

Academic Senate CSU

Plenary Minutes

Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium

March 17, 2011 10:00 a.m.—5:00 p.m.
March 18, 2011 8:30 a.m.—3:00 p.m.

Call to Order

Meeting was 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, Dianne Rush Woods; (Fresno) Jacinta Amaral, Otto Benavides; (Fullerton), Reyes Fidalgo, Diana Guerin, Barry Pasternack; (Humboldt) Bernadette Cheyne, Marshelle Thobaben; (Long Beach) Margaret Costa, Eileen Klink, Praveen Soni; (Los Angeles) Kevin Baaske, Robert Land; (Maritime) Steven Browne, Tony Snell; (Monterey Bay) Karen Davis, J. Ken Nishita; (Northridge) Sandra Chong, Terri Lisagor (for Jennifer Matos), Steven Stepanek; (Pomona) Lisa Alex (for Saeed Monemi), Jared Stallones; (Sacramento) Robert (Bob) Buckley, Thomas Krabacher, Christine Miller; (San Bernardino) Buckley Barrett, C. E. Tapie Rohm; (San Diego) Edward Aguado, Carole Kennedy, Cezar Ornatowski; (San Francisco) Andrea Renwanz Boyle, Martin Linder, 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) Catherine Nelson, Brian Wilson; (Stanislaus) Steven Filling, Paul O'Brien; (CSU Retired Faculty) Harold Goldwhite; (Chancellor's Office) Ephraim Smith

Approval of Agenda

Approved as amended.

Approval of January 20-21, 2011 Minutes

Approved as submitted.

Announcements/Presentations/Introductions

- Senator Stepanek encouraged senators to attend a meeting at CSUN on April 22, 2011 entitled "The CSU: The Next Fifty Years." Chancellor Reed will give the keynote.
- Lisa Alex, chair of the Pomona Academic Senate, was introduced.
- Marshalle Thobaben has been re-elected to the ASCSU. Next year marks her 22nd year of service to ASCSU.
- Other senators re-elected to the ASCSU at their respective campuses were congratulated: Manzar Foroohar (SLO), Susan Gubernat (East Bay), Catherine Nelson (Sonoma), Bob Buckley (Sacramento), Judith Lessow-Hurley (San Jose).

Reports

Chair's Report

Chair Postma reviewed his written report, in which he addressed the upcoming fiftieth anniversary of the ASCSU, the status of the CSU and ASCSU budgets, the 2009-11 faculty trustee appointment process, and updates on implementation of the Early Start Initiative and SB 1440.

Standing Committees

Committee chairs provided brief reports on the work of the committees, particularly resolutions in first and second reading. Faculty Affairs is investigating concerns communicated from a number of campuses about the role of extended education. ASCSU Lobby Day will be April 12th.

Other Reports and Liaisons

Admissions Advisory Committee (AAC)

Senator Stepanek reported that AAC has not met.

General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC)

John Tarjan reported that GEAC decided to de-list all courses in about 1.5 years with less than 2 units in the Arts area. These courses will need to be resubmitted. Recommendations regarding articulation of critical thinking courses were made. GEAC is hoping that external funding will be available to assist campuses associated with efforts to implement the "Give Students a Compass" Project. GEAC received updates on Statway, International Baccalaureate, and on alignment of GE Breadth and IGETC (no progress on alignment). There may be some ITL resources to help faculty move toward assessment of outcomes for general education.

Budget Specialist

David Hood reported that the Governor does not have the votes to put the tax extensions on the June ballot. If the tax extensions are put on the ballot, it is critical for the CSU that they pass.

John Travis, CFA

CFA has taken a tentative "support" position on the tax extensions, should they be placed on the ballot. CFA support may be impacted by issues tied to the tax extensions (for example, if a spending cap or pension reforms are tied to the tax extension).

Our contract expired on June 30, 2010. Bargaining is not going well. The Chancellor's Office published full bargaining proposals on its website, which has never happened before. Usually, verbatim proposals have not been posted as the bargaining process involves give and take. CFA is committed to transparency and will do the same on its website.

Many contracts across the country have an article on academic freedom. A new article on academic freedom was been submitted to Chancellor's representatives a few weeks ago.

Faculty members on campuses most frequently raise questions about workload and compensation. With respect to workload, class sizes have grown, we have lost over 1700 FTEF in the past two years, and student enrollment has increased. CFA has proposed

Academic Senate CSU

conceptual principles on how workload is addressed. Although this was not posted on the Chancellor's Office website, but it will be posted on the CFA website. The proposal is to use curriculum to help define workload, as was done with EPR 76-36 (mode and level of instruction).

With respect to compensation, faculty on campuses want to know if the compensation lost over the past few years can be restored, or if there are furloughs in the future.

CSU faculty should have a national voice on higher education. Most of the conversations about higher education are among administrators, think tanks, and bureaucrats who have no experience in the classroom. CFA held a meeting attended by participants from over 30 states. Clear from these discussions is that concerns are similar across the country. There will be a press conference about this group in Washington DC in May, around the time of graduation. The group is still seeking a name, but it has a set of general principles that can be viewed on the CFA website.

CFA has scheduled events on every campus on April 13th. A primary focus will be on restructuring. Students have their own set of concerns that they will also be addressing on April 13th. In common is the concern about lack of support for higher education. Each campus is taking a unique approach, but every campus will have some discussion on that date.

Q: Will the ASCSU be invited to the national conversation CFA is coordinating about higher education?

A: Yes.

Q: What is the process to make changes to the contributions that faculty make to their retirement and health care benefit plans?

A: Historically, CFA has not bargained on these issues. These are handled by CalPERS. The Chancellor has never put those on the table for CFA, although theoretically he could. We have not been approached. The Chancellor's Office did not put Article 32 on the table in their sunshine proposals. CFA put forth sunshine proposals on Parental Leave. Pensions can be changed by statute; legislators, for example, could bill a law to change employee contributions to pensions. We have not seen any bills like this, yet.

Q: Is the 1700 FTEF (2500 headcount) figure you cited part-time faculty loss?

A: Yes, that is the loss over the past 2.5 years. There has been a return of some of those faculty members, however, due to the recent increase in enrollments.

Q: Are you also taking into consideration Garcetti decision in relation to academic freedom?

A: Yes. This is one of the reasons that we introduced the article on academic freedom.

Q: Is there any information posted about the CFA national conversation on higher education?

A: Yes, there are reports. The principles are posted on the CFA website (www.calfac.org).

Q: Guidance for faculty on restructuring?

A: Some campuses have dealt with restructuring for a long time. CSUDH was involved in restructuring last year, for example. Our CFA Headlines updates have focused on

restructuring. Faculty can also talk to their local chapter officers. John expects to see more discussions about restructuring (especially program elimination) as the budget crisis continues to wear down the CSU. CFA will put out more information on this on its website.

Q: The full professor salaries seem to be lower than comparable institutions. Will this be addressed in the CBA?

A: The last contract had a PPI program for full professors over two years. However, we haven't talked about salary at all with respect to the next contract, and we do not know when the Chancellor will provide his proposal.

Q: Faculty should read the *Academically Adrift* book so they can understand the national dialogue.

A: Good suggestion.

William R. Blischke, ERFA Liaison

The ERFA website (www.csuerfa.org) has a newsletter, which includes numerous timely articles. He encouraged senators to review it. ERFA's next meeting will be on April 23rd at the LAX Crowne Plaza.

Neil Sanchez, CSSA Liaison

Mr. Sanchez was not present.

Ad hoc Task Force on Senate Bylaws

Senator Baaske reported that Judith Lessow-Hurley was elected chair of the task force. At this plenary, the task force will put forth resolution AS-3005-11 regarding election of committee chairs for the body's consideration. The task force will continue to meet.

Guests

Ben Quillian, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer

In this climate of uncertainty and shifting sands, it has been exceedingly difficult to plan effectively. However, we now think we have enough information to establish enrollment targets for 2011-12 and provide campuses with a projection of their General Fund allocation and the necessary budget reductions.

You will recall that the 2011-12 CSU General Fund allocation was reduced \$500 million by Governor Brown, from a little less than \$2.8 billion to slightly less than \$2.3 billion. I should point out that \$2.3 billion is approximately the same funding level we had in 1999-2000, and we are now serving 70,000 more students. Moreover, the costs of providing quality academic offerings have increased dramatically. Instruction today is much more than a blackboard and chalk.

I understand the amount of the reduction has been questioned in some quarters, but before technical adjustments are made, before student tuition fees are projected and before unfunded mandatory costs are considered, the budget reduction is indeed a painful \$500 million. Taking those factors into account, the actual adjustment approaches \$400 million. A reduction of that magnitude presents a very significant challenge.

Academic Senate CSU

Several weeks ago Chancellor Reed directed the presidents to identify strategies they might employ to make the necessary reductions to their budgets. To provide general direction, they were told to think in terms of their proportionate share of \$300 million.

As we prepared the more detailed projections that were given to the campuses this week, we changed our allocation methodology to take into account the needs of our smaller campuses, and we gave consideration to the impact of State University Grants. In addition, we talked with the CFOs and the presidents to gain a fuller understanding of campus needs and challenges. The projections we provided this week set a system-wide enrollment target of 331,716 Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) and resulted in total budget reductions that approach \$300 million, with our largest campus having to reduce its budget by over \$26 million. The average campus reduction will exceed \$12 million. We are planning to reduce the budget of the Chancellor's Office by over \$10 million. Such reductions are nothing to sneeze at – quibble if you will over the percentage of the reductions.

We hope to be able to make system-wide changes to cover the remaining \$100 million. For example, we are changing the technology used in the Unisys data center to yield some \$10 million annually in cost reductions. We are implementing the Common Financial System and the Common Human Resources System, both of which will yield millions in reduced costs. We are engaged in the synergy projects to generate administrative efficiencies, which also should yield significant cost reductions. And, we are making proposals to the labor organizations with the intent of working together to reduce costs.

I have been meeting with the campus Chief Financial Officers, Ephraim has been meeting with the Provosts and Chancellor Reed has been working closely with the Presidents. I would be misleading you if I said there will be no pain, but we are confident we can manage through this very difficult situation. But, you have to understand certain things:

- There will be reductions in the workforce. Some term contracts may not be renewed. There will be far fewer new hires. Vacated positions may not be refilled. As our plans are developed, discussions will take place with our labor organizations and faculty governance bodies.
- There will be reorganizations to reduce administrative overhead.
- Special efforts will be made to reduce utility costs, equipment purchases, travel expenses, etc.
- Steps will be taken to review our use of technology to ensure increased efficiency.
- The use of on-line academic delivery systems will be examined to increase student access and generate revenue.
- Increased emphasis will be placed on enrollment management.

The campus leadership teams, working in consultation with our faculty governance bodies and the unions, will be looking for all reasonable ways to reduce costs while to the extent possible continuing to offer quality academic programs to our students. The changes will necessarily be transformative and intended to accommodate the dramatically reduced state support. Short-term remedies at the margins will not be sufficient.

I think everyone in this room knows the \$500 million budget reduction may not be the worst case scenario. Governor Brown has proposed a budget that is intended to close a \$25 billion gap. His budget is made up of \$12 billion in cuts (the CSU share of the cut is the \$500 million). Another billion dollars will be generated through the internal shifting of funds. And \$12 billion will be in the form of revenue enhancements, mostly from the extension of taxes that have either recently expired or will expire at the end of the fiscal year.

However, the Governor promised during his campaign that he would not extend or increase taxes without a positive vote of the citizens of California. A two-thirds vote in the Legislature is needed to place the matter before the voters. The Governor will have to have all of the Democrats and four Republicans to get that two thirds vote. To date, he has not yet received the needed support from the Republicans.

Assuming the Governor is successful in getting the two-thirds vote in the Legislature, the voters by simple majority would need to vote in favor of the tax extensions. It is not at all certain the voters will support vote in favor of extending the taxes.

The Governor hopes to be able to put the matter before the voters in June. To do so, he will need to get the support of the Legislature in the very near future. Yesterday the legislature took some actions on the budget, but their work has not yet been completed. They have not yet voted on placing the tax extensions before the voters. They have not yet voted on the budget bill or the education trailer bill.

So what if the tax extensions do not ultimately pass? Governor Brown has said to Chancellor Reed that the reduction could be as much as doubled for the CSU if the taxes are not extended. If that happens, all options would be on the table. We have begun to give preliminary thought to various options, but at this time we are a long way from developing solid plans to accommodate a \$1 billion budget reduction.

During these exceedingly difficult times, it is important that we all work together for the greater good of the CSU, the students, the faculty and staff. The stakes are much too high to continue playing destructive games and letting self-interests weigh against the credibility and worth of this institution. If ever there was a time for unity and single purpose, it is now.

Q: Shouldn't the CSU be talking publicly about what the budget cuts do to the system? That is, the ramifications of failing to pass the tax extensions? Can we re-frame the debate from tax increases to tax extensions?

A: Garrett Ashley and his team are working on this. We are ill-prepared to talk about the effect on other agencies, however. It is difficult to be very specific, because we must talk about our plans with our labor organizations first. Clearly, we would have to do something about tuition, and that would be terrible. The campuses have begun to cut deeply into their operations already. If the total cuts are \$1 billion, we would regrettably have to look to our students and their families. We are limited by the constraints we are under as a state institution with respect to the ways that we can generate revenues. Hopefully, the Legislature and Governor would not double the cuts to the CSU budget from \$500 million to \$1 billion.

Q: The citizens of California need to understand the transformative change that these budget cuts have over time. How can we possibly speak of "maintaining quality?"

Academic Senate CSU

A: I can't disagree. I can only point out that we have attempted to describe some of the changes that would have to be made, and we have been accused of scare tactics. There is going to be an impact on the quality of the offerings that we will have to give. We are viewing this as a major shift that will be long term. We need to work together now more than ever.

Q: Are the sacrifices we are constantly asked to take shared sacrifices? It seems like president salaries and car allowances are increased at a time when faculty salaries are stagnant.

A: To the best of my knowledge, there have been no increases in the salaries of sitting presidents in quite a while. However, the CSU is having a difficult time attracting qualified leadership at this time. We are finding it increasingly difficult to hire talented presidents. We have to increase the salary sometimes to get the presidents we want to hire. What is not noticed is that some of us do not seek reimbursement for meals during travel or purchase our own phones.

Q: When you talk about reductions to the CSU budget, what is the time period covered?

A: It's not a point in time; it is fiscal year to fiscal year appropriations from one year to the next. So it's the 2010 fiscal year versus the 2011 fiscal year as proposed by the Governor.

Q: With respect to the change in allocation method, is this a one-time approach? Or is this a permanent change?

A: Allocations have traditionally been based on the proportion of the budget. We need to be more responsive to the circumstances of the individual campuses. Based on feedback from the campuses, modifications were made. Thus, it was a more interactive process. This will be the method as long as I am Chief Financial Officer.

Q: Is the target of 331,176 FTES an increase or decrease?

A: It is a slight increase over this year's actual, which was approximately 328,000 FTES. However, it is below the level funded in the budget last fall, which was 339,000.

Q: We want to work with the CSU on the initiative campaign to tell our story to the public.

A: Karen was going to launch that, and I will get back to you on what is being done.

Q: If we all need to be pulling together this year, what is the strategy of opening bargaining contracts this year? I believe Vice Chancellor Brooks mentioned at our last meeting that all of the contracts are open except for one this year. Why not extend the contracts? CFA was willing to do so.

A: This is outside my responsibility in the organization. My staff and I are contacted about the fiscal implications of proposals made at the table. There may be some things in the current agreements that may need to be addressed before going another year with them. In order to handle the \$500 million or \$1 billion cut, we can't let the status quo go another year.

Q: Can you set up a website to try and quantify the sacrifices everyone in the system is making right now? This might be useful in talking to the Governor or legislators.

A: I know that you are making sacrifices, and this is a good point.

Q: What is the magnitude of the changes resulting from the new method of determining campus allocations?

A: We set a figure for base costs. Then we looked at the institutions with large numbers of State University Grants. They do not receive as much student fee revenue as other campuses. Then we talked to the campuses. The numbers were similar to that from the proportionate allocations. Some of the very small campuses got a raise, but this method seems to be viewed as equitable.

Q: What adjustment of student fees would be necessary if we get the \$1 billion reduction? When should that information go out to the public?

A: \$2,000 adjustment, if we get the \$1 billion cut. But that is not going to be acceptable. A mix of strategies would be needed. Some of the strategies would require consultation with our unions.

Gary Rhoades, Secretary General American Association of University Professors (AAUP)

Higher education has been changing more than many other sectors in terms of the structure of employment, the way we finance higher education, and how students access higher education.

Two basic themes that he hears around the country are that faculty members want to have a voice in the decision making on the matters that fundamentally shape the institution. There is a sense that shared governance is decreasing. The perception that we are in perpetual crisis prevents faculty participation from taking place.

The second theme is a fear about exercising faculty voice. That is, faculty are wondering to what extent they will be punished for exercising their voice on matters pertaining to the direction of the institution (per Garcetti). AAUP is encouraging academic senates (and where appropriate, faculty unions) to introduce language about freedom of speech regarding institutional matters without fear of retaliation.

There are three basic trends in higher education over the past 30 years. First, there has been a complete reversal in the structure of employment in the academy. Now, two-thirds of faculty members are contingent faculty; this impacts the ability of the academy to provide the engagement to students that is so important to quality. The numbers of faculty have not increased over time relative to the number of administrators, there have been increases in the numbers and proportions of senior administrators as well as of academic professionals, the clearest example of which are professionals in the area of student affairs. But there have been significant increases in non-faculty professionals in other realms as well. There is also a major challenge in the faculty demographic. The modal faculty member is a white male in his 50's; academic senates can help institutions think about what the faculty should look like in twenty years. How can we systematically rebalance the professoriate?

Second, there has been a shift in cost of the responsibility for higher education. There has been a shift from the state to individuals, and in student financial aid there has also been a shift from grants to loans. Students now graduate with crushing debt loads; in fact, the amount owed for higher education is higher than debt due to credit cards.

Academic Senate CSU

The third overhaul is educational outcomes. It is no accident that we have gone from measuring graduation rates in 4 years to measuring it in 6 or 8 years. Why? Perhaps it is because of the shift of the burden of cost to students/families, and the shift away from tenure track faculty, and the shift away from tenure track faculty. As we charge the students more and more, and hire more and more contingent faculty, students have less access to full-time faculty. Students pay more and more to have access to less and less. There is a need to assess, systematically, the impact of remediation programs for various types of students in various fields.

On each of these challenges, the structure of employment, structure of funding, or assessment of student learning, is more important than ever for faculty to be full participants and take the lead in seeking to reverse these patterns so that the institution can focus its resources on what works. Based on evidence, what kinds of programs work? Nationally, we are going down paths to do things that we know don't work.

Unity among Management and Labor externally makes sense in that the public higher education enterprise is underfunded. We need to make the case collectively with a variety of groups that the future of the state rests in more fully investing in the educational future of its citizenry.

However, there is another pattern that is troubling with respect to what is done with the money once it gets into the system. The national pattern in every educational institution is an increase in non-educational administrative personnel. These data are from the Delta Project, which produces a report on costs in higher education. We need to concentrate the money where the students are. This is an internal challenge that we need to change.

We need to change these 30-year patterns to get back to concentrating on what a university is really about.

Q: What kind of legal weight does our resolution on Garcetti have?

A: The administration's response to your resolution ("We will follow the law entirely") misses the point. Historically, the AAUP has focused not on the law as the basis for protection in academic freedom claims, but instead on the policies and procedures and the collective bargaining agreements of the institutions. The law here is going in the wrong direction. Embed in these other documents a commitment to the principle of academic freedom, as other major institutions have done.

Q: In *Academically Adrift*, many students report having no contact outside of the class with students.

A: I am reviewing that book now. There is an acknowledgement that there are some structural factors that have contributed to this situation (see *Horace's Compromise* book). There is another problem embedded in the instrument that he is drawing on and that so many policymakers are using, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The whole premise of these metrics is that all institutions are small liberal arts colleges. It would be an enormous contribution for faculty in a system such as yours to identify the relevant measures of engagement on campuses where students are largely commuters. We need to calibrate any measure of engagement with the institutional

context. If you want to engage students, you have to engage faculty. Faculty members need office space, pay to be available to meet with students, etc. The working conditions of the professoriate are the learning conditions of the students. The book does not fully acknowledge the differences in spending per student across institutions. Go to the Delta Project to see these data, and recognize that the growth in students is lower income, students of color, and immigrants.

Q: How do we reverse the trend in contingent faculty hiring?

A: Last year, community colleges turned away hundreds of thousands of students. The federal government wants to see a higher percentage of college graduates. We do not have a sufficient number of faculty members; indeed we do not have the capacity to teach current student demand. We need to invest in our human capacity to accommodate student demand. Our private sector thrives with public investment. Who paid for the railroads, roads, Internet, etc.? So, too with higher education. We need a balance between the public and private sectors. Otherwise, we are renegeing on our promise as a country.

Q: How do we get back to the university being a collection of faculty coming together to educate students? Those who have the power are the senior administrators, not the faculty.

A: One of my predecessors wrote a book called *Whatever Happened to the Faculty?* One of our leaders has been touring the country analyzing university budgets. The overriding theme of his analysis is that we should put the money back in the core academic mission. The meeting in late January initiated by the CFA was also focused on this issue. They are organizing various groups to come together. There is a list of seven basic guiding principles about how decisions are made in the university, and the campaign will be rolled out in mid-April and May. The message is that faculty members from around the country have a vision of what the future of higher education looks like. Faculty are the center of leading that conversation. They are building a coalition of middle class and lower middle class, with the message that we need to invest in higher education. This is the country's future, and the future rests in investing in higher education, not slashing and bashing it.

Q: I think that the biggest threat to academic freedom is in Ohio.

A: In Ohio, there is a new verb: Yeshivaed. There will be challenges to the law, and groups are working for a referendum to repeal the law (SB 5). The danger is that if you fulfill any responsibilities associated with being a full faculty member, you are classified as a manager and therefore cannot be part of a bargaining unit. The polls are 2-to-1 against SB 5. People are really put off by what they see as attacks on the middle class.

Q: We (academia and others in the public realm) don't have a good propaganda machine, but we are competing against organizations that do. Are there any initiatives in the AAUP to work against this?

A: You are right about the scale of the campaigns being waged. There is a series of ads being sent out now that basically portrays public employees as thugs. There are tens of millions of dollars going into this (compared to AAUP's national budget of \$6 million). Where can we leverage our strength? We can do that through a show of unity. Campus presidents cannot get out and march in the streets, but faculty can. Getting out and advocating in any way possible, such as writing an op-ed piece, voting in an online poll, etc., are important ways of communicating with the public, the legislature, and the

Academic Senate CSU

governor. AAUP is involved with other groups to articulate a vision of what our future can be.

Ephraim Smith, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

On SB 1440, we've had some bumps in the road. With respect to priority admissions, the CSU proposal has been accepted. Inclusion of the American Ideals in the first 60 units was strongly opposed by the California Community Colleges (CCC); they want it to be included in CSU upper division or as an option for the campuses. After much discussion, they suggested that we make American Ideals an option on the CSU campuses. That was agreed to by the Chancellor. The remaining issues to be resolved are the transfer model curricula. The committee meets again on April 18th.

On Early Start, the committee has been meeting. The Executive Order allowed students to take remediation at the community colleges. We are meeting with them on April 4th and 5th. Due to budget cuts, some of the community colleges will not be offering summer school.

On the Graduation Initiative, we have completed almost all of the 23 campus site visits. The good news is that graduation rates are increasing. However, we have not closed the achievement gap. There will be an Request For Proposal (RFP) to campuses to identify best practices on what we can do to close achievement gap.

Debra Farar, CSU Trustee

Trustee Farar thanked the ASCSU for its hard work on behalf of the CSU. The BOT appreciates learning from the faculty, who are working directly with students. She shared her educational background (she has a degree from CSU Northridge), her professional career, and her experience with the BOT. She was appointed to the BOT by Governor Davis in 1999, and re-appointed by Governor Schwarzenegger in 2006. Trustee Farar chaired the BOT in 2002-04. Good communication and collaboration are essential to support the mission of the CSU. Shared governance is particularly important during these hard budget times.

Q: Can the BOT or individual trustees speak out publicly (letters to editor, etc.) on the impact of the budget cuts on the CSU? The impact on student fees, for example, might be shocking to the public.

A: We have in the past written editorials. We have a very good public relations operation here. The Chancellor consistently does interviews. But everyone else in the discretionary part of the state budget is also speaking out, and we are competing with them. As to fees, current BOT policy is that student fees should not exceed one-third of the cost. Members of the BOT also advocate in Washington DC with our legislators. Term limits make this challenging.

Q: I am worried about the future of the CSU. How can we give hope to our faculty about the future?

A: It is difficult. We are asking a lot of the faculty. We also have a hard time recruiting presidents; most of them take a pay cut to come to the CSU. Perhaps trustees should get out to campuses more to communicate to faculty how much we appreciate all they

do. However, we are trying to save money, too, so we travel less. But the BOT understand that the faculty drives the quality of education in the CSU.

Q: How much are faculty viewpoints included in the process of campus president searches?

A: Our search process for presidents is very inclusive. The selection committee includes faculty. There is a shared governance question that is included in the interview. A good candidate will have a history of shared governance. Remember that the candidate must also want us.

Q: The best case scenario is a \$500 million cut. What are the trustees considering on the system level?

A: The BOT gives the presidents a lot of autonomy and tries not to micromanage the campuses. Our mission is to provide access and still maintain quality. That is what we try to do, in accordance with the Master Plan.

Q: Is the BOT considering modifying the one-third set aside?

A: I am not sure. I know that Trustee Linscheid has mentioned this, but I am not sure how a change would be made.

Q: I have heard rumors of a 24th CSU campus, a fully-online campus. Is there any truth to this?

A: I have not heard anything of this.

Q: We used to have an annual academic conference attended by trustees, campus presidents, academic senators, and others. This facilitated communication between the BOT and the academic community. Is there a chance that we could arrange a half-day informal get-together between BOT and members of the ASCSU to facilitate communication?

A: That is an excellent idea that should be brought to the BOT, especially if it is tied to a board meeting when we are all here anyway.

Q: Do you believe the BOT would be in support of having two faculty trustees with staggered terms? We passed a resolution to that purpose this morning.

A: I think this would be an excellent idea, especially if the voting was set up the same way as it is with students where there is only one faculty trustee at a time with voting privileges. Everyone on the BOT is upset that there is not a faculty trustee at this time.

Q: Do you see any outcomes for the CSU from the teacher educational summit?

A: It was very successful, and we will see about outcomes at the board meeting.

Q: To make up for budget cuts, some campuses are taking more out-of-state students. Can California students who do not get accepted as in-state students choose to pay out-of-state fees to gain admission?

A: I can't imagine this happening.

Charles Reed, Chancellor

Academic Senate CSU

The CSU has a big cloud hanging over us if the state budget tax extensions are not extended for the next five years. We would probably be cut another \$500 million, and that would be absolutely devastating. In 2009-10, we cut \$500 million of the \$625 million centrally through furloughs, tuition increases, and reducing enrollments. The campuses did not have nearly the challenge they have now.

We have assigned budget cuts to each of the institutions this year. The big campuses will take \$25-26 million cuts; the mid-sized campuses will take \$12-14 million cuts; and the smaller institutions will take \$5-7 million. These cuts range from 4 to 7% of campus operating budgets. The Chancellor's Office budget will be cut by 14%, after a cut in 2009-10 of \$10 million. We cut a little over 100 employees here. He has asked the campus presidents to have a process of consultation with the campus constituencies about how they will take their cuts.

Another \$500 million cut would entail looking at furloughs/compensation adjustments, enrollment declines, and tuition increases again at the system level.

If we do not make our enrollment within 1600 FTES next year, we will have to return funds. We did not make the enrollment target this year, and we returned about \$75 million.

Our terminology has been changed from student fees to tuition.

In terms of our ongoing work here, we have on our agenda the following: two ongoing campus presidential searches, implementation of SB 1440 and Early Start, and the graduation initiative.

Q: What values would you use in making any needed budget cuts?

A: Protecting educational quality is first. Access would be reduced to first-time students and transfer students. For example, we would not be able to take any community college transfer students in January. We would need to look at furloughs or our compensation situation again. Significant tuition increases would be needed. We would not look at closing campuses or branch operations. We would have to look at workload. Public safety and health centers need to be protected. We have seen an increase in the number of students needing mental health services.

Q: How long do you expect the CSU budget to be challenged?

A: The state economy will be slower to recover than in the past. If Governor Brown can extend \$12.5 billion in revenues, then education and higher education will get a much bigger share. Chancellor Reed would like to work with the Governor to pass a compact to get the CSU support budget back.

Q: A number of community colleges give more units for corresponding courses than we do. This has implications for SB 1440, because students can take fewer courses before transferring. Will AB 1440 be amended to address this?

A: No. This will need to be handled through discussions with Chancellor Scott.

Q: With respect to quality, is everything "on the table" in dealing with the budget cuts? For example, 120 units, GE breadth, faculty release time, program restructuring, etc.?

A: Everything has to be on the table if we have to deal with another \$500 million cut, and the best decisions will come from that. We offer some courses/sections with enrollments that are too small. We can't afford that. We have a wide array of class sizes; class sizes will need to be reconsidered. We need to be creative and make different kinds of decisions for different kinds of disciplines. Classes of 5 or 6 cannot go anymore. Programs with small numbers of graduates need to be examined, especially when there are multiple campuses geographically close to each other offering the same degree. Reducing the number of colleges/schools can cut administrative costs and the need for assigned time.

Q: Does converting from quarter to semester schedule save money?

A: Conversions are not done for cost savings, but for what is best for education/learning. He believes that 15 weeks are better than 10 for student learning.

Q: What core service does the CSU provide? What percent of the general fund is spent on the CSU?

A: The CSU is the economic engine of the work force of California; we supply 90,000 to 100,000 graduates to the work force every year. Access is a part of our mission, especially to the neediest and underserved communities.

The percentage of the general fund has steadily decreased over the past 13 years. With the University of California (UC), our percentage of the general fund was 14% when Dr. Reed came here; this year, it is 8%. We have 70,000 more students now than we had in 2000, but our budget is now what we had in 2000.

To get back to our previous percentage of the budget, healthcare costs need to be controlled. CSU healthcare costs are going up \$39 million next year. Costs for healthcare have gone up \$349 million since he has been Chancellor, and we have not received any increase in appropriations for that. Prison costs also need to be controlled for our share of the budget to increase. Dr. Reed wrote an opinion editorial citing the costs of various types of prisoners. The Governor cut higher education in his budget by \$1.4 billion; the budget for prisons was increased \$400 million to pay for prison guard overtime.

Q: What do you think the chances are for the tax extension measures to pass?

A: He is optimistic. However, if the tax extensions are not passed in the week, the timeline will not permit them to be on the June election. Behind the scenes conversations about changing the environmental development regulations, putting a spending cap on the governor and legislature, and pension reform are being held.

Q: I saw the piece you wrote with President Alexander yesterday. Can you comment on summer Pell?

A: CSU is the largest Pell recipient in the country. The Obama administration has stated that they cannot afford to fund summer Pell grants. It will cost about \$3 billion to fund summer Pell. Chancellor Reed and President Alexander (CSULB) wrote an article on this topic that legislators will use in Washington DC to advocate for summer Pell.

Academic Senate CSU

Q: What points should we make when we lobby legislators on April 12th?

A: That the CSU is the economic workhorse for California, that we are willing to do our share by cutting the CSU budget by \$500 million, that another cut of \$500 million will be devastating to the CSU, and that CSU needs its share of the tax revenue.

Q: We have a resolution supporting the appointment of two faculty trustees to the Board of Trustees. Is this something you can support?

A: Let me think about that. The students have two trustees, one non-voting. I think that if you get two or three names to the Governor's Office, you have a good chance to get a faculty trustee appointed.

Q: Thank you for your leadership in getting the Doctorate of Nursing Practice.

A: Thank you. We had to agree to limit the number of programs we started with through consortiums, and this will help us get to where we want to be.

Committee Recommendations

AS-2969-10/EX – Withdrawn

Changes to the List of Faculty Trustee Nominees for the Remainder of the 2009-2011 Term Ending June 30th 2011

AS-2998-11/AA/APEP (Rev) – Approved unanimously

Support for Intersegmental Collaboration in the Implementation of SB 1440

AS-2999-11/AA/APEP (Rev) – Approved unanimously

Support for Faculty Collaboration in the Development of Model Transfer Degrees

AS-3000-11/AA/FGA (Rev) – Approved unanimously

Support for Adequate Resources for CSU Libraries

AS-3001-11/AA/APEP (Rev) – Approved

Support for a Three-Year Pilot Program of the Statway Curriculum as an Alternative for Establishing Proficiency in Quantitative Reasoning

AS-3002-11/FA (Rev) – Approved unanimously

Recognizing the Joint Committee Report on Student Evaluations of Teaching

AS-3003-11/FA (Rev) – Approved unanimously

Amending the Constitution of the Academic Senate, The California State University to Include a Statement Upholding Academic Freedom

AS-3005-11/Bylaws Committee – Failed

Amendments to the Senate Bylaws for Direct Election of Standing Committee Chairs by the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)

AS-3006-11/FGA (Rev) – Approved without dissent

Support of the Development of a Consistent Methodology for the Analysis of the Student-Faculty Ratio and Intra- and Inter-Campus Expenditures on Instruction

AS-3007-11/AA/FGA (Rev) – Approved

Support for the California State Student Association (CSSA) Resolution Calling for the Standardization of Student Response Systems

AS-3008-11/APEP (Rev) – Approved without dissent

Comprehensive Strategic Plan for Reducing CSU Remediation Needs to Negligible Levels

AS-3009-11/APEP (Rev) – Tabled until May 2011 plenary

Renewed Call for Establishment of a Task Force to Respond to Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code – Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses

AS-3010-11/FA/FGA/AA (Waiver) – Approved unanimously

Condemnation of the Suspension of the Faculty Senate at Idaho State University

AS-3021-11/FA/FGA (Waiver) – Approved

Support for Collective Bargaining Rights of College and University Faculty

First Reading Items

AS-3011-11/FGA

Support of SB 8 (Yee, D-San Francisco): Higher Education Transparency

AS-3012-11/FGA

Support of AB 130 (Cedillo): Student Financial Aid Eligibility and the California Dream Act of 2011

AS-3013-11/EX

Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2011-2012 Meetings

AS-3014-11/APEP

Common Reporting Requirements of Campuses' Early Start Program Effectiveness

AS-3015-11/FGA

Statewide Access to California State University

AS-3016-11/FGA

Concerns about Summer Session Courses and Fees

AS-3017-11/EX

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

AS-3018-11/AA (Tabled indefinitely)

SB 1440 and Upper Limits on GE in Light of the 60 Unit CSU Requirement

AS-3019-11/AA (Tabled indefinitely)

Support of High Impact Practices Facilitating Graduation Efforts

Academic Senate CSU

DRAFT

AS-3020-11/APEP/AA

Grade Minima for CSU General Education Course in the “Golden Four”

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Diana Guerin, ASCSU Secretary

DRAFT