

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

**MINUTES OF**  
**The Academic Senate**  
**Tuesday, February 11, 2003**  
**UU220, 3:00 to 5:00 pm**

- I. Minutes: The minutes for the Senate Committee meeting of January 21, 2003 were approved without change.
- II. Communications and Announcements: (Menon) Handout –President Baker has made the appointments to the Council on University Citizenship. They will begin their work very soon.
- III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair: None.
  - B. President’s Office: None.
  - C. Provost’s Office: (Zingg) Two weeks ago it was expected that, without including the one-time costs made permanent, our budget reduction would be about 6.5%. When you add in the one-time cost becoming permanent our budget changes to a reduction of 8.5%. Today we are looking at a budget reduction of about 9% because the Chancellor’s Office has provided the campuses with greater specifics as to how the cuts, identified in the Governor’s budget, will affect the individual campuses in the system. This means an 8.9% reduction of state allocated budget for next year, which translates to \$14.9 million. It’s important to understand that the \$14.9 million figure includes no mitigation efforts, and there are many strategies that our campus can adopt to mitigate the cut but it also includes no funding of several million of dollars of items that have been identified as unmet costs including enrollment growth allocations. Other issues to focus on: (1) Enrollment targets – The university has followed an enrollment growth plan that is tightly connected to the Master Plan. This year on a budget designed to support 16,800 FTE students in a calendar year, we are currently supporting 17,502 students. Two good things will happen next year, enrollment will drop from 17,502 to 17,100, and funding will increase from 16,800 to 17,420. The reason that we can focus on a target that is less than funded is because there has been a 2%, more or less, acceptable, permissible range between funded target and actual target for many years in the system. Our target for next year is to come in on the low side of the 2% permissible range. (2) Resource strategies that the university has in place include the following – Cal Poly is in the strongest position of any campus in the system because of the strategy that has been in effect in this university for at least 8 years. That strategy has been to build a resource base that is consistent with what the trustees and the California post secondary have recommended, which is to create a fair balance of the responsibility for funding higher education that looks to the state, to the students, and to private support, but not in equal thirds. In terms of private support, we are in the midst of a successful capital campaign that should exceed its \$225 million goal by the end of next year. Students with a combination of original Cal Poly Plan and college-based fees have provided us with the equivalent of a \$280 million endowment. Not a dime of the college-based fee is administered in the administration building. The colleges, in consultation with the students, administer all those funds, and no budgets are reduced as a result of funds that come into the colleges via the fees.
  - D. Statewide Senators: None.
  - E. CFA Campus President: None.
  - F. ASI Representatives: None.
  - G. Other: None.
- IV. Consent Agenda: None.

V. Business Item(s):

- A. **Presentation on ACR 73: Jacquelyn Kegley** – Chair, Statewide Academic Senate CSU, Andy Lyons – Research Specialist, CFA, Andrew Winnick – Associate VP, Academic Affairs, CSU Los Angeles. All presentations and handouts are available at [www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen](http://www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen) click on “News and Documents” and “ACR73 presentations” **Lyons** – ACR73 is short for Assembly Concurrent Resolution 73. It was passed in Fall 2001 and it calls for the CSU to do four things: Develop a plan to raise the percentage of tenure/tenure faculty to 75% of all CSU faculty, second, do so without affecting the jobs of any current CSU lecturers, third, attempt to move existing CSU lecturers into tenure/tenure tract positions, and fourth, it seeks to increase faculty diversity. The issue of tenure became a major issue in the latest round of bargaining, which began in the spring of 2001 and concluded last spring. The contributions that lecturers make to the system are greatly recognized and appreciated. There is no hope that the ACR73 plan will be funded in 2003-2004 and there are some questions for 2004-2005 but it is important that this is kept in front of the legislature. **Kegley** – ACR73 is a very collaborative effort between the Statewide Academic Senate, CFA, and the Chancellor’s Office and we need to work together to keep before the legislature, the key elements of the ACR73 plan. ACR73 is about the quality of education so we need to go to Sacramento and say that quality can’t continue to be eroded in the CSU. ACR73 is also about the issue of SFR as a quality-indicator, the ability to attract good faculty to the CSU, and is about workload. **Winnick** – The ACR73 report consists of five elements including a cover letter to the Senate and a 35-page analysis that precedes the discussions titled “An Analysis of the Use of Tenure and Tenure Track and Lecturer Faculty in the California State University.” Early on, the role that the tenure and lecturer faculty play in the CSU was recognized explicitly. Lecturer faculty are essential to the role of delivery of quality education within the CSU. The role of delivery consist of four parts, one is labeled *Structure* (requires 2,000 FTES) - which includes the replacement of permanent faculty who has temporary non-teaching assignments. *Faculty flow* (requires 1,100 FTES) – it bridges the gap between when permanent faculty leaves and a replacement is found. *Enrollment Growth* (requires 660 FTES) – a need for temporary faculty until funding for permanent positions become available. *Curricular and Flexibility* (requires 8000 FTES) – curricular brings practitioners into the classroom and flexibility when demand is shifting between disciplines. This analysis demonstrates a need for 30% of the faculty to be lecturers. The issue of searches is very time consuming, very expensive, energy intensive, very resource consuming and approximately 1 in 6 searches end up hiring a lecturer. Faculty diversity is difficult when the hiring pool is static but the system has a 75% success rate on all searches. The marginal cost funding is currently inadequate. It’s currently funded at a level that presumes that the average faculty salary is \$42,000, where the average system wide salary is between \$57,000 to \$59,000. This funding doesn’t include mandated cost such as insurance, disability, risk management, etc. The cost to conduct a faculty search averages \$11,000 and the average start-up for a new faculty is \$7,500. Both of these fees are totally unfunded. As a system we are in worse trouble now than in 91-92 due to the following two factors: (1) The state’s budget deficit is bigger than it was a decade ago (2) in 91-92 the system absorbed a substantial part of the deficit by reducing enrollments. The state has \$260 million less, system wide, to educate 5% more than actually allocated.
- B. **Curriculum Proposal for Master of Public Policy (MPP):** Due to lack of time it was postponed until the next meeting.
- C. **Resolution on Class Attendance (CAM 485.2):** Due to lack of time it was postponed until the next meeting.

VI. Discussion Item(s): None.

VII. Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory,  
Academic Senate