RECEIVED

California State Polytechnic College

APR 8 1905

April 7, 1965

OFFICE OF VICE PRES.

To: All Faculty, Administrative Personnel, and Student Affairs Council Members, San Luis Obispo Campus and Kellogg Campus

From: President Julian A. McPhee

Subject: Implementation of "Emphasis for Tomorrow" consistent with the basic polytechnic character and objectives of the

In January 1965 I communicated with all faculty, administrative personnel, and SAC members at both campuses providing an additional opportunity for all concerned to consult and respond to the college's plans for using enrollment quotas for certain departments in fall 1965 as a means of maintaining the college's polytechnic character and emphasis. The initial plans involved limitations on the rate of growth of the departments of English and Speech and Social Sciences at San Luis Obispo and Language Arts and Social Sciences at Kellogg, to maintain a definite emphasis on the applied fields of Agriculture, Engineering, Business, Home Economics, and related supporting fields of Physical Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics. The basic concept of proposed emphasis and control was stated in the publication "Emphasis for Tomorrow, A Long Range Educational Plan," distributed to all teaching and administrative faculty in September 1963. numbers of first-time must be translated into the numbers of accepted applica

Responses have now been received from both campuses, including faculty organizations, student organizations, line departments and divisions, alumni organization, and others. Many helpful and constructive suggestions and recommendations were received, and all such reports will continue to receive careful study and consideration. At this time, however, it is necessary that an official position be adopted so that we can move ahead at both campuses. I am sure that full and adequate opportunity for consultation has now been provided all parties.

As President, I am charged with the basic responsibility and accountability for operations of the college, including planning for its growth and program development. Therefore, after consideration of all recommendations and alternatives presented, I am adopting the following principles and taking the indicated implementing actions: I am also asking each Dean of the College to continue to stu

1. The basic polytechnic character and objectives of Cal Poly are reaffirmed, as supported by the great majority of responses from all concerned. In this connection, the basic plans and guidelines outlined in "Emphasis for Tomorrow" are also reaffirmed.

I am approving the recommendation made by many gr

2. The concept of planned growth and development of the college and its several departments will be used, including such enrollment controls as may be necessary, to maintain the basic polytechnic character and objectives of

Implementation of "Emphasis for Tomorrow" Page 2

the institution, and to maintain the effectiveness and quality of instruction in all departments. Planned enrollment growth within the limitations of budgetary support, facilities, staff, and program is now a necessary part of planning and operation within the state college system.

- 3. I am rescinding the initial proposals for enrollment quotas for fall 1965 on the basis of recommendations from both campuses that the departmental enrollment projections in connection with our 1965-66 support budget are consistent with the basic polytechnic character and objectives of the college.
- 4. To provide an orderly procedure for planned enrollment growth consistent with the character and objectives of the college, I am adopting the departmental enrollment projections referred to above as the official target enrollments for all departments at both campuses. The departmental enrollment projections are those shown in the table entitled "Estimate of Enrollment by Major Fall 1965" dated 1/19/65. The total fall 1965 enrollments for each campus are consistent with the annual FTE support budget enrollments used for 1965-66 staffing purposes.
- 5. The total target enrollment estimate for each department for fall 1965 is made up of the components of continuing and returning students, first-time freshmen, and new transfers. The numbers of first-time freshmen and transfers must be translated into the numbers of accepted applications for admission which, on the basis of experience, would be expected to produce the appropriate numbers of actual new students. I am therefore directing each Dean of the College to process and accept that number of applications for fall 1965 which, when combined with the estimated number of continuing students (adjusted for winter and spring admissions), can be expected to produce the total departmental target enrollments. However, I am also directing that the numbers of accepted applications allowed for small departments, defined as departments or majors with enrollments of less than 150 students in fall 1964, may be exceeded without special permission. For other departments or majors with fall 1964 enrollments of 150 or more students, target numbers of accepted applications may be exceeded only by special permission. Any such requests for special permission should be forwarded through normal line channels.
- 6. I am also asking each Dean of the College to continue to study and recommend additional procedures or priorities which may be necessary in accepting applications in majors where the number of qualified applicants may exceed the target enrollments set.
- 7. I am approving the recommendation made by many groups that a standing committee be organized at each campus to study departmental and campus enrollment trends and projections each year, and to recommend to me by November 1 each fall, departmental enrollment projections for the succeeding budget year which are consistent with the basic polytechnic character and

Implementation of "Emphasis for Tomorrow" Page 3

objectives of Cal Poly. I believe such a committee at each campus should have representatives from both instruction and administration. It is my hope that such committees will be appointed and organized at both campuses by May 15 of this year. The following composition and appointment procedure should be followed.

- (a) Two representatives from each instructional division should be appointed by the Faculty-Staff Council at San Luis Obispo and by the Faculty Council at Kellogg. Such representatives should serve for three-year periods with overlapping terms, for continuity and efficiency of service, and might well have substantial length of service at Cal Poly as well as endorsement by their respective instructional divisions for qualifying nominations. Essentially these procedures were recommended by the Faculty-Staff Council at San Luis Obispo.
- (b) One representative should be appointed by the Dean of the College at each campus to serve an indefinite term.
- (c) I believe it is desirable to have a representative of college-wide administration on each committee. I will appoint such a representative to each committee.
- (d) A liaison representative from the Student Affairs Council at each campus should be invited to sit with the committee. The Dean of the College at each campus should extend this invitation and notify the committee of the representative appointed.
- (e) The committees should elect their own chairman and secretary, and should be able to call on members of the faculty or administration for assistance or advice as necessary.
- (f) The committee at each campus may be designated as the Committee on Planned Enrollment Growth.

Finally, I am asking that the Dean of the College at each campus discuss with those concerned means whereby special study and consideration can be given to the organization of a committee to follow up the many suggestions in the area of curriculum organization and content. The Kellogg Faculty Council report, for example, suggested a number of possible principles and criteria for evaluation of present or future majors as to their occupational goals and joboriented methods. The concerns of such a committee might also include study and evaluation of occupational needs in California, and of the success of Cal Poly graduates in their occupational fields.

California State Polytechnic College ESTIMATES OF ENROLLMENT BY MAJOR, KELLOGG CAMPUS, FALL 1965

Majors By Department	Fa11 1963					Fall 1964					Fall 1965 Estimates 1/				
	Cont. & Ret.	Trans- fer	First- Time	Tota No.	1s %	Cont. & Ret.	Trans- fer	First- Time	Tot	als %	Cont. & Ret.	Trans- fer	First- Time		als %
Ag. Bus. Mgt.	78	23	16	117	3.0	87	23	11	121	2.7	90	25	.7	122	2.5
Ag. Ser. & Insp.	27	9	6	42	1.1	30	5	1	36	0.8	26	5		31	0.6
Agronomy	38	6	7	51	1.3	40	3	2	45	1.0	35	5	2	42	0.9
Animal Sci.	101	24	35	160	4.1	109	28	32	169	3.8	115	30	20	165	3.4
Fruit Ind.	30	4	5	39	1.0	27	8	3	38	0.8	26	5	2	33	0.7
Land. Arch.	141	41	24	206	5.3	160	48	32	240	5.4	187	50	20	257	5.3
Orn. Hort.	57	10	11	78	2.0	56	11	7	74	1.7	53	10	4	.67	1.4
Soil Sci.	4	2	2	8	0.2	4	0	0	4	0.1				***	
Totals	476	119	106	701	18.1	513	126	88	727	16.4	532	130	55	717	14.9
Aerospace	87	25	55	167	4.3	114	21	64	199	4.5	135	20	58	213	4.4
Chemica1												5	5	10	0.2
Civi1	104	25	40	169	4.4	135	45	61	241	5.4	193	60	56	309	6.4
Electronic	410	116	97	623	16.1	420	97	93	610	13.8	409	105	85	599	12.4
Industrial	64	11	12	87	2.2	84	12	25	121	2.7	116	10	23	149	3.1
Mechanical	195	27	47	269	7.0	197	35	53	285	6.4	208	40	48	296	6.1
Totals	860	204	251	1315	34.0	950	210	296	1456	32.9	1061	240	275	1576	32.7
Accounting	100	43	16	159	4.1	116	32	31	179	4.0	131	35	28	194	4.0
A.& S. (Elem. Ed.)	126	48	63	237	6.1	45	0	.0	45	1.0	20	0	0	20	0.4
Bio. Sci.	126	27	43	196	5.1	158	38	66	262	5.9	212	45	59	316	6.
Bus. Mgt.	273	61	72	406	10.5	271	67	103	441	10.0	295	75	92	462	9.
Educ., Sec.	15	9	0	24	0.6	19	13	0	32	0.7	25	10	0	35	0.
Language Arts	45	25	23	93	2.4	117	35	65	217	4.9	158	45	58	261	5.
Marketing	24	9	3	36	0.9	25	3	8	36	0.8	25	5	7	37	0.
Mathematics	81	24	37	142	3.7	112	22	52	186	4.2	147	25	46	218	4.
Physical Ed.	123	22	23	168	4.3	116	22	38	176	4.0	121	20	34.	175	3.
Physical Sci.	41	20	12	73	1.9	54	24	21	99	2.2	73	25	19	117	2.
Soc. Sci.	175	52	92	319	8.2	316	125	131	572	12.9	400	160	132	692	14.
Totals	1129	340	384	1853	47.9	1349	381	515	2245	50.7	1607	445	475	2527	52.
Campus Totals	2465	663	741	3869	100.0	2812	717	899	4428	100.0	3200	815	805	4820	100.

^{1/} Includes estimated full effect of new freshman admissions standards, but no other controls.