

**Academic Senate of the California State University
Ad Hoc Task Force on the Senate Budget
Final Report to the Executive Committee
December 2005**

Members of the task force were Senators Anagnoson (chair), Buck, Cook, Edelman, and Hood. Members were joined by Senator Jensen for an oral discussion of the options available. Each of the members of the task force is a current or previous member of the Executive Committee or a Senate committee or task force chair. Several have been members of the Senate for a decade or more.

Background.

The Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) budget consists of several elements:

- Approximately \$550,000 to \$600,000 in assigned time, currently assigned at the rate of 3 units per semester for all Senators in their second or subsequent years. Senate committee chairs and the members of the Executive Committee are assigned an additional 3 units per semester for a half time release from instructional duties. The chair of the ASCSU receives 100% assigned time.
- Approximately \$200,000 in travel, including travel to and from plenaries and interim committee meetings, plus travel for Senators to sit on system wide committees. While a few of these have travel paid for from other sources, most are committees where the ASCSU pays for the travel associated with getting Senators to and from the committee meeting location.
- Approximately \$200,000 in staff salaries.
- Approximately \$67,000 in o/e and the chair's travel
- Approximately \$30,000 in summer stipends for the Vice Chair, Secretary, and the two at-large members of the Executive Committee, who have traditionally received one month's pay to compensate for their duties during the Summer.

The range of the Senate's budget is from approximately \$1,047,000 to \$1,097,000. Many of the expenses vary year by year, based on the campuses of the chair and the members of the Executive Committee, whether the CSU is the host for the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) (as it is during 2005-06), the frequency and locations of the system wide committee meetings, as well as the locations of the Senators named to sit on those committees, how many Senators are re-elected (thus continuing to receive Assigned Time, as opposed to new Senators, who do not receive Assigned Time in their first year), and other factors.

In most recent years, the budget has been sufficient to maintain an even balance.

The last three years, however, have seen an increasing set of problems that grew to a substantial deficit in 2005-06. In 2002-03, the Senate added eight new Senators, so that the two smallest campuses at the time (CI and MA) would have a second Senator and several of the medium sized campuses would receive a third Senate position that had been cut during the budget crisis of the early 1990s. In combination with other factors, it became clear during the summer of 2005 that the Senate's budget had a structural imbalance, resulting from the increase in the number of Senators and the Senate's promise that it would handle the increased number of Senators within its current budget.

The 2002 Increase in the Number of Senators.

In 2001 the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) contained 51 elected campus representatives, apportioned among the campuses as follows:

- One senator from each campus with an FTEF of 100 or less
- Two from each campus with an FTEF over 100
- One extra Senator for as many campuses as possible apportioned on the basis of the highest FTEF

In addition, the immediate past chair is a member of the Senate if not an elected member, and the Chancellor or representative is an ex-officio non-voting member.

In 2002, the Senate recommended a change in its membership to the Trustees, after a vote in the Senate and a majority vote among the campus faculty as per the requirements for a constitutional change. That change dropped the requirement of 51 senators and allowed the Senate's membership to float upward according to the following requirements:

- A minimum of two Senators from each campus
- An additional Senator, for a total of three, from each campus whose FTEF exceeds the average FTEF (determined by the $1/n$ fraction of the systemwide FTEF, where n is the number of campuses), plus an additional senator (for a total of 4) for any campus whose FTEF exceeds twice the average FTEF (i.e., $2/n$ times the systemwide FTEF).
- The immediate past chair, with language added to the constitution to indicate that this person should not be counted as a campus representative if not an elected member.
- The Chancellor or his representative as an ex-officio non-voting member.
- One emerita/emeritus selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association.

A clause was added to the constitution allowing the Senate, "through its by-laws, to resolve issues concerning the implementation of this section" of the Constitution.

When the item was to come before the Board of Trustees, the Senate was asked how it would accommodate the increased number of Senators within its then current budget. The answer as given to the Board in the Committee on Educational Policy item of July 2002:

“The Academic Senate understands that the expansion of campus representatives and the emerita/emeritus member would be accomplished without an increase in budgeted resources. The Academic Senate Executive Committee intends to accommodate the proposed amendments through reductions in member travel and/or release time assignments.”

The increase in Senators is:

- 2002-03 – 51 Senators
- 2003-04 – 59 Senators – 8 new Senators were in their first year
- 2004-05 – 59 Senators – 8 new Senators were in their second year
- 2005-06 – 59 Senators – 8 new Senators were in their third year.

The increase in Assigned Time was felt during 2004-05 and 2005-06.

Why has the budget crisis hit in 2005? The answer is that several factors affected the Senate’s budget at the same time.

- One is the new Senators added are now in their third year, i.e., this is the second year that they have received assigned time (release time) for Senate duties.
- Due to an increased number of Senators who were re-elected to their positions, more Senators than average were to receive assigned time in 2005-06 in accordance with present practices (assigned time is provided to every Senator in his or her second year, no matter when he or she started the previous year).
- The Senate had increased responsibilities for other committees in 2005-06, in particular the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), whose leadership rotates every third year. 2005-06 is CSU’s turn to chair the group and to host the meetings.

Using current full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) data, updated to Fall 2004, the most recent available, the old and new constitutional language results in the following allocation of Senators by campus as illustrated in Table 1:

Table 1
Apportionment, 2002 Rules and 2005 Rules
November, 2005

Campus	FTEF Fall 2004	2002 Rules	2005 Rules
MA	69	1	2
CI	121	2	2
MB	210	2	2
SM	286	2	2
SO	353	2	2
ST	369	2	2
BA	382	2	2
HU	399	2	2
DH	446	2	2
HA	501	2	2
SB	636	2	2
CH	710	2	3
LA	795	2	3
PO	798	2	3
FR	842	2	3
SLO	885	2	3
SF	1,102	2	3
SJ	1,133	3	3
SA	1,162	3	3
FU	1,176	3	3
SD	1,249	3	3
NO	1,282	3	3
LB	1,328	3	3
Emeriti			1
Totals		51	59
Average	705.8		
Twice Average	1,411.7		

Two other possibilities, in broad form, presented themselves to the task force.

One centered on cutting assigned time in years when revenues were forecast to fall short of expenditures. The other centered on returning to a smaller Senate, prior to the expansion in 2002-03.

A second option is to define a priority list for cutting assigned time. Under this option, the Executive Committee would award assigned time each year in accordance with a priority list.

1. Last would be first year Senators.
2. Next would be 2nd year Senators who were appointed or assumed their seats after the September plenary meetings the year before.
3. Next would be second year senators, and so on.

4. Savings: could be elastic, but the number of second year Senators in the last three years was 6, 12, and 7 (the 12 figure reflects the 6-7 new Senators added in 2003-04) – using an average of the 6 and 7 figures at 6.5 Senators in their second year per year, the savings would be about $6.5 \times \$9,000 = \$58,500$ per year.

The major disadvantage here would be that Senators who did not receive assigned time would not be members of committees until the third year of a three-year term. Since most Senators have found that an individual's real understanding and contribution to the Senate does not take place until he or she is a member of a committee, this proposal seems to have real disadvantages.

To the committee, the three options came down to two contrasting philosophies regarding the Senate and its budget. One alternative is that we maintain the current size of the Senate, resulting in budget crises in many years and uncertainty about whether second year Senators would have assigned time, whether systemwide committee assignments could be carried out, whether the Executive Committee could attend the Board of Trustees meetings, and all the other practices we implemented to survive the current year.

The alternative is to be a somewhat smaller Senate that would have sufficient funds under the present budget practices and allocations to carry out its business.

A majority of the committee strongly prefers the second philosophy. Under it, the Executive Committee would not have to spend the extraordinary amount of time it did this year on the Senate budget, and there would be sufficient funds for assigned time and travel to meet the Senate's current responsibilities.

Recommendation.

That the Senate goes back to the constitutional rules prior to the current constitutional change. The Executive Committee should draft the appropriate language to change the Senate's constitution in time to send the change out for ratification during the current academic year.

Senator Buck's dissent is printed on the next page.

Dissent by Senator J. Vincent Buck

I favor doing basically what we did this year: reduce travel. We should fund three instead of four interim meetings (leaving the date up to the individual committees); fewer members of exec should attend BOT meetings to sit there like statues; and the CO should directly fund our travel to participate in non-Senate meetings. Those savings along with not funding ICAS should get us through the next year. We might also restrict local senators from staying overnight in Long Beach, or restrict the number of nights that they can do that.

Second, we should be arguing for greater funding. Our funding as a percent of the total CSU budget has decreased.

Third, I strongly oppose any proposal to cut assigned time for second year senators. Reducing assigned time will reduce commitment of time to the Senate and the Senate will function less well. To use the argument in the body of the report, it will “restrict the Senate and its members from performing their core duties.” I think that the improvement was notable when we funded first year senators.

Fourth, I feel comfortable about reducing the membership on the Senate for campuses with fewer than 200 FTEF. I feel less comfortable about cutting representation for the mid-sized campuses. However, if this is done, a “formula” should be designed that follows natural breaks in FTEF. If the break comes between two campuses with similar FTEF then a seat could shift back and forth every year or two. In that vein the break should come between San Francisco and SLO, not between San Francisco and San Jose. I would also like to note that FTEF is quite different from FTES or student headcount and under funded campuses are penalized in this representative scheme. Fullerton, the largest campus in head count is only fourth largest in FTEF, reflecting its history of being the least well funded of the campuses. Likewise SFSU is also an under funded campus.

Fifth, our budget comes out of Academic Affairs. ITL is also in Academic Affairs and it has not been fully functioning for several years. I would further reduce that budget before making cuts to the Senate that restricts its effectiveness.

Finally, some of general comments about the budget:

- The comment given to the Board of Trustees in 2002 is quite different from what Dave Spence told the Senate. He said, in effect, that the budget would not be a problem. Not that it will make any difference, but it might be worthwhile to check with Gene Dinielli to confirm that. Regardless, I was one of the strongest advocates of expanding the Senate and I would not have advocated so strongly if I thought that the expansion would not be fully funded.
- There must have been years during which our funding was richer. There used to be five persons (including a student) in the office and there was at least one year when first term senators were given assigned time.

November 1, 2001

Amendment to the Constitution

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) recommend to the faculty of the CSU the following constitutional amendment regarding Senate membership.

Article II

Section 1. Membership

1. The Academic Senate shall consist of elected campus representatives apportioned as follows:
 - a minimum of two senators from each campus plus one additional senator (for a total of 3) for each campus whose FTEF exceeds the average FTEF (determined by the $1/n$ fraction of the systemwide FTEF, where n is the number of campuses), plus an additional senator (for a total of 4) for any campus whose FTEF exceeds twice the average FTEF (i.e., $2/n$ times the systemwide FTEF)
2. The Academic Senate shall also include:
 - a) the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member (who shall not be counted as a campus representative if not an elected member);
 - b) the Chancellor or representative as an ex-officio non-voting member
 - c) one emerita/emeritus selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association
3. The Academic Senate shall have the power, through its by-laws, to resolve issues concerning the implementation of this section (Article II, Section 1.) of the Constitution (membership).

RATIONALE: Senate membership was reduced in the mid 1990s (from 57 to 51) and its total size capped, in response to fiscal exigencies. Since that time new campuses have entered the system, and more are expected. Because of the cap on senate membership new campuses can be accommodated only by removing seats from the larger campuses, resulting in a Senate which will not reflect a balanced compromise between equal campus representation and proportional faculty representation.

This change permits every campus two senators, which is the minimum necessary to achieve organizational continuity of representation for a campus, it assures all campuses with more than the average number of faculty three senators, and it allows for the possibility that a very large campus could grow into a fourth senator. The immediate effects would be a second senator for our smallest campus and the restoration of a third senator to four of those mid-size campuses that lost representation in 1996. The longer term effects of this proposal when compared to the 1995 constitution would be growth restrictive, except for the addition of new campuses, and would stabilize Senate membership well below what would have resulted under the 1995 constitution.

Clause 3 permits the Senate to respond to any practical difficulties that may arise in implementing apportionment and membership issues, such as the timing for creation of new seats, determination of annual reapportionment procedures, establishing staggered elections for new campuses, assuring that any reallocation of a seat occurs at the conclusion of a term of office, etc.

APPROVED – January 24-25, 2002

Memorandum to Charles Reed, Chancellor, and David Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, June 5, 2002, from Jacquelyn Kegley, Chair, ASCSU, Subject: Constitutional Revision for the Academic Senate CSU.

On March 7, 2002, the Academic Senate CSU sent to the campus academic senates its proposed constitutional revision. By May 1, 2002, we were notified by the majority of all campuses that the majority of their faculty ratified the proposed changes. At this time, as per Article VII of its constitution, the Academic Senate CSU respectfully requests the CSU Board of Trustees approve the following two amendments to its constitution.

The two following revisions (language from ballot included below) were duly approved by CSU faculty, as follows:

Item 1:

- There would be a minimum of two senators from each campus. A campus would receive one additional senator (a total of 3) if its FTEF exceeds the average systemwide FTEF. A campus whose FTEF exceeds twice the average systemwide FTEF would receive an additional senator (for a total of 4).
- The Academic Senate would have the power, through its bylaws, to resolve issues concerning the implementation of these sections of the Constitution concerning membership.

Item 2:

- That the Academic Senate would also include an emerita/emeritus selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association.

JAK/dwh

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate California State University

Presentation By

David S. Spence
Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Academic Officer

Jacquelyn Kegley
Chair, Academic Senate, CSU

Summary

This item recommends approval of amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate California State University. These amendments revise the formulae for determining the size of campus delegations to the Academic Senate. They also extend membership in the Academic Senate to include a representative of the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association.

Background

At its meeting of January 2002, the Academic Senate, CSU, passed a resolution proposing amendments to its Constitution as described below. As required by the Constitution, these proposed amendments were submitted to the individual campus academic senates for faculty ratification. By May 1, 2002, the Academic Senate, CSU, had been notified by a majority of the campuses, that a majority of faculty on those campuses had ratified the proposed changes.

Chapter VII, Section 2, of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees states "Amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University shall become effective when ratified according to its provisions and approved by the Board of Trustees."

The key changes recommended are the following:

- The representation formula would be revised to provide a minimum of two senators from each campus. A campus would receive one additional senator (a total of 3) if its full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) exceeded the systemwide average FTEF, and would receive a second additional senator (a total of 4) if its FTEF exceeded twice the systemwide average FTEF.
- The Academic Senate would be granted the authority to resolve issues concerning the implementation of the above section on campus representation, through its by-laws. Such issues could involve definitions, sources of data, or implementation dates.
- The membership of the Academic Senate, CSU, would be expanded to include an emerita/emeritus member selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association.

The specific proposed amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate, CSU, are included in Appendix A. They have been carefully reviewed by the staff of the Chancellor's Office, who concurs with the changes. If approved and implemented, the changes would increase the size of the elected campus representatives to the Academic Senate from 51 to 58. Appendix B shows the distribution of the campus representatives to the Academic Senate based upon the fall 2001 total of 15,721.7 FTEF, yielding a systemwide campus average of 683.6 FTEF.

Besides the elected campus representatives, the Academic Senate membership currently includes the Chancellor (or representative) as a non-voting member and the immediate past chair (if not an elected campus representative). To this would be added the emerita/emeritus member selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association. **The Academic Senate understands that the expansion of campus representatives and the emerita/emeritus member would be accomplished without an increase in budgeted resources. The Academic Senate Executive Committee intends to accommodate the proposed amendments through reductions in member travel and/or release time assignments.** (emphasis added)

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the proposed amendments to the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University included in Appendix A to Agenda Item 3 of the July 16-17, 2002, meeting of the Trustees' Committee on Educational Policy, having been ratified by the faculties of a majority of the campuses, are approved by the Board.

**Constitutional Language
The “Old” Language**

**The Constitution
of the
Academic Senate of the California State University**

Article II

Section 1. Membership

1. The Academic Senate shall consist of 51 elected campus representatives as follows:

A minimum of two senators from each campus plus one additional senator (for a total of 3) for each campus whose FTEF exceeds the average FTEF (determined by the $1/n$ fraction of the systemwide FTEF, where n is the number of campuses), plus an additional senator (for a total of 4) for any campus whose FTEF exceeds twice the average FTEF (i.e., $2/n$ times the systemwide FTEF)

2. The Academic Senate shall also include:

- a) the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member
- b) the Chancellor or representative as an ex-officio non-voting member.

The immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member shall not be counted as a campus representative.

**Constitutional Language
The “New” Language**

**The Constitution
of the
Academic Senate of the California State University**

Article II

Section 1. Membership

- (a) The Academic Senate shall consist of elected campus representatives apportioned as follows: a minimum of two senators from each campus plus one additional senator (for a total of 3) for each campus whose FTEF exceeds the average FTEF (determined by the $1/n$ fraction of the systemwide FTEF, where n is the number of campuses), plus an additional senator (for a total of 4) for any campus whose FTEF exceeds twice the average FTEF (i.e., $2/n$ times the systemwide FTEF)
- (b) The Academic Senate shall also include:
- 1) the immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member (who shall not be counted as a campus representative if not an elected member);
 - 2) the Chancellor or representative as an ex-officio non-voting member.
 - 3) one emerita/emeritus selected by the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association
- (c) The Academic Senate shall have the power, through its by-laws, to resolve issues concerning the implementation of this section (Article II, Section 1.) of the Constitution (membership).

Resolution approved at the January 2003 ASCSU meetings.

AS-2589-02/FLOOR APPORTIONMENT OF SENATE SEATS

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University create a 9th Bylaw, as follows:

1. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for recommending the apportionment and reapportionment of Senate seats using the formula listed in Article II Section 1 of the Constitution. Each year it shall conduct a "census" using the most recent and reliable Fall FTEF data to determine whether reapportionment of seats among campuses is necessary. The results shall be presented to the Senate for its approval at its first meeting in the calendar year.
2. When new seats are added to the Senate due to the addition of campuses or constitutional revisions, these seats shall be filled in the next spring election cycle following the Executive Committee's completion of the census.
3. Whenever reapportionment results in a campus losing a seat, the seat lost shall be the first seat to complete its three-year term following the announcement of the reapportionment, and the seat shall not be lost until the three-year term expires.
4. Whenever a campus is entitled to a new seat, the Executive Committee shall determine whether the length of the first term for that seat shall be 1, 2, or 3 years. In making this determination, the Executive Committee shall attempt to stagger the years in which that campus's seats expire, so as to maximize continuity in representation from that campus.

RATIONALE: This Bylaw concerns apportionment of Senate seats, prepared by the special committee appointed for this task. The purpose of this bylaw is to give the Senate a transparent procedure for implementation of the new constitutional amendment and for keeping apportionment up to date in the future.

AS-2589-02/Floor motion approved unanimously.

***March 6-7, 2003—The Senate instructed the Executive Committee to recommend (during this Senate meeting) changes that would take place for the Academic Year 2003-2004. The Senate approved the recommendation of the Executive Committee that increases representation by one additional senator for the campuses of Chico, Fresno, Los Angeles, Maritime Academy, and Pomona. It also allocates two senators to the new campus at Channel Islands.**