Faculty Affairs Committee
Revision to UFPP 12.2: Office Hours

Winter 2022

UFPP 12.2. Any subordinate policy consistent with the minimal provisions of the new office hour policy remain in effect until that faculty unit decides to revise it.

Implementation

The new office hour policy would go into effect in a timeline set by the Academic Senate and ratified by the President. FAC recommends that it go into effect in Fall 2022.

The implementation of university office hour policies requires colleges to assess their own office hour policies for consistency with the university policy and resolve any inconsistencies in their subordinate policies.

Colleges may impose further restrictions on office hour modality so long as those restrictions are otherwise consistent with UFPP 12.2. For example, imposing a limit on the amount of synchronous virtual office hours is consistent with the allowance of virtual office hours, and thus would be allowed so long as the college implemented the policy by the procedures set out in their personnel policies documents. However, allowing asynchronous online communication to count as office hours (such as counting time engaged in email communication as office hours) would be inconsistent with UFPP 12.2 since 12.2.4 explicitly distinguishes such asynchronous communication from office hours.

College level office hour policies would be in Chapter 12 of the college personnel policy document, and would be subject to approval the same way that any personnel policy is approved as per UFPP 1.5.5 and 1.5.6.

Consultation

FAC and Academic Personnel distributed a draft of the proposed policy to the college deans for them to gather feedback on the revisions from their faculty and college leadership. The policy text proposed here reflects revisions based on that consultation.

What follows is the proposed policy text in a clean form, and also in a version that reveals its revision history. Existing policy can be found in the current academic year’s version of UFPP, on the Academic Personnel website.

Faculty Affairs Committee
12.2. **Office Hours**

12.2.1. Policy in 12.2 established by AS-886-20. This policy supersedes the previous university policy on office hours originally in CAM 370.2.

12.2.2. Cal Poly’s Educational Mission: “Cal Poly is committed to excellence in teaching and learning. In all disciplines, we seek to provide a student-centered, learner-focused education, facilitated by a low student-teacher ratio in classes conducted primarily by full-time, regular faculty. The cornerstone of our educational philosophy is our commitment to Learn by Doing whereby classroom instruction is complemented by practical, hands-on learning in the laboratory, the studio, and the field.” (Cal Poly Catalog)

12.2.3. Each faculty member must schedule and conduct office hours each week for consultation with students. One-on-one, direct, personal engagement between students and their instructors and faculty advisors in regularly scheduled office hours is a vital means of contributing to the student-centered mission of Cal Poly.

12.2.4. Asynchronous communication (e.g. email) with students and ad hoc appointments to meet with students are expected normal instructional duties distinct from scheduled office hours.

12.2.5. An office hour is one credit hour (i.e. 50 minutes) of regularly scheduled time for faculty to be available to meet on regularly scheduled days and times.

12.2.6. Faculty with instructional assignments shall hold scheduled office hours scaled to their instructional assignments. Scheduled office hours should be held during the days and times when classes are normally scheduled, distributed across days and at times suited to the needs of students. During final exam week office hours may be rescheduled as necessary, and should be suited to the needs of the students served in the instructional assignment.

12.2.7. Colleges that assign duties warranting the holding of office hours shall include office hour policies in their personnel policies documents.

12.2.8. **Scheduled instructional office hours**

12.2.8.1. Minimum weekly office hour scheduling shall be scaled to instructional assignments as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional WTU</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Tenure-Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0 up to and including 4</td>
<td>1 office hour</td>
<td>2 office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4 up to and including 8</td>
<td>2 office hours</td>
<td>3 office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 8 up to and including 12</td>
<td>3 office hours</td>
<td>4 office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12</td>
<td>4 office hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.2.8.2. Faculty receiving assigned time for teaching large format classes shall schedule office hours according to the total WTU for the instructional assignment and assigned time related to that course.

12.2.8.3. Tenure-line faculty whose instructional assignments have been reduced to zero WTU but who are involved in research or other projects involving supervision of students shall hold a minimum of one regularly scheduled in-person office hour.

12.2.8.4. If colleges or departments have any further provisions about the scheduling of office hours, those provisions shall be defined in their personnel policy document.

12.2.9. **Scheduled advising office hours**
12.2.9.1. Assigned time for advising duties may have an amount of office hours defined as part of the advising function. Any advising office hours attached to assigned time shall be determined by the instructional unit that issues the assigned time and specified in the assignment. Office hours for advising duties earning assigned time contribute to the total office hour obligation of the faculty member.

12.2.9.2. Department chair and head responsibilities shall include the requirements for the scheduling of advising office hours required for their assignment. Colleges shall determine the minimum office hours required for department chairs and heads.

12.2.10. Mode of office hours
12.2.10.1. The mode of scheduled office hours should meet the needs of students for the instructional or advising function that requires the scheduling of the office hours.

12.2.10.2. Acceptable modes of holding scheduled office hours include office hours held in-person or held synchronously online using technology readily available to the campus community and generally available to the students served by the office hours (e.g. Zoom).

12.2.10.3. Scheduled office hours held in-person should be in the faculty member’s office or some other definite and regular location.

12.2.10.4. Colleges and departments shall specify in their office hour policies any general allowances or requirements for alternate locations or synchronous online modes of conducting office hours.

12.2.11. Notification
12.2.11.1. Office hours shall be posted by the beginning of the second week of instruction in faculty listings on department websites. Colleges and instructional units can determine additional ways for posting office hours that conspicuously and conveniently inform the university community of when and where office hours shall be conducted, such as common boards at department offices, on placards near faculty offices, or other online directories.

12.2.11.2. If the university adopts a standard online directory generally accessible to the university community that is capable of presenting faculty schedules, then office hours should be posted in such an online directory.

12.2.11.3. Faculty should notify enrolled students and department administrators and administrative support staff of any need to cancel, reschedule, or relocate office hours in a timely manner appropriate to the needs of the students served by those office hours.

12.2.12. Exceptions
12.2.12.1. Exceptions to the policies about the scheduling of instructional and advising office hours should coordinate the needs of the instructor and the students given the nature of the instructional or advising assignment.

12.2.12.2. Exceptions require department chair/head and college dean approval.

12.2.12.3. Exceptions should be temporary and specific.

12.2.12.4. Exceptions that extend beyond a specific instructor’s temporary needs should be treated as a basis for revisiting the college or department office hour policies.
12.2.12.5. Colleges and departments with standing needs that deviate from university policy should treat those needs as a basis for asking the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee to revisit university level office hour policies.
12.2. Office Hours

12.2.1. Policy in 12.2 established by AS-886-20. This policy supersedes the previous university policy on office hours originally in CAM 370.2.

12.2.2. Cal Poly’s Educational Mission: “Cal Poly is committed to excellence in teaching and learning. In all disciplines, we seek to provide a student-centered, learner-focused education, facilitated by a low student-teacher ratio in classes conducted primarily by full-time, regular faculty. The cornerstone of our educational philosophy is our commitment to Learn by Doing whereby classroom instruction is complemented by practical, hands-on learning in the laboratory, the studio, and the field.” (Cal Poly Catalog)

12.2.3. Each faculty member must schedule and conduct office hours each week for consultation with students. One-on-one, direct, personal engagement between students and their instructors and faculty advisors in regularly scheduled office hours is a vital means of contributing to the student-centered mission of Cal Poly.

12.2.4. Asynchronous communication (e.g. email) with students and ad hoc appointments to meet with students are expected normal instructional duties distinct from scheduled office hours.

12.2.5. An office hour is one credit hour (i.e. 50 minutes) of regularly scheduled time for faculty to be available to meet in-person regularly scheduled location days and times.

12.2.6. Faculty with instructional assignments shall hold scheduled office hours scaled to their instructional assignments. Scheduled office hours should be held during the days and times when classes are normally scheduled, distributed across days and at times suited to the needs of students. During final exam week office hours may be rescheduled as necessary, and should be suited to the needs of the students served in the instructional assignment.

12.2.7. Colleges that assign duties warranting the holding of office hours shall include office hour policies in their personnel policies documents.

12.2.8. Scheduled instructional office hours

12.2.8.1. Minimum weekly office hour scheduling shall be scaled to instructional assignments as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional WTU</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Tenure-Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0 up to and including 4</td>
<td>1 office hour</td>
<td>2 office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4 up to and including 8</td>
<td>2 office hours</td>
<td>3 office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 8 up to and including 12</td>
<td>3 office hours</td>
<td>4 office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12</td>
<td>4 office hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.2.8.2. Faculty receiving assigned time for teaching large format classes shall schedule office hours according to the total WTU for the instructional assignment and assigned time related to that course.

12.2.8.3. Tenure-line faculty whose instructional assignments have been reduced to zero WTU but who are involved in research or other projects involving supervision of students shall hold a minimum of one regularly scheduled in-person office hour.

12.2.8.4. If colleges or departments have any further provisions about the scheduling of office hours, those provisions shall be defined in their personnel policy document.

12.2.9. Scheduled advising office hours
12.2.9.1. Assigned time for advising duties may have an amount of office hours defined as part of the advising function. Any advising office hours attached to assigned time shall be determined by the instructional unit that issues the assigned time and specified in the assignment. Office hours for advising duties earning assigned time contribute to the total office hour obligation of the faculty member.

12.2.9.2. Department chair and head responsibilities shall include the requirements for the scheduling of advising office hours required for their assignment. Colleges shall determine the minimum office hours required for department chairs and heads.

12.2.10. Mode of office hours

12.2.10.1. The mode of scheduled office hours should be congruent with the needs of mode of engagement with students for the instructional or advising function that requires the scheduling of the office hours.

12.2.10.2. Acceptable modes of holding scheduled office hours include office hours held in-person or held synchronously online using technology readily available to the campus community and generally available to the students served by the office hours (e.g. Zoom).

12.2.10.3. For normal classroom instruction, scheduled office hours should be held in-person should be in the faculty member's office or some other definite and regular location.

12.2.10.4. Faculty with more than one scheduled office hour may hold up to one office hour conducted in a synchronous online mode suited to the nature of the engagement with the affected students.

12.2.10.5. For online courses, scheduled office hours should be conducted in a synchronous online mode suited to the nature of the engagement with the enrolled students.

12.2.10.6. Hybrid courses may warrant an appropriate combination of in-person and synchronous online office hours.

12.2.10.7. Colleges and departments shall specify in their office hour policies any general allowances or requirements for alternate locations or synchronous online modes of conducting office hours.

12.2.11. Notification

12.2.11.1. Office hours shall be posted by the beginning of the second week of instruction in faculty listings on department websites. Colleges and instructional units can determine additional ways for posting office hours that conspicuously and conveniently inform the university community of when and where office hours shall be conducted, such as common boards at department offices, on placards near faculty offices, or other online directories.

12.2.11.2. If the university adopts a standard online directory generally accessible to the university community that is capable of presenting faculty schedules, then office hours should be posted in such an online directory.

12.2.11.3. Faculty should notify enrolled students and department administrators and administrative support staff of any need to cancel, reschedule, or relocate office hours in a timely manner appropriate to the needs of the students served by those office hours.

12.2.12. Exceptions
12.2.12.1. Exceptions to the policies about the scheduling of instructional and advising office hours should coordinate the needs of the instructor and the students given the nature of the instructional or advising assignment.

12.2.12.2. Exceptions require department chair/head and college dean approval.

12.2.12.3. Exceptions should be temporary and specific.

12.2.12.4. Exceptions that extend beyond a specific instructor’s temporary needs should be treated as a basis for revisiting the college or department office hour policies.

12.2.12.5. Colleges and departments with standing needs that deviate from university policy should treat those needs as a basis for asking the Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee to revisit university level office hour policies.
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-__-22

RESOLUTION ON REVISING THE COLLEGE BASED FEE STRUCTURE AT CAL POLY

Impact on Existing Policy: None

1 WHEREAS, Cal Poly is focused on providing access to excellence to all students of the State of California, including those from a lower family income; and
2 WHEREAS, the cost of providing a Cal Poly “Learn by Doing” education is not fully funded for California residents by the State Government through the Chancellor’s Office; and
3 WHEREAS, the California State University Board of Trustees has not set tuition by enough to cover those costs; and
4 WHEREAS, even with the additional campus fees such as the Student Success Fee, and the Cal Poly Opportunity fee, the cost of a Cal Poly education is not covered; and
5 WHEREAS, Cal Poly faculty salaries are below what is needed to attract and retain faculty; and
6 WHEREAS, Cal Poly hasn’t fully funded the Teacher-Scholar Model; and
7 WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s tenure density is below the target of 75%; and
8 WHEREAS, the net cost of attendance at Cal Poly to students from families that are below the median family income for the state is higher than if those same students were to attend a University of California campus; and
9 WHEREAS, a large proportion of the money raised by increasing the College Based Fee would be set aside to provide financial aid to students with family incomes below $150k; and
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WHEREAS, students with family incomes below $90k will have their total cost of attendance greatly reduced; and
WHEREAS, students with family incomes in the $90-150k range will not have their total cost of attendance raised; and
WHEREAS, the lower cost of attending Cal Poly for the majority of families in the State of California will likely increase the diversity of the student body at Cal Poly; and
WHEREAS, better funding the Academic mission of the University will increase the quality of education at Cal Poly; therefore be it
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate endorse the Proposed plan to change the College Based Fee; and be it further
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate requests that all additional funds raised from this change in the College Based Fee be used for financial aid and for the academic mission; and be it further
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate requests that a minimum of 35% of the additional funds be used for the academic mission of the institution, a target of 5% of the additional funds be used for institutional priorities via one-time funds, and that a minimum of 50% of the additional funds be used to provide financial aid and scholarships for California students unless State, Federal, or Philanthropic resources decrease the level of need for financial aid; and be it further
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate suggests that the financial aid and scholarships for California students be awarded in a fashion to lower the total cost of attendance the most for those with the greatest need, and that students from families with income in the range of $120k-$150k shouldn't pay more than currently; and be it further
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate urge the President and Deans to continue to raise private dollars to provide financial aid and help fund the cost of a Cal Poly education; and be it further
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate charge the Faculty Affairs Committee to work in consultation with CFA, Academic Affairs, and Academic Personnel to write a data-driven report for the Provost and Executive Committee of the Academic Senate outlining the nature and scope of necessary equity salary adjustments for faculty to make it easier to continue to attract excellent tenure track and retain tenured faculty; and be it further
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate recommends that a committee be formed to offer advice on the prioritization of the use of the funds for the academic mission but that until such a committee is formed and can carefully consider the needs at hand, the Academic Senate affirms that the initial priorities of the fund usage within the academic mission should initially be first, equity salary adjustments for faculty, and second, release time to fund the Teacher-Scholar model including funding library resources without lowering holding tenure density, and then be used to increase tenure density; and be it further

RESOLVED: that in the spirit of shared governance, the Academic Senate concur with the nature, membership, and structure of the Committee outlined in Attachment B; and be it further

RESOLVED: that any lowering of the minimum of 50% for financial aid and 35% for funding the Academic Mission floors above be only done after seeking input from CFAC, the ASI Board of Directors, the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee, the Academic Senate Executive Committee, as well as the committee outlined in the Attachment B; and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate request an annual report of the use of all revenues raised with this College Based Fee adjustment and estimates of the impact of funding changes on the Cal Poly, including the impact on the number of applicants (by income group), the yield of admitted applicants (by income group), salaries, release time, and tenure density where other factors have been taken into account be provided to ASI, Budget and Long Range Planning Committee, and the Academic Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED: that Budget and Long Range Planning Committee develop a resolution by on a standard of reporting by June 2022 and will do so in consultation with Academic Affairs and AFD

Proposed by: Budget and Long Range Planning Committee
Date: January 4, 2022

Attachments:
Attachment A – the CBF Objective Statement, Nov 5, 2021
Attachment B – the addendum to the CBF Objective Statement, Dec 20, 2021
Attachment C – Cal Poly Opportunity Fee Report, Oct 15, 2021
Objective Statement
The Cal Poly College Based Fee Student Aid and Learn by Doing Plan

Summary
Cal Poly is a comprehensive polytechnic university – a destination campus with a statewide mission to deliver equitable access to its education for all qualified Californians. Cal Poly has built a reputation of excellence over the years through a focus on student success and our signature Learn by Doing pedagogy. However, Cal Poly is not equitably accessible to all qualified Californians and is also chronically underfunded given the nature of our pedagogical and polytechnic ethos.

Cal Poly is a proud member of the California State University. However, our main competitor for students is the University of California (UC). For students who rely on financial aid to attend college, Cal Poly is one of, if not the most expensive public universities in California in terms of out-of-pocket costs. Although Cal Poly’s annual “sticker price” is approximately $5,000 lower than the price of attending a UC campus, our effective price—how much students actually pay once financial aid is considered—is $2,000-$4,000 higher than the UC. The result is that lower-income, California-resident students are less likely to apply to or attend Cal Poly than a UC. As one indicator of the scale of this difference, 55% of UC students pay no tuition or fees due to financial aid and scholarships, while overall 24% of Cal Poly students pay no tuition, only 14.5% of Cal Poly students pay no tuition or fees. This contrasts with 59% of students in the CSU who pay no tuition and 49% who pay no tuition or fees. Nationwide, the 2021 Wall Street Journal ranking of U.S. colleges and universities found that Cal Poly was 316th out of 337 public universities in terms of the cost of attendance after financial aid—this means that for low-income students, 315 public universities are less expensive to attend than Cal Poly.

Cal Poly’s inability to offer competitive financial aid and scholarships affects all students. It means that we are not able to recruit from a group of highly qualified students as successfully as other public universities in the state. Thus, the university is only partially fulfilling its mission to educate qualified California students. This also impacts Cal Poly’s ability to achieve its goals regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion. The result is that the Cal Poly student body does not reflect the diversity of the state of California.

Moreover, Cal Poly does not have sufficient funding to fulfill its statewide mission as a comprehensive polytechnic university. Other than Cal Maritime, Cal Poly has the highest percentage of high investment majors (agriculture, architecture, and engineering) in the CSU. Simply put, Cal Poly is not funded adequately for the scope of our polytechnic mission. The gap in funding for our statewide polytechnic mission and our need for facilities to carry out a Learn by Doing pedagogy in our high investment majors prevents Cal Poly from growing enrollment and meeting the intense demand from all California students who wish to attend Cal Poly. This also impacts our ability to fulfill the demand from employers that seek to hire more Cal Poly graduates.

The funding required to meet the objectives outlined above is significant. The primary sources of our funds that support the Cal Poly academic mission include state appropriations, tuition, student fees, donations, and entrepreneurial activity. The first two sources of funds are beyond our control. Donations are a significant source of revenue, but the amount needed to fulfill our mission exceeds any reasonable expectation for these funds to be an adequate source. For example, we were fortunate to receive a $110 m donation targeted to support undergraduate research in perpetuity. However, to meet the needs outlined above, we would need well over an endowment of $1.5 b.
Due to these factors, on October 21, 2021, Academic Affairs submitted a proposal to increase / adjust the college-based fee (CBF). The fee would be assessed on newly enrolled students beginning Fall 2022. Subsequent fee increases would be made on a cohort basis. All currently matriculated students would continue to pay current college-based fee rates.

Importantly, the proposed increase in college-based fees will allow Cal Poly to:

- Establish a new campus-based source of financial aid (CBF Student Aid) to augment CSU, state and federal aid, and provide scholarships to lower the net cost of attendance for those students with the greatest economic need;
- Provide merit scholarships for students;
- Appropriately fund our high investment programs in support of our comprehensive polytechnic mission;
- Appropriately fund academic infrastructure for college needs such as equipment, labs and associated information technology,
- Enhance faculty recruitment and retention;
- Improve tenure density; and
- Allow the campus to fund the teacher-scholar model more fully, which is critical to our Learn by Doing curriculum.

The positive impacts of this additional funding would be experienced by all students across all colleges because it will improve the quality of our Learn by Doing education. This funding will also help us increase the diversity of our student body.

The proposed changes involve three components:

(a) Incoming students in Fall 2022 would pay an additional college specific fee amount [ranging from $614 - $864/year; this represents a 6% to 8.5% annual increase of total tuition and fees]. These students will continue to pay the same college-based fee throughout their undergraduate tenure at Cal Poly; subsequent cohorts would pay an additional 4.9% to 7.7% annual increase of total tuition and fees compared to the previous cohort for years 2, 3 and 4. Again, each cohort would pay the same college-based fee that they are assessed throughout their undergraduate tenure at Cal Poly.

(b) The intent of this proposal is to allow each college to retain revenue generated by the current CBF ($1,044 per student) by the end of year four. However, the current CBF for the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) is significantly lower than those for other colleges. To ensure equity, the CLA CBF will be raised over four cohorts (years) to the same (current) level as the fees for the College of Science and Mathematics (CSM) and Orfalea College of Business (OCOB); a proportional amount of the adjustment per cohort will be assigned to CLA or the Provost.

(c) By the end of year four, the fees for our high-investment colleges (College of Engineering [CENG], College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Science [CAFES], and the College of Architecture and Environmental Design [CAED]) would be higher than the fees for the remaining colleges.

It is important to remember that the amount of increase in the CBF is proposed to provide revenue to meet the financial aid and scholarship needs of students, and to provide a significant increase in funding required for our statewide polytechnic mission while remaining at less than 90% of the cost of attendance for residential undergraduates enrolled in the UC. Revenue from the $1,044 base and associated annual adjustments will continue to be administered by the college dean. Note – for CLA, this will be the new base of $1,044. New revenue from the cohort
adjustments and proportional annual adjustments for 26-27 and beyond will be administered by the Provost.

Following the phase in of increases in CBF by cohort, subsequent annual increases in the CBF would include annual adjustments equal to the California Consumer Price Index (CCPI) or Higher Education Price Index (HEPI) following discussion with the Chancellor. Annual increases greater than 6% will require consultation with the Chancellor.

These changes are summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Investment CBF (CAED, CAFES, CENG)</td>
<td>$1,044</td>
<td>$1,908</td>
<td>$2,772</td>
<td>$3,636</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>$864</td>
<td>$864</td>
<td>$864</td>
<td>$864</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change as % of Tuition &amp; Fees /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27 on as % of CBF</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Fee Increase over 21-22</td>
<td>$864</td>
<td>$1,728</td>
<td>$2,592</td>
<td>$3,456</td>
<td>$3,591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Investment CBF (CSM, OCOB)</td>
<td>$1,044</td>
<td>$1,658</td>
<td>$2,272</td>
<td>$2,886</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>$614</td>
<td>$614</td>
<td>$614</td>
<td>$614</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change as % of Tuition &amp; Fees /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27 on as % of CBF</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Fee Increase over 21-22</td>
<td>$614</td>
<td>$1,228</td>
<td>$1,842</td>
<td>$2,456</td>
<td>$2,561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA CBF</td>
<td>$648</td>
<td>$1,361</td>
<td>$2,074</td>
<td>$2,787</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change</td>
<td>$713</td>
<td>$713</td>
<td>$713</td>
<td>$713</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Change as % of Tuition &amp; Fees /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27 on as % of CBF</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Fee Increase over 21-22</td>
<td>$713</td>
<td>$1,426</td>
<td>$2,139</td>
<td>$2,852</td>
<td>$2,957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These funds will be used to establish the CBF Student Aid to support greater financial aid and fund merit scholarships for students, with an initial allocation set at 60% of new, incremental revenue. Providing need-based financial aid will be the priority use of the revenue designated for financial aid and scholarships. While the greatest portion of these funds will be utilized for need-based scholarships, a portion will be utilized for merit-based scholarships. Merit based scholarships are an additional avenue to lower the net cost of attendance for prospective Cal Poly students and is a necessary tool to recruit these most sought-after students. In addition, the increase in financial support for students will require a minimal increase in staff in the office of financial aid to manage the additional financial aid processes. The incremental revenue generated by the adjustment or increase in the CBF will be managed at the central level. As noted previously, the baseline CBF and the adjusted baseline CBF for CLA (and the annual adjustment for 26-27 and beyond) will remain under the direction of the respective dean. Deans and appropriate division leaders will submit an annual report to the President and Provost outlining use and impact of CBF and CBF Student Aid. The President and Provost will, in turn, submit an annual CBF report to academic senate and ASI.

This fee is classified as a Category II fee - a campus mandatory fee. Category II fees are “fees that must be paid to enroll in or attend the university.” In accordance with the Education Code and Executive Order 1102 this fee proposal is subject to either an advisory student referendum or other advisory alternative consultation mechanism.

We are recommending alternative consultation for the following reasons:

- Due to the lack of financial aid, Cal Poly currently has a lower percentage of students from a lower socioeconomic status than other public universities in California (see graph below depicting distribution of students by parental income; data provided by Cal Poly Office of Financial Aid). Lower socioeconomic status students (SES), especially those who will benefit most from the plan and come from families with incomes less than $90,000 per year, remain a significantly smaller percentage of currently enrolled students.
Consequently, a referendum would not allow for these lower socioeconomic students to be appropriately represented.

- A referendum would also not allow us to fully understand the rationales for support or opposition. The consultation process, by contrast, allows for considerations of the complexity of the support and/or opposition to the fee increase in qualitative not just quantitative terms.
- Alternative consultation also allows us to account for the disparity in the representation of students from a lower socioeconomic status on our campus and focus on a more equitable response.
- Finally, the plan will be phased in with new students. Therefore, current students will not be directly impacted by this plan.

![Percentage of Students by Parent Income Level](image)

**Background**

(1) Cal Poly is one of, if not the most expensive public university in California, after taking financial aid into account.

The table below, using data from [College Navigator](https://www.collegenavigator.com), shows that the average financial aid grant/scholarship amount for students receiving financial aid at Cal Poly is less than the cost of attendance. Cal Poly is the only public university in California where that is the case. The consequence is that Cal Poly remains one of, if not the most expensive public universities in the state for students who need financial aid to pay for college.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>Avg financial aid grant/scholarship</th>
<th>Diff Avg grant to fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>$7,419</td>
<td>$9,484</td>
<td>$2,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands</td>
<td>$6,802</td>
<td>$8,548</td>
<td>$1,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>$7,806</td>
<td>$8,865</td>
<td>$1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>$6,946</td>
<td>$8,755</td>
<td>$1,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$8,312</td>
<td>$1,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>$6,589</td>
<td>$9,769</td>
<td>$3,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>$6,924</td>
<td>$8,612</td>
<td>$1,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>$7,864</td>
<td>$9,208</td>
<td>$1,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>$6,834</td>
<td>$8,722</td>
<td>$1,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$6,768</td>
<td>$10,159</td>
<td>$3,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>$7,116</td>
<td>$8,777</td>
<td>$1,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>$7,143</td>
<td>$8,725</td>
<td>$1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>$6,977</td>
<td>$9,442</td>
<td>$2,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>$7,396</td>
<td>$8,301</td>
<td>$905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>$7,368</td>
<td>$8,755</td>
<td>$1,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>$6,886</td>
<td>$9,621</td>
<td>$2,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$7,510</td>
<td>$9,481</td>
<td>$1,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>$7,266</td>
<td>$9,251</td>
<td>$1,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>$7,852</td>
<td>$8,729</td>
<td>$877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>$9,943</td>
<td>$6,996</td>
<td>($2,947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>$7,717</td>
<td>$8,250</td>
<td>$533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>$7,880</td>
<td>$7,985</td>
<td>$105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>$7,542</td>
<td>$9,179</td>
<td>$1,637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>Avg grant/school</th>
<th>Diff Avg grant to fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>$14,253</td>
<td>$19,359</td>
<td>$5,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>$14,495</td>
<td>$17,476</td>
<td>$2,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>$13,538</td>
<td>$21,735</td>
<td>$8,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>$14,391</td>
<td>$18,590</td>
<td>$4,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$13,991</td>
<td>$17,161</td>
<td>$3,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
<td>$13,727</td>
<td>$18,273</td>
<td>$4,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
<td>$13,853</td>
<td>$16,159</td>
<td>$2,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC San Diego</td>
<td>$14,415</td>
<td>$18,914</td>
<td>$4,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>$13,240</td>
<td>$16,180</td>
<td>$2,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, the UCs have significantly more financial aid and scholarships than Cal Poly and the CSU. The graph below (source) shows that unmet financial need (or the cost of attendance after financial aid is awarded) is higher for Cal Poly than the average cost of the CSU and the UC except for those students in the highest income bracket.

![Unmet Financial Need (19-20) by Income Ranges for UC's, CSU and Cal Poly](image)

2) Cal Poly and UC Relationship

The CSU maintains a list of "Comparison Institutions" that are similar to Cal Poly in terms of the size of their student bodies, range of majors and degrees offered, the area from which they recruit students (regional vs. national), and so on (source). Although these institutions are appropriate comparators on the basis of specific criteria, they are not the institutions with which we directly compete for highly qualified students. When it comes to competing based on our student profiles, our most relevant competitors are the UC campuses.

Evidence of this competitiveness with the UC comes from several sources. The most important source is the National Student Clearinghouse Competition Analysis. The data from the National Student Clearinghouse allows us to see where students ultimately enrolled after they were admitted to Cal Poly. The graphs below show the data for fall 2020 for new Freshmen. The top graph shows the top five schools where students attended if they did not enroll at Cal Poly. The second graph shows where students who were admitted to Cal Poly but chose not to attend eventually enrolled. The last or lower graph shows the top five locations for enrollment for students who were not selected by Cal Poly.
These data suggest that, especially for students who are offered admission at Cal Poly, UC campuses are their primary alternative destination. Since the UC is offers considerably more in financial aid and scholarships than Cal Poly can offer, it stands to reason that some students (especially those who need financial assistance) are accepting offers from UCs and turning down Cal Poly’s offer of admission because of the significant out-of-pocket price difference.

Further evidence of the need for greater financial aid is found in the relationship between yield and expected family contribution (EFC) for Cal Poly. The lower yield that Cal Poly has historically experienced with lower EFC, first generation, Hispanic and Latinx students is largely driven by a lack of financial aid. Location is a secondary factor.

With this new CBF Student aid, we have an opportunity and obligation to reduce or eliminate the gap between the cost of attendance after financial aid between the UC, Cal Poly and other public universities in California. The UC has recently implemented a similar model and increased tuition, fees and financial aid (see the UC Multi-Year Tuition and Financial Aid Plan). The UC plan, however, will make the gap between our ability and their ability to offer more financial aid and scholarships bigger if we do not take action to increase Cal Poly’s financial aid and scholarships.

3) Cal Poly's Learn By Doing Comprehensive Polytechnic Statewide Mission is Underfunded

Beyond the need for financial aid and scholarships, more funds are needed now to fund our high-cost majors and to fulfill our mission as a Comprehensive Polytechnic University. As noted above, Cal Poly has the highest percentage of high-cost majors in the CSU (with the exception Cal...
Maritime) as a Comprehensive Polytechnic University. The result is that Cal Poly is seriously under-resourced given the cost of its majors. This economic reality is evidenced by the following:

**Annual Core Expenses Per FTES**

A summary of annual core expenses per FTES over time and adjusted for inflation was presented to the [CSU Board of Trustees during the February 2021 retreat](#). The last year of Integrated Post-secondary Educational Data System (IPEDS) data showed that the average core undergraduate expenses of the CSU were significantly lower than the average of the aforementioned comparison institutions (34% lower) and the UC (63% lower). For 2018-19, average annual core expenses per FTES for the CSU was $15,653 compared to $23,706 for the comparison institutions and $41,861 for the UCs. Cal Poly's annual core expenses (cost of instruction plus all university expenses) for 2018-19 was ~$18,000. Again, taking into account the makeup of our majors, our polytechnic Learn by Doing curriculum, and comparing us to the UCs as comparator institutions - it is clear that we are woefully underfunded.

**National Rankings**

National rankings demonstrate that we are an outstanding institution in many areas but also note that we are under resourced in some areas. For example, limited resources for financial aid, overall gaps in financial resources and limited resources for faculty all contribute negatively to our rankings ([see link for description of US News and World Report](#)). In the *Wall Street Journal* ranking, in particular, Cal Poly was found to have one of the highest costs of attendance net of financial aid of all public universities in the US (316th of 337).

|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Out of 126 regional universities in the West:  
  • Graduation and Retention Rank #1  
  • Peer Assessment Rank #1  
  • Faculty Resources Rank #70  
  • Financial Resources Rank #56  
| Out of 796 ranked universities:  
  • 189th overall  
  • 25th public in outcomes  
  • 382nd of 796 universities in Avg Net Price  
  • >500th on all resources  
  • 316th of 337 in Avg Net Price ($21,232 - highest in CA)  
| Out of 600 total ranked universities:  
  • 58th overall  
  • 20th public university  

Out of 122 regional universities in the West:  
• Social Mobility Rank #94

In list of top 100 public universities ranked:  
• 52nd overall  
• 8th overall in CA

Out of top 150 total ranked universities:  
• 149th out of top 150 in size of financial aid

Furthermore, the cost of living in San Luis Obispo and limited career opportunities in San Luis Obispo County for life partners hampers our efforts to recruit and retain talent. Similarly, housing, childcare costs and their availability are growing pressures influencing our ability to recruit and retain faculty and staff. The relative lack of diversity in the area has another impact on faculty and staff recruitment and retention. Cal Poly also competes nationally for faculty and
staff. In some instances, this involves direct competition with universities in locations with a lower cost of living or with industries that offer higher paying jobs. All these factors, individually and combined, stress our limited resources for faculty and staff compensation. To address some of these issues, Cal Poly provided a salary equity program but was only able to implement the program once over the last decade due to our limited financial resources. Failure to enhance our ability to recruit and retain of faculty and staff will diminish our ability to deliver our statewide polytechnic mission over time.

Changes in State / CSU Support of Cal Poly and High-Cost Programs

Decades ago, the CSU funded individual universities based on the nature of programs such as agriculture, architecture, engineering and nursing. CSU campuses with a greater number of these programs received greater funding per full-time-equivalent-student (FTES) than other campuses with fewer of these programs. Over time, and especially as the state reduced investment in higher education, these allocations were reduced. Consequently, the CSU and especially Cal Poly increased fees relative to tuition to make up for these reductions. By contrast, the UC increased tuition. Many intended and unintended consequences resulted from these changes.

The UC approach resulted in greater financial aid for students but the CSU did not see a similar effect for its students because of the difference in financial aid for tuition versus fees. The UC also increased system funding for financial aid. In comparison to the UC, the CSU did not increase tuition at the same level or rate as the UC. These key differences meant that to maintain funding for its statewide polytechnic mission, Cal Poly had to increase campus fees. But, until recently, it was not able to increase financial aid. As an example, the CSU did not allow the state university grant (CSU internal financial aid program) to be used for fees until 2019, which meant that UC students could offset the increasing cost of attendance through financial aid, while CSU students could not. This resulted in creating the economic gap in cost of attendance described above in which low-income students can attend UCs at lower cost after financial aid even when compared with multiple CSUs.

In addition, Cal Poly has experienced greater budget reductions during economic recessions than other CSUs. During the most recent reductions (2010-11, 2019-20), Cal Poly and San Diego State University’s budgets were reduced more than other campuses.

To its credit, the state of California has provided additional investment to higher education over the past few years. For appropriate reasons, the state’s reinvestment in the CSU has not been distributed strictly based on number of California resident students. Graduation Initiative 2025 (GI2025) funding has been focused on CSUs where the percentage of Pell students are higher. While this is understandable, Cal Poly is $8,700,000 behind in recurring dollars attributed to GI2025 compared to a distribution directly correlated with number of California students enrolled in each CSU.

Overall general fund allocations are also adjusted for actual tuition collected – for both California resident and nonresident students alike. Approximately 33% of the residential tuition charge ($5,742 per student per academic year) is dedicated to financial aid. The result is that Cal Poly is a net contributor of financial aid to the CSU. Of the $114 m collected in tuition, the campus provides financial aid to Cal Poly students in the amount of $12 m and contributes approximately $22 m to other CSU students. In essence then, Cal Poly only retains 10.5% of the tuition it collects for financial aid.
Again, Cal Poly’s contribution to financial aid for the rest of the CSU is understandable. And, the high demand to attend Cal Poly by nonresident students translates to an ability for us to bring in additional revenue. As of last academic year, due to higher-than-expected yield of nonresident students, we are currently at 16.4% nonresident students and 83.6% California resident students. Collectively, the funds from our campus fees and our nonresident students have allowed us to cover some of our deficit despite our contributions to the CSU. Nevertheless, our goal is to serve a super-majority of California residents (by at least 85%) and this commitment underscores our additional need for resources.

At present, due to recent budget reductions less restoration, required participation in mandatory cost increases over the past 10 years (including $3.5 m in unfunded general salary adjustments across all employees), $3.5 m equity program several years ago and deficits in funding university functions we estimate an $8.5 m deficit.

In summary, Cal Poly is chronically underfunded for financial aid and support for our statewide polytechnic mission. Equally important, the CSU is not funded adequately for financial aid or resources by the State to deliver its academic mission to a student population with significant economic disadvantages. Consequently, our plan is to generate revenue at the campus level and thus decrease pressure on the state and CSU for funding our mission and our high-cost programs. This is part of our plan— in establishing a campus-based source of financial aid/CFB Student Aid— to support and provide access to all Californians and fulfill our statewide academic mission. It is important to note that this plan is intended to supplement not replace funding from the State and the CSU.

(4) Impact of Proposed Plan

The projected impact on net cost of attendance after aid by family income level is shown in the following graphs. These graphs show projected change in net cost of attendance with (bars representing cohorts) or without (solid line) implementing the increase in the CBF. Contributors to cost of attendance include tuition, fees, room & board, books and travel. For contributors other than tuition, costs increase each year due to cost-of-living adjustments, salary adjustments and cost of inputs (e.g. room and board). The various bars represent different cohorts following the implementation of the proposed plan. The difference between the line (status quo) and the bars represents the reduction ($150,000 parent income and below) or increase (>=$150,000 parent income) in net cost of attendance.
Keeping in mind that the UCs are the major competitors for Cal Poly and given our polytechnic nature, the following graph shows the increase in cost of attendance for the three high investment colleges for residential undergraduate students with family incomes over $150,000 without implementation of the plan and the increase in CBF by cohort as compared to the UC plan with 90% of the UC level depicted. Our increase for these colleges was targeted to meet the financial aid and scholarship requirements and a portion of the funding required for our polytechnic model while staying less than 90% of the cost of attendance for residential undergraduates enrolled in the UC.
Major impacts:

- Implementing the plan and establishing CBF Student Aid will significantly decrease the net cost of attendance for students with family incomes less than or equal to $90,000 per year because they will be receiving larger financial aid packages thanks to CBF Student Aid. In addition, students from families with incomes between $90,000 and $150,000 will pay less than they would if we do not implement the plan.
- Failure to implement The Cal Poly College Based Student Fee Aid and Learn by Doing Plan will result in an increasing net cost of attendance for low- to middle-income California students with family income less than or equal to $150,000 per year. This coupled with the plan approved by the UC will further exacerbate our financial aid deficit with the UC.
- Students with family incomes over $150,000 will pay more to attend Cal Poly in total cost of attendance with the implementation of this plan. However, Cal Poly will continue to be lower in cost than the UC for students from families with incomes over $150,000.

Cal Poly’s statewide polytechnic mission requires enhanced investment because we have a significantly higher percentage of STEM majors than all other CSU campuses (other than Cal Maritime). We have evaluated extensive models to determine the cost of instruction for each major at Cal Poly and are providing an average annual cost of instruction for each college as shown below. As shown, costs are highest in the three colleges already noted as high investment programs and which necessarily have a slightly higher CBF.

Overall, recurring funding for cost of instruction shows a deficit of approximately $11.5 m. It is important to note that the recurring deficit would be significantly higher if not for the revenue from nonresident students.
The proposed plan will also significantly increase Cal Poly’s ability to recruit and retain excellent faculty and staff. Resuming a salary equity program (through CBF funds) as well as building housing for faculty and staff on campus (through non-general fund or non-student fee funds) are goals for the future that will be increasingly difficult to achieve without this plan. Estimates for adjusting staff salaries within academic affairs will be included but have not been modeled in as great a detail as faculty because the CSU has embarked on a staff salary analysis (as recommended and funded by the legislature).

As for faculty salaries, two different salary comparisons illustrate the need for a robust equity plan for faculty. As shown in the graph below, Cal Poly is significantly below the highest salaries across the CSU for Assistant, Associate and especially -- Full Professors. Average salaries for lecturers, however, are the highest in the CSU.
As noted previously, the CSU has compiled a list of comparator universities for comparison of tuition and fees. Using this same framework, average salaries for Full Professors at Cal Poly are significantly lower than all but two of the comparators. As an added note, while our competitors for students are the UCs, it is difficult to compare salaries for faculty who teach only undergraduate and masters and not PhD or professional school students. With these caveats in mind, average faculty salaries for the UCs are significantly higher than Cal Poly, the CSU and the comparator universities shown in the graph below.
Across all comparators, San Luis Obispo is also one of the locations with the highest cost of living. This is primarily due to housing costs.

The estimated recurring investment needed to move faculty salaries to a competitive level relative to the CSU, comparator universities and the cost of living in our area is $9,500,000.

Cal Poly’s Learn by Doing pedagogy relies on the teacher-scholar model of faculty who are required to be excellent teachers and produce original research and creative works. A detailed description of the teacher-scholar model can be found at this link. A practical way to think of the teacher-scholar model is to think of providing time for faculty to participate in projects, research, scholarship and creative activity that allows them to stay current in their field and, as a result, expand Learn by Doing activities for their students. These activities, in turn, result in a more robust and excellent experience for students in formal classes and labs. An added benefit is that faculty and students have the capacity to help California industries solve everyday problems. Just as there is demand for employees, California’s economy demands knowledge to solve problems, and up-skill and re-skill their workforce. Consequently, fully implementing the teacher-scholar model requires providing time for faculty to engage in research, scholarship and creative activity and maintain currency in their field, as well as making funds available for research costs (such as hiring undergraduate and graduate student assistants) which all serves to bolster Learn by Doing for students. In some cases, this also requires increasing the number of faculty in a department or major because we have not kept up with enrollment growth.

Currently, the university is only able to partially fund the teacher-scholar model due to limited funds. Our current projections estimate that we have a deficit of $5.3 m in funding the teacher-scholar model. To better serve students and industries, we estimate a total need of $8.8 m recurring funds. The proposed fee change would make additional revenue available to better fund the teacher-scholar model and these additional funds would benefit faculty and students. As for other areas, funds available will be augmented through robust fundraising efforts.

Learn by Doing and the overall excellence of Cal Poly’s experience and graduates requires a mix of 75% tenure-track and 25% non-tenure-track faculty. While all faculty are important, tenure-track faculty fully participate in the scholarship of their field and are required to carry out service to the department, college, university, and profession. As tenure-track faculty spend time outside the classroom in pursuit of their scholarship (e.g. engineering research, performances), it requires a higher investment to employ tenure-track faculty than non-tenure-track faculty. In addition, given Cal Poly’s geographic location, our ability to hire lecturer faculty on short notice is very limited and often creates challenges to adding sections of courses to support student progress to degree. Cal Poly’s regional accreditation body, the WSCUC/WASC, has set a target for Cal Poly’s tenure density (the percentage of faculty who are tenured or on a track toward tenure) of 75%. Our current rate is 64.2%. Increasing our tenure density by 10-11 percentage points would require considerable additional resources beyond what are currently available.

Our plan is to meet the goal of 75% tenure density in two major phrases. The initial phase is to move tenure density from 64.2% to 70%. Increasing tenure density to 70%, however, requires approximately $7.3 m recurring. The final stage would be to move from 70% to 75% and would require a recurring investment of an additional $5 m for a total of $12.3 m.

Finally, with a more sustainable financial model that allows us to better serve the demographics of California, Cal Poly will be positioned to grow. The demand for many of our majors is well documented. Initial growth will occur through enhancing our partnership with Allan Hancock and Cuesta Community Colleges and by moving to a more year-round operation with the transition from quarters to semesters effective Fall 2025-26. This plan and its future enrollment growth will increase head of household jobs on the Central Coast. This is greatly needed with the pending loss of over 1500 head of household jobs with the scheduled closure of Diablo Canyon Power
Plant. Moreover, increasing diversity of our students, faculty, and staff along with growing jobs in our area will contribute to a more diverse and sustainable Central Coast.

(5) Purpose of the Fee.

Student learning is the original and continuing purpose of Cal Poly’s College Based Fee (CBF). Current CBF are used effectively and somewhat differently across colleges to positively affect Learn by Doing. However, additional revenue above the current level (current base for all colleges but CLA - CLA’s new adjusted level) is required and will be directed to financial aid or to further the academic mission within our colleges. New revenue will be administered by the Provost and Executive Vice President as the academic mission is the result of a matrix of activities across the colleges. Examples of opportunities that will be made possible with the fee include:

- Making a Cal Poly education more affordable and more equitably available to all qualified Californians through increased financial aid and scholarships.
- Appropriately funding the cost of our Learn by Doing instruction model across all colleges and appropriately funding our high investment programs, in support of our comprehensive polytechnic mission.
  - Continuing to sustain and enhance quality degree programs with unique Learn by Doing opportunities that distinctly characterize a Cal Poly education.
  - Scheduling of additional classes and course sections needed to promote timely progress to graduation.
- Increasing tenure density and stabilizing release time strategies and funding, thus enhancing the teacher-scholar model.
  - Enhancing opportunities for student-faculty research / scholarly collaborations and project-based learning.
- Enhancing recruitment and retention of faculty by providing appropriate levels of compensation, and correspondingly student access to faculty and services.
  - Increasing graduation rates and eliminating equity gaps.

The following provides a summary of recurring needs as outlined previously in the document. New revenue will not be sufficient to meet all needs so distribution of available funds across these categories will be determined in the future in relation to the priorities at the time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Recurring Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Instruction</td>
<td>$11,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; Academic Staff Equity Program</td>
<td>$9,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the Teacher Scholar Model</td>
<td>$8,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Tenure Density</td>
<td>$12,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,100,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) Relationship of the proposed fee increase to the Cal Poly Opportunity Fee (CPOF) and Cal Poly Scholars program.

The CPOF was created in 2018 by charging additional fees to nonresident students in order to bring the total cost closer to market for a nonresident student to attend Cal Poly. Consequently, it is important to understand the relationship of the CPOF and the increase in CBF. The success of Cal Poly Scholars suggests that Cal Poly has the knowledge and skill to increase recruitment, retention, and timely graduation of students from low-income backgrounds. However, CPOF is
only assessed to non-resident students, and thus this fee has only so much room to create additional revenue, as a key value for Cal Poly is to serve a super-majority (85% of the student body) of California residents. Therefore, this fee alone is insufficient to increase financial aid, scholarships or to provide other funding needed to make Cal Poly sustainable into the future.

The proposed change to college-based fees is intended to augment the CPOF and other financial aid. It is also intended to bring the university's ability to offer financial aid and scholarships in line with what is available at the UC campuses, which are Cal Poly's main competitors for students.

Cal Poly Scholars is a program that provides scholarships to students from low-income families and who graduated from a Cal Poly Partner High School or community college. In addition, it provides intensive advising and other support services to these students. The program was started in 2012 with 14 students but has significantly increased in recent years. The data show that Cal Poly Scholars are more likely to stay enrolled, earn a higher GPA, and graduate at a higher rate than similar students not in the program.

Because of encouraging data from this program, in 2018 the campus engaged in an alternative consultation process and adopted the Cal Poly Opportunity Fee (CPOF), which raised fees on non-resident students in order to accomplish the goals of the Cal Poly Scholars program. The revenues are dedicated to financial aid (at least 50%), hiring tenure-track faculty (half of the remainder), and providing advising services that benefit Cal Poly Scholars and all students (the rest). As a result of this new, sustainable source of revenue, Cal Poly Scholars has been able to expand and bring in an estimated 657 new scholars for the 2021-2022 academic year. The program is projected to provide scholarships for 900 new students each year by 2023, with a stable population of approximately 3,000 scholars across campus.

Please click this link for a summary of the Cal Poly Scholars and CPOF.

**Revenues and Expenditures**

Revenues above the current CBF revenue (which is managed by colleges – including new CLA CBF) are shown in the graph / table below. All revenue collected for financial aid will be expended in this manner shown below during year 1. The $1,713,041 for our academic mission is anticipated to be expended in year one on Learn by Doing and Teacher-Scholar opportunities. This includes but is not limited to enhancing educational quality and academic experiences, student-faculty research and scholarly collaborations, project-based learning and providing opportunities in support of faculty scholarly work. Future uses (year two and beyond) of the CBF in support of the academic mission will also include strategic priorities in support of enhancements of instructional programs and student experiences (e.g., tenure density, access to classes, faculty equity programs - i.e., faculty/staff recruitment, retention, compensation) and efforts to support academic retention and progress to degree. The aim of the funding in support of academic mission is to remain relevant to Cal Poly’s commitment to Learn by Doing and the Teacher-Scholar model.

Importantly, our initial projections show 60% of revenue dedicated to financial aid and scholarships. It is important to balance lowering the net cost of attendance for lower-income students with providing adequate funding for Cal Poly’s high investment comprehensive polytechnic (and statewide) mission. If, for example, we are not able to recruit and retain faculty and staff then the student experience will be diminished. We are confident that this plan will create greater access for all students to the excellent education we provide at Cal Poly.
As shown above, revenue increases steadily during the first few years as we phase in the fee increase through a cohort model. This process provides predictability and transparency for new students and for the campus. The result is that expenditures are divided into two primary areas:

- Financial aid and scholarships
- Academic mission

As noted earlier, funding is not sufficient to both close the financial aid gap with the UCs and enhance delivery of our comprehensive polytechnic mission. So, at least 60% of revenue will be used to provide financial aid and scholarship through the first four years. Additionally, an aggressive fundraising campaign will be initiated to further augment support for financial aid and scholarships for all students at Cal Poly.

The remainder of the funding (40%) will go towards the academic mission.

![Revenue Generated for College Based Fee Broken Down by Distribution](image)

### Process for Engaging Students

As noted above, we are recommending alternative consultation for the following reasons:

- Due to the lack of financial aid, Cal Poly currently has a lower percentage of students from a lower socioeconomic status (SES) than other public universities in California (see earlier graph depicting distribution of students by parental income). These students (from families with incomes less than $90,000) in the future who will benefit the most from this fee increase but remain a significantly smaller percentage of currently enrolled students. Consequently, a referendum would not allow for these students to be appropriately represented.
- A referendum would also not allow us to fully understand the rationales for support or opposition. The consultation process, by contrast, allows for considerations of the complexity of the support and/or opposition to the fee increase in qualitative not just quantitative terms.
- Alternative consultation also allows us to account for the disparity in the representation of students from a lower socioeconomic status on our campus and focus on a more equitable response.
The plan will be phased in with new students. Therefore, current students will not be directly impacted by this plan.
**Accountability**

Deans and appropriate division leaders will submit an annual report to the President and Provost outlining use and impact of CBF. This will include but not be limited to the impact on target items noted in this document. The President and Provost will, in turn, submit an annual report to academic senate.

**Summary and Objective Analysis**

The primary purpose of the proposed increase to the college-based fee is to provide financial aid and scholarships to students and to appropriately fund Cal Poly’s high investment programs in support of our comprehensive polytechnic mission. This model, once fully implemented, will significantly lower barriers of access to a Cal Poly degree that have arisen over multiple years. These barriers have arisen over multiple years due to the scarcity of financial aid, scholarships and funding for our comprehensive polytechnic mission. The additional funding would provide a sustainable resource base to allow us to lower the net cost of attendance for students with family incomes less than $150,000 (with greatest impact on students with annual family incomes less than $60,000 then followed by students with annual family incomes between $60,000 and $90,000) while increasing the percentage of students with the lowest socioeconomic status (who pay nothing for tuition and fees). Funding will also address the needs of our high-cost programs, academic infrastructure for college needs such as equipment, labs and associated information technology, investment in recruitment and retention of faculty and staff, and enhance tenure density, while also allowing the campus to more fully fund the teacher-scholar model, which are all critical to our Learn by Doing curriculum.
Background

Cal Poly does not have sufficient funding to fulfill its statewide mission as a comprehensive polytechnic university. Other than Cal Maritime, Cal Poly has the highest percentage of high investment majors (architecture, agriculture, and engineering) in the CSU. Simply put, Cal Poly is not funded adequately for the scope of our polytechnic mission. The gap in funding for our statewide polytechnic mission and our need for facilities to carry out a Learn by Doing pedagogy in our high investment majors prevents Cal Poly from growing enrollment and meeting the intense demand from all California students who wish to attend Cal Poly. This also impacts our ability to fulfill the demand from employers that seek to hire more Cal Poly graduates.

Funds from the Cal Poly College Based Fee - Student Aid and Learn by Doing Plan will provide financial aid and scholarships to students and increase funding for Cal Poly’s academic mission as a comprehensive polytechnic university.

The fee would be assessed on newly enrolled students beginning Fall 2022. Subsequent fee increases would be made on a cohort basis. All currently matriculated students would continue to pay current college-based fee rates.

Committee Purpose

The CBF Academic Mission Advisory Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. The committee will provide input on priorities (not funding allocations) for the academic mission component of the Cal Poly College Based Fee - Student Aid and Learn by Doing Plan to the Provost/EVP.

Committee Composition

The committee will include representation from faculty (at least three), students (at least three), associate deans, department heads/chairs and college budget personnel. All nomination recommendations will be submitted to the President and Provost/EVP for endorsement, in consultation with Academic Senate Chair and ASI President.

- At large members:
  - Academic Senate nominated Representatives (2)
  - ASI nominated Representatives (2)
- College and PCS representatives determined by the Provost/EVP in consultation with deans, Academic Senate Chair and ASI President
  - CAED Representative (1)
  - CAFES Representative (1)
  - CENG Representative (1)
  - CLA Representative (1)
  - CSM Representative (1)
  - OCOB Representative (1)
  - PCS Representative (1)
- Presidential Appointee (1)
• Provost & Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (chair, ex-officio)
• Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs Finance and Administration (ex-officio)
• Representative nominated by the Senior Vice President Administration and Finance (ex-officio)
• Budget and Long-Range Planning (BLRP) Representative (ex-officio)

Each member, listed above, will serve a one-year term, and may serve up to two terms.

Summary: 16 [non-voting] members, a minimum of 3 of whom are students, and a minimum of 3 who are faculty, there are 4 ex-officio members. Note: ex-officio members serve as a function of their position.

CBF Academic Mission Advisory Committee Responsibilities

• Discuss and provide advice on the prioritization (not funding allocations) of the academic mission component of the Cal Poly College Based Fee – Student Aid and Learn by Doing Plan

Committee Protocol

• Committee members have an obligation to discharge their responsibilities with the best interest of the university at the forefront of their considerations. While each committee member is appointed to represent a particular area/unit, it is important to rise above self-interest in committee deliberations.

Operation of the CBF Academic Mission Advisory Committee

Typically, appointments to the Committee will occur during the spring for service in the subsequent academic year.

The Committee will meet two-three times during the academic year to discuss priorities for the academic mission component of the Cal Poly College Based Fee - Student Aid and Learn by Doing Plan.

NOTE: The committee operational calendar is to be determined by June 2022. Typical activities will include:

• Committee Orientation
• Committee discusses and advise on prioritization of the academic mission component of the Cal Poly College Based Fee – Student Aid and Learn by Doing Plan
• Office of Budget and Finance prepares academic mission fee revenue projections for the following budget cycle
• Academic Affairs leadership determines and finalizes CBF academic mission priorities, taking into consideration advisory recommendation from the Committee
• Funding allocations are made in support of applicable academic mission priorities
REPORT: Cal Poly Scholars and the Cal Poly Opportunity Fee

Executive Summary

Cal Poly Scholars was created in 2012 to provide financial support to begin to close the financial aid gap at Cal Poly. Cal Poly was then and remains today the most expensive public university in California net of financial aid. This is a critical obstacle to making Cal Poly’s campus more diverse, and thus to fulfilling Cal Poly’s statewide mission of educating all qualified California students.

Cal Poly Scholars receive financial aid to pay for Cal Poly campus fees, a technology stipend, and various means of support through advising, peer mentoring, special campus services and a residential experience that are all designed to ensure personal and academic success.

Results to date show Cal Poly Scholars to be a strong success – worthy of expansion. Our results demonstrate the following:

- Cal Poly Scholars reflect the diversity of California – 85% nonwhite, almost 60% Under Represented Minority (URM; largely Hispanic and Latino)
- Retention and graduation rates of Cal Poly Scholars have met or exceeded those of the general student population at Cal Poly.
- The cost of attending Cal Poly has been the largest factor in suppressing enrollment of URM, first-generation, and low-income students.

The problem that Cal Poly Scholars helped to partially solve was our limited ability to provide adequate financial aid. While the UCs responded to cuts in state funding by increasing tuition, Cal Poly responded by increasing campus fees, which were not covered by the State University Grant (SUG, a major source of financial aid). Prior to 2014, Cal Poly did not include financial aid as a part of increases in campus fees. The cumulative result was an increase in cost of attendance less financial aid. This has been exacerbated by an annual redirection of SUG to other campuses and, before 2019, the prohibition on using SUG for campus fees.

Cal Poly followed the process of alternative consultation to establish the Cal Poly Opportunity Fee (CPOF). Market studies documented that the difference in cost of nonresident attendance between Cal Poly and the UCs presented a pathway to generate funds. The CPOF is a campus-based fee assessed on nonresident students, on a cohort basis. At full implementation the fee will be $8,040 ($2,680/quarter). During the 23-24 academic year, the CPOF is projected to generate $23 million, of which at least 50% is dedicated to financial aid, half of the remainder to advising and student services that benefit Cal Poly Scholars and all students, and the rest to hiring tenure-track faculty with a focus on diversity. The CPOF fee and its increase over the past three academic years has not impacted applications, admissions, enrollments, or retention of nonresident students. Our yields to date, and the UCs’ recently approved increase in resident and nonresident tuition and fees, indicate that the financial sustainability of the program is strong.

The increase in secure financing has been transformative for the program, moving us from <100 Cal Poly Scholars being added per year to approximately 900 being added per year and a running
population of 3,000 (~13% of total enrollment) by the 23-24 academic year. While this source of funding is sustainable, it is not adequate to assist us in providing financial aid for fees for 45% of our students, which is our goal. The success of the program indicates that expanding Cal Poly Scholars through generating additional funding from other sources would allow us to expand access, improve campus diversity, and raise achievement. Our goal is to triple the number of CP Scholars, growing to 10,000 (41-45% of the student body) and achieving Hispanic Serving Institution status by 2028. Through additional strategies, we will also grow all URM groups and take what we have learned from Cal Poly Scholars to enhance the experience, achievement and graduation rates for all Cal Poly students. Our focus during the 2021-2022 academic year is identifying a new, equally sustainable source of funding to support that expansion.
Detailed Report

Background

While Cal Poly currently has lower tuition and fees than a UC or private university, it is nonetheless the most expensive public university in California for the students who are in greatest need, due to its limited ability to offer adequate financial aid and scholarships. In other words, highly qualified, low-income, California-resident applicants who are offered admission often cannot afford to attend Cal Poly, and often receive more generous scholarship and aid packages from other schools, particularly the UCs.

This problem is reflected in our national rankings. For example, the 2021 U.S. News and World Report college rankings show us (in comparison to other masters-level public universities in the West) as achieving the following:

- Graduation and Retention Rank #1
- Peer Assessment Rank #1
- Faculty Resources Rank #70
- Financial Resources Rank #56
- Social Mobility Rank #94

The 2021 Forbes ranking has us as the 58th best university in the U.S. (public or private, regardless of highest degree awarded) and the 21st best public university, but also shows us as being 149th out of 150 when it comes to the size of our average financial aid package.

The 2021 Wall Street Journal rankings tell a similar story:

- 189th overall university
- 52nd overall public
- 316th of 337 publics in Average Net Price less financial aid ($21,232 - highest in CA1)
- 382nd of 796 universities in Average Net Price
- 25th public in outcomes
- >400th in resources available

Due to our limited control over tuition, over the past few decades, Cal Poly has devised multiple fees to support the hands-on pedagogy and high-investment polytechnic majors for which our campus is known. The inclusion of financial aid was considered for previous fees but was not deemed feasible until recently, when Cal Poly included financial aid in an increase in the health fee. The crux of the matter is that the CSU’s State University Grant (SUG) and the state’s Cal Grant Program only cover tuition and do not cover campus-based fees (SUG policy was amended in January 2019 to allow campuses to use it to cover up to 50 percent of campus-based fees2). Federal Pell grants can help, but the maximum amount of aid available from all sources for low-income Cal Poly students does not cover the

---

1 Cal Maritime net cost of attendance less financial aid is higher than Cal Poly but not included in the WSJ rankings.
2 While SUG can be used for fees, our SUG funding is no longer adequate to cover fees and therefore, by default, only covers tuition.
campus fees and room-and-board costs. Moreover, the total SUG aid has actually fallen as Cal Poly has seen our SUG redirected to other campuses by 5% per year for the past few years.

In contrast, during preceding years the UC increased both tuition and financial aid, exacerbating the gap in cost of attendance less financial aid versus Cal Poly and many CSU campuses. The recent decision by the UC to increase tuition over multiple future years and dedicate 45% of the increase in undergraduate tuition for financial aid, which the UC itself predicts will result in a net increase in financial aid, will further worsen the gap. Prior to this increase, 55% of UC students do not pay financial aid or fees. In contrast, 23% of Cal Poly students do not pay tuition and only 14.5% do not pay tuition and fees.

The following comparison was presented during the alternative consultation during the winter quarter of 2018, which led to adoption of the Cal Poly Opportunity Fee (CPOF). This figure displays the difference between university tuition/fees and financial aid for universities within the University of California and the California State University for fiscal year 2016-17—Cal Poly students then paid more than $3,500 in unmet costs. At that time, the gap between tuition/fees and financial aid was larger at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo than at any other UC or CSU – a gap that still exists today, and which will get worse as the UC increases its financial aid. The result of this gap is that low-income students, who are disproportionately URM, do not choose to apply to and/or attend Cal Poly in part because they receive more generous financial aid support from the UCs, and thus enjoy a lower cost of attendance less financial aid at a UC campus.

---

We have continued to monitor these differences. The following graph shows unmet financial need (or cost of attendance less financial aid) for various income brackets for Cal Poly compared to the average of the CSU and UC. As can be seen from the graph, the unmet financial need is higher for Cal Poly than the average of the CSU and the UC except for the highest income bracket. It is clear from the data and from communications from the UC that students from families with over $110,000 annual income are receiving scholarships and aid. Across all income groups, the UCs have significantly more financial aid and scholarships than Cal Poly and the CSU.
**Purpose of the Cal Poly Opportunity Fee (CPOF)**

The primary purpose of the CPOF is to provide increased access for and retention of California low-income students by providing enhanced financial aid support through the Cal Poly Scholars program.

The ultimate goal of CPOF when fully implemented is to provide financial aid for campus fees for California resident undergraduate students from Partner High Schools (high percentage, typically over 66%, of students with free or reduced lunch) and with an Estimated Family Contribution of less than 40% of the cost of attendance for a California resident. The goal of Cal Poly Scholars is to recruit and retain high-achieving, low-income, California-resident undergraduate students and eliminate the achievement gap experienced by these students as soon as feasible (target date – GI2025). In addition to funding through CPOF, potential donors (individuals and companies) are provided the opportunity to contribute to the Cal Poly Scholars program, thus allowing benefits to flow to more students. All Cal Poly Scholars have been (since 2014) required to live in university housing for their first and second years at Cal Poly unless an exemption is approved. AB 540 students are eligible to be Cal Poly Scholars.

The CPOF applies only to non-California-resident students. Out-of-state students do not contribute to the California tax base from which Cal Poly’s state funding comes, and therefore pay a higher amount to attend Cal Poly and other public universities.

**History of the Cal Poly Opportunity Fee**

Cal Poly is a high-value university, which in 2016-17 was $22,500 less expensive than the UC for nonresident students (this gap will increase with UC’s recent decision to increase nonresident tuition effective fall 2022). This was derived from lower residential and nonresidential tuition as well as room and board. (Cal Poly room and board was similar to the average for the CSU and $2,000 lower than the average for the UC.) These differences are very similar today.

The graph below shows Cal Poly’s position in the market across the most populous states at the time CPOF was proposed and adopted. The data is derived from an annual calculation by the state of Texas\(^4\). They base their nonresidential tuition on the average of the states noted.

\(^4\) Current data (2018-19 – similar to 2016-17) used by Texas to set 21-22 nonresident tuition rates can viewed at: https://reportcenter.highered.texas.gov/reports/data/tuition-rate-for-nonresident-and-foreign-students-ay-2021-2022/
In sum, Cal Poly is an excellent education at a relatively low price for nonresident students. Cal Poly’s strong market value provided this campus the opportunity to implement the CPOF. Fifteen percent of gross revenue will be returned to the CSU Chancellor's Office. Following discussions with the Academic Senate and ASI during winter quarter 2018, Chancellor White agreed that Cal Poly would return General Fund in a phased approach (year 1 and 2 – 0% of CPOF revenues; year 3 – 5%; year 4 – 10%; and years 5 and beyond – 15%). It is important to note that this is occurring in the midst of an annual and recurring 5% redirection of Cal Poly’s allocation of the State University Grant (SUG) to other campuses with larger populations of low-income students and differential distribution of GI2025 funds.

Following a lengthy discussion with the Academic Senate and ASI, the President recommended, and the Chancellor approved, CPOF target expenditures to be 50% or higher to Cal Poly Scholars (financial aid) and the remaining balance split evenly between advising support for Cal Poly Scholars and support for all students (25% or less), and hiring tenure track with an emphasis on diversity (25% or less).

**Implementation of CPOF**

Following alternative consultation and discussion/negotiation with the Academic Senate and ASI, the President submitted the CPOF to the Chancellor for implementation in fall of 2019. The fee was assessed on all newly enrolled out-of-state students — all then-current students were and are exempt from the fee.

Incoming out-of-state students paid or will pay the following based on a cohort model. Each class paid or will pay an additional $2,010 a year and continue to pay the same annual fee during their undergraduate tenure at Cal Poly. CPOF will be fully phased in during Fall 2022.

- **Incoming Fall 2019 Class:** $2,010 ($670/quarter)
- **Incoming Fall 2020 Class:** $4,020 ($1,340/quarter)
- **Incoming Fall 2021 Class:** $6,030 ($2,010/quarter)
- **Incoming Fall 2022 Class:** $8,040 ($2,680/quarter)
The proposal included a provision allowing the President, following consultation with the Chancellor, to increase CPOF in years beyond 2022, if needed, to fund Cal Poly Scholars. Current market studies confirm that the combination of total tuition, campus fees and the Cal Poly Opportunity Fee for nonresident students should never exceed 90 percent of the comparable tuition and fees for the average of the UC.

In addition, the percentage of nonresident students admitted to Cal Poly was targeted at 15 percent, which was the level in 2018. Nonresident enrollment, as projected, was not reduced by implementation of the CPOF. In fact, and largely related to the uncertainties of COVID, our yield of nonresident students has been volatile (and greater than our projections), resulting in a current elevation of nonresident students to slightly above 16%. Cal Poly plans over the next few years to reduce our nonresident percentage to 15% as soon as feasible, ideally by preferentially growing low-income, transfer and overall California residents largely in high demand majors.

**Results to Date – Cal Poly Scholars**

The Cal Poly Scholars program seeks to support and retain high-achieving students from California schools by providing financial, academic and community resources. The primary goals of the program include:

- Building a personal support network for college success
- Fostering an inclusive community of Scholars
- Developing knowledge and skills for lifelong success

Goals inherent to establishing Cal Poly Scholars were the achievement of our GI 2025 graduation objectives and elimination of achievement gaps and thus further diversification of Cal Poly’s student body by exceeding 25% Hispanic and Latino students by the end of this decade.

Cal Poly Scholars was established with a first class of 14 Engineering majors in 2012. Since its inception, the Cal Poly Scholars program has expanded to include undergraduates pursuing degrees in over 50 majors across all six academic colleges at Cal Poly. One of the motivations for the creation of Cal Poly Scholars was the recognition early on that while the number of Hispanic and Latino applicants had increased significantly, the yield of low-income, high-achieving and majority minority (and also Hispanic and Latino students) was significantly lower than with other students. As noted previously, based on our research, the biggest reason Cal Poly is the least diverse public university in California is due to the high net cost of attendance less financial aid (i.e. unmet financial need).

Students are automatically considered for the Cal Poly Scholars program when they apply for financial aid by filing the FAFSA or California Dream Act application. Currently, there is no additional application process, and offers to join the program are only made after a student is admitted. Scholars are selected at the discretion of the Office of Financial Aid & Scholarships, in a manner consistent with Prop. 209 and all relevant statutes.
The program was started through campus General Funds (growth in revenue from nonresident students) and expanded development efforts. Prior to initiation of the CPOF, 426 students, first limited to First Time Freshman (FTF) Engineering majors and then expanded to all majors and transfers, were enrolled from 2012 through 2018.

Initial cohorts were based on EFC and received an annual, renewable scholarship of $3-3,500. Following cohorts received an annual, renewable scholarship equal to campus fees up to $5,000 due to the generosity of some donors (e.g. Northrop Grumman Cal Poly Scholars).

During their first year enrolled at Cal Poly, a $900 technology credit is provided toward the purchase of a laptop, tablet or desktop computer. All fees to attend orientation and WOW (Week of Welcome) are waived. It is also important to note that Cal Poly added financial aid for housing in 2018 for students with an EFC <$6000, resulting in an average of 10% housing discount.

Cal Poly Scholars has been a Learn by Doing experience. Changes have been made to make the program better. One refinement after the initial cohorts was to focus offers to low-income, high-achieving students from Partner High Schools (as previously noted, these are high schools with high percentages of students receiving free or reduced lunch—typically 66% or higher).

A second change was to require that all Cal Poly Scholars live on campus for two years, because our research suggested that doing so was associated with better academic outcomes. This has now been expanded in a phased program to require all Cal Poly FTF (optional for transfers) to live on campus for two years.

Other program components include Scholar Mentors (paid student leaders – upper division Cal Poly Scholars), proactive & intentional advising, and UNIV 100 – a required course for first-time, first-year Cal Poly Scholars that emphasizes building community, exploring campus resources and developing skills for college success. All scholars with a cumulative GPA of <=2.5 and / or on Academic Probation/Subject to Disqualification have additional required advising interactions.

Initial cohort numbers were slightly reduced as it was important to establish our advising network prior to ramping the program up from a cohort of 90 in 2018 to the following actual and projected cohorts as funded by CPOF:

- 2019 – 277 (actual)
- 2020 – 386 (actual)
- 2021 – 657 (actual, pre-census)
- 2022 – 900 (projected)
- 2023 and beyond – 925 new per year with 3,000 total Cal Poly Scholars

The graphic on the following page depicts the demographics of Cal Poly Scholars as of Fall 2020 (n=663). Cal Poly Scholars were 85% non-white. It is important to note that Cal Poly Scholars are majority Hispanic and Latino and Asian. Cal Poly Scholars does not significantly
impact enrollment of other URM groups. It is also important to note that Cal Poly has
implemented and planned several Prop. 209 compliant scholarship programs focused on
growing the percentage of other URM groups. In particular, and with proper funding from
donors and other sources, our goal is to grow our percentage Black population from <1% to
over 4% by 2030.
SCHOLARS: FALL 2020 SNAPSHOT

85% Pell-Eligible

3 683

58% URM

4 44% First Gen

45% Female

SCHOLARS

ALL CAL POLY

FEDERAL RACE/ETHNICITY

SCHOLARS

ALL CAL POLY

683 Scholars reached, to date

191 Degrees awarded, to date

790 Total enrollment, fall 2020

1 Eligible for Federal Pell Grant as of Fall 2020 (census).

2 Underrepresented Minority: Federal race/ethnicity is Hispanic/Latino, Black/African American, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, or multiracial with at least one of the prior categories.

3 First Generation: Neither parent/guardian attended college. Aligned with CSU Chancellor’s Office definition.

4 Legal sex. Remaining percentage represents undergraduate whose legal sex is male.

5 As reported to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Unknown includes Non-Resident Foreign National.

We also have strong data showing that retention rates of Cal Poly Scholars are higher or at least equal to the average of Cal Poly students. The following graph depicts 1-, 2- and 3-year retention rates from all cohorts from 2013 to 2019.

The next graph drills down into details of the first year retention of our first CPOF cohort of Cal Poly Scholars in 2019. In all but one category, Cal Poly Scholars exceeded the same group of non-Cal Poly Scholar students.
Collectively, these data are strong evidence that our retention rates will be translated into outstanding graduation rates. While preliminary, the four-year graduation rate of the 2016 Cal Poly Scholars cohort (63.2%) exceeded the rate of our general student population (59.6%).

Surveys of Cal Poly Scholars emphasize the reasons for success. The largest decision factors in selecting Cal Poly were: overall financial aid, Cal Poly Scholars aid, and cost of tuition. Over 95% of Cal Poly Scholars reported feeling supported by the program. Equally important, survey results demonstrate that programming enhanced Cal Poly Scholars’ sense of belonging. Over 79% of the students reported that being a scholar “helps me feel like I belong at Cal Poly,” 95% feel “the community cares about my success” and 83% “feel comfortable being myself with other Scholars.”

**Financial Report – CPOF**

The table below depicts revenue and actual or budgeted expenses. We have also included use of donor or SUG funds to support Cal Poly Scholars. The Chancellor allowed use of SUG for campus fees beginning in 2019.

As noted previously, the amount of funds for financial aid was adjusted the first two years in order to establish an advising program appropriate for success. However, the shortfall was more than made up through donations and the new ability to use SUG for campus fees, and the total amount of financial aid exceeded 50% of CPOF revenue. Retention and graduation rates to date verify the effectiveness of the program.

Donor support for Cal Poly Scholars and later program support is expected to grow due to pledges and ongoing commitments.

As planned when CPOF was created, we have allocated funds for 21-22 to support enhanced advising, diversity and inclusion (cultural) programs that will support the entire Cal Poly Community. These include establishing a Hispanic and Latino Center, a Native American and Indigenous Cultural Center, enhanced support for multiple programs including the Black Academic Excellence Center, Transfer Center and continued expansion of advising programs and the BEACoN Research and Mentoring Program.
## Conclusion

The CPOF and Cal Poly Scholars program have proven successful to date as evidenced by 1) retention rates of Cal Poly Scholars matching or exceeding students not in the program, and 2) Students from Partner High Schools, Hispanic and Latino, and low-income groups in the program having higher retention rates than cohort non-Cal Poly Scholars. As projected, demand for Cal Poly by nonresident students has not declined. However, the scope for using nonresident funds for the purpose of closing our financial aid gap with the UCs is very limited. In other words, the Cal Poly Opportunity Fee was a good start, and will provide stable funding for the future, but it cannot be expanded.

The key to the future is to find additional resources (well beyond what CPOF can provide) to move the program from 3,000 to 10,000 Cal Poly Scholars. This, coupled with Prop. 209 compliant scholarships to quadruple the number of Black students at Cal Poly, will transform Cal Poly for the future. We will also grow all URM groups and take what we have learned from Cal Poly Scholars to enhance the experience, achievement and graduation rates for all students. As noted above, our focus during the 2021-2022 academic year is identifying a different, equally sustainable source of funding to support that expansion.