

## Senate Chair's Report – January 2012

### Goals

The Senate's Extended Executive Committee (Executive Committee plus the committee chairs) met for a one-day retreat on the 6<sup>th</sup> to discuss the work of the Senate for spring. While issues of budget and the working relationship with the administration dominated all of the discussion, the major topic of the retreat was to ensure that the Senate continue its essential role in the governance of the CSU and not overwhelm its agendas with other matters.

### Spring Operations

As a result of Senate budget decisions to accommodate our 2011-2012 allocation, a 0.10 assigned-time was offered to all 2<sup>nd</sup>-year Senators. This resulted in two resignations from the Senate (Susan Gubernat from CSUEB and Carole Kennedy from SDSU.) Twelve Senators did not accept the 0.10 offer but three of these transferred the allocation to a campus colleague. Two of the Senators who declined the assigned-time allocation also indicated that they intended to curtail some of their assigned committee work. (In addition, nine 1<sup>st</sup>-year Senators are not receiving assigned-time.)

With these reductions in budget dedicated to assigned-time, the Senate should be able to fund its "normal" operations for the spring. ("Normal" is now defined as in-person plenary meetings, virtual interims, tight limits on travel, and the other constraints that have been in place the past year.)

### The Senate's Budget

A meeting is scheduled for January 18 with the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor Smith, Assistant Vice Chancellor Vogel, Trustee Cheyne, Senator (and former Trustee) Goldwhite and me to discuss "The Academic Senate Base Budget Going Forward." The Senate has asked for a predictable budget since at least 2006 (see AS-2751-06/FGA, <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/2005-2006/2751.shtml>, and AS-2836-08, <http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/2007-2008/2836.shtml>.) If this meeting meets the goals of its title and with resources commensurate with the role of the Senate, that will be progress indeed. But in the current context, the outcome of the meeting will be seen as much for its symbolic content as to the value of the Senate and the commitments of the Board to the Senate's role as an essential component of the collegial decision-making processes of the CSU and "essential for the success of the academic enterprise." (From the *Report of the Board of Trustees' Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, Collegiality, and Responsibility in the California State University*, see page 41 of <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/pp.pdf>.)

To put the Senate's budget in perspective, I'll repeat information that was disseminated for some of our past discussions and add to that a bit.

	<b>Total Allocation</b>	<b>\$ Cut</b>	<b>% Cut</b>	
<b>2007/2008</b>	\$1,048,155			
<b>2008/2009</b>	\$1,035,140	(\$13,015)	-1%	
<b>2009/2010</b>	\$879,160	(\$155,980)	-15%	
<b>2010/2011</b>	\$832,926	(\$46,234)	-5%	
<b>2011/2012</b>	\$740,350	(\$92,576)	-11%	
<b>2011/2012</b>	\$790,350	(\$42,576)	-5%	after augmentation

Assigned-time plays a large role in the Senate's budget. Consider the following budget items and their associated annual costs:

1. 0.20 A-T for 52 Senators (2 per campus, +1 from the 7 largest, -1 for Chair)	\$517,088
2. Additional 0.20 A-T for Ex. Comm. and Comm. Chairs (8)	\$ 79,552
3. Senate Chair (full-time calendar year)	\$ 57,084
4. Staff	\$145,974
5. Travel for 5 plenary meetings	\$122,216
6. Travel for Chair	\$24,544
7. Catering	\$12,702
8. Photocopies and Printing	\$2,594
9. Supplies	\$2,509
10. Postage	\$331
11. Telephones	<u>\$3,441</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$968,035</b>

Clearly this total exceeds the Senate's allocation for 2011/2012 and thus we have reduced assigned-time allocations from the ideal shown above. To put this in context:

1. 0.20 A-T for 42 Senators (assuming 10 1 <sup>st</sup> -year Senators w/o A-T)	\$417,648
2. 0.10 A-T for 42 Senators (assuming 10 1 <sup>st</sup> -year Senators w/o A-T)	\$208,824

Our actual expenditure on assigned-time in 2011/2012 has yet to be finally determined, but as you know, it will lie roughly between the last two figures (approximately \$300,000) and thus the grand total will closely match our overall allocation.

A few comments as you consider the above figures:

1. I've used an assigned-time figure that assumes that all Senators receive 0.20 assigned-time and committee chairs and Executive Committee members receive additional 0.20. We've not had that kind of Senate the past few years but I have a hard time creating a justification for less support than that if the Senate is to share in governance. (You can calculate alternatives from the above figures by using a figure of \$10,000 per annual 0.20 allocations; the actual figure is currently \$9,944.)
2. Suggestions to reduce staff can be considered but all of our past experience is that the loss of a staff person is accompanied by the loss of the salary and benefits budget for that person (a net savings of \$0).

3. Fewer plenary meetings could represent lower travel costs (~\$5,000 per meeting) but the schedule is currently linked to the 5 annual Board of Trustee meetings.

### **Spring Operations**

As a result of Senate budget decisions to accommodate our 2011-2012 allocation, a 0.10 assigned-time was offered to all 2<sup>nd</sup>-year-and-beyond Senators. This resulted in two resignations from the Senate (Susan Gubernat from CSUEB and Carole Kennedy from SDSU.) Twelve Senators did not accept the 0.10 offer but three of these transferred the allocation to a campus colleague. Two of the Senators who declined the assigned-time allocation also indicated that they intended to curtail some of their assigned committee work. (In addition, nine 1<sup>st</sup>-year Senators are not receiving assigned-time.)

With these reductions in budget dedicated to assigned-time, the Senate should be able to fund its “normal” operations for the spring. (“Normal” is now defined as in-person plenary meetings, virtual interims, tight limits on travel, and the other constraints that have been in place the past year.)

### **The Online Initiative**

Senate discussions with President Welty in November along with our resolution concerning the online initiative (AS-3050-11/EX, <http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/2011-2012/3050.shtml>) resulted in the addition of another faculty (the Senate Chair) to the CSU Online Board.

The Board has met twice since our last plenary. The first meeting was organizational in nature and included the introduction of the Executive Director of CSU Online, Ruth Black. You can read about the Board makeup as well as some background on the Director at <http://its.calstate.edu/onlinelearning/>.

It is likely that the initiative will propose a name change to Calstate Online as the efforts of Colorado State University and others with the CSU moniker already have web space carved out under the CSU Online tag.

The second meeting was an opportunity to hear from a variety of online education models in the country, including the Western Governor’s University. It is becoming clear that the initial offerings of Calstate Online will be those of our current online programs, both from our University Extension as well as State-supported offerings.

The Senate will have the opportunity to interview the Executive Director at its plenary this week as well as query the Chancellor on this issue. Ms. Black is also open to visiting the campuses to become acquainted with current online operations and the campus cultures from which Calstate Online is expected to grow.