

Academic Senate CSU

Academic Senate CSU Plenary Minutes January 21-22, 2010

Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 10:00 a.m.

Roll Call

Senators Present: (Bakersfield) Michael Ault, John Tarjan; (Channel Islands) James Meriwether, William (Billy) Wagner; (Chico) Kathy Kaiser, James Postma; (Dominguez Hills) Kate Fawver, Patricia Kalayjian; (East Bay) Susan Gubernat, Henry (Hank) Reichman; (Fresno) No senators present; (Fullerton) Reyes Fidalgo, Diana Guerin, Barry Pasternack; (Humboldt) Bernadette Cheyne, Marshelle Thobaben; (Long Beach) Margaret Costa, David Hood, Praveen Soni; (Los Angeles) Kevin Baaske, Robert Land; (Maritime) Tony Snell, James Wheeler; (Monterey Bay) Karen Davis, J. Ken Nishita; (Northridge) Sandra Chong (for Nicholas Dungey), Steven Stepanek, Barbara Swerkes; (Pomona) David Lord, Saeed Monemi; (Sacramento) Robert (Bob) Buckley, Thomas Krabacher, Christine Miller; (San Bernardino) Buckley Barrett, C. E. Tapie Rohm; (San Diego) Edward Aguado, William Eadie, Cezar Ornatowski; (San Francisco) Andrea Boyle, Jerald Shapiro, Darlene Yee-Melichar; (San Jose) 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, Paul O'Brien; (CSU Retired Faculty) Harold Goldwhite; (Chancellor's Office) Colleen Bentley and Leo Van Cleve/Thursday (for Jeri Echeverria), Jeri Echeverria

Guests: Gail Brooks, Steven Dixon, Dunixi Guereca, Elizabeth Hoffman, Benjamin Quillian, Charles Reed

Approval of Agenda

Agenda was approved as amended.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes of November 5-6, 2009 were approved as submitted.

Announcements

The Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee will meet next Monday.

Presentations/Introductions

- Senator Costa introduced Lisianny Ferreira, a student visiting from Brazil.
- Chair Tarjan introduced Colleen Bentley, Director of Special Projects for the California State University Office of the Chancellor.
- Chair Tarjan introduced Leo Van Cleve, Director of International Programs.

Reports

Chair's Report

Chair Tarjan referred senators to his written report distributed previously.

Standing Committees

Senators Postma (AA), Buckley (APEP), Baaske (FA), and Barrett (FGA) provided brief reports on the activities of the respective standing committees.

Academic Senate CSU

Discussion of Faculty Trustee Appointment

The Academic Senate moved to a committee of the whole. Chair Tarjan reviewed the timeline of events pertaining to the appointment of a faculty trustee. Senator Goldwhite, Chair of Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee, reviewed the actions of the committee. Without dissent, the committee recommended supporting the nominees submitted to the Governor and also pursuing all actions to persuade the governor to appoint a faculty trustee. Former Faculty Trustees Craig Smith, Kathleen Kaiser, and Harold Goldwhite provided their perspectives on the ramifications of the faculty trustee vacancy in terms of board functioning and actions. Various senators provided their perspectives on addressing this issue. Straw votes were taken on various response options. The Academic Senate moved from the committee of the whole.

Other Committees and Committee Liaisons

Senator Van Selst: The General Education Advisory Committee discussed whether or not general-education granting test-out options for the College Level Exam Program (CLEP) should be expanded. It is envisioned that GEAC will recommend to AA to sponsor an ASCSU resolution in support of this expanded CLEP list. Other topics discussed were out of state articulation issues, the annual review of Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) equivalencies for GE, and area E credit for military service.

Senator Montanari: The search for the statewide dean of the extended university has progressed, and a recommendation has been made to EVC Echeverria.

Senator Nelson: The Travel and Scheduling Task Force will be underway in a few weeks. Anyone interested in joining the task force should contact her.

Senator Swerkes: The downsizing of the Lower Division Transfer Program (LDTP) is progressing rapidly. Most of the LDTP programs have been removed from the Academic Affairs website; the ten remaining programs are listed for advisement purposes. The remaining programs have been archived. A resolution from APEP will address this transition.

Gail Brooks, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources

Chair Tarjan asked Vice Chancellor Brooks to provide an update on the Human Resources Division. Vice Chancellor Brooks has been in her current position for three years. Shortly after she arrived, a major project was to integrate the PeopleSoft system with the State Controller's new payroll system (SAP; 21st Century Project). CSU was to go "live" with a new payroll system in June 2009. However, due to the bankruptcy of the firm hired to perform the integration of the system, this is now projected to take place in 2014. This is a problem because we have a legacy system that is very fragile. Making changes for employee benefits, for example, is quite challenging.

Vice Chancellor Brooks described the strategic plan that was shared with the ASCSU. The purpose of the document is to define the kind of human resources environment we want for the CSU. Some of the recent successes of the division include opening up collaboration across the organization. For example, an absence management self-service HR module has been designed. All campuses have agreed to a single core process to manage employee absences, and this will save money because every time there is an update to PeopleSoft the upgrade can be done just one time at the CO rather than at the campuses. Additionally, a core module that can be used on each of the campuses to handle temporary faculty hiring/contracts has been designed, and all campuses have agreed to use it when it is completed next year.

Academic Senate CSU

Interactive web-based technology is now being used to hold regular meetings between the CO and faculty affairs, associate vice presidents, provosts, and HR staff at the campuses. Her division has partnered with the crafts union to develop online safety training. In the next few weeks, online training on the transition from faculty to department chair should be on the web. Also, online training for search committees is under development. The faculty retention and recruiting survey has been expanded. Another area of focus is to examine best practices in HR departments pertaining to faculty and staff in higher education and share this with our campuses.

With respect to collective bargaining, there are three contracts expiring this year: APC (academic professionals such as counselors and financial aid), UAW (teaching associates), and CFA (California Faculty Association). She expects that CSU will sunshine its proposals at the March board meeting. Proposed changes to state employee working conditions contained in the governor's proposed budget (pay cuts, increases in pension contributions, and caps on pay raises) do not apply to faculty.

Questions asked of VC Brooks:

Q: Three areas of concern (furlough implementation, employee assistance program, sexual harassment training) were raised.

A: With respect to furloughs, she doesn't know if the CSU will have furloughs again, but if we do we will deal with them more effectively. She is passionate about providing a quality employee assistance program, she is considering putting out a system-wide contract RFP to improve this service on all campuses. She agrees the sexual harassment prevention 2-hour training requirement is difficult but is required by law.

Q: In the strategic plan, a reinvestment in faculty excellence is prominent, including faculty research and scholarship and pedagogy. Can you tell us what happened to the funding for research and scholarly/creative activities this year?

A: I am unfamiliar with what happened in this regard

Q: CSU would be forward-thinking to look at faculty turn-over, including implementing ACR 73. What is happening in terms of opportunities for faculty development this year?

A: These would occur at the campus level and in academic affairs. She suspects that not a lot is happening this year. She will check on this with the campuses and get back to ASCSU.

Q: Is there any preliminary data on tenured or tenure-track faculty who are terminating their relationship with the CSU?

A: We have some data on the difference between 2008 and 2009, but nothing more current than that.

Q: In developing the HR modules, for example, that for temporary faculty, who do you consult with when you seek input?

A: A variety of people; there is a system-wide committee comprised primarily of IT and faculty affairs, and they were to solicit input from campuses. Also, provosts are consulted.

Q: On page 5, goal 4 of the strategic plan, I don't think we can mirror the diversity of the student population. I don't see how we can accomplish this, as our student population turns over much more quickly than our employee population. Also, this section could be strengthened by including a nondiscrimination statement with respect to hiring.

A: Thank you.

Academic Senate CSU

Q: Where are we in the negotiation of 2008-09 raises? 2009-10? Also, there was a task force on anti-Semitism formed last year; what is its status?

A: In terms of 2008-09 increases, we are in fact-finding. On the 2009-10 increases, we have not started the discussion. The governor's task force on anti-Semitism has met several times.

Q: When possible, it would be useful to have meetings between department chairs face-to-face.

A: We do offer, once a year, a face-to-face orientation for new department chairs. Due to the budget, we were unable to bring chairs together this year.

Q: In the strategic plan, can you explain what is meant by "workload reallocation for exceptionally productive faculty"?

A: The person who has worked on this particular part of the plan is not here today, so I can't comment on that specifically. Where we have best practices across the system, we should disseminate them.

Q: How can faculty know who to call at the system level with questions about their 403b plans? I could not figure out who to contact.

A: The implementation of the 403b plan administration was bumpy, and your comments are well taken.

Q: Can emeriti be used to mentor new department chairs? They have a lot of experience they can share.

A: Thank you. That is a good idea.

Q: I have heard there is a plan to centralize admission grievances. Is this true?

A: There is a law in the government code that requires that we have an appeal process for students and applications for student admission where there is a claim of harassment, retaliation, or discrimination. We will be issuing a new executive order next week that will require a consistent process at the campus level for the handling of those complaints. There will be an informal and formal process at the campus, and the appeal comes to the Chancellor's Office.

Vice Chancellor Brooks was thanked for her visit.

Charles Reed, Chancellor

The CSU bond rating is now four notches better than that of the State of California, which saves the system a lot of money. The CSU has about \$450 million worth of projects and \$200 million worth of lease-revenue bonds that need to be issued this spring, and we are trying to do these on our own credit.

In the last few months, he has spent a lot of time with the Department of Finance and the governor's office to advocate for higher education. The CSU-UC working relationship is the best ever, and the CSU and UC have worked together well to advocate for higher education.

In October, Chancellor Reed wrote an op-ed piece in the *San Francisco Chronicle* that California is on the way to having world-class prisons and second-class universities. This caught the attention of the governor and his staff, and Chancellor Reed presented a lot of information about this to them. UC waited until November to raise fees last year, but CSU did this in July. Additionally, UC fees were raised for September 2010 in November 2009.

Leadership in this state is very concerned about access for higher education. In his budget, the governor treated UC and CSU the same. Everyone thinks that UC and CSU are being treated better than everyone else. This is true. The governor had to cut about \$19 billion from the state budget, and he had to cut deeply in other areas such as health, welfare, and prisons. He has recommended that CSU and UC receive \$366 million each. This revenue was reallocated from other agencies. Also, the governor anticipated that \$6.9 billion of California's revenue will come from the federal government. However, the governor did not get a

Academic Senate CSU

favorable reception in Washington. Some of the money for the CSU and UC is contingent on the federal money, but not all of it. \$305 million is not contingent on the federal funds. Last year, the governor vetoed \$255 million that was to be repaid to the CSU and the UC. The legislature cut us an additional \$50 million last year; the legislature said it would try to repay us if they could. The CSU has planned to cut enrollment by about 30,000 more students this year. There is \$60.6 million more in the budget for approximately 8,000 FTES. The additional money is to reduce enrollment cuts. Governor's Office requested that we not cut our enrollments as we had projected. He will talk to the campus presidents next week about building waiting lists for admissions. So far, there has been one budget hearing this week, and not much has come from that. The governor's budget also includes anticipated revenue for both CSU and UC from a student fee increase of 10%. We have not made any decisions about revenue; we included a 10% fee buy-out in our budget request, and the governor did not fund that. The governor's budget does not include any capital projects. They will come back to address these in May, depending upon the state's budget and bond ratings. We have projects approved two years ago; we are projects ready to go, so we are trying to get our own bonds this spring. This is at a time when we are getting the best prices on construction that we have seen in the last five or six years, so we are trying to move our projects forward.

Questions asked of Chancellor Reed:

Q: Have you already communicated with the governor, or will you, about the appointment of the faculty trustee?

A: I don't get in the governor's business. There has been a lot of turnover in the governor's office. If they ask me questions or keep me informed, I appreciate that. Earlier in the fall, Chancellor Reed said it was important to appoint a student and a faculty member. At this time, both of these positions are vacant (the recently-appointed student trustee has resigned).

Q: Is the \$305 million tied to any increase in enrollment?

A: No, it is not tied to any increase in enrollment. But, what we have to worry about is that everybody else sees that revenue and, of course, they want that, too. Dr. Reed is not counting on an increase in enrollment, because he does not see the funding coming from the federal government. He is going to talk to the presidents about use of waiting lists.

Q: What do you see that we need to be doing from the faculty side to advocate?

A: What we all need to do is to be advocates for the CSU and UC. We need to talk about how important access is for young people to get a college degree. Chancellor Reed is talking with Mark Yudof this afternoon to talk about a combined assault in April to advocate for our budget. Chancellor Reed gets frustrated at times that we don't all work together as a family. We need all the help we can get to sustain our advocacy efforts this year. We need to change the culture back to what it used to be. That is, California should be investing in our future rather than paying for our failures (prisons). The governor hears this message.

Q: Why is it that the UC and CSU are treated the same in the budget proposal, but the CSU is so much larger?

A: They got the same cuts at the same time we did. The governor thought that since the cuts were the same, the same dollars should be restored.

Q: Of the \$70 million federal monies we received in the fall, approximately \$20 was put into the schedule for the spring. About \$50 million was held in anticipation of cuts in the spring. What is the status of that money?

A: He doesn't think we are going to get cut any more this spring. He is planning to use the \$50 million to offer more classes in the fall. This is one-time only money. We have to remember that we have a

Academic Senate CSU

potential \$70 million liability due to a class action suit by a few students about the recent general fee increases.

Q: In this year's budget, money for research, scholarly, and creative activities was cut. This is important to support our junior faculty. Will this relatively small amount be reinstated?

A: I agree with you, and if we get the \$305 million perhaps we can re-invest in the CSU.

Jeri Echeverria, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

The Graduation Initiative (formerly "Closing the Achievement Gap") is a six-year initiative to take place at the Chancellor's Office as well at the campuses. This initiative grew out of discussions at last June's president's summer retreat in June. Kati Haycock, the president of the Educational Trust, spoke about the enormous challenges of closing the achievement gap, particularly in California. In spite of all of our efforts, we are losing ground in terms of closing the achievement gap. The achievement gap refers to the difference in graduation rates between the non-underrepresented minorities and underrepresented minorities. Although the federal definition of who is an underrepresented minority is evolving, we are in general referring to graduation rates between Latino, African-American, some Southeast Asian students and what we have traditionally called Anglo students.

Today in the U.S., among 25- to 29-year-olds, of those with a bachelor's degree or higher, 37% are Anglo, 20% are Black, 12% are Latino, and 58% are Asian/Pacific Islanders. There is a disparity across the country, not only in California. We had an effort to improve retention and graduation rates that we called "22 points of light." Despite those efforts, our graduation rates cumulatively across the CSU are an average of 65% in 6 years. Right now, the average graduation rate for new full-time freshmen in the CSU is 58% for white students, 33% for Latino students, and 9% for African-American students. The gap persists. There are 24 systems in the country that are participating in this effort in conjunction with the two groups that sponsored the "Access to Success Initiative," the National Association of System Heads (NASH) and the Education Trust. Chancellor Reed is the president of NASH, and he has been a spokesperson for this issue for years. He brought this initiative to the campus presidents at their retreat in June, and they did.

Sir Michael Barber gave a two-day seminar on graduation rates, and the presidents committed at that meeting to bring their campus graduation rates to the top quartile of national averages based on data from the Education Trust. In many ways, perhaps we got the cart before the horse. There are a few campuses whose graduation rates are already in the top quartile. They have been asked to increase their graduation rates by 6%. This refers to the six-year graduation rate for the incoming freshman class. Out of the October 26-27 meeting, the Chancellor stated he would like the campus "delivery plans" submitted by Christmas. EVC Echeverria read them. There was a diversity of plans, which are draft plans that may be changed. This will be an iterative process. The target, however, cannot change.

There is a delivery team at the Chancellor's Office who meet with EVC Echeverria every week to figure out how to be supportive to campuses as they struggle with this. There are some things that are not known about graduation. For example, which strategy in the campus plans will have the strongest effect? We don't know, because we don't collect data systematically. There is a belief that better advising is the key, but we don't have a way to tie our activities to the outcomes when rates change. This initiative is different from others because it is a "super initiative" under which most of the things we do make sense. There is a lot of good that takes place on campuses that does not relate to graduation; however, the degree is what gets students into doors. The CSU has not spent a lot of time and attention on getting students to complete the degree. The degree will help students advance in society. This is a focus point that is worth doing. On your campus, tell your provost you want to get involved.

Academic Senate CSU

Questions asked of EVC Echeverria:

- Q: The CLA Task Force recommended administration of the CLA at least every three years, but the directive now is that the CLA be administered by campuses every year.
- A: Yes, this recommendation was made to the President's Accountability Task Force, who also agreed with the recommendation. The Chancellor's concern is that campuses would move away from administering the test, and he wanted the data to be annually collected and posted. He views the CLA as the sole indicator to measure our effectiveness in the two areas assessed, analytical thought and composition. Hence, he directed that it be offered annually.
- Q: Shouldn't we have an initiative that is focused on increasing the rates of intellectual growth and skill acquisition rather than the current graduation initiative focus on graduation rates? There doesn't seem to be much faculty participation in this initiative so far.
- A: The focus of this initiative is not how quickly we can get students out. On the state and national level, we have several invocations to look at graduation rates. This is the first generation where we will have fewer college graduates than in prior generations. I believe that if we engage faculty partnership in answering the types of questions I raised earlier, we will be a better and stronger system and we will learn some things about ourselves. I thought that we might need to pinpoint interventions for nontraditional students. National data, however, do not support this. For example, shoring up advisement helps close the gap. Yes, we haven't reached out to faculty to the extent that we need to do. This is a process.
- Q: It seems like the state budget crisis is compromising our ability to increase our graduation rate. For example, we have a backlog of freshman students needing composition. Also, the incoming freshman group we are focusing on in this initiative has already been impacted by K-12 budget cuts, so their preparation is less than that of prior cohorts.
- A: Yes, this is very complex, and this is a very challenging time. But, I have faith in us and I hope you will participate in a meaningful way to make it better.
- Q: When we privilege one indicator (graduation rate), we subordinate all other indicators that are also important, which may lead to the compromising of quality. Other factors that are beyond our control also influence graduation rates.
- A: I agree with your concern about single indicators. I am interested in learning through multivariate analyses the variables that impact graduation rates.
- Q: The "command and control" language in the Barber method speaks for itself. Deliverology seems like it is more than a methodology, and it is inherently contradictory with shared governance. It has a methodology with an embedded ideology. It is not a partnership opportunity structure, but a compliance structure. As this methodology begins to be implemented, what will be the impact on campus decisions to restructure curriculum?
- A: I would be interested in looking at some way in which faculty can participate in this. Data from the Education Trust show that in K-12, the major key to success of any student is a good teacher. Some presidents at the October meeting suggested that we are the only state with an upper division general education requirement, and perhaps we should drop it. This should go through faculty governance.
- Q: How big is the scope of the graduation initiative effort? For example, would we encourage students to go full-time instead of part-time? Our budgets are all about FTEs, rather than graduation rates.
- A: I think there may be proposals along these lines. For example, what if CSU rewarded campuses so that a portion of their allocation was based on closing the graduation rate?

Academic Senate CSU

Q: Have you considered closing the gap between males and females? And between disciplines? Also, I think the key to success is personal contacts, and that small steps are progress that should be recognized.

A: Yes, hopefully disparities such as you mentioned will be examined.

Q: Faculty are often in a reactive mode, with a top-down decision being made and sent down. Most of what we do requires engagement of faculty. We do not disagree with the goals. However, a decision was made about implementation without faculty involvement. Wouldn't starting with the idea that faculty involvement is needed and starting with them be a better approach, rather than having to defend your actions/decisions after the fact?

A: I appreciate your comments. Anytime a group such as ASCSU is put in a reactive position is a problem. I have found myself in that situation as a faculty member and as an administrator.

Q: On the CLA and its implementation, I believe the administration of the test makes the data problematic. I haven't seen any progress on this.

A: I have not seen any progress on this, but the designers of the CLA insist that the data are valid.

Q: I teach in another country, and there is an entire societal structure there that supports the notion that students complete their degrees in four years. This is not the case here, and this initiative overlooks the diversity of our students.

A: I think some of these concerns have been raised.

Q: I applaud the goal of closing the achievement gap, but I am concerned that it does not recognize the different experiences and expectations that students of color experience. Would we receive extra funding if our campus graduated students of color at higher levels than predicted?

A: I would like to say yes, but I can't guarantee this.

Q: Agreeing on some principles to guide the graduation initiative so that students are not harmed might be important.

A: Yes, it would be helpful to do this and to evaluate the impact of the principles on graduation rates. For example, requiring students to select a major focuses them to at least begin thinking about the decision.

Q: I am concerned about the impact of deliverology methodology on quality. That is, to get to the target, people will lower quality. This is what was found in the U.K. with the deliverology model implementation.

A: This is possible. I have noticed that people will game the system. This would happen whether the decision was made top-down or bottom-up.

Q: How do the wait lists proposed by the Chancellor for admissions play out? The budget is often passed by the governor and legislature very late.

A: Some of our campuses already use wait lists, and the timing is an issue. We may not know about the funding for enrollment growth until after July. Campuses are being directed to follow the enrollment targets already in place.

EVC Echeverria noted that the Academic Senate is often in a reactive position, and she encouraged us to have a conversation about the upcoming issues and take the initiative on addressing them.

Ben Quillian, Executive Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance

EVC Quillian reported that the governor's budget was very encouraging to the CSU. The proposed budget from the governor actually increases the CSU budget over last year. At the last Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting, the CSU requested \$884 million over last year's budget. Although it was believed unlikely that the

Academic Senate CSU

CSU would receive the entire amount, it was also believed that the CSU should explain our needs and put them forward to the governor. Instead of \$884 million, the governor's budget gave the CSU \$377 million above last year's appropriation. The governor promised to restore \$255 million that he cut out of the budget last year, and the legislature cut our budget by \$50 million. Thus, the \$305 million has been restored in the Governor's proposal. In addition, there is \$60.6 million in the governor's proposed budget to fund 2.5% enrollment growth (8,000 more students). This proposal has to go through the legislative process. It is premature to say that we have those funds, and we are probably in for a long slog with the legislative process.

The state has approximately a \$20 billion shortfall. The governor has called the legislature into special session to address the current \$8.9 billion shortage this year. The governor hopes to resolve this by the end of February. Most experts do not think that this is likely.

The governor also recently went to Washington, D.C. to ask for \$6.9 in federal aid. The Legislative Analyst's Report does not think it likely that the governor will receive the entire amount being requested; the LAO thought the governor might get \$2-3 billion from the federal government. The CSU will do all it can to encourage the legislature to grant us at least the \$377 million. However, we need to realize that higher education is vulnerable, because the governor proposes deep cuts for K-12 education, corrections, health and welfare. The proposed budget for K-12 is \$585 million below the maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement, but higher education is \$884 million above the MOE requirement. Thus, higher education is somewhat vulnerable. CSU will do all that it can to demonstrate the importance of higher education as the budget goes through the legislative process. There is some optimism, because where we start in the budget process is usually near to where we end. However, we are doubtful that we will get the \$60.6 million, because it is tied to a trigger related to receiving a certain amount of federal funds.

EVC Quillian is now working with Robert Turnage to run various budget scenarios to look at our planning assumptions. That is, what the CSU will do if it receives various levels of funding. At this time, planning assumptions have not changed. We are still planning conservatively as if we are not receiving the \$305 million and will have no furloughs.

Questions asked of EVC Quillian:

Q: If we have employee furloughs next year, can you assure us that the vote will happen before the school year ends.

A: No, I can't assure you when the vote would take place. Last year, it certainly took place later than we would have desired. This was due to the lateness of the budget and the length of time it took to communicate with various labor organizations. The Chancellor is very mindful of need to decide this as quickly as possible.

Q: Next year is the fiftieth anniversary of CSU. Are there any plans to commemorate this?

A: Garret Ashley is aware of this, and whatever is done will not be overly costly.

Q: How did the lobbying for lease revenue bonds turned out?

A: Not as well as we had hoped. We were told that lease-revenue bonds would not be issued until 2013. Department of Finance is now anticipating a bond sale this spring, and at this time they are planning to include 2 of 5 CSU projects. Treasury makes the decision of what to include, and they have said that they will make every effort to issue bonds in the spring. However, S& P recently dropped the credit rating of the state. This will impact the credit rating of state and may impact the decision of the treasurer as to whether the State can afford the rates. The Chancellor asked EVC Quillian to pursue alternate strategies to fund our projects. CSU cannot legally use commercial paper. CSU also cannot use student fee revenue to purchase bond anticipation notes from the state. Legally, we have no

Academic Senate CSU

options. We are continuing to push both Finance and the Treasurer to do a bond sale as soon as possible. It is still a question as to whether our projects would be included in a bond sale, however.

- Q: Rather than viewing the 50 year celebration as costing money, perhaps we should look at it as a revenue opportunity. San Jose State realized millions in donations when it celebrated its 150 year anniversary.
- A: I will share this information with Garrett Ashley.
- Q: In the *New York Times*, there have been many articles about finances in the university. Two themes are putting caps on the cost of sports and the cost of presidents. Are we moving in that direction?
- A: This has not been a topic of discussion. Athletics is something the Chancellor thinks about a great deal in terms of expense, however. Most campuses are seeking to reduce the use of state money that goes to athletics. There has been no actual movement to change the way athletics is funded, but the Chancellor is interested in reducing the amount of state monies that go into athletics. Remuneration for presidents is BOT decision.
- Q: Do the various budget scenarios include any enrollment growth?
- A: Yes, we are going to look at enrollment targets as it relates to the amount of money we receive. If the \$305 million were used exclusively for enrollment growth, we would still reduce enrollment growth, we would just reduce the enrollment targets less. Our need, as put forth by the BOT, was \$884 million.
- Q: What would the 2.5% enrollment growth be based on?
- A: (EVC Echeverria responded) It would be based on the calculations we are using this year for next year. On top of 342,000 FTES.
- Q: Cuts in enrollment may impact campus ability to pay for bonds used to build dorms, etc. Are we considering that?
- A: Yes, campuses are coming up with strategies to deal with this. Particular attention is being given to the scope and size of future facilities.
- Q: With respect to campus budget plans due to you by February 15th, have you made any changes following the governor's budget?
- A: No, we are using the same planning assumptions. They represent the worst-case scenario with planning assumptions of no \$305 million, no furloughs, no enrollment growth money.
- Q: There are many decisions being made now based on the worst-case scenario you describe, such as program cuts, etc. Is there any way to help campuses so they don't go too far in making cuts?
- A: On the administrative side of things (versus academic side), EVC Quillian does not think they can go "too far" in making cuts, as long as core functions such as public safety and the management of finances are properly maintained. He believes their planning assumptions are not that far off.
- Q: Is it true that the one-third financial aid set-aside leaves campuses forever?
- A: No. It is taken, and then returned to campuses based on projected financial aid needs.

Ben Quillian was thanked for his visit.

Academic Senate CSU

Elizabeth Hoffman, CFA

CFA and CSU are in fact-finding on the 2008-09 pay increases. There is a meeting tomorrow. When the fact-finding report comes out, there is a 10-day black out period. At the moment, the CSU position is 0-0-0 (SSI, GSI, equity/merit). If there is no agreement, CSU can impose and CFA can suspend Article 9 and do concerted action at that time.

They have not started bargaining for 2009-10 pay raises. The second year of the equity program is a particular priority; the first year was implemented, but not the second.

The faculty contract expires June 30, 2010. Currently, we are in the process of doing public notice proposals. CSU may give theirs during the March board meeting. A CFA bargaining survey will go out soon. There is the possibility of extending the contract, and both sides must agree.

CFA is concerned about the lack of a faculty trustee. They have consulted with legal counsel, and there is no encouragement that CFA has the standing to intervene (or that it would be helpful).

With respect to shared governance, CFA developed a paper on restructuring. She encourages senators to read it. CFA is concerned about early start programs and wants to be sure that there is adequate faculty input. The current programs are recognized as successful. CFA lost 2,000 lecturers from fall 2008 to fall 2009 (1,000 FTES positions) on top of losses from 2007-08. In the past decade, FTEF has gone up 3%, but FTES has gone up 25%. There is also a drop in tenured faculty from 2008 to 2009. New data have been posted on the CFA website at www.calfac.org. (See lecturer's link). CFA is concerned about access and quality in the CSU.

To get more resources in the CSU, CFA has sponsored AB 656 Gas and Oil Severance Tax. CFA collected over 50,000 signature cards supporting AB 656. The bill has helped CFA get out the message that the CSU needs more resources.

SB 218 Transparency and Accountability passed through the Legislature last year, but was vetoed by the Governor. It is now SB 330, co-authored by Tom Harman.

CFA is pleased that the governor made higher education so prominent in his state of the state speech. CFA got over 5,000 e-mails in its e-march on the budget. A press conference was attended by 30 media outlets.

CFA is sponsoring an Statewide Day of Action on March 4th, and this is intersegmental. The pattern across the state is to have off- and on-campus events, perhaps with the theme of "Keep the Doors Open." President Mark Yudof of the UC has stated he will participate in one of the off-campus events.

Questions asked of Elizabeth Hoffman:

Q: Are you saying that when we go into full-contract bargaining for our successor contract that an extension is possible? How can this be done when the contract has been broken?

A: Yes, the parties can agree to extend the contract. The pay raises were subject to getting a certain level of funding, so we don't know yet what we will get out of the 2008-09 raises. Then the 2009-10 raises are also subject to separate bargaining.

Q: Were there any unspent funds from the PPIs in the last contract?

A: So far, we haven't uncovered any unspent money.

Academic Senate CSU

Q: AB 1604 has been introduced, and it includes an oil/gas severance tax that goes into the state's general fund. What is CFA's position on this?

A: CFA continues to support AB 656.

Q: If a faculty member retires in 2012 and pay raises are retroactively negotiated, is the faculty member's pension adjusted to reflect the increase?

A: When you are retired, you are no longer on the payroll of the CSU. This would need to be investigated further.

Q: Is CFA concerned about take-backs in the successor bargaining?

A: We are all concerned about the impact of a really tough economic environment.

Q: Do you have any sense if furloughs will be back next year?

A: Furloughs end June 30, 2010. Nothing new can be done about furloughs without a faculty vote.

Chair Tarjan thanked Elizabeth Hoffman for her report.

Dunixi Guereca, CSSA Liaison

The CSSA is organizing a March on the Capitol on March 22. It is coordinated with California Community College Senate. We hope to get a good turnout.

The newly-appointed student trustee has resigned. We are investigating how to replace the trustee, and at this time there is only one student trustee.

Academic advising is CSSA's focus this year. They want to form a task force between the CSSA, ASCSU, and the Chancellor's Office to focus on advising.

Chair Tarjan thanked Dunixi Guereca for his report.

Committee Recommendations

AS-2916-09/EX (Second Reading)

Addition of a Second Faculty Trustee to the CSU Board of Trustees

Tabled until May 6-7, 2010 Plenary

AS-2917-09/FA (Second Reading)

A Resolution in Support of Reinstating Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Awards for 2010-2011

Approved unanimously

AS-2918-09/AA (Second Reading)

Reaffirming the Need for Consultation in Campus-based Program Reduction, Suspension, and Elimination Policies

Approved unanimously

AS-2919-09/FGA (Second Reading)

Call for Adequate and Sustainable Funding in Support of Public Higher Education

Approved unanimously

AS 2920-09/FGA (Second Reading)

Dealing With the Impact of Funding Shortfalls on the Winter/Spring Admissions of Transfer Students

Approved

Academic Senate CSU

AS 2921-09/FGA (Second Reading)

Requesting Modifications in SB 48 (College Textbooks: Electronic Versions)

Approved

AS-2923-09/APEP (Second Reading)

Assessing the Effectiveness of the Early Assessment Program (EAP) in Increasing the Academic Readiness of Graduating High School Seniors

Approved unanimously

AS-2924-09/APEP/AA (Second Reading)

Support of Legislation to Authorize the Offering of the Doctoral of Physical Therapy (DPT) Degree in the CSU

Withdrawn

AS 2925-09/APEP/AA (Second Reading)

Establishment of Campus-Level “Presidential Enrollment Management Advisory Groups” as Specified by CSU Enrollment Management Policy and Practices

Approved unanimously

AS-2926-09/AA/APEP (Second Reading)

Recommendations Regarding the Implementation of Mandatory Early Start Programs

Approved unanimously

AS-2927-09/AA/APEP (Second Reading)

Support of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates’ (ICAS) Statement on Competencies in Mathematics

Approved unanimously

AS-2928-09/AA (Second Reading)

Shared Governance in Enrollment Management and Facilitating Graduation for High Unit Students

Approved unanimously

AS-2929-19/APEP/AA (Second Reading)

Continuing Support for Efforts Facilitating Transfers Between Community Colleges and the CSU

Approved unanimously

AS-2930-09/APEP (Second Reading)

Establishment of a Change Control Process for Authorizing Customizations to the Common Management System (CMS) in Response to Changes in Policy Practices

Approved without dissent

AS-2931-09/FA (Second Reading)

Protecting the Rights of Contingent Faculty Who Participate in Shared Governance

Approved unanimously

AS-2933-10/APEP (First Reading/Waiver)

Establishment of a Task Force to Respond to Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code: Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses

Approved unanimously

Academic Senate CSU

AS-2934-10/FA/AA/FGA (First Reading/Waiver)

Affirming Shared Governance within the CSU: Adoption and Use of Deliverology as a Tool to Achieve Administrative Action
Approved unanimously

AS-2941-10/EX (First Reading/Waiver)

Support for the Appointment of an Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) Nominee as CSU Faculty Trustee
Approved without dissent

AS-2935-10/FA (First Reading)

Continuing Lack of Faculty Representation on the Board of Trustees
Withdrawn

AS-2936-10/FA (First Reading)

Private Donors' Respect for Academic Freedom

AS-2937-10/AA/FGA (First Reading)

Opposition to AB 440, as Amended (July 4, 2009), Beall. California Community Colleges: Student Transfer

AS-2938-10/AA (First Reading)

Openness of the Accountability Process in the Graduate Professional Business Programs

AS-2939-10/AA (First Reading)

Use and Implementation of the Collegiate-Level Assessment (CLA)

AS-2940-10/AA (First Reading)

Proposed Repeal of Title 5 Section 40503 Relative to the Bachelor of Vocational Education Degrees

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.