CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE
805.756.1258

MINUTES OF
The Academic Senate
Tuesday, December 3, 2002
UU220, 3:00 to 5:00 pm

I. Minutes: None.

II. Communications and Announcements: None.

III. Reports: None.

IV. Consent Agenda: None.

V. Business Items: None

VI. Discussion Item(s): **Discussion with CSU Board of Trustees members DEBRA FARAR (Chair of the Board), HAROLD GOLDWHITE (Faculty Trustee), and President BAKER.**

After some introductory remarks by Senate Chair Menon, the Trustees were invited to comment on the current budget situation. This was followed by several questions from Senators and other faculty present at this special session of the Senate. A summary of these discussions is recorded below:

Farar – At a meeting with Chancellor Reed and finance people on how to cut $5 billion statewide it was determined that "everything is on the table" but nothing will happen until next year. At this time, we don't know in what direction we are headed except that there will be cuts.
Goldwhite – Constitutionally required programs would not get cut. Many campuses have firm contracts that are difficult to cut.
Harris – What do we do with extra Tidal Wave II students and no budget for remediation?
Goldwhite – Some problems have no solution. The group of students in Tidal Wave II are different from students in the past. My personal view is that the quality of education in the CSU has declined over the past 20-25 years and based on standards and resources, the decline will continue.
Farar – There has to be balance between quality and access and any strategies and decisions will be about access. "Access without quality scares me. But quality without access scares me even more."
Iqbal – How can trustees explain the ever-increasing demands on the faculty for higher quality performance in the areas of research, teaching (higher enrollment and larger class sizes) and service with ever decreasing resources and undoubtedly low salaries? At the minimum, it is unfair to expect greater and higher quality output without increasing the inputs (resources) and competitive compensation.
Goldwhite – Agree with the second sentence. The Board of Trustees makes major decisions for the CSU but doesn't set the standards for faculty. We need to give the faculty the power to make decisions on standards. The faculty, not the trustees, have placed the demands on the faculty. We now demand a lot more from our faculty than in the past. We must have serious conversations with the Senates about these decisions and demands.

Farar – The CSU understands that faculty drives the quality of our institution. Chancellor Reed and the Board of Trustees want any available money to go to faculty compensation.
Foroohar – We need to emphasize not how small the budget is but the allocation of that budget, which is something we can do something about. The budget proposal that Reed brought to the Board and passed doesn't take into account priorities set by two previous resolutions, one deals with faculty salary and the other with class size. None of the two priorities are emphasized and we also ask; what about shared governance.
Farar – The breakdown with shared governance is that when things don't turn out, there is no explanation. The resolutions were given heavy consideration and maybe the manner in which the decision was reached wasn't communicated properly.
Foroohar – How much was assigned to the CMS program?
Farar – CMS was heavily discussed and consistently brought up, but it was not a solution. The budget reflects commitment to access. $400 millions have been budgeted for CMS over the next seven years.
Goldwhite – The process of shared governance gets advice, consults, and decides. The Board of Trustees made a decision and when disagreements occur it has the obligation to explain. The position of the Academic Senate was forcefully brought forward.
Hood – The budget crunch should not be a surprise. Each campus needs to discuss what to do to make these cuts. On this campus, nothing has been planned. It's time to do something, we need direction and to set priorities. We need realistic priorities set from the Chancellor on down.
Farar – Some decisions will be handed down from the legislatures but depend on the Senates for resources.
Laver – Is the current situation scary enough to consider raising tuition?
Farar – Yes, but nothing has been decided.
Hannings – It might help us if Chancellor Reed made sympathetic comments.
Goldwhite – Reed in general speaks very positive of the faculty.
Montgomery – One of the biggest concerns is the ability of junior faculty to get housing – is there a way for the Board of Trustees to come up with some solutions?
Farar – Other programs for existing housing are being discussed for five campuses in the CSU system with Cal Poly being one of the five.
Baker – Housing is an issue across the entire state and we get a double whammy with salaries too low and housing too high.
Goldwhite – The Board of Trustees did put a line item for housing but it got chopped down.
Stephens – on the issue of health care – is the Board of Trustees doing anything to address accessible and affordable care?
Goldwhite – The faculty negotiations have not been too successful. We are aware of the problem but not much has been done and the legislature didn't get far.
Greenwald – If we are told that we have to cut budget and take on more students, this is not a favor to students if graduation takes six years due to class accessibility. The number of students admitted must have some correlation with the budget.
Farar – Absolutely.
Ashbaugh – Is it possible for an optional student fee, as it was done here to reduce class size.
Goldwhite – There was a lot of concern at the Board of Trustees for this campus when there was a fee increase. The danger of many fee increases is that it looks like general fees increase. Several campus' student-body are different, they are not willing to impose fee increases on themselves.
Farar – Many students came here for the renowned Architecture program and see the fee increase as an investment in their future but not all CSU students see it that way.
Goldwhite – The point is well taken. At a conference in Sacramento, we were criticized for not putting together a good plan for the next 10 years. We are "muddling thru"
Harris – We need a diverse faculty to accommodate a diverse student body. Muddling thru will kill us because we can't adjust to changes.

Goldwhite – A number of private universities are doing that which the CSU would like to do. We do have options but most of them are campus options. We have a great deal of autonomy in spending money. An increase of under-represented faculty is difficult where there is no community support for minorities.
Lewis – The "muddling thru" remarks are well taken as an example of no leadership.
Greenwald – We all see a crisis but no one is doing much about it. We should have a retreat of trustees, presidents, and others to brainstorm and come up with possible solutions, so that when a crisis does occur, we have at least thought about it.
Goldwhite – Good idea.
Farar – Good idea.
Foroohar – Some solutions are not expensive, for example, forgivable loans for doctorate students.
Baker – There is a system wide program already in place. A problem with forgivable loans is that they are less effective since Proposition 209.
Hood – In the 90s the CSU "muddled thru," when student services were cut, and they really suffered. We can't afford to muddle again, we need to set priorities and try to achieve them.
Farar – It was a good idea to have us here for these discussions.
Goldwhite – We'll do it again.
Menon – We thank Trustees Farar and Goldwhite for having participated in this Senate discussion.

VII. Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory,
Academic Senate