I. Minutes:

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair:
   B. President's Office:
   C. Vice President for Academic Affairs:
   D. Statewide Senators:
   E. CFA Campus President:
   F. ASI representatives:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
The agenda was reordered to heard the following two resolutions. A time certain was set at 4:10pm to begin discussion of the Academic Senate budget recommendations for 1994-1995.

G. Resolution on Department Name Change for Ornamental Horticulture, first reading: This will be a second reading item at the next Academic Senate meeting.

J. Resolution on Department Designation Change for the Architecture Department, first reading: This will be a second reading item at the next Academic Senate meeting.

VI. Discussion:
Academic Senate budget recommendations for 1994-1995: Vice President Koob explained the three cycles of budget planning: (1) planning (until the governor's budget is announced), (2) development (until the legislature announces its budget decision), and (3) implementation (when the annual budget for the campus is received). Koob would like the Senate to participate earlier in the cycle so budget recommendations could be proposed together instead of having proposals brought to the Senate.

The Academic Senate is requested to recommend approaches for handling budget decreases—e.g., horizontal cuts across the colleges or targeting specific activities/programs? The administration would like to have the Senate direct its attention in preparing budget scenarios. The deans and vice presidents have been asked to prepare example budget implementations to share with the campus around the first of April. This could be "what-if" scenarios. These will be refined through ongoing discussions until the middle of May.

The Deans' Council has said it would like to have the following pattern pursued: reallocate dollars among colleges every other year. This year, according to how much the budget changes from its current value, each college would donate to a common fund. If the budget increases by 1% or more, 3% of a college's budget would go into a common fund for reallocation back to the colleges. If there is no change in the budget (i.e., purchasing power), 2% would go into the common fund for reallocation back to the colleges. If there is a budget reduction, 1% would be contributed to the common fund for reallocation back to the colleges. The suggested criteria for reallocated use of funds are: (1) to leverage additional income from outside the university, (2) to increase diversity of faculty, and (3) for significant innovation.

Discussion regarding the budget will continue after the college scenarios are received.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.