Executive Committee

Academic Senate of the California State University

January 22-23, 2003

1. The Meeting was called to order at 9:45 a.m. with Hood, Jensen and Pineu present. Faculty Trustee Goldwhite joined the meeting at 10:20.

2. Member-at-large Jensen presented the following report on the Academic Technology Committee. Please see addendum I:

3. Mr. Hood reported on the Workload Task Force, announcing that Richard Serpe will make a presentation on Thursday at 1:15 p.m. This report demonstrates what can be done when all segments of the CSU act in concert.

4. Mr. Hood reported on the Faculty Flow Committee, saying that it will meet Wednesday afternoon to finalize the report and to polish the recommendations.

5. Member-at-Large Jensen reported on the CPEC meeting of January 17, 2003. Please see Addendum II.

6. Member-at-Large Jensen reported on the Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee. Please see Addendum III.

7. The Executive Committee discussed the committee vacancies arising from Senator Charnofsky’s death and recommended the following appointments:

   a. ITL: Anagnoson

   b. Admissions Advisory Committee: Kaiser

   c. Graduate and Post-Baccalaureate: no appointment

   d. Pre-Doctoral Advisory Committee: Thobaben

8. The Committee briefly discussed the Straw Poll agenda item.

9. The Committee discussed the agenda for the February meeting of the Campus Senate Chairs. It was agreed that the major agenda item would be the budget, with updates on the Technology Committee, the Workload task Force, and the Department Chair Study Group. There should also be information about the Senate’s resolutions about the increased SFR and the Student Fee issue. In addition, the Committee decided to ask for a plenary Committee of the Whole on Thursday, Feb. 13 from 3:00-6:00 in addition to the regularly-scheduled Interim Committee Meetings on Friday, Feb. 14th.
10. It was agreed to forward the report of the Workload Task Force to Faculty Affairs and Fiscal and Governmental Affairs to examine the Task Force’s recommendations and to develop a strategy for addressing them.

11. The committee discussed the transfer issue. Please see Addendum IV.

12. The Committee discussed the current presidential review process.

13. The Committee recessed at 1:55 p.m. until 9:15 a.m. on January 23rd.

14. The Committee met with the Standing Committee Chairs and set the agenda for the Plenary Session.

15. The Committee heard a report from Chair Kegley on the Higher Education Symposium sponsored by the Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education which she had attended on January 22nd. Please see Addendum V.

16. Chair Kegley adjourned the meeting at 10:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Hood
Vice Chair
Addendum I: Technology Committee

Report on Activities of the Academic Technology Planning Committee January 24, 2003

Jensen, Thobaben, and Parsons

The Academic Technology Planning Committee (ATPC) is a working group requested by the CSU Presidents’ Technology Steering Committee (PTSC) and convened by Assistant Vice Chancellor Ernst and Associate Vice Chancellor Hammerstrom. Colleagues Consulting is the consulting group facilitating the meetings of ATPC. The charge of this group’s work has been defined by the PTSC and is focused around four basic goals:

The ATPC is comprised of four faculty members who also serve on the Academic Technology Advisory Committee: Jackie Kegley, Marshelle Thobaben, Sandy Parsons, and Cristy Jensen. The group met three times during the fall to complete a planning process which has paralleled a data collection process comprised of campus focus groups/visits and a survey of promising campus academic technology initiatives and

The committee met for three days in January to consider the data collected in the context of the program goals, planning assumptions, and strategic criteria and begin to develop a set of academic technology initiatives and project ideas. The focus group results suggest initiatives in the following areas

   Faculty Support: includes pedagogy, workload, RTP, instructional support and policies

   Student Academic Support: includes student preparedness, access to technology, student workload, and support services

   Resources: includes faculty, technology, support staff, and leveraging

   Technology: includes infrastructure and learning technology tools

Next steps:

1. Web posting which includes various documents produced to date as well as reports of campus visits

2. consultation with ATAC (January 31)

3. development of power point presentation for campus discussion

4. continue campus visits (7 completed by Dec; remainder Jan-March)

5. identification of projects within the initiatives defined
Addendum II

DRAFT NOTES
CPEC MEETING (FISCAL POLICY AND ANALYSIS COMMITTEE)

JANUARY 17, 2003

Report to Executive Committee on CPEC Meeting Inviting Segments to Discuss Impacts of Proposed 03-04 Budget on Higher Education Access

January 17, 2003

Jensen and Mc Killop
(Please note that there are two detailed reports of the substance of the meeting which are attached. This brief report will only summarize major issues)

Representatives of the Community Colleges, the University of California, and the Student Aid Commission made reports and entertained questions on the impacts of the cuts. The CSU was not represented because of a conflict with the meeting with Presidents to discuss the budget cuts. The meeting shed light on how the various segments are reacting to the cuts, the general issues involved, and in the case of the Student Aid Commission, provided information on the funding of Cal Grant Entitlements.

The Community College system is claiming the “most hurt” both in terms of the public policy agenda re: access and in absolute dollar cut terms. They are hurt by the proportion of Prop 98 cuts they must take in 02-03, the fee increase (11-24 dollars per unit) and the broad cuts to their apportionment funds (their greatest source of flexibility). Governors budget anticipates a reduction reportedly of between 65,000 and 100,000 FTES. They are actively promoting a alternative strategy to the Governor’s proposal (but one which notably apparently falls $100,000 short of the cut level Gov proposed.)

The University of California also claims “a world of hurt” based on 10% cut to research support (from General Fund which will affect “match” for other presumably federal sources of research support); targeted cuts to a number of outreach programs, some related to K-12 education programs they had received in recent years (including major cuts to subject matter programs). Similar to CSU they received funding for enrollment growth including previous year unfounded growth and assumptions re: another 25% fee increase. They assert a strategy for coping with cuts as follows: 50% from program cuts, 25% from fee increase, and 25% from deferred salary (claim to forego $26 million in merit pay this next year)

The Student Aid Commission reported an increase in funding for the Cal Grant Entitlement was $674 to $724 million to permit funding of all eligible students; they say these grants will cover the fee increase for the approximately one fourth of college attending high school grads. Student Aid commission estimates this number to be 80,000 annually (two thirds community college students). Governor’s Budget proposes ending the State funded Work Study Program (apparently not effecting the Federal program funding). Reported the proposed drop in Cal Grants to private university students from $9708 to 8800 per year (which I note is higher than the marginal cost at which CSU is funded total).

2003-2004 Higher Education Budget Committee
Purpose of meeting: Discuss State funding for higher education in California for 2003-4 fiscal year; budget cuts and their impact on access to educational opportunities.

Attendees: Commission members and staff, representatives of three segments, privates, and Student Aid Commission

I. California Community Colleges: Robert Turnage
(see attachments)

What is cut?

Dec Mid Year cuts included Prop 98 (179M GF) and Property Tax Loss (71M) for total 250M

Jan 10 extended Prop 98 cuts to 288.8 or 5 1/2%

03-04 Budget included another 5% for a total 18 month cut of 10 1/2%

What are elements?

1. double student fees to $24 (from $330 to $750 for 30 units/one year)
2. but have offset the 149 M income from that by anticipating a 65,000 FTES loss and therefore budget has reduced GF apportionment by 217 M
3. CC argues that they have taken a disproportionate share (32%) of the total Prop 98 drop
4. Governor hit the more flexible apportionment money—a particular problem
5. 10.82% across board cut to categoricals

What is alternative CC is proposing to legislature?

1. seek to protect apportionment dollars and get their proportional cut from Prop 98 to = K-12’s share (which they estimate will protect an additional 3.36%)  
2. examine where they can cut categoricals by recovering unspent, delaying, etc.

Senate Action last week on mid year

Senate adopted alternative with some “twists”; 3% enrollment growth cut to 2.9% leaving a 105 M discrepancy between Governor and Senate; more smoke and mirrors by delaying some costs from June to July buys system some time
Turnage characterized the Senate committee’s approach as “pro Community Colleges” identifying support from Scott and Vasconcello; senate subcommittee’s process with report to full Budget Committee and then decision made by full senate; reported desire to avoid conference committee and strive for 2 house consensus on mid year cuts.

What changes can we anticipate in “how things are done”?

1. more centralization re: high importance course offerings although it was acknowledged that this is difficult in the highly decentralized CC system where CO has few tools
2. drop the campus reserve requirement
3. tightening up things like the PE courses for high school athletic teams
4. creativity re: $100 million add’l PERS costs
5. reduction or cancellation of summer session offerings

Discussion centered on:

1. fundamental core mission issues: transfer function vs. local economic develop/skills/trade training; Turnage said any differentiated fee system related to that mission is very problematic with core constituencies
2. fee increases and attention to alternatives
3. future of non credit classes, ESL and citizenship; though it was pointed out these are free
4. loan issues: limits and family contributions
5. Financial Aid: Pell Grant availability will kick in at $17 unit

II. University of California: Debbie Obley

What is cut?

10% cut to everyone for state funded research: for UC this is critical to matching funds for other sources of research support and issue of support for grad students

Assembly committee adopted all the mid year UC cuts except outreach; teacher professional development monies cut from budget (e.g. K-12 Internet= Digital California)

What are elements to 2003-2004 budget?

While fully funding enrollment growth (in fact went back and funded the previously unfounded enrollment from 02-03 – for CSU too?), cut student services and specified no cuts in registrar, financial aid support, advising, but cut discretionary re: counseling, health services, etc.

Unallocated reduction is equal to a 25% fee increase to protect instruction (again same as for CSU?); a second 34.8 million in unallocated cuts are not to be supported through fee increases.

What is UC strategy?

As per 90-91, overall strategy: 50% absorbed by program cuts; 25% by fee increase.; and 25% by deferred salary (they got capital budget as scheduled in bond measure)

Obley supported Governor (vs LAO) interpretation of deficit by defining partnership commitment as a cut – no 4% partnership increase is a real cut because it affects salaries (claim to forego $26 million is merit pay), space, and support; UC claims 4.4% cut vs. DOF claim of 2.4% increase

No Golden Handshake like 90-91 is in the works – this time there is no scaling back; student enrollment growth is expected

Discussion

1000 of 13,000 funded growth is for graduate education; common mc because “too difficult to differentiate”

professional fees for Medicine, Law etc. will go up about 35%
no real concern re: financial aid for fee increases; fee increases for those students covered by grant will have fees covered

III. California State University: Karl Engbretson

Pretty standard, what we already knew

$60 mil mid year; fee increase will cover $20 mil

3 4 the good:

enrollment growth funded (16,000 + 8,000 unfunded from last year) = 24,000 growth

3 5 the bad:

326 M GF cut
143 unallocated (covered by add'l 25% fee increase totaling 38% for 18month)
112 academic/institutional/student services
53 increased sfr
13 outreach cut (50%)

IV Student Aid Commission: Wally Boeck

Cal Grant Entitlement Recipients have grown from 30,000 to 48,600 to anticipated 61,000 this year (2/3 go to CC); Boeck estimates 1 in 4 HS grads as prospective recipients which yields 80,000; funding increased from $674 M to $ 724M to support coverage of fee increase

Cal Grant Competitive (capped at 22,500 recipients): previous funded 1 grant for every 2 ½ eligible; now ratio is 1 grant for every 7 eligible

The “Rub”

State funded work study $ are gone

Cal Grant Privates drop from max of $9708 to $8800

Discussion of “transfer entitlement” and CSU efforts to extend 24 yrs age limit; UC and Student Aid Comm sounded like they opposed.
Addendum III

Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee

Report on System Budget Advisory Committee Meeting

January 21, 2003

Jensen

Richard West presented an update on the 2002-03 mid year cuts and the Governors proposed 2003-04 budget.

2002-03

The 59.6 million mid year cut twas ratified by the Board during its meeting on December 16 in which the Board approved the fee increases

West expects the Legislature to complete deliberation and decision making on the mid year cuts by January 31 and expects ratification of the Governor’s proposal.

(note: subsequent meeting today, 1/22) noted an April 30 deadline for report to Legislature/Governor/DOF about mid year cuts to address 1. accommodation of budgeted enrollment 2. protection of student services and 3. avoidance of layoffs)

2003-04

West argues that Governor’s budget is “best case” for CSU; that will be his touchstone. Expressed concern that there is some sentiment in Sacramento that CSU hit is less than share; we need to communicate strongly that this is not true. Also expressed concern that there is great uncertainly re: revenue enhancements (TAXES) , timing of budget enactment (could be as late as October) and legislative mood over health and welfare and cc cuts. Also uncertainties re: LAO figures and calculation of percentage cuts (e.g. LAO does not include enrollment growth as a mandated cost, does not include partnership as a mandated commitment)

Issues:

--Need for planning of enrollment growth and simultaneous reduction in student services (students will understandably find that paying higher fees at the same time they experience reduced class offerings and reduced student services to be problematic)

--Need for a mix of strategies to achieve increase in SFR from # of courses, to size of courses, to part time full time ratios, funding of sabbaticals and assigned time. Upshot is that average cost per student will go down

--Need to be open to opportunities for doing things differently: e.g. use of academic technology to make SLO remediation courses available to CSULA students

--enrollment growth money total 24,000 FTES will represent an increase in enrollment growth from
anticipated 5% to 7% (the budget proposal includes about 45 million to cover this additional 2%); probably most controversial part of this discussion is the gamble/risk involved in taking the 2% in anticipation of protection the 45 million augmentation to base---what if it doesn’t become permanent? West expects all campuses will get 1% of this growth/money and other 1% will be held for special allocations.

--ACR 73 is on back burner

Process for Communication and Action

Assume: Governor's Budget and June 30 implementation (neither of which is realistic assumption)

1. Board of Trustees will not consider a fee increase for 03-04 in January, maybe March or even maybe May
2. SBAC will meet at least monthly
3. BOT Committee on Finance will meet monthly and probably follow format of plenary BOT meetings with Senate, CSSA, and public representation
4. Feb 1: campuses will receive enrollment and dollar targets for fall
5. Presidents have been advised to follow campus planning processes to discuss and assess tradeoffs and choices

Note: at subsequent meeting with West on 1/22 he indicated support for an early March convening of constituencies: CSSA Exec, ASCSU Exec, Presidents, ASI Presidents, Campus Senate Chairs
Addendum IV

Pressure continues to mount for action on transfer issue whether formal degree or ????

Pressure from trustees linked to facilitating graduation report

Pressure from legislature

Pressure from failure of the dual admissions/4CSU initiative

What to do?? Declare victory

FAST PASS (similar to expedited toll lane access)

Take most successful completed core alignment projects and anoint them as FAST PASS baccalaureate programs (which would recognize a common curriculum for baccalaureate preparation in certain majors, recognized and accepted throughout the CSU to include 39 units of GE and at least 12 units of LD major prep and recommended electives)

This will do several things:

Communicate to students and public that we are doing something

Communicate to CC that we will do things with or without them

Communicate to faculty disciplines who have not been involved to date that FAST PASS may be a strategy for increase their majors and thus provide an incentive for those disciplines who have been reluctant to participate
Addendum V
Report on Higher Education Symposium
Sponsored by the Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education

Jackie Kegley, Chair
CSU Academic Senate

On January 22, 2003, I was part of a CSU Team attending a Higher Education Symposium in Sacramento. This was sponsored by the Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education chaired by Senator Dede Alpert. This was an invitation only event with a limit to forty participants representing all the Higher Education segments including the independent colleges and universities, members of the California Business Roundtable, the Secretary of Education and CEPC. Legislators in attendance were Senator Dede Alpert, Senator John Vasconcellos, Senator Charles Poochigian, Senator Jack Scott, Senator Bruce McPherson, Senator Richard Alarcon, Assemblywoman Lynn Daucher, Assemblywoman Carol Liu and Assemblyman Darryl Steinberg. The team from CSU was as follows: Trustee Chair Debra Farar, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer David Spence, Jacquelyn Kegley, Chair, CSU Academic Senate, Atremio Pimentel, Chair, CSU Associated Students, President Jolene Koester (Northridge), Alexander Gonzalez (San Marcos), and Jim Rosser, President (Los Angeles). William Hauck, CSU Trustee was present as President of the California Business Roundtable. The purpose of the symposium was to clarify the state’s public policy goals for higher education and to begin formulating a process for assessing these goals.

The basic document for the symposium was a report An Accountability Framework for California Higher Education” by Nancy Shulock, Director for the Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy, CSU, Sacramento. Jane Wellman, Senior Associate, Institute for Higher Education Policy chaired the symposium. David Longanecker, Executive Director, Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education and Patrick Callahan, President, The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education made brief presentations. Longanecker discussed lessons to be learned from other states and Callahan discussed briefly the lessons to be learned from his national report studies. Nancy Shulock then gave an overview of her report. (Slide summary of this is attached).

After lunch there was vigorous discussion of possible state goals and of means to assess them. Jim Rosser and I argued that an overall goal might be “Closing the Achievement Gap,” and that other sub-goals under this major goal could be access and participation, completion, and student outcomes, expressed in graduate and employer satisfaction as well as professional tests and movement to advanced degrees and professional degrees. This elicited a fair amount of support and discussion. Another topic was kind of system of accountability that might be envisioned and general agreement was elicited that a tiered system would be most appropriate. There would be state policy goals and a state reporting system, segment goals and a reporting system and campus data. (See page 3 of attachment). Jane Wellman also asked the group to
consider how detailed any state goals should be and there was general consensus that there should be a small number of goals and measures and that student learning outcomes should remain at the campus level and within the segments. At some future date one might consider how this data would be relevant to the overall system of accountability.

This perhaps is the first time there has been this kind of policy discussion with the major players in higher education and the legislature. I will keep the CSU Academic Senate apprised of any further developments on this process and issue.