I. Minutes:

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

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

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
   The remaining items from the February 15, 1994 agenda will be continued at this meeting.

   D. Resolution on Calendar—A. Brown, Chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading (pp. 7-10).
   E. Resolution on Definitions of Professional Programs, Technical Programs, and Significant Majority—Nulman, Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, second reading (p. 11).
   G. Resolution on Department Name Change for Ornamental Horticulture—Hannings for the O.H. Department, first reading (pp. 15-19).
   H. Resolution on Campus Policy on Repatriation of Native American Objects—Gish, Director for Ethnic Studies, first reading (pp. 20-28).
   I. Resolution on The Review of Telecommunications Course Offerings as New Courses—Dana/Nulman/Vilkitis, first reading (p. 29).
   J. Resolution on Department Designation Change for the Architecture Department—Cooper/Bagnall, Directors for the Architecture Department, first reading (pp. 30-33).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
Memorandum

To: Jack Wilson, Chair  
    Academic Senate

From: E. J. Carnegie, Chair  
      ASBC (Academic Senate Budget Committee)

Subject: Budget Cuts

As the University moves into yet another year of poor or bleak economic times, we must consider various budget reduction alternatives. The current projections suggest a budget reduction for the campus of between 0 and 6%. The uncertainty of next year's universities budget is due to the system wide mandatory costs, the possible range of revenues from student fees, and the inability to predict state resources. The Academic Senate Budget Committee sees no easy answer to the problem facing Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate on horizontal or vertical cuts. If the past is a picture of the future, we have not seen a pure horizontal or vertical cut, but a combination of both. If the cuts are significant the least destructive to the University "in total" is a vertical cut of some programs. Faculty input for vertical cuts is critical if the best interest of the university is to be preserved. The Academic Senate Budget Committee is not equipped to make a recommendation on the merits of existing programs. This recommendation must come from a faculty committee with that task as its charge. The greatest challenge to the vertical cut is the time lag from action to result because of commitments to students and the time required to eliminate programs. Vertical cuts have many system constraints caused by bargaining agreements, personnel inertia and the necessity to make long term commitments. After the last few years of budget cuts, a pure horizontal cut could force some programs below a level of critical mass. This reasoning then leads to some sort of diagonal cut that can maintain the quality of our existing programs.

Attention: Academic Senators,

The Budget Committee's recommendations above will be discussed at the Academic Senate meeting scheduled for Tuesday, March 8, 1994 at 3pm. Please bring this memo to that meeting.
As the University moves into yet another year of poor or bleak economic times, we must consider various budget reduction alternatives. The current projections suggest a budget reduction for the campus of between 0 and 6%. The uncertainty of next year's universities budget is due to the system wide mandatory costs, the possible range of revenues from student fees, and the inability to predict state resources. The Academic Senate Budget Committee sees no easy answer to the problem facing Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate on horizontal or vertical cuts.

WHEREAS, If the past is a picture of the future, we have not seen a pure horizontal or vertical cut, but a combination of both; and

WHEREAS, If the cuts are significant the least destructive to the University "in total" is a vertical cut of some programs; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Budget Committee is not equipped to make a recommendation on the merits of existing programs; and

WHEREAS, The greatest challenge to the vertical cut is the time lag from action to result because of commitments to students and the time required to eliminate programs; and

WHEREAS, Vertical cuts have many system constraints caused by bargaining agreements, personnel inertia and the necessity to make long term commitments, and

WHEREAS, After the last few years of budget cuts, a pure horizontal cut could force some programs below a level of critical mass; therefor be it

RESOLVED; That some sort of diagonal cut that can maintain the quality of our existing programs be implemented; and be it further

RESOLVED; That the degree of the vertical cut increase with the size of the budget cut; and be it further

RESOLVED; That input from faculty for vertical cuts is critical if the best interest of the university is to be preserved; and be it further

RESOLVED; That recommendation for vertical cuts must come from a faculty committee with that task as its charge.
REPORT TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE ON BUDGET
3/8/94

BACKGROUND

1) The governor's January proposed budget for 1994/95 represents an increase of 3.19% over the 1993/94 budget. No increase in student fees were included. However mandated cost increases, over the 93/94 budget, including costs for increased compensation ($51 million), revenue bond payments ($22.8 million), health and other employee benefits ($5.1 million) total $91 million. The final result is that when mandatory cost increases are factored in the governor's proposed budget represents a decrease in actual dollars of 2.3% from 93/94. Inflationary costs would add to the decrease. The bad news is that the governor's proposed budget for the state is based on a 'rosy' scenario including assuming $2.3 billion from the federal government, to help with the costs of providing aid for illegal immigrants.

2) State Senator Alquist, chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, said in a meeting on campus on 2/25/94 that higher education should expect no increase in its budget for 94/95. The state may have a $3 billion dollar deficit by July 1, 1994 and that deficit could increase to $6 billion by July 1, 1995. Over the past 3 years California has added 7500 new Correction Officer's positions while decreasing faculty in the CSU, UC and Community College System by roughly 7500.

3) The CSU Trustees can enact a 10% fee increase without new legislation, however it is questionable whether the legislature would allow it. A 10% fee increase represents an additional $40.7 million to the CSU. The preliminary draft of a report on higher education in California issued by the California Higher Education Policy Center recommends against any further fee increases at this time.

CAMPUS PLANNING FOR BUDGET FOR 1994/95

1) The campus target in planning is a 3% decrease in buying power of the 94/95 budget with respect to 93/94. This is the best judgment of the administration. The range is from zero to a 6% decrease.

2) Campus planning is greatly hindered by the fact that we have to wait for the legislature and governor to act and that may not occur before July 1st.

3) In the spring of 1992 the deans and V.P. Koob undertook the first biennial redistribution of resources among the 6 colleges and the UCTE under the title of Budget Change Proposals. This process is being repeated again this spring for redistribution for the period 1994/96. The maximum possible change of a college's budget will depend upon: A) the budget for Academic Affairs and B) three criteria which are: (1) how well a college can leverage non-state funds, (2) plans for improving faculty diversity and (3) how funds can be used for innovative improvements in programs. The maximum possible change in percent of a college's budget as a function of the budget change in Academic Affairs is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in budget of A.A. wrt 93/94</th>
<th>Max. possible change in college budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a reduction</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no change</td>
<td>± 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an increase</td>
<td>± 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Faculty input to the budget process largely takes place at the department level through the dept. heads/chairs to the dean of the college. Another source of faculty input occurs through PACBRA (the President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation) whose voting members are the 4 vice-presidents, the president of ASI, the president of Staff Council and the chair of the Academic Senate. The chair of the Academic Senate Budget Committees sits in an advisory capacity. Last year PACBRA recommended that the budgets of Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Business Affairs and Information Systems all be reduced 7%. The exceptions were that the Library be exempted from any reduction and that
Athletics be reduced 10%. Both the Library and Athletics are part of Academic Affairs. All of the actual reductions for 1993/94 are unknown at this time.

The third source of faculty input is through the Academic Senate. Last year the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate undertook a substantial study of the entire campus budget. As a result of that study 6 recommendations on budget were passed by the Academic Senate in the late spring of 1993. The recommendations were:

1) That state funding for Athletics be reduced by 100%.

2) That the administration carefully review the fiscal advisability of continuing the current Transportation Services Department.

3) That there be no increase in the general fund support for University Relations and Development over that provided in 1992/93.

4) With the decreasing number of enrolled students, we support continuing reductions in the number of administrators in administration in general.

5) We are concerned with the cost of central computing services provided by Information Services. We request that the Administrative Advisory Committee on Computing, the Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing and IRMPPC: (1) report to the Academic Senate on what are the essential computing functions on campus; and (2) recommend the most cost-effective ways of delivering those services.

6) That faculty are to be consulted in each college on the question of total personnel costs versus Operations and Equipment funds.

President Baker's response to these 6 recommendations is given in the attached letter. I will add what I have learned since the receipt of that letter.

Athletics - We are all aware that this is the last year of Division II participation for Athletics and they are preparing for competition at the Div. I level. State funding for Athletics was reduced 6.75% from 1992/93 to 1993/94.

University Relations and Development -
The consulting firm of Ketchum, Inc. recommended that the state support for University Relations and Development be increased. They also recommended the hiring of a Vice President for Development. The president has rejected the first recommendation. A search is in progress for a Vice President for Development. President Baker assured me that that person's salary will not cause the state support of UR&D to be increased.

Administration - The administration's numbers show a steady decrease in administrators from 124 in 1984 to 88 in 1992. Ninety plus percent of that decrease has occurred at the Administrator's III and IV (lower) levels. The number of top administrators, Administrators I and II had been reduced little as of 1992. In 1984 Administrators I and II comprised 48% of the total. In 1992 the comparable figure was 63%.

Computing Services - Against the advice of faculty the administration purchased the IBM 9000 computer in the late summer of 1993. The chair of the Instructional Advising Committee on Computing told me that that committee is working now on a plan that would essentially address the 2 points the senate made in its recommendation on computing. I assume IRMPPC and AACC are doing much the same thing. Presumably they will have in place a set of recommendations that would influence the next major decision on computing when that time comes. The administration is working hard to sell computing services to other campuses in the CSU and to other possible users as a means of generating additional income streams.
I appreciate the extra effort the Senate put into developing budget recommendations this year. As you know, these items were considered by PACBRA as you presented them there. As a response to these recommendations, I will provide a short summary of the action taken for each.

1. Athletics. I have chosen to follow the recommendation of the Athletics Governing Board on this issue. They unanimously recommended that the Department of Athletics suffer a loss in State funds equal to twice that assessed to the Colleges. Please recall that the Board is comprised of three faculty selected from a list of six nominated by the Academic Senate, three students, and is chaired by the Academic Vice President. This Board more accurately represents the partnership with student government on Athletics and it has significantly more opportunity to study the issue than the full Senate. Nevertheless, I understand and appreciate the message sent by the vote of the Senate on this issue.

2. Transportation Services. This Department has been placed on a self-sustaining basis for its fleet vehicles. Departments have complete freedom to purchase services from this unit or commercial vendors. However, State funds are provided for the maintenance, upkeep, and replacement of the infrastructure vehicles, i.e. public safety, facility services, etc.

3. University Relations and Development. I have asked the firm of Ketchum, Inc. to review the status of this function at Cal Poly. I expect to receive their report shortly. In the interim, there has been no increase in funding for this unit.

4. Administration. The numbers of General Fund supported administrators has declined significantly since 1984 (over 25%) and that decline continues into the current fiscal year.

5. Computing Services. Each of the committees mentioned has expressed its willingness to relay to the Senate whatever information it requests. Each has continuously attempted to find the most cost effective ways to deliver services.

6. Faculty Consultation. The Senate position echoes mine and that of the Academic Vice President. How this is accomplished in each College is the responsibility of the Dean of that College.
Memorandum

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: E. J. Carnegie, Chair
      ASBC (Academic Senate Budget Committee)

Subject: Budget Cuts

As the University moves into yet another year of poor or bleak economic times, we must consider various budget reduction alternatives. The current projections suggest a budget reduction for the campus of between 0 and 6%. The uncertainty of next year's universities budget is due to the system wide mandatory costs, the possible range of revenues from student fees, and the inability to predict state resources. The Academic Senate Budget Committee sees no easy answer to the problem facing Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate on horizontal or vertical cuts. If the past is a picture of the future, we have not seen a pure horizontal or vertical cut, but a combination of both. If the cuts are significant the least destructive to the University "in total" is a vertical cut of some programs. Faculty input for vertical cuts is critical if the best interest of the university is to be preserved. The Academic Senate Budget Committee is not equipped to make a recommendation on the merits of existing programs. This recommendation must come from a faculty committee with that task as its charge. The greatest challenge to the vertical cut is the time lag from action to result because of commitments to students and the time required to eliminate programs. Vertical cuts have many system constraints caused by bargaining agreements, personnel inertia and the necessity to make long term commitments. After the last few years of budget cuts, a pure horizontal cut could force some programs below a level of critical mass. This reasoning then leads to some sort of diagonal cut that can maintain the quality of our existing programs.

Attention: Academic Senators,

The Budget Committee's recommendations above will be discussed at the Academic Senate meeting scheduled for Tuesday, March 8, 1994 at 3pm. Please bring this memo to that meeting.
MEMORANDUM

Date: February 28, 1994

To: ALL ACADEMIC SENATORS

From: Margaret Camuso

Academic Senate

Subject: ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING OF MARCH 8, 1994

NOTICE OF MEETING

The Academic Senate will be meeting on
Tuesday, March 8, 1994, from 3 - 5pm in UU 220.

Please bring your agenda from February 15, 1994.