

**Academic Senate CSU
January 22-23, 2009 Plenary Minutes**

Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium

Thursday January 22, 2009 3:30 p.m. — 5:00 p.m.

Friday January 23, 2009 10:00 a.m. — 4:00 p.m.

5:15 p.m. Social – Academic Preparation & Education Programs (APEP) hosting

1. Call to order

10:30AM Thursday January 22, 2009

2. Chancellor Reed

This is a Challenging time for the CSU. California is about to go over the financial cliff. Leadership of the CSU through a period of time when we are dependent on the state for 75% of our resource has been taxing. Place number one on our priority list is to protect our employees and our students. Messages from the Chancellor have been shared widely and often as we start a new session at our various campuses.

One of the tremendous messages from the Obama inaugural address is that individuals will have to sacrifice some for the common good. It would seem that no one in CA wants to sacrifice for any cause. An entitlement culture in California is a problem. Everybody thinks you can get more without anybody having to pay for it. The world has changed, ever since September. Economic predictions indicate that California will probably surpass a 10% employment number in the near future (9.3% at the current time). Layoffs nationwide continue and are far from being complete. Warner Bros, Disney, Hertz, Alcoa, and Microsoft are all reducing their numbers of employees.

The CSU was subject to a \$500 million cut in the early 2000s. We have never recovered from this cut. Our budget for 08/09 has been cut by \$97 million (to be cut from active operating budgets within the next five months of the current cycle). Plus, the Compact will not be funded. The CSU has worked with the Department of Finance, the Governor's office, and the Legislature to try to maintain the CSU budget. Midsize to Small campuses have a harder time accommodating this type of cut than the larger campuses. As a result of the very unstable budget situation, there has been a monthly (rather than bimonthly) meeting of the presidents. The CSU has been working hard to ameliorate the impact of the existing cut and any potential reduction in the current or next year's budget.

There is some hope that an 18 month budget will be passed by the legislature in the near future. IOUs will be used for income tax reimbursements since the state is running out of money.

California is, or will shortly be, out of cash. Tax funds will be delayed. Cal Grants will not be fully funded.

The 09/10 budget will include the \$31 million taken from the 08/09 budget. \$270 million will be lost from the compact. Enrollment increases will not be funded. There will be a continued cut, and it will be deep. There are also costs of increasing operations that will not be reimbursed by the state government. Both the UC and CSU will be relatively “better off” than many agencies in state government. The CSU will continue to put 1/3 of student fee increases into financial aid. The additional cut will be calculated independent of the 10% fee increase. Vice-president and higher level salaries will be frozen at their current level. Travel is heavily restricted. Large equipment purchases have been delayed to accommodate lapsed funding. Student enrollment will decrease by about 10,000 students.

The state bond pool fund is out of cash. We were in line for over a billion dollars in state funding for approximately 100 construction projects that have been shut down. The cost of shutting down these projects is in the range of \$50-70 million – none of which will be reimbursable. In many cases we were able to temporarily cover expenditures during this shut down period. In some cases it will cost more to shut down a project than it will be to finish it. These changes from shut-down will drive costs above what they would otherwise have been.

Cal-Grants for spring may not be available to students. \$108 million cut from the CAL-Grant A program. Campuses are borrowing from other funds to backfill the CAL-Grant B program.

Given that a priority is to protect employees, the CO has looked at the monthly cash flow needed to support ongoing operations. The CSU requires approximately \$296 million a month to meet payroll (student employees, faculty, administration, etc.) and a further \$80 million a month for travel and other expenses.

The current goal is to get to June 30th and meet payroll each month. California will run out of cash in February and there is no reasonable methodology to ensure an adequate cash flow. At the current time, the CSU can meet payroll through May. We will likely need to borrow from enterprise funds to meet our June payroll – this may run afoul of internal bookkeeping restrictions that require fund-to-fund reimbursements to occur within the same fiscal year.

There is a possibility that President Obama’s Economic Stimulus Package for Higher Education will provide some relief. This could lead to action on behalf of higher education in terms of \$6 billion support for construction in public higher education.

There is a possibility of \$10 billion for California in the stimulus package for Medicare, K-12, and direct support for higher education.

In the stimulus bill there is an additional \$62 million dollars as part of an additional \$500 million for Pell grants. There is additional money proposed to support a 50% increase in work-study program funds (up to \$2400/student). It will take until at least late February for the stimulus package to clear Congress, with the funds being distributed some time after this.

Other state agencies are not funding grants made to the CSU. The resulting shut-down in projects may result in lay-offs of project funded staff.

California and New York unemployment funds are broke and are having to look to borrowing to meet their obligations.

There is a rumor that the state will approve an 18 month budget by a 2/3 vote by February 15th.

The Democrats attempt in December to approve a budget with 50% approval would have ended up in courts with no distribution of funds until the court had resolved the dispute – thus even such a “take action now” approach would be unlikely to provide a timely impact.

Q: Will the congressional stimulus package allow us to prevent shutting down construction projects?

A: The CSU bonds have a higher rating than California bonds, but the CSU bonds are inherently perceived as tied to the California bonds – we will lose money with the a downgraded California bond rating. It is unclear when new monies will be available to the CSU for building projects. We hope for only a 90 day delay.

Q: What are the formulas by which Federal stimulus money will go to the states and to higher education?

A: It is unclear. Population distributions will play a role, but it is unclear how these distributions will take place. It will be hard to manage because it is not a continuing appropriation. The impetus for the stimulus is to keep people working and to revive a weak economy.

Q (statement): California contribution requires bond payment first, then salary. School districts are hurt by income reductions. These have impacts on higher education.

A: In a similar vein, other state agencies are also cutting payment on awarded grants since the agency does not have money to cover the grant payment. This has important consequences on demand for unemployment payments.

Q: On employee protections, we thank you for your efforts. What can CSU faculty do to further protect the system?

A: The state of California and the USA are both shy of money. We need congress to act quickly and to affect appropriate priorities in their action. On the last trip to New York, the Carnegie Foundation sponsored a meeting to look at support for public institutions – these are core needs of society that we need to find a way to meet.

Q: in the early 90s the declines in the economy it took us about four years and opportunity lost for 75,000 students to recover from the cuts. At what point are we going to cut our support for educating students who are repeating classes for the third or fourth time? Is there an option to allow concurrent self-support and public-support opportunities for students to better utilize our educational resources?

A: UC charges students who take more than some percentage of the units required for their program(s). Thus far the CSU has been reluctant to pursue this. All options could be looked at.

Q: Do you know Arnie Duncan well enough to speculate on future policy direction?

A: I do not. I know the individual well enough to say he is very bright, very capable, but at this time he may not know higher education well enough....at this time. He is aware of the large role played by financial aide. I look forward to working with him in the future.

Q (statement): The CSU should not ask for money from the table of others. Advocacy ought to remain holistic – Education should be a focus rather than the CSU as the sole focus.

Q: The cal-grant loans will be impacted very early. How will this affect our campuses?

A: Pell grants remain available. Hopefully our campuses can help support our students. It is our hope that the state will find the money to support the Cal-Grant A funding and reimburse the CSU for our bridge loans that we will provide to our students.

Q (statement): We recognize the stresses inherent in the position you are in.

A: thank you.

3. Roll call

- Roll call was delayed until the afternoon in order to best accommodate the time made available by Chancellor Reed.
- **Senators Present:** (Bakersfield) Michael Ault, John Tarjan; (Channel Islands) Paul Rivera, Billy Wagner; (Chico) Kathy Kaiser, Jim Postma; (Dominguez Hills); Caroline Bordinaro, Patricia Kalayjian; (East Bay) Susan Gubernat, Henry (Hank) Reichman (Fresno) Jacinta Amaral, Otto Benavides; (Fullerton) Vince Buck, Diana Guerin, Barry Pasternack; (Humboldt) Marshelle Thobaben, Bernadette Cheyne; (Long Beach) David Hood, Praveen Soni, (Los Angeles) Kevin Baaske, Robert Land; (Maritime Academy) James Wheeler; Tony Snell (Monterey Bay) Karen Davis; Ken Nishita; (Northridge), Steven Stepanek, Barbara Swerkes; (Pomona) David Lord, Saeed Monemi; (Sacramento) Robert Buckley, Thomas Krabacher, Christine Miller; (San Bernardino) Buckley Barrett, C.E. Tapie Rohm Jr.; (San Diego) Edward Aguado, Fred Hornbeck, William Eadie (substitute for Cezar Ornatowski); (San Francisco) Andrea Renwanz Boyle, Jerry Shapiro, Darlene Yee-Melichar; (San José) Michael Kaufman (substitute for Judith Lessow-Hurley), Romey Sabalius, Mark Van Selst; (San Luis Obispo) Manzar Foroohar, James LoCascio; (San Marcos), Glen Brodowsky, John (Dick) Montanari; (Sonoma)

Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson; (Stanislaus) Steven Filling, (Retired & Emeritus Faculty) Harold Goldwhite; (Chancellor's Office – Executive Vice Chancellor) Gary Reichard.

- **Others Present:** Charles Reed, Chancellor; Brandon Chapin, CSSA Liaison; Benjamin Quillian, Associate Vice Chancellor Finance; John Travis, CFA; Gail Brooks, Vice Chancellor Human Resources

4. Approval of agenda

- Approved as amended.

5. Approval of minutes

- Approved as amended.

6. Announcements

The executive committee is seeking nominees to fill the four faculty positions on the Chancellor's Office ad hoc committee "Formative Review for Faculty Scholarship of Community Engagement." Please forward declarations of interest to John Tarjan.

7. Presentations/Introductions

8. Chairs' Report (Tarjan)

Budget constraints continue to influence Academic Senate CSU effectiveness. At the current time our intention is to ensure that the remaining plenary and interim meetings remain as scheduled (i.e., in person and on the regularly scheduled dates). There is, of course, lingering uncertainty around the California State budget, the CSU budget, and the Academic Senate CSU budget. Travel is really the only 'real' source of budget savings for 08/09. I am grateful to the other members of the Executive Committee for assuming liaison responsibilities to groups such as CSSA, the alumni, CFA, and the retired faculty. We have attempted to share assignments while being mindful of budget constraints.

Our Long Beach office is currently staffed by only two people. Given this, it is important to be as proactive as possible with requests and to ensure travel claims are submitted expeditiously.

The hiring committee for the new executive director has met and the search is proceeding.

The full chair report was and is posted on the Academic Senate CSU web-site (http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/documents/Jan09_Chairs_Report.pdf); it lists the activities of the chair over the last two months.

There were no questions from the body.

9. Standing Committees

9.1 Academic Affairs: (Postma)

As listed in the agenda, there are three second reading items and several new items. Some of the items are best described as trial balloons designed to assess the will of the body. The Academic Affairs Committee meeting also heard reports from its liaisons.

9.2 Academic Preparation and Educational Programs: (Stepanek)

Many of the reports to the Academic Preparation and Educational Programs Committee were delayed till Friday. As listed in the agenda, there are several second readings and several new resolutions – these include a reaction to the potential to reduce the duration of the required K-12 academic year as well as continued issues concerning a-g requirements.

9.3 Faculty Affairs: (McNamara)

A “thank you” was provided for the particular efforts of Senators Kalayjian, Davis, and Gubernat. As listed in the agenda, there are several second readings and several new resolutions. John Travis and Margaret Merryfield both covered several Human Resource issues in their presentations to the committee. John Travis additionally reported that CFA will be meeting with CSU on the Patents and Technology Report and, eventually, decide whether or not to go forward with a grievance on this. He also reported that CFA has put out a higher education report. CFA and CSU appear to be at an impasse on contract negotiations. Margaret Merrified (HR) submitted a draft of new guidelines to eventually come out on hiring practices. Faculty Affairs will respond to these once the final guidelines are released.

9.4 Fiscal and Governmental Affairs: (Barrett)

One second-reading will come to the floor in co-sponsorship with Faculty Affairs along with a co-sponsored first-reading resolution with Academic Affairs. Additionally, several waived first items will appear, one in co-sponsorship with Academic Preparation Education Programs. Karen Zamarippa and Robert Turnage provided excellent reports (via phone) to update the committee on developments in Sacramento. Discussion of possible future bills and discussions around movement in the budget situation occupied much of the day.

10. Other committees and committee liaisons

10.1 Admissions Advisory (Stepanek)

The impact of CSU-wide facilitation of impaction was actively discussed. The *Troops to College* initiative leaves the door open to veterans even at colleges that would otherwise be closed to new admissions. The next joint meeting of Admissions Advisory and UC admissions council (BOARS) is coming up soon. The University of Maryland initiative continues to occupy a great deal of committee effort.

10.2 Search Committee (Academic Senate CSU Staff) (Pasternack)

The intent is to have the new staff person (Academic Senate CSU Executive Director) start March 1st. The search committee will meet to go over resumes tonight.

10.3 Task Force on Career and Technical Education (Krabacher)

We are at the end of a legislative session in which the CSU had to fend off an attack on CSU faculty authority to evaluate a-g content (the intent of the legislation was that this authority be yielded to the board of education – The Career Technical Education (CTE) movement has much more weight with the Board of Education than at the level at which CSU and UC provide structure for the evaluation of a-g coursework). This issue is likely to return in the current (upcoming) legislative session. There are a variety of interested parties. The CSU will have to actively monitor these efforts to ensure the appropriate academic content of courses that the CSU uses to establish CSU eligibility. The CSU is actively involved with ConnectED. The CSU will be more involved in the BOARS process – from the outside, especially as presented by those looking to strip CSU authority around the a-g requirements; there is a perspective that the CSU is too compliant with UC action. We need to be more public about our role. There is a concern that the UC and CSU requirements may be bifurcated by legislative action. This would not serve students well.

10.4 General Education Advisory Committee (Baaske)

The remote meeting held in December (video & phone) yielded mixed success as a result of the technological separation of the participants. We approved some modifications to the agreements with AP coursework and GE breadth. The IGETC standard review committee is up and running. The CSU evaluation of International Baccalaureate coursework has begun and an additional teleconference is planned to address questions that have arisen. GEAC also looked at the MOU with the University of Maryland (university circle) and their agreement (or lack thereof) with the LDTP patterns. It is intended that GEAC will play a role helping to align the University of Maryland Patterns with what the disciplines have indicated as appropriate patterns of pre-transfer coursework.

10.5 COMPASS (Baaske)

The “*Give Students a COMPASS*” project is a joint Oregon & Wisconsin. The project seeks to develop and study "high impact" practices in GE. Representatives from three campuses (San Jose, Sacramento, and Chico) competitively selected for participation in additional efforts are currently attending a student success conference in Seattle. There is a plan for a systemwide conference on high impact practices in ensuring student success for summer 2010.

10.6 Campus Senate Chairs (Baaske)

The CSU campus senate chairs did not meet in December (fiscal and time constraints), but have been actively using their listserv for communication.

10.7 Lower Division Transfer Patterns (Swerkes / Van Selst)

LDTP activities are highlighted in the Academic Senate CSU newsletter. The statistics are generally very good – there are 943 additional courses that have been submitted by the community colleges for review. The reviews are troublesome in that the throughput is relatively slow – this can be a problem both from an organizational standpoint and a Public Relations viewpoint. Timely reviews are important. We are working on ways to facilitate these reviews. In the November advisory committee meeting it was reported that some of the CSU articulation officers were using the TCSU approval lists to ask their campus departments to articulate against the course. This increases “outside of LDTP” articulation. Concerns about the structure of the information system, the need for information maintenance, the lack of a clear overall design structure regarding information flow, and apparent lack of support for continuing pattern development were raised.

10.8 Task Force on CLA (Nelson)

Some members were unavailable for the initial meeting on Wednesday. We covered the scope of the role of the task force as given by the Presidents Council on Accountability (PCA). The task force has taken a narrow charge to select one of the three accountability measures approved by the voluntary system of accountability (MAAP, CAAP, and CLA). There is some language in the Presidents’ charge that connects the accountability measures to curricular outcomes. After discussions with Executive Vice Chancellor Reichard, the committee perspective that none of the VSA-mandated assessments would be presented as reflecting the learning outcomes of any particular course (nor the entirety of GE) was affirmed.

Q: Please explore alternative means of assessment

A: There are various campus-based resolutions on VSA and the CLA urging us to do this as well.

10.9 Commission on the Extended University (Rohm)

The January Meeting began with presentations from both Chancellor Reid and Executive Vice Chancellor Reichard. The state of the California budget, the lack of funding for Cal-grants, and other fiscal aspects dominated the early part of the meeting. The role of the Commission vis-à-vis *Access to Excellence*, the new commission web-site, and the focus of the current rfp process to look at inter-campus efficiencies dominated the remainder of the meeting. The role of the commission in *Troops to College* and other initiatives was assessed. The hiring process for the state dean for extended studies was reported on.

10.10 California State University Alumni Council (Van Selst)

The ability to raise funds to sponsor Alumni events has been harmed by the downturn in the economy. Legislative days have been transformed from a Sacramento-based activity to one that will focus on local outreach.

11. Other Reports

11.1 Benjamin Quillian (10:30 Time Certain Friday January 23rd)

The CSU is facing difficult times. In listening to the discussion of the senate around the protection of instruction during budget crises, I see that there is recognition that the cost of Federal and State Legislative requirements are expensive. Conceptually, the protection of instruction is important and I am heartened to see the breath of conceptualization is the senate.

When I agreed to return from Washington to California, I was aware that a late budget is not unusual for California. The lack of budget was worrisome. Two days after I arrived the Governor signed the budget – but is hobbled together with little more than chewing gum and would be revisited very quickly. In October, we were anticipating a \$3-6 billion dollar budget shortfall for the state. As December came and went, the deficit was predicted to be \$14 billion.

At the current time California unemployment is 9.4%. The controller of California has stopped paying for construction projects. This is an expensive mess for the CSU. The state of California has no credit and cannot issue bonds. I have asked the campus CFOs to do a cash-flow analysis to determine when the CSU will run out of cash. Some internal borrowing will be required to allow us to complete our 08/09 fiscal year. Our \$66 million dollar cut added onto the current year cuts predicted in the Governors budget is a blow to our effectiveness. We are restricting enrollment. The Chancellor's outreach programs are continuing, but those being reached out to may not find a place at the table of the CSU. Where possible, the CSU is restricting travel, hiring, and salary increases for high level administrators. We are being creative – we are using technologies and approaches in new ways to attempt to meet the needs of doing business. I have been amazed that our construction people have not been active in Sacramento. I have been surprised that the media have not been pursuing the seriousness of our economic situation. In the global economy, we have almost unprecedented economic pressures that need to be addressed.

Q: the Budget Advisory Committee normally meets in January. Why has it not met?

A: Richard West and I are in transition mode. I envision this meeting taking place shortly.

Q: we are about to see parents informed of the number of teachers cut from the K-12 rolls. The danger I see is that education will end up competing within itself for expenditures. The impact of social services that people depend on will be huge and most people do not realize how bad it will be.

A: I have visited the K-12 facilities in the Los Angeles unified school district and I am concerned for them.

Q: Is the BoT budget that will shortly be adopted illusory, or is there any chance it is real?

A: The budget is not a “pie in the sky” budget. It is an attempt to illustrate the needs of the CSU. I am concerned that the CSU will receive a greater cut in the ‘final’ budget than as indicated in the current budget negotiations.

Q: There is a hiring freeze. On some campus the student assistants are not being hired for the current semester. Is this universal?

A: All hirings are subject to review to determine if they are ‘essential’. Each campus determines if each position is “essential”.

Q: Are the travel restrictions only on state-sponsored travel or on all travel.

A: All travel is to be reviewed to determine if it is “essential”. The definition of this is also to be determined at a campus level.

Q: What can be done to encourage the media to cover the plight of the CSU? The stories seem to focus on the UC rather than the CSU. I worry that the CSU as a system does a poor job of self-advocacy, particularly as compared to the UC.

A: I have noticed a similar phenomenon. A particular example would be on the reallocation of funds for construction. The controller stopped paying the bills in November and December. The projects sent forward by the CSU were generally unsuccessful, the projects sent forward by the UC, even when requiring much more money, were more successful in retaining funding.

Q: There is a list of “shovel-ready” projects that could proceed if provided with funding. Is this list available?

A: Yes, it should be. There is a copy of such a list in the BoT package (BoT agenda; committee on buildings & grounds – Federal Disbursement Request).

11.2 Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer (11:00 a.m. Friday)

Associate Vice Chancellor Jeri Echeverria will begin work in the Chancellor’s Office on Feb. 2nd.

Regarding the position of State University Dean for Extended Education; the search process will reopen shortly. Interviews of three finalists were conducted on January 20; on basis of search committee recommendations and input from Deans and other individuals within the Academic Affairs Division of the CO, the decision was to extend search. There will be further consultation with Deans of Extended Education and Commission members regarding the immediate future of Extended Education. We have not had a Dean here for too long and we will endeavor to reestablish some momentum in this domain in the near future.

Enrollment management – in November the BoT agreed with the Chancellor and Presidents to facilitate declarations of impaction at the campus level. Freshman outside of the local area are eligible to be required to meet higher entry standards. We needed to stem the flow of new students into the system to allow a contraction of approximately

10,000 students. There were already six institutions that had declared themselves impacted before the board action. As a result of the permission to pursue impaction, seven other institutions have declared impaction. The status of applications is that freshman applications are about even with the status last year (up 5% across the system), even after reductions in the number of “free” applications that were possible. The “campus yield” from these applications cannot be determined at this time. In times of economic crisis yield rates generally go up. Transfer applications are up substantially this year. The problem of how to balance the number of upper division transfers with native freshman remains a concern at many campuses. Nine CSUs will remain open to new applicants until March 1st.

Weekly updates regarding enrollments are being provided to the university presidents.

The “Proficiency in the First Year” conference was a response to the BoT resolution on proficiency (need remediation). We are looking at a number of solutions that bring students up to proficiency prior to their matriculation on the campus (“early start” programs). Technology solutions are not always the correct answer (they do not work for many of our students). The task of bring proficiency to our students pre-matriculation is also contained within our outreach efforts to the K-12 system (e.g., EAP, the use of “ALEKS” tutorials, etc.). When we are under-resourced to do our job we cannot spend resources on remediation and proficiency issues. We are working on establishing effective practices and working with our K-12 partners to ensure that achieving proficiency is part of the preparation yielded through the twelfth grade experience.

On professional doctorate issues, we are not moving forward on seeking authorization for audiology or physical therapy doctorates at this time. We are pursuing authorization to offer an independent doctorate in nursing practice. One of the foci of these programs will be to prepare nursing faculty. The current legislative efforts do not envision that we will hurry to offer these programs. The programs will not be implemented prior to establishing an adequate resources stream to support the programs.

The Professional Science Programs are yielding nationally recognized successes. Student employment upon graduation is good as are the connections with the business programs that support them. There are efforts at PSM credential preparation programs within the military. These efforts have been illustrated in the Council of Graduate Schools newsletter. Fourteen CSU campuses will have PSM programs by 90/10 in a range of fields. A high level PSM Advisory Board will have its second meeting in the CO on Feb. 2nd.

The Lumina grant has delivered on funding for the planning year grant (\$150K). The funding is in preparation for submission of a grant to look at those strategies that will help the state of California, in a cost-effective manner, to increase the number of graduate students produced. There are three components to the proposal. The first was called the policy audit, now referred to as an “opportunity analysis” – It looks at opportunities regarding policy, regulation, and practices that have potential impact on segmental work on making quality education cost-effective so that the number of CSU graduates can be

increased—e.g., CSU fee policy, State and institutional financial aid policies, others. A second component looks at the needs met by baccalaureate holders to business. This component develops business advocacy for higher education and assesses the degree to which baccalaureate preparation aligns with business needs. The third component is a flow analysis with a special effort on looking at bottleneck experiences. The goal of this analysis is to identify and rectify bottlenecks in the pipeline of higher education. The goal is to see where focused interventions might be most effective.

Q: Colloquially, we refer to a “declaration of systemwide impaction”, what does this mean?

A: Impaction in this context would mean that additional criteria are evaluated for “out of area” students. It is up to each campus to make a campus-specific declaration of impaction (or not).

Q: Cal Poly San Luis Obispo is pursuing dramatically increased campus student fees. What is the CO perspective?

A: The Chancellor is generally not in favor of presidents advocating for additional student fees.

Q: The local executive director of the ACLU spent a lot of time at a recent breakfast talking about how many students do not have access to a-g coursework, especially those from rural or under-funded school districts.

A: The senate has spoken on these issues in the past. Much of the deficit in a-g availability reflects school funding concerns for both instruction and support. It is clear that the CSU a-g requirements do reflect the criteria that we hold students to in order to ensure adequate preparation.

Q (statement): Thank you for your remarks regarding the independent doctorate of professional nursing. This is not something that will appear on 23 campuses. It is not an unfunded mandate.

A: That is correct.

Q: Chancellor Reed is resistant to student fee increases, but at some campuses student fee increases have funded athletics without a vote of the full student body because the “where feasible” clause has been used to allow a May vote of the student government to facilitate the imposition of this additional student fee.

A: Student fee increases are covered in Executive Order 1034. I do not know the specifics of the situation you describe.

11.3 Gail Brooks

Although there are some fundamental differences on salary issues, in other domains CFA and the CO have engaged in collaborative action. In many cases grievances that were scheduled for mediation have been resolved amicably without waiting for the full formal process to take place.

Q: Is there an intention for the CSU to do faculty exit interviews?

A: The issue that you are raising is addressed on some campuses. We have been working with the Academic Senate CSU Faculty Affairs committee to provide reports in a centralized fashion regarding these issues.

11.4 John Travis, CFA (10:10 Time Certain Friday January 23rd)

Welcome, most of the items today follow along the types of discussions you have been having over the last several days. CFA continues to work to ensure its presence in Sacramento. We are working to reduce the “accepted” budget cuts for the CSU in the higher education budget. The “cuts have consequences” campaign is collecting and disseminating stories of the impacts that the cuts have on individuals. We continue to work on other approaches as well. At the Pell Institute, Tom Mortenson, has written a report for the CFA ([calfac.org](http://www.calfac.org)) “*California at the edge of the cliff*” (<http://www.calfac.org/calattheedge.html>) looking at the long term consequences of cuts to the CSU to California. California higher education has deteriorated dramatically. In the last two decades support for higher education has been decimated. One response on the part of CFA to the cuts to higher education was the CFA resolution “a new deal for the new millennium” ... the thrust of the resolution is that \$700 billion dollars for financial institutions should mean that 10% of that could be provided as a “bailout” for higher education. Senator Portantino carried the resolution (http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/asm/ab_0001-0050/hr_4_bill_20081201_introduced.pdf) to ask the Federal government for support for higher education.

On Bargaining, last Friday’s “last best final offer” was 0% SSI, 0% equity, etc., which was also the administrations first offer. Thus, we are effectively at impasse although impasse has not yet been formally declared. If the compact was not funded, a meet and confer was possible. If the meet and confer was not successful, binding arbitration (mediation + arbitration) is one option. The other possibility is to allow concerted job action (the statutory route). At this time the future direction of CFA and CSU interaction has not yet been determined. Bargaining around the 2009/2010 contract elements will be reopened soon. In article 31 the SSI and CSI are contractual while traditional HEERA guidelines covered equity increases. There is currently an agreement to treat all three elements in a similar manner vis-à-vis bargaining.

Q: What is the status of other organizations?

A: Most agreements with other unions in the CSU are looking at zero percent increases.

Q: The current contract was to rectify historic years of no or low salary increases for instructional faculty. It seems unconscionable to maintain a “no increase” party line on the part of the CSU in bargaining. Is there any rationality possible here?

A: Reason, rationality, and argumentation are not necessarily part of bargaining. It is more about power than reason. The statute in California allows bargaining re-opening at any time the state of California does not have sufficient funds to adequately support contractual obligations. Do we as faculty, staff, and students agree with the arguments

that money allocation for salary within the CSU is limited by competing demands and thus unavailable for contractual obligations? I do not believe so.

Q: There seems to be a number of ballot initiatives on CalPERS.

A: CFA is very concerned about threats to CalPERS and we work hard to protect CalPERS. There is another initiative sponsored by CTA that allocates a sales tax increase to guarantee a further earmark on California expenditures. The signature collection process for this ballot proposition has not yet been completed.

Q: Across the United States the percentage of lecturers is increasing. There is also evidence that the cost of higher education is increasing, particularly in the domain of student services (e.g., health and required accommodations). The expectations of service delivery seem to be rapidly increasing.

A: CFA is aware of this study and is looking to assess the extent to which it is true in California. This is an instance where “competing demands” are coming in to play.

Q (statement): Public opinion and public perception are exceptionally important in California. It is important that we (CSU) manage public perceptions.

11.5 Brandon Chapin, CSSA Liaison (4:15PM Thursday)

The “big” issue for CSSA is the budget, which is directly tied to the membership dues issue. Three campuses that are current paying members and three non-paying members brought forth a joint proposal that was presented to the larger group. These are positive developments.

The new student trustee is Russell Stratham.

The failure of the State of California to fund Cal-grants is of concern.

The two major goals of CSSA this year are textbook affordability (and reserve access to textbooks) and student fees.

CSSA is hard at work on the upcoming “CHESS” (California Higher Education Student Summit) conference, which is the annual CSSA conference on student leadership.

12. Committee Recommendations

AS-2869-08/AA (Rev)

Acknowledgement of Faculty Involvement in the *Access to Excellence Accountability Plan*

Approved Unanimously

AS-2870-08/AA (Rev)

Support of the *Give Students a Compass Project*

Approved Without Dissent

AS-2871-08/AA (Rev)
Quality Assurance in Technology Mediated Course Offerings
Approved Unanimously

AS-2872-08/FA/FGA (Rev)
Protecting Instruction During Times of Budget Crises
Approved

AS-2873-08/FA
Collecting Survey Data About Concerning Voluntary Faculty Declined Offers of
Employment from the CSU
Approved Unanimously

AS-2874-09/FGA
Support for the Proposed Higher Education Investment Act
(Waiver) Approved Unanimously

AS-2875-09/APEP/FGA
Criticism of the Contemplation of a Reduction to the K-12 Academic Year
(Waiver) Approved Without Dissent

AS-2876-09/FGA
Reaffirmation of Campus Faculty Consultation in Budget Decisions (Waiver) Approved
Unanimously

**The following items were introduced at the January 22-23, 2009 meeting and will be
acted upon at the March 19-20, 2009 meeting.**

AS-2877-09/AA
Voting Rights for Academic Council on International Programs International Program
(IP) Coordinator Liaisons

AS-2878-09/AA
The Right of the Faculty to Have a Vote of No Confidence

AS-2879-09/AA
Keeping Recognition for Faculty Creators and/or Founders for Centers and Institutes
developed within the CSU System

AS-2880-09/AA
Faculty Support for Energy Conservation

AS-2881-09/FA
Support for Improved Faculty Development Opportunities for Lectures

AS-2882-09/FA

Opposing Restrictions on Educational Exchanges With Cuba

AS-2883-09/FA

Affirmation of Equal Rights for All Individuals Regardless of Race, Ethnicity, Gender, Sexual Orientation or Other Dimensions of Diversity

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 PM