Minutes
Executive Committee
Academic Senate of the California State University
March 5, 2003

1. The meeting was convened at 9:15 a.m. with Cherny, Jensen, Kegley and Pincu present as well as Chairs Cook, Krabacher, Shifflett and Snyder. Mr. Hood arrived at 9:45.

2. The Executive Committee met with the Standing Committee Chairs to review the committees’ agendas and possible upcoming resolutions.

3. Chair’s Report
   a. Chair Kegley reported on her testimony before the Board of Trustees’ Committee on Finance (Attachment 1). (NOT YET RECEIVED)
   b. Christy Jensen reported that the Academic Technology Planning Committee (ATPC) met on March 1st to finalize a set of nine initiatives for review and adoption by the CSU Presidents’ Technology Steering Committee (TSC). ATPC also developed and prioritized two project concepts within these initiatives which are being “vetted” by the consulting group Collegis to determine resource needs, viability, etc. ATPC and TSC hope to “roll out” the CSU Academic Technology Initiative/Plan by May of this year.
   c. Chair Kegley reported on her testimony before the Assembly Committee on Higher Education (Attachment 2). (NOT YET RECEIVED.)
   d. Task Force on SB 81
      This will be composed of the chair and vice chair of TEKR and Academic Affairs as well as two members of the Executive Committee.

4. Senate Budget Scenarios

The committee agreed on a number of budget principles:

   Equity
   Senate business has precedence over liaison meetings; liaison meetings are to be prioritized.
   Selective assignments where appropriate (the closer and cheaper the better)
   Productivity (advance study) for meetings

The Committee discussed how the Senate can reduce its 2003-2004 budget by 15%, or $150,000. Among the reductions considered were:

Replacing the interim committee meetings with conference calls (savings: $46,000)
Reducing Liaison travel (savings: $8,607)
Reducing release time (savings: $61,085)
Eliminating Executive Committee Summer Stipends (savings: $42,000)

5. Campus Senate Chairs Agenda for April 3, 2003

Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs: Presentation

System Budget Summit:

   How Presidents involved faculty in consultation prior to the summit
   How chairs communicated with faculty after the budget summit
6. **David Spence:**

Senate will have control of its web site by Friday

Chancellor’s Office is planning on reducing its own budget by 15%.

The Enrollment agenda item for the Board will be information only in March; action in May.

There was considerable discussion of SB 81, the undergraduate education degree bill. David reported that some amendments to the bill have made the bill more acceptable to the CSU.

There was discussion of proposed budget reductions to outreach programs and how these might be mitigated.

CAN was discussed. Several members of the Executive Committee argued for the usefulness and necessity of CAN. David agreed that CAN will be continued, but possibly reduced in funding.

YRO: The Chancellor’s Office will investigate whether, in light of financial exigency, there can be a temporary mix of general fund and YRO activities in the summer until the budgetary situation improves. The danger is that the Department of Finance might remove the summer from the General Fund entirely.

7. **Legislative Agenda**

The Executive Committee felt that the following topics should be stressed:

- Timeliness of the budget decision.
- Faculty Responsibility for the curriculum.
- Fees

The Executive Committee is also watching the following bills:

- **AB 242**: Master Plan Omnibus with mention of duties of full-time and part-time faculty
- **AB 825**: CAL Grant modifications for eligibility
- **AB 843**: Student Fees
- **SB 6**: Removing Academic Senates from Community College governance
- **SB 81**: CTC and the Education major
- **SB 542**: CPEC’s role in higher education
- **SB 550**: Master Plan omnibus bill and the transfer associate degree.

The Executive Committee urges Senate Chairs to participate in the alumni legislative day with their alumni representatives.

8. The Executive Committee met with committee chairs for agenda setting.

9. The meeting recessed at 5:00 until 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 6th.

10. At 8:30, Steven Raskovich of the Office of the General Counsel spoke to the Executive Committee. He clarified the thrust various sections of both state and federal statutes about accommodations that are required for visually-impaired persons. Although the CSU is not currently compelled to comply with portions of the federal statute, the Office of the Chancellor has voluntarily agreed to bring its web sites into compliance.

11. **Voting Task Force**
The Executive Committee discussed the report of the Voting Task Force and will ask the members to report to the Executive Committee in April.

12. The Executive Committee discussed the Board of Trustees’ March Agenda.

13. The Executive Committee adjourned at 10:20 a.m. on Thursday, March 6.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Hood

(These Minutes have not been approved.)
Again I want to thank Chancellor Reed and the Board of Trustees for their continued commitment to a broad and frequent consultative process to address the serious budgetary problems created by the fiscal crisis in California. I am appreciative of this opportunity for the CSU Senate to speak to budgetary matters before the Committee on Finance. I can inform you that we have established a Budget Advisory Task Force that is presently analyzing budgetary alternatives as well as various fiscal scenarios for the state. The Task Force is in the process of looking carefully at the recommendations of the Legislative Analyst Office and is preparing a senate response. In addition, I will be testifying on March 4th before the Assembly Committee on Higher Education on fees and fee policy. Copies of this testimony will be available to all interested parties.

I will focus most of my remarks today on the topic of student fees. I can say that many senators and faculty members are gravely concerned about the prospect of sudden, unpredictable, and significant increases in student fees. This is especially unfortunate since both the CSU Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees have argued at least since 1993 that there should be a fee policy that is coherent and long term and centered on fee increases that are gradual, moderate and predictable. Thus in 1993, after a recommendation and white paper from the CSU Academic Senate on a Fee Policy, the Board of Trustees adopted a policy document entitled, “Quality and Affordability: Policies for Pricing and Strategies for Paying.” (March 17, 1993). The Board of Trustees should be commended for its insight and leadership at that time on the question of student fees. Further, the Board, in subsequent budget proposals, recommended modest, reasonable and predictable fee increases. However, the legislature chose to backfill and buyout fees and they did so as long as the state could afford this action. Now the Governor and the state are again “hitting up the students” to pay for serious budgetary shortfalls. This is not wise public practice and huge fee increases are not good fiscal management or policy. If only the legislature had followed the wise counsel of the CSU Senate and the Board of Trustees we would not be agonizing today over the tradeoffs between a semblance of quality education for our students and a serious strain on already stretched student and family budgets. Our deepest fear is that fees do not so over-burden some of our students that they must give up the dream of seeking a higher education.
In our testimony on fees we will argue that any discussion of student fees must be grounded in the careful balance of access and quality. Access to higher education significantly contributes to the quality of life for the citizens of California for it opens the door to a better economic and social future. Access for a diverse population contributes to their social mobility but it also contributes to a quality education for all. As teachers, CSU faculty members know that diversity of culture, race, ethnic background, gender, age, and viewpoint greatly enriches the classroom experience. However, access without quality is not access worthy having. Without a commitment to excellence and the resources required, promises of access are potentially bankrupt. Access to a quality degree is what students need and what California citizens should demand.

Access and quality are the important goals for higher education. When the general fund revenues have been sufficient, the preservation of low student fees has been an important means for achieving these goals. Access has been promoted through low fees compensated for by General Fund allocations generally assumed sufficient to support and provide for the necessary resources for a quality education. Now, however, general fund allocations are hardly sufficient to maintain our goal of providing a high quality education for our students. Fee revenue becomes a necessity.

In considering changes in resident student fees and financial aid resources, we request that adequate data be collected that will permit an analysis of the impact of such changes on both current and prospective students. This data must accurately reflect the varied CSU student profile. The LAO and others need to recognize that our students are not generally 16-24 years old. They have families and work responsibilities. To base financial aid and enrollment projections on this traditional college-going population is a false picture for the needs of the CSU. The CSU Academic Senate strongly supports the efforts of the Chancellor and Board to change the age restrictions of the Cal Grant program as well as to change the expectation that recipients be only one year out of high school. These limitations discriminate against many of our current CSU students. Further, CSU provides 63% of master degrees given in public higher education in California. We need to assure that our graduate students, who receive little financial aid, can continue to complete degrees that are essential to their employment and advancement in their professions. Their enhanced skills are also essential to the economic vitality of California.

The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education has issued a report entitled “College Affordability in Jeopardy.” Patrick Callan, President of the Canter, sees our present fiscal state of affairs as a “Different Kind of Recession.” As we well know, he observes that this is the “first time in the modern era that a state economic downturn coincided with a time of projected enrollment increases. A new generation of students is knocking at the door of higher education. They are “the poorest as well as the most ethnically and
 racially heterogeneous students to appear at the doorstep of American higher education.” Further, surveys reveal that their college aspirations are very high. Are we going to fail these students? Is the future of educational opportunity at stake?

All of us must be as resourceful as possible as we address our budgetary options for the coming year. The CSU Academic Senate pledges to work with all in dialogue and analysis and with the best creative facility that we can offer. Creative balancing of quality and access and tough tradeoffs will be necessary to preserve what we all hold dear.
On behalf of the CSU Academic Senate, I want to thank the committee for the opportunity to address the committee on the crucial topic of student fees. In my remarks I will address the concerns of the Senate about the present student fee situation and particularly the impact of the sudden increase in fees on our students. In addition I will speak to our view on the proposal for a long-term student fee policy that recommends moderate, reasonable and predictable increases in student fees.

The Academic Senate of the California State University believes that any discussion of student fees must be grounded in the careful balance of access and quality. Quality and access influence each other and interact in significant and subtle ways. Access to higher education provides quality of life for the citizens of California that is essential to their economic and social future and to the civic and economic future of the state. Access for a diverse population contributes to a high quality education for all. The National Survey of Student Engagement found that diversity-related experiences are positively related to self-reported collegiate gains in personal, social and general educational experience. As teachers, CSU faculty members know that diversity of culture, race, ethnic background, gender, age and viewpoint greatly enriches the classroom experience. In California we have made a historic commitment to protecting access through low fees.

Access to a higher education for the citizens of California has always been among the priority concerns of the CSU Academic Senate. We wish to note, however, that today we face a relatively new situation regarding access. Pat Callan, in an editorial entitled “A New Recession,” argues that this is the first time that a state fiscal crisis has been coupled with a significant increase in demand for access.¹
Today the CSU is faced with providing access to 17,000 new students while at the same time receiving a significant decrease in funding for instruction and services. Low fees, in the past, have been accompanied by an assumption that General Fund appropriations would cover the basic costs of education. Yet, as others have noted today, the marginal cost formula for funding new enrollment does not cover the real cost of education and the partnership agreement on between the CSU and the Governor has not always been honored.

Access is a key goal for higher education in California, but we, the CSU Senate, are convinced that access without quality is not access worth having. Without a commitment to excellence and the resources required, promises of access are potentially bankrupt. We must address the question: “Access to What?” and we must couple access with a commitment to student success, with the earning of a degree. Student success requires adequate student support in terms of advising and addressing enrichment of student abilities and competencies to allow achievement in the degrees they pursue. Access to a quality degree is what students need and what California citizens should demand. This means that there must be adequate numbers of faculty with proper curricular expertise and time to advise and support students; adequate instructional facilities including labs, library resources and physical capacity, and a student faculty ratio (SFR) that allows quality interaction between student and instructors. Quality means resources, which means higher costs.

Access and quality are the goals of California higher education, and the preservation of low student fees has been an important means of achieving the goal of access. Now, however, in a period of severe economic stress in California, we must examine how our fundamental goals for Higher Education, the goals of quality and access, can be maintained in a way that makes it possible to keep our essential promise to the citizens of California to provide constructive socioeconomic mobility for all. The benefits of higher education must be available to newer constituencies, to families who may be new to America and unfamiliar with higher education. These benefits must also continue to be available for relatively low costs to those who are least able to pay.

A final context of a student fee policy today is a clear recognition by the CSU Academic Senate that budget decisions are often, if not always, trade-offs of things we care about. We remain concerned that fees do not so over-burden some of our students that they must give up the dream of seeking a higher education. Yet, we stand firm in our commitment to seeking adequate resources to maintain those quality factors essential to an excellent educational experience and to facilitate student success and achievement of a degree. A rational, long-term student fee policy should be coordinated with a rational,
long-term stable funding policy for the public institutions of Higher Education in California.

Within this framework, the CSU Academic Senate is reluctantly willing to support a reasonable fee increase for students if it is the only way to maintain the quality of instruction, but with the understanding that such fee increases are accompanied by appropriate increases in student financial aid. In considering changes in resident student fees and financial aid resources, we request that adequate data be collected that reflects the impact of such changes on both current and prospective students. We are especially concerned that this study reflects adequately the varied CSU student profile. Our CSU students are not overwhelmingly from the 16-24 age group; many of our students support families and work long hours. In considering Cal Grant awards, we support the efforts of the CSU to change the age restrictions of the Cal Grant program as well as the expectation that recipients be only one year out of high school. These limitations discriminate against many of our current CSU students. Further, CSU provides 63% of the Masters degrees given in public higher education in California and we need to assure that graduate students, who receive little financial aid, can continue to complete degrees that are essential to their employment and advancement in their professions. Their enhanced skills are essential to the economic vitality of California.

The CSU Academic Senate believes that for the long-term funding stability of the CSU, the legislature must develop and implement a coherent plan that provides for fee increases that take place in a gradual, moderate and predictable manner. In fact, we have strongly advocated for such a policy in our testimony and responses to the Master Plan Committee. Historically, both the CSU Academic Senate and the CSU Board of Trustees have argued that there should be a fee policy that is coherent and long term and centered on fee increases that are gradual, moderate and predictable. In 1993, after a recommendation and white paper from the CSU Academic Senate on a Fee Policy, the CSU Board of Trustees adopted a policy document entitled, “Quality and Affordability: Policies for Pricing and Strategies for Paying.” (March 17, 1993). This document outlines a long-term fee policy based on gradual, modest increases. Further, the Board, in subsequent budget proposals, did recommend modest, reasonable predictable fee increases. However, the legislature, in the years following, chose to buy out fees. The CSU Academic Senate supports the policy principles and a framework for implementation for a long-term resident student fee policy recommended by the California Postsecondary Education Commission. A fee policy for California public higher education is desperately needed. Our CSU students are currently facing the prospect of an increase in fees of 35% or more in just two years. For students who have family obligations, as many of ours do, and who squeeze the money
for fees out of a family budget that may already be stretched thin, this is a very big increase. It may be necessary in the end to have this fee increase now to maintain some semblance of quality, but it will also affect access for some, if not many, of our CSU students.

Finally, as Chair of the CSU Academic Senate, I urge you to enact appropriate fee policy and provide key budget decisions in a timely manner so that students and families and our university may have sufficient time to prepare for these changes. Campuses and students are already making enrollment decisions for fall 2003. We must provide a quality education to those students who have been given access. I wish you well in your creative balancing of quality and access and in making tough tradeoffs that may be necessary to preserve the promises about higher education that have been made to the citizens of California.

---

1 Pat Callan, “A New Kind of Recession,” in *College Affordability In Jeopardy (Winter, 2003).* A Special Report from the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.