

Senate Chair's Report – January 2011

The CSU and Senate Budget

I testified on Tuesday, along with Dr. Reed, Dr. Carter (Chair of the BOT,) and Chris Chavez (CSSA President,) to the Assembly higher Education Committee. (The Community College system and the University of California also had teams that participated in the hearing.) The committee was interested in issues of quality and efficiencies. I believe that we made a good impression on the “efficiency” topics with our presentation on Early Start and SB 1440 implementation (see below.) But I was left with the impression that they believe that we can cope with a ~\$500 million budget cut with further “efficiency” efforts and that tuition increases and enrollment limitations need not be a significant part of our planning. It is too early in the 2011-2012 budget process to know much about its impact, other than the obviously large, negative message. The committees received some information yesterday and we will receive updates today from our Budget Specialist and Chancellor's Office staff, but there are significant political and economic uncertainties that are largely in uncharted territory.

The \$500 million figure is an overall, unallocated cut to the CSU's general fund appropriation from the State. The Governor's message hints at some mitigation measures that are already in place, i.e., replacement of federal ARRA funds that we received in 2010-2011, and the already-approved (by the BOT) fee increase of 10.25% (5% + 5%). Some of the items listed as mitigations to higher education do not affect our budget (but do affect student budgets,) such as the increase in Cal Grant funds.

You can arrive at a wide range of estimates for the fraction of the CSU budget that is devoted to personnel costs, by choosing different bases to measure against. Regardless of the fraction, most of the non-personnel costs in the SU budget, e.g., bond payments and utility costs; are outside of our control, so it is clear that the cuts will dominantly affect staffing levels with the known fallout consequences that we are (all too) familiar with.

There was a line included in the Governor's budget message that read, “The Administration will work with the Office of the Chancellor and the Trustees, as well as stakeholders (including representatives of students and employees), to determine the specific mix of measures that can best accomplish these objectives.” This has resulted in a meeting scheduled by the Department of Finance for Friday (1/21/2011) that includes UC and CSU representatives, to which I am invited to. Because of scheduling issues, the Executive Committee has asked Tom Krabacher to represent us. He will report on the meeting next week.

Another issue has risen as late as this morning: the possibility of forming a broad consortium (faculty, staff, and student groups representing various aspects of CSU constituencies) to support the CSU budget in Sacramento and to the electorate. Not details are available at this time as to specific membership, goals, or strategies, but unless there are objections from Senators, I will let it be known that the Senate is interested in participating. (Author's note: No objections were stated.) There is no news to report regarding the Senate budget. Once the spring enrollment numbers are in, there will be allocations to the campuses and with that possibly some opportunity to bump our budget. But

certainly long-term, it doesn't look good. Evaluations of Senate structures and processes should emphasize this issue as a priority, in my opinion.

The Early Start Initiative

The Early Start Initiative Implementation Team met for its second meeting on December 16. By that time, campuses had submitted their respective plans, since the dominant approach to their Board initiative has been to let the campuses decide what works best for their contexts (while keeping System needs and goals in mind.) If there is a pattern to the 23 plans, it is this: build on what we've been doing. Soon after our next meeting (February 3) I expect the plans will be available on a public web site. They're not quite ready for that yet, as our review will result in requests to several campuses for information on missing components or plans inconsistent with guidelines.

The English Council representative joined the Implementation Team at this meeting to fill out the faculty membership. She spoke eloquently about the successful bridge programs that have been implemented on many campuses and other successful approaches and my sense of the Team is that they are open to facilitating the expansion and continuation of these efforts under the Early Start umbrella.

Cost issues, to the student and to the System, have been prominent issues in the Early Start discussions. Most of the plans (but not all) addressed their cost structures, which generally follow traditional CSU models, i.e., State tuition rates for native students and Extended Education rates for visiting students with financial aid available as the rules allow. The Implementation Team needs to have a fuller discussion of whether there needs to be a Systemwide tuition structure for the Early Start programs. Some believe a common cost structure is needed, especially to facilitate the cross-campus billing mechanisms that are needed to handle financial aid issues. But the current guidelines allowed for a variety of campus plans and with those a variety of "tuition" rates.

The campus plans included a variety of approaches, some of which included community college offerings, on-line instruction, and cooperative programs with K-12 institutions. (When you allow faculty to be creative, they are.) This variety is good and should allow us to accommodate the large demand for these programs. And successes can be emulated by others in future years.

I suspect that enforcement of the Early Start mandates will be fairly loose during the startup period until we gain confidence in the communication and database systems that are being created to record student progress through these new programs.

SB 1440 Implementation

Senator Boyle, Baaske, and I have spent a considerable amount of time with our community college counterparts in the last few months to implement "The Transfer Bill", SB 1440. The first two Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) should be announced in a week or so (Psychology and Communication.) Individual community colleges will use these templates to build their Transfer Associate Arts or Science degrees (T-AA or T-AS) in these disciplines. The TMS's will also be sent to the CSU campuses so that the undergraduate deans, articulation officers, department chairs, and curriculum committees can evaluate them and consider how these fit into our BA and BS degrees. The TMCs are the result of faculty efforts through the C-ID project (www.c-id.net) of the Community College system which includes CSU discipline faculty. Other disciplines are queued up and will be announced over the next few months as the faculty processes result in TMC agreement. (The job is not done at this stage as the C-ID project also needs to deliver the course descriptions that are utilized by the TMCs.)

The TMC development process has been quite positive, which is my ongoing experience of what occurs when inter-system discipline faculty get together and talk about how they can help their mutual students. But this new structure raises some important issues and challenges to our established articulation

CSU Campuses

Bakersfield

Channel Islands

Chico

Dominguez Hills

East Bay

Fresno

Fullerton

Humboldt

Long Beach

Los Angeles

Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay

Northridge

Pomona

Sacramento

San Bernardino

San Diego

San Francisco

San José

San Luis Obispo

San Marcos

Sonoma

Stanislaus

structures. For instance, SB 1440 specifies that any course that is in the T-AA degree becomes part of the 120-unit BA degree which results. The completed TMCs include a number of unspecified courses which could include a community college course that is currently not articulated. Our current articulation processes insure a vetting by CSU faculty as a necessary component. But this new structure bypasses these established processes.

There are a lot of issues yet to be resolved that connect SB 1440 to our admission structures and processes. These are being worked on, but the challenges of our budget situation and the impaction issues for most of our campuses create an array of challenges that also need to be resolved. The faculty are concentrating our efforts on the development process for the curricula, but are involved in these discussions as well.

WASC

Ralph A. Wolff, President of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) met with the Executive Committee on Wednesday, along with Jackie Donath (from CSUS) who is working with WASC. We had a wide-ranging discussion of items connected to accreditation, including: 1) the need to improve faculty engagement in the process, 2) criticisms about the timing, time commitment, pace, and value of the current process; 3) current issues of graduation rates (and gaps,) 4) transparency in the process, and 5) accountability to the public. Ralph had noted that the CSU was participating in and, in many cases, leading-by-example the national discussions about quality of learning I higher education.

CSU Campuses

Bakersfield

Channel Islands

Chico

Dominguez Hills

East Bay

Fresno

Fullerton

Humboldt

Long Beach

Los Angeles

Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay

Northridge

Pomona

Sacramento

San Bernardino

San Diego

San Francisco

San José

San Luis Obispo

San Marcos

Sonoma

Stanislaus