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Executive Summary

Emerging from the recession of the early 1990’s, Cal Poly developed a multi-pronged strategic plan designed to preserve and enhance its unique “learn by doing” philosophy and polytechnic mission within the CSU system.

The Cal Poly Plan established multiple goals aimed at improving curriculum, graduation rates and financial support necessary to meet the university’s educational commitment to students and address California’s growing need for university trained professionals in applied, polytechnic disciplines. Today Cal Poly has the largest undergraduate enrollments in architecture, engineering and agriculture in the CSU, producing a significant portion of the technological and scientific workforce for California’s critical industries.

The Cal Poly Plan may also be seen as a response to the Trustees’ urging that each CSU campus should design strategies uniquely appropriate for its mission and as a long-term, concerted effort to take more responsibility for our own future.

The Trustees enthusiastically endorsed the Plan at its inception. [See attached, Minutes from July 1996 Trustees Committee of the Whole]. Since implementation of the Plan 13 years ago, Cal Poly has, to a remarkable degree, achieved the Plan’s goals and objectives.

A cornerstone of the plan was the ability to assess campus-based fees that would be used for academic purposes. Those fees were formally authorized by the Trustees in 1996 and delegated to the Chancellor and the presidents to execute. [See attached resolutions.]

The Cal Poly Plan fees, twice approved by our students, in 1996 and 2002, have enabled Cal Poly to achieve two important goals: (1) to improve the size and quality of our relatively higher-cost polytechnic programs, and (2) to achieve a higher graduation rate and reduce the average time-to-degree.

Cal Poly’s polytechnic programs require resources that significantly exceed the average per student funding provided by the State. The costs are higher due to the higher percentage of courses taught in laboratory, field or specialized studio settings, with lower student/faculty ratios. The focus on project-based, learn by doing requires additional technology infrastructure, laboratory equipment, shops and testing facilities.

Increasing the graduation rate will contribute directly to better meeting the growing needs of the scientific and technological workforce. Decreasing the time to complete a degree will reduce the cost to the State to produce a graduate and reduce the total cost of education for students and their families.
In March of this year, our students voted overwhelmingly to support another increase in Cal Poly’s campus-based fees to continue progress on these two goals. Nearly one-half of the student body voted and 78 percent endorsed a $100-per-quarter increase in academic fees to begin in Fall 2009 and grow to a $300-per-quarter increase over three years.

Following the students’ overwhelming vote, as California’s budget problems mushroomed, the Chancellor in April requested that we delay implementation of the fees until there was more clarity regarding the 2009-10 budget. Following the governor’s recent signing of the Legislature’s 2009-10 budget, the CSU system was dealt a $584 million cut, and Cal Poly’s share is $33.7 million, approximately 15 percent of our operating budget.

Against this backdrop, the proposed increase in Cal Poly’s academic fees is ever more essential to maintaining the commitment in the Cal Poly Plan (crafted jointly by students, faculty and the administration), regarding preservation and expansion of access to quality academic offerings.

It’s no exaggeration to say that the ability to raise funds through the student-approved fees has given Cal Poly the resources to expand the quality and quantity of trained scientific and technical employees that California’s industry desperately needs. The challenges of the 21st Century require that Cal Poly not merely continue to do what it has done so well, to produce well-trained scientific and technical professionals, but must also improve on its record.

The professionals we graduate must be ever more adept at solving complex problems, and must be capable of shaping and leading public policy.

While we understand that maintaining enrollments in the CSU is not possible in the current budget environment, the fact remains that California needs even more well-trained professionals, particularly in agriculture and the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) fields and Cal Poly must continue to take positive steps to meet this need. By making additional improvements in graduation rates and by further shortening time to degree, we will be able to continue to make progress, even in the midst of retrenchment in enrollments.

As to the impact on affordability of a Cal Poly degree, even with our proposed increases, total annual academic costs of attending Cal Poly will still be one of the best values in the nation, and well below the average cost of attending a University of California campus. After implementation of the $326-per-quarter increase to the State University Fee in accordance with recent Board of Trustees actions and including the initial $100-per-quarter of the Cal Poly Plan fee, Cal Poly students will pay $6,498 for academic year 2009-10, compared to $5,043 in 2008-2009. By comparison, a full-time undergraduate student will pay $8,720 to attend the typical
University of California campus, fully 34 percent more than it would cost to attend Cal Poly ($6,498).

As approved by students, this $100-per-quarter increase in academic fees, intended to begin in Fall 2009, would grow to a $300-per-quarter increase over three years.

Importantly, we have committed that these increased fees will not adversely affect high-need students; they will be protected through Cal Poly scholarship support and by increased access to PELL grants.

The proposed fee increases – worth $21 million annually when fully implemented – will enable Cal Poly to continue to improve the graduation rate, decrease the average time to complete a degree, and increase the number of graduates in agriculture, architecture, science, technology, engineering and mathematics, as well as increasing the number of K-12 science and math teachers. We have no doubt that the fees will prove to be an excellent return on investment for students and their families, for taxpayers and for the CSU.

With the increased fees, we will be able to achieve several, critically important outcomes.

We will preserve and ultimately expand access to classes, increase graduation rates, and shorten time to degree. Our objective is to do what is necessary to achieve a graduation rate and average time-to-degree that equals the UC’s top tier, given that the profile of Cal Poly’s students is comparable to students at these UC campuses.

By graduating students in less time, we will increase access for more students.

An improvement in time-to-degree by even one quarter will save a Cal Poly student approximately $5,000 in fees and living expenses as well as get the student into the workforce earlier.

Increased throughput of students means we will make better use of our educational infrastructure, thus using taxpayers’ dollars more efficiently.

Without the fee increase, we cannot improve time-to-degree nor can we maintain current target enrollment levels that exceed our funding level, particularly in agriculture, architecture, engineering and the other STEM related fields.

Industry leaders have expressed concern to us about whether Cal Poly will have the financial stability to continue producing the current quantity and quality of graduates. Donors have
similarly expressed their growing concern that failure to stabilize a funding model for Cal Poly will be a disincentive for philanthropic fund raising.

Cal Poly takes great pride in knowing that we have been clear about our objectives, that we have been creative and successful in finding ways to support and achieve those objectives. We are particularly proud of our students’ unwavering support of the Cal Poly Plan goals and their continued participation in the process to allocate funds consistent with their academic needs for the past thirteen years.

By implementing the mandate from the students and responding to the requests from leaders of California’s industry as well as the desires of our friends and donors, Cal Poly will use the revenue from this fee increase to continue to serve California with distinction.

Historic Context – The Cal Poly Plan

The Cal Poly Plan was born more than 15 years ago in the wake of steep budget cuts triggered by California’s recession in the early 1990s. At that time, the faculty, administration, students and staff engaged in a thorough review of our long-term objectives for Cal Poly. That review considered how we were going to adjust to a newly instituted campus funding allocation using the CSU average marginal cost per FTES from the historical allocation by course mode and level which accounted for differential program costs on a campus by campus basis. In developing the strategic plan for the university in 1994-95, we specifically committed to:

- Renew and enhance educational quality
- Increase student learning and reduce time to degree
- Increase enrollment with an emphasis on growth in the colleges of agriculture, architecture, and engineering
- Improve institutional productivity and strengthen accountability

It’s worth underscoring that Cal Poly’s campus-based academic fee was enthusiastically endorsed by the Trustees in 1996 and that these fees are consistent with the Trustees’ expressed desire that each campus should take responsibility, insofar as possible, for its own distinctive mission. One of the most gratifying aspects of the Cal Poly Plan is that it has been a well-planned strategy to assume more responsibility as stewards of Cal Poly’s distinctive mission.
These goals became the heart of the Cal Poly Plan, which we developed consistent with the
Trustees’ direction that each campus should take responsibility, insofar as possible, for its own
distinctive mission.

The Trustees enthusiastically embraced our strategy and the details of the Plan, as the minutes
show from the July 1996 meeting when President Warren Baker gave an in-depth progress
report. Reactions ranged from “very impressed” to “terrific approach” to “a model for the rest of
the CSU.” At that same meeting the Trustees underscored their desire that campuses “develop
unique plans premised upon their own character, mission, and location.” [See attached minutes
of the July 10, 1996 Trustee Committee of the Whole.]

That notion that each campus has a differentiated mission was reiterated in the 2008 “Access to
Excellence” report: “California is too big and diverse to have a one-size-fits-all approach to
university education. The twenty-three universities that comprise the CSU each have distinct
strengths, serve distinct communities … [and are] highly differentiated institutions.”

Student Support

As per the Trustees’ directive that the administration consult with various campus constituencies
including the students, who indicated their support of a fee increase, we initiated Phase I of the
Cal Poly Plan at the beginning of the 1996-1997 academic year supported by a $45 per quarter
university-wide academic fee.

In 2002, students voted overwhelmingly to endorse an additional $200 per quarter academic fee
in all colleges ($125 in Liberal Arts) to be retained and invested within each of the colleges in
further support of the Cal Poly Plan after consultation with student committees.

This past March, as previously noted, nearly half of our students participated in another advisory
dvote; again, an overwhelming number (78 percent) endorsed increasing college academic fees
over the next three years, resulting in an academic fee totaling $562 per quarter, a $300-per-
quarter increase for students in all of the colleges (more in Liberal Arts, catching up from its
lower fee set in 2002). The students voted to phase in this increase over a three-year period,
starting with an additional $100 fee-per-quarter in Fall 2009.

Again, as previously noted, even with those increases, Cal Poly’s total annual academic costs
will still be one of the best values in the nation. After implementation of the $326-per-quarter
increase to the State University Fee in accordance with recent Board of Trustees actions and
including the initial $100-per-quarter of the Cal Poly Plan fee, Cal Poly students will pay $6,498
for academic year 2009-10, compared to $5,043 in 2008-2009. Even with these increases, it will
cost a full-time undergraduate student fully 34 percent more to attend the typical University of
California campus ($8,720) than it would cost to attend Cal Poly ($6,498).
Nor will these increased fees adversely affect high-need students; they will be protected through Cal Poly scholarship support and by increased access to PELL grants.

By their expressions of support for increased academic fees, our students have repeatedly endorsed the importance and value of Cal Poly's style of education embedded in "learn by doing" and created in an environment different from most campuses.

**Mission Differentiation**

Indeed, among the CSU campuses, Cal Poly is highly differentiated not only in its mission, historically identified in the California Education Code, but also in whom it serves and the outcomes it delivers:

- **Mission:** As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly is charged with developing well-trained scientific and technical professionals. More than 30 percent of total student credit units at Cal Poly are in resource-intensive scientific and technical program areas, specifically, agriculture, architecture, and engineering. At almost all other CSU campuses, these programs and nursing represent 10 percent or less of the curriculum. [See chart, next page.]
Student Credit Units-Discipline by Campus Chart, 2006-2007 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>Humboldt</th>
<th>Pomona</th>
<th>San Marcos</th>
<th>Sonoma</th>
<th>Stanislaus</th>
<th>Bakersfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.94%</td>
<td>11.17%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>18.45%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan Island</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>Domin Hills</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
<td>4.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont Bay</td>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>San Bernard</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Fran</td>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>6.46%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>5.11%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>7.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Chart](chart.png)
- **Service area:** Cal Poly serves students from all across the State of California rather than from a geographic radius, as is usual at most other CSU campuses.
  
  - Fewer than 10 percent of Cal Poly's students come from the four Central Coast counties of Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara. The bulk of Cal Poly’s students come from the Bay Area, Southern California, and the Central Valley. Hence, Cal Poly is a large residential campus.

- **Outcomes:** Despite higher-cost polytechnic programs, Cal Poly ranks 12th among CSU campuses in funding per student credit unit (General Fund + State University Fees). Cal Poly receives $735 per student credit unit; the CSU average is $730.
  
  - Cal Poly ranks among the nation’s top 10 universities producing graduates in engineering, architecture, and agriculture. In 2006-07, Cal Poly was the top producer of all CSU bachelor’s degrees awarded in agriculture, architecture, and engineering. [See chart, next page]
2006-07 Bachelor's Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplines</th>
<th>All Other CSU Campuses</th>
<th>Cal Poly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Bachelor's Degrees Awarded (70,887)</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Bachelor's Degrees Awarded (982)</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture Bachelor's Degrees Awarded (539)</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Bachelor's Degrees Awarded (3,701)</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Disciplines are based on the NCES Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) coding structure. Agriculture excludes Recreation, Nutrition, Earth Sciences, Ag. Sci., and BRAE. Architecture is the individual program only from SLO and Pomona campuses. Engineering excludes Computer Sci. and Software Eng., but includes BRAE, Arch. Eng., and Construction Mgmt.
**Success in Attaining Goals**

We have delivered on the goals we set for ourselves in the Cal Poly Plan, and the student-approved academic fees have provided indispensable support in delivering those results.

**Goal 1:** We have preserved and strengthened the quality of our academic programs. As a result:

- Cal Poly increasingly has been recognized for its academic excellence.
  - The College of Engineering, Cal Poly's largest college and the ninth largest undergraduate program in the country, was named the nation's top public, non-doctoral engineering school in U.S. News & World Report's 2008 Best Colleges rankings.
  - The College of Architecture and Environmental Design's undergraduate program was recently ranked third in the nation by the journal DesignIntelligence. (Cornell University and Virginia Polytechnic ranked #1 and #2.) The College is one of the top two in enrollment in the country.
  - The College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences is the country's fourth largest agriculture college, produces the most agriculture graduates in California and has the state's largest wine and viticulture program.
  - The Orfalea College of Business recently was ranked one of only two public universities in California in the nation's Top 100 undergraduate business programs by Business Week magazine. UC Berkeley was the other.

- Demand for Cal Poly's programs has increased dramatically.
  - In Fall 1994, nearly 9,800 students applied for admission as first-time freshmen; one of every two was accepted. In Fall 2008, nearly 33,350 first-time freshman applications poured in; one in three was accepted. [See chart, next page.]
- UC admission data consistently show that UC campuses lose more cross-admitted students to Cal Poly than to any other university outside the UC.

**Goal 2:** We have substantially improved access to classes, graduation rates, and time to degree, particularly in the STEM majors. **Our objective is to do what is necessary to achieve a graduation rate and average time-to-degree that equals the UC’s top tier.** This goal was suggested by the last WASC accreditation visitation team and is consistent with the team’s observation that Cal Poly’s student profile is directly comparable to the UC student profile.

- Cal Poly’s overall graduation rates are the best in the CSU and have increased significantly since the inception of the Cal Poly Plan. The six-year graduation rate has increased 18.6 percent; the five-year rate has improved 44.4 percent and the four-year rate has more than doubled.
  - 6-year rate for Fall 1990 cohort was 58.5%; Fall 2002 cohort was 69.4%
  - 5-year rate for Fall 1991 cohort was 42.8%; Fall 2003 cohort was 61.8%
  - 4-year rate for Fall 1992 cohort was 11.5%; Fall 2004 cohort was 26.4%

- Cal Poly’s graduation rate for science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) majors is also the best in the CSU, more than double the average six-year rate for all other CSU campuses, nearly triple the five-year rate and nearly double the four-year rate for the other CSU campuses.
  - Cal Poly’s 6-year rate for Fall 2001 cohort STEM majors was 47.3%; The CSU average without Cal Poly was 20%
  - Cal Poly’s 5-year rate for Fall 2002 cohort STEM majors was 43.9%; The CSU average without Cal Poly was 15.4%
  - Cal Poly’s 4-year rate for Fall 2003 cohort STEM majors was 9.5%; The CSU average without Cal Poly was 5.2%

- Following the approval of Proposition 209, which bans consideration of gender and ethnicity in admissions, Cal Poly has partnered with high schools with large percentages of underserved student populations in an effort to ensure that Cal Poly is as accessible to as broad and diverse a California student population as possible. As a result, applicants admitted to Cal Poly for Fall 2008 generally mirrored California’s ethnicity among high school graduates eligible to attend Cal Poly.
### Ethnic Proportions of Pipeline Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>African or Native American</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>CA Public Elementary Enrollment (K-8)</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>CA Public Secondary Enrollment (9-12)</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>CA Public High School Graduates</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>California College-Going (enrolled at CCC)</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>California College-Going (enrolled at CSU)</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>California College-Going (enrolled at UC)</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Cal Poly Applicants</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fall 2008</em></td>
<td>Cal Poly Eligible (exempt from remediation)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Cal Poly Selected</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>Cal Poly Enrolled</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "Cal Poly Eligible" was determined by using test score values that exempted students from remediation.

- Cal Poly also has contributed significantly to the diversity of the STEM professions:
  - Cal Poly is ranked among the top 10 educators of Hispanic engineers and agriculture graduates nationwide. [Source: Diverse Issues in Higher Education, 2007, most recent available]
  - Cal Poly produced almost twice as many Hispanic engineers as the highest-ranked UC Campus (Berkeley). [Source: Diverse Issues in Higher Education]
  - Cal Poly's graduation rates among STEM majors are significantly above the CSU average for all students and for minority students. [Source: CSU Analytics/CSRDE data]
  - Cal Poly's overall graduation rates among minority students are substantially better than the CSU average for Latinos and African-Americans. [Source: CSU Analytics/CSRDE data]
Goal 3: We have increased enrollment overall and in the colleges of agriculture (CAFES), architecture (CAED), and engineering (CENG).

Cal Poly Enrollment Trends
Goal 4: We have achieved a high level of institutional productivity and accountability.

- In a study performed by the Education Trust aggregating student-related costs and graduation rates at universities across the nation to develop an efficiency calculation (annual student-related costs divided by six-year graduation rates) Cal Poly’s annual cost per FTES graduated ($12,590) is lowest of all California Public universities. The CSU median is $18,193; the UC median is $23,000. Cal Poly’s cost effectiveness is a result of the combined impact of its relatively low cost and relatively high freshman cohort graduation rates. [Source: Education Trust]

Managing Resources in Support of Cal Poly’s Polytechnic Mission

As you would expect of any good business plan, the Cal Poly Plan included a multi-pronged resource management and development strategy designed to utilize our human and capital resources as wisely as possible, as well as to augment revenue.

This became especially prudent in light of the state’s retreat from higher education funding over the past few decades. As one indicator of that shrinkage, state funds in 2002 supported 83 percent of the cost of a Cal Poly education; today the state pays 71 percent. In that same period, Cal Poly experienced $33 million in state funding reductions.

To address the deterioration in state support, we have undertaken a number of measures to control and reduce costs. A few examples:

- A 40 percent reduction in IT maintenance costs that also yielded improved functionality campus-wide for students as well as faculty and staff.

- A nearly 10 percent reduction in utility costs per square foot since 2005.

- A 20 percent reduction in custodial staff after rigorous benchmarking to national cleaning standards and staffing levels.

We have also worked hard to increase support from the private-sector and other sources:

- At the conclusion in 2004 of Cal Poly’s first-ever fundraising campaign, more than $264 million was raised to support a variety of academic programs, capital projects, and to build the endowment.
- As of the end of FY 2007-08, Cal Poly’s endowment reached $180 million. The endowment has paid out an annual average of $6.4 million the past three years in support of Cal Poly programs, scholarships, endowed professorships, and other educational uses.

- Today, Cal Poly raises approximately $30 million annually in gifts, pledges, and bequests from our generous alumni and other private contributors, with a recent one-year high of $95 million.

- Currently, the Cal Poly Plan student academic fees generate $16.7 million annually. With full implementation of the recently approved fee increases, they will generate $37.6 million annually, sufficient to stabilize our ability to maintain our high-quality, higher-cost programs as well as enable us to continue making rapid progress in reducing time-to-degree completion.

- Funds derived annually from sponsored research (grants and contracts) have also increased, from $7 million in 1995 to about $25 million this year.

Consistent with the Cal Poly plan’s goal of sustaining the University’s polytechnic focus and programs, Cal Poly has implemented an ambitious new Master Plan.

- We have constructed over $71 million in instructional facilities since 2001 to meet enrollment demands and to support student learning particularly in the fields of engineering, architecture, agriculture, and science.

- Our donors, recognizing the importance of state-of-the-art support facilities for our students to remain competitive in the global economy, have provided $30 million in funding for the Advanced Technology Lab, the Bonderson Projects Center, the Simpson Strong-Tie Materials Demonstration Lab, and the Center for Science.

- We also have built over $400 million in student housing recognizing Cal Poly’s state-wide service area. These new housing complexes, with their associated programs, support student learning and promote academic success.

*The Challenges Ahead*

It’s satisfying that we have met the objectives we set out for ourselves when we conceived the Cal Poly Plan.

We have achieved a national reputation for academic quality, particularly in our core programs; we have improved graduation rates; we have reduced time to degree; we have increased institutional productivity and strengthened accountability, and we have accomplished all of this while managing within constrained resources.
We are keenly aware that the challenges that precipitated the Cal Poly Plan remain with us today, and, indeed, are even more complex and demanding. The challenges of the 21st Century require that Cal Poly not merely continue to do what it has done so well to produce well-trained scientific and technical professionals, but must also improve on its record. California needs even more well-trained professionals, particularly in agriculture and the STEM fields. These professionals must be ever more adept at solving complex problems, and must be capable of shaping and leading public policy.

All of the initiatives we have undertaken to build a solid financial footing – fundraising to build the endowment and to support annual operating costs, successful attainment of research grants and contracts, and the implementation of student academic fees – have helped Cal Poly improve its distinctive program offerings. All of them must continue to be part of our overall strategy as we strive to continue serving California with distinction.
Attachments

- Trustees of the California State University, "Minutes of Meeting of the Committee of the Whole," July 9-10, 1996.
- CSU Board of Trustees Resolution, "California State University Student Fee Policy," May 14-15, 1996
MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Trustees of The California State University
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California

July 10, 1996

Members Present
Martha C. Fallgatter, Chair
William Hauck, Vice Chair
William D. Campbell
Ronald L. Cedillos
Jim Considine
Gray Davis, Lieutenant Governor, ex officio
Bernard Goldstein
James H. Gray
Barry Munitz, Chancellor, ex officio
Joan Otomo-Corgel
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Ted J. Saenger
Michael D. Stennis
Anthony M. Vitti
Frank Y. Wada
Stanley T. Wang

Members Absent
Roland E. Arnall
Ali C. Razi

Chancellor's Office Staff
Molly Corbett Broad, Executive Vice Chancellor
Peter S. Hoff, Senior Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
June M. Cooper, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources and Operations
Richard P. West, Vice Chancellor, Business and Finance
Christine Helwick, General Counsel

The meeting was called to order by Chair Fallgatter at 9:55 a.m.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the meeting of May 15, 1996, were approved by the committee as presented.

Partnership Proposal—California State University, San Marcos Student Health Services Center
Vice Chancellor West mentioned that this was a follow-up to an item presented to the committee in July 1995 for a partnership proposal between CSU San Marcos student health services and Palomar/Pomerado Health Systems (PPHS) and turned the presentation over to President Stacy.
President Stacy stated that the proposal represents the completion of planning efforts to identify much needed physical space as well as outstanding medical care for the students at San Marcos. The item asks the committee to approve the concept of a long-term lease agreement for the use of space for student health services provided by the Palomar/Pomerado Health Systems for California State University, San Marcos.

President Stacy added that the proximity of the PPHS medical office complex to the campus makes it ideal in that students would benefit from having a variety of specialized medical opportunities at their immediate disposal.

Trustee Vitti asked President Stacy to elaborate on the economics of the partnership comparing it to the costs involved if the university were to undertake building on the campus. President Stacy stated that it would take approximately $7 million and two years to construct a facility on campus to house the student health services.

Mr. Russell Decker, director of campus physical planning at CSU San Marcos, added that this partnership would be much more beneficial to the campus because not only would the campus avoid the $7 million cost of building a full-sized student health center but the students would benefit from having access to specialized medical services such as radiology, laboratory, and physical therapy in the same building.

Trustee Vitti asked if San Marcos presently charged a separate fee for health services and, if so, would this partnership impact the fee. Mr. Decker answered that the fee for student health services is currently $6.00 and that there is no particular reason to increase the fee at this time.

Trustee Pesqueira congratulated Dr. Stacy on this venture and added that Palomar/Pomerado Health Systems is a good health care system. The ability for students to have a primary physician who can refer them to specialists in the same building will be convenient and cost effective.

Trustee Otomo-Corgel echoed Trustee Pesqueira’s support.

The committee recommended approval of the proposed resolution (RCOW 07-96-02).

Update on the Cal Poly Plan, San Luis Obispo

Trustee Fallgatter asked Chancellor Munitz to introduce the item.

Chancellor Munitz introduced the item with some background information. He stated that the leadership for the CSU have been talking about being more creative in the way the CSU does business particularly in the context of how to handle the gap between available resources and enrollment demands at a campus like Cal Poly San Luis Obispo where there exists a difficult ratio between applicants for admission and spaces available. President Baker and his staff have been searching for ways to make Cal Poly San Luis Obispo available to more students but also to increase the number and strength of the faculty, change the use of the physical facility, and look more creatively at the impact of technology on the educational process.

Chancellor Munitz asked President Baker to give the committee an overview of the Cal Poly Plan and the consultation process used to arrive at the plan. President Baker began by stating that the
impetus for this plan goes back about six years when Cal Poly San Luis Obispo began an intensive strategic planning process. The campus began to look to the future of how a polytechnic institution that has programs that are not broadly available in the state can be made more accessible to students. The plan focuses on increasing access while enhancing quality and efficiency.

President Baker explained that the Cal Poly Plan is a multi-year plan and investment strategy that addresses four interrelated issues, all geared toward increasing student learning: improvement in institutional productivity; increased student learning and timely progress to degree completion, enhanced educational quality; and development of accountability and assessment measures.

President Baker offered the example that if time to degree completion could be decreased by one quarter, it would permit access to nearly 1,000 additional students per year. Access to advising and counseling, opportunities to attend classes in the summer, and financial aid incentives would allow students to take larger unit loads thereby moving them more quickly through the system.

He continued by stating that currently year-round operations are a significant problem because of the structure of financial aid. The Cal Poly Plan would begin to build innovative financial aid packages that would make it easier for students to attend school during the summer.

To arrive at the Cal Poly Plan, the campus was involved in a comprehensive consultation process. Students, faculty, administrators, former AS presidents, alumni, and businesses who hire Cal Poly San Luis Obispo students were asked for input on the plan. Additionally, surveys of students regarding the Cal Poly Plan were conducted and showed that a significant majority support the plan. The consultation process will continue during the implementation phase of the plan, with a student referendum planned for the spring of 1997 to provide input on the continuation of the plan and its associated fees.

Trustee Fallgatter stated that she was very impressed with the plan and the consultation process used. She commended the campus for its work and its willingness to change.

Trustee Campbell praised the plan and encouraged other campuses to look to it as a model.

Trustee Gray felt the plan was a terrific approach that would position the CSU at the forefront of looking beyond what has been into what can be.

Trustee Saenger hailed the campus’s efforts and the progress it has made in a relatively short amount of time. He asked about the key indicators the campus would be looking for to signify a measure of success. President Baker responded that the two key indicators signifying success would be a reduction in the time to degree completion and student satisfaction to the overall educational experience.

Trustee Goldstein added his enthusiasm for the plan and highlighted the importance of the consultation process. He asked Chancellor Munitz about the role of the other campuses with regard to quality, efficiency, assessment and accountability, stating that this plan opens the door for every campus to be innovative with regard to these issues. Chancellor Munitz stated that all of the campuses will be watching this plan very carefully to better understand the process and identify ways in which they can adapt a similar plan for their respective environments.
Trustee Otomo-Corgel asked about student support for the plan and the fees associated with its implementation. President Baker introduced Mr. Steve McShane, associate student body president at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, and asked him to elaborate on student involvement in the consultation process. Mr. McShane stated that students were involved in every aspect of putting this plan together. The students determined what the fee increments would be and had veto power throughout the process. The surveys that went out to the students were very thorough and gave students the ability to write out in detail how they felt about the plan. All of the comments were put together into a packet and given to the steering committee.

Mr. Fred Pierce, president of the CSU Alumni Association, hailed the plan for its involvement of constituencies that are not usually involved in this type of process, such as alumni and employers of students who graduate from the university.

Trustees Vitti and Pesqueira added their congratulations to Cal Poly San Luis Obispo for the plan.

Lieutenant Governor Davis complimented President Baker on a thoughtful presentation and asked for details on how the campus would measure whether or not education has been enhanced. President Baker stated that the campus will depend heavily on faculty assessment in terms of enhancement of quality to the educational process. Also, the campus will be looking at other measures such as increases in retention rates and in student unit loads. Ultimately, however, student satisfaction will be the best measure of success.

Chancellor Munitz added that the goal is to keep interviewing alumni and employers about satisfaction and taking their comments and recommendations seriously into consideration to shape the education of the next generation of undergraduates.

Lieutenant Governor Davis asked about the progress in increasing private funds to augment the cost of the plan. President Baker stated that the campus has already made some headway in this area by securing a half-million-dollar grant from Hewlett-Packard to convert traditional classroom into studio space. The goal is to continue to seek private and public funding partnerships for various aspects of implementing the plan.

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 11:11 a.m.
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Update on the Cal Poly Plan, San Luis Obispo

Presentation By
Peter S. Hoff, Senior Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Warren J. Baker
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Summary
The CSU encourages campuses to develop unique plans premised upon their own character, mission, and location, and to experiment with promising new approaches. Within this context of innovation and experimentation, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo is developing a broad new approach, called the Cal Poly Plan. The Plan's purposes are:

- renewal and enhancement of educational quality;
- increased student learning and timely progress to degree completion;
- improvement in institutional productivity; and
- development of accountability and assessment measures and procedures.

The Cal Poly Plan offers a model for meeting future demand for public higher education, while enhancing quality and efficiency. Cal Poly will seek ways to improve student time to degree, increase student learning, enhance the productivity of the faculty and staff, promote the more effective use of fixed resources, and implement quality improvement through comprehensive assessment. The Plan will support creative approaches to teaching and learning and their measurement, curriculum design and scheduling, and the application of information technology to instruction. These efforts require multi-year investments in human resources (professional development for faculty and staff) as well as in equipment.
The following resolutions are recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that Attachment A to Agenda Item 2 of the May 14-15, 1996, meeting of the trustees' Committee on Finance, titled "The California State University Student Fee Policy" is approved and shall take effect immediately; and, be it further

**RESOLVED,** That the chancellor is directed to take all necessary action to implement the student fee policy in a manner consistent with existing statutes and provisions of bond indentures; and, be it further

**RESOLVED,** That the campus presidents are encouraged to evaluate all existing fees charged to students to determine if some fees can be consolidated or eliminated to simplify the administration of fees and to enhance the ability of students and their families to plan for the costs of higher education without impairing the ability of the campus to provide access to a high quality program.
The California State University Student Fee Policy

I. Definitions

A. Mandatory fees – Fees that must be paid to apply to, enroll in, attend, or graduate from the university or to take a course offered through the state-funded instructional program.

B. Tuition – Fees to pay the full cost of instruction required of some students by statute.

C. User fees – Fees paid to receive non-instructional materials, services, or for the use of facilities provided by the university or to enroll in a course offered through a self-support instructional program.

D. Penalty fees – Fees or deposits to reimburse the university for additional costs resulting from dishonored payments, late submissions, or misuse of property or as a security or guaranty.

II. Authority

A. The Board of Trustees provides policy guidance for all matters pertaining to student fees.

B. The board retains authority to establish, increase, decrease, or abolish systemwide mandatory fees.

C. The chancellor is delegated authority to establish new campus mandatory, user, and penalty fees. The chancellor is not delegated authority to establish new systemwide mandatory fees.

D. The president is delegated authority to increase, decrease, or abolish campus mandatory, user, and penalty fees. The president is not delegated authority to increase, decrease, or abolish systemwide mandatory fees.

III. Responsibility

A. The president is responsible for assuring that appropriate consultation occurs prior to adjusting any fee and before requesting the chancellor to establish a new fee. This authority is subject to the accountability requirements described below in Section IV.

1. The president shall establish a fee advisory committee comprised of student, faculty, staff, and administrative representatives to provide advice to the campus president.

2. The president shall consult the committee before adjusting any fee and before requesting the chancellor to establish a new fee including a consolidation of existing fees.

3. A statement of revenues and expenditures including a minimum of one year of actual costs and two years of projected revenue and expenditures for the fee revenue supported activity shall be developed by the campus chief financial officer and considered by the campus fee advisory committee prior to the campus president adjusting fees or requesting the chancellor to establish a new fee.
Date: July 26, 1996

To: Dr. Warren J. Baker, President
    California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

From: Barry Munis
    Chancellor

Subject: Materials, Services and Facilities Fee—California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo—Executive Order No. 658

I am transmitting to you a copy of Executive Order No. 658 which authorizes at California Polytechnic State University the establishment of a Materials, Services and Facilities fee. Based upon a review of the consultation process employed by the campus and upon your intention to conduct a referendum in Spring 1997 to provide students a further opportunity to express their views on the Cal Poly Plan and related fee actions, appropriate and meaningful consultation has occurred as required by Board of Trustees Resolution RFN 05-96-06.

In accordance with policy of The California State University, the campus president has the responsibility for implementing Executive Orders where applicable and for maintaining the campus repository and index for all Executive Orders.

BM:rp

Attachment

Distribution: Chancellor's Office Staff
Executive Order No. 658

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4275
(310) 985-2800

Executive Order No: 658

Title: Materials, Services and Facilities Fee-California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Effective Date: July 26, 1996

Supersedes: No Previous Executive Order

This Executive Order is issued pursuant to authority granted by Education Code Section 89700; Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 41800; and Board of Trustees Resolution RTIN 05-96-06.

Effective with the Fall Quarter 1996, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo is authorized to establish a mandatory campus Materials, Services and Facilities fee in the amount of $45 per quarter. Pursuant to section 89724(a) of the Education Code, money received from this fee is appropriated for the support of the university in addition to such other amounts as may be appropriated therefor by the Legislature. Revenues received from this fee must be deposited in the State Treasury to the credit of the General Fund (Government Code Section 16300 et seq.).

Dated: July 26, 1996

[Signature]
Barry Munitz, Chancellor