

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2868-08/FGA/APEP
November 12-13, 2008

**Systemwide Impaction, Enrollment Management and the 2009-2010
Budget Environment**

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) reaffirm its commitment to assisting the CSU in carrying out its mission, as defined by the California Master Plan for Higher Education (Donahoe Act, 1960) and Title 5, *to wit*: making higher education accessible to the people of California; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU maintain that access must be *authentic access*, meaning that eligible students be admitted to CSU campuses that have the resources to provide the quality programs and facilities to which students are entitled; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recognize that the 2009-2010 state budget environment suggests that the Legislature is unlikely to provide the CSU the resources necessary to fund fully the anticipated 2009-2010 enrollment demand; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, in order to preserve quality and authentic access, to take whatever steps necessary, up to and including a declaration of systemwide impaction, to align actual enrollment with the funded enrollment; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That this resolution be distributed to the Board of Trustees, and campus presidents.

RATIONALE: The CSU is committed to, and takes pride in, its mission of providing access to quality higher education for the people of California. For the CSU, such access must be authentic access, which means that students are to be admitted to campuses that possess sufficient resources to offer the high quality facilities and academic programs to which they are entitled. In the words of a former CSU administrator, "Access without quality is not access."

*The CSU's ability to achieve these goals is dependent upon the state's willingness to provide the resources necessary for it to do so. Key to this has been the state's commitment to fully fund enrollment growth in the CSU, a commitment that has been enshrined in California code: "The State of California reaffirms its historic commitment to ensure adequate resources to support enrollment growth" (66202.5). Unfortunately, since the early 1990s vagaries in the state's fiscal environment have meant that funding for the CSU has been erratic and for much of this period, student enrollment has not been fully funded. Shortfalls in funding have been "paid for" by gradual erosions in quality, as identified in the report *The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century*. As a result of budget shortfalls in recent years, the CSU has reached the point where further reductions in the quality of the education it offers are intolerable.*

Current CSU enrollments are not fully funded by the State of California. The University has currently enrolled approximately 10,000 students above the level for which it receives state support. The legislature's 2008-2009 budget does not provide the CSU with funding for enrollment beyond that which it received for the previous year, 2007-2008. The state's current fiscal situation makes it now almost certain that funding for

2009-2010 will at best remain at the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 levels, despite ever-increasing enrollment demand.

In order to prevent a further deterioration in the quality of the educational experience offered CSU students, it is important that the University manage its enrollment to ensure that it does not exceed the levels for which it is funded. This is consistent with the position taken by the Academic Senate of the California State University under similar budgetary circumstances in the past (AS-2612-03). The Chancellor and the Board of Trustees are urged to take whatever actions are necessary, including a declaration of system-wide impaction, to achieve this end. A declaration of impaction allows programs, campuses, or the system as a whole to use additional admission criteria beyond the regular admission requirements for the CSU. This will provide the CSU with additional tools for managing enrollment to levels consistent with that for which it is funded.

Approved – November 13, 2008

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2612-03 /FGA
May 8-9, 2003

Recommended CSU Budget Priority for 2003-2004

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge the CSU Board of Trustees to secure funding that will ensure a high quality education for every student admitted to the CSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge the CSU Board of Trustees to limit enrollment to the number of students for whom the state has provided sufficient funding.

RATIONALE: Since the Donahoe Act of 1960, the state of California has taken pride in seeking two goals in public higher education that are commonly summarized as “quality” and “access.” Both of these goals have been enshrined in California code: “It is the intent of the Legislature that the segments of higher education recognize that quality teaching is the core ingredient of the undergraduate educational experience” (66050). The CSU’s success in achieving these goals, in turn, has traditionally been dependent upon the state’s willingness to provide the necessary resources, a commitment it also makes explicit in code “The State of California reaffirms its historic commitment to ensure adequate resources to support enrollment growth” (66202.5).

*Unfortunately, the resources provided by the state in recent years have been inadequate for the CSU to achieve both of these goals at the highest level. Access, in the form of nearly unlimited admission to qualified students, has been preserved. However, shortfalls in funding during this period have been “paid for” by reductions in quality, as outlined in the report *The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century*. The CSU has reached the point where additional reductions to the quality of the education it provides are intolerable. To quote a former CSU administrator, “access without quality is not access.”*

*Because the admissions calendar does not correspond to the state budget calendar, the CSU admits students for an academic year prior to receiving the budget that is required to pay for that academic year. In years when the state fails to meet its legislative commitment to support enrollment growth the CSU must still accept and educate those students who have already been admitted. In the past, the CSU has done so by accepting an on-going deterioration in the quality of the education it has provided. Examples of this deterioration, as highlighted *The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century*, include:*

- *Failure of student-faculty ratios to return to their pre-1990 levels*
- *Increasingly inadequate technology and staff to support instruction*
- *Purchasing power for library collections have plummeted while the librarian-student ratio has worsened by almost 45%*

- *Non-competitive salaries combined with California's high cost of living have diminished our ability to recruit the best faculty from a national pool*
- *Expanded reliance, since 1990, on temporary faculty rather than permanent faculty has led to a concomitant increase in permanent faculty service loads, which has resulted in a declining capacity to mentor and advise students*
- *Accumulation of delayed maintenance*

The CSU has reached the point when reducing admissions has become the lesser of the evils. Cuts in quality must not be the sole mechanism for surviving difficult budgets, for quality will reach a level at which access itself becomes meaningless, prompting the question "access to what?" To maintain an acceptable level of quality, it is necessary for the CSU to limit enrollment to the number of students for which we have sufficient resources. Growth in enrollment during a time of diminished resources ultimately serves no one. In order to implement this necessary but unpleasant measure, the Board must be prepared to reduce the number of students admitted to correspond to any shortfall in state provided enrollment growth funds for the previous year.

Approved Unanimously – May 8-9, 2003