

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

MINUTES OF
The Academic Senate
Tuesday, January 22, 2002
UU220, 3:00-5:00 P.M.

Preparatory: the meeting was opened at 3:10 PM

- I. Minutes: The minutes for the Academic Senate meetings of October 30 and November 20, 2001 were approved without change.
- II. Communications and Announcements: John Maxwell from Chemistry & Biochemistry was introduced as a new senator for the College of Science and Math and Barbara Franz from Modern Languages as the part-time lecturer representative.
Presidential Responses to Academic Senate Resolutions: includes responses from President Baker approving many resolutions that were submitted during the past year, including the resolutions on commencement and RTP. RTP is an action item, which is to be taken up by departments and colleges.
- III. Reports:
 - A. Chair: (Menon) President Baker was in attendance to brief us on the budget situation, which seems to be much better than we had anticipated. Curriculum Committee is working on the 180-units issues and will be coming to us with a recommendation. Budget and Long Range Planning Committee worked hard last quarter to formulate priorities and guidelines, which have already been accepted and received favorably by various levels of administration.
 - B. President's Report: (Baker) The budget was a surprise, considering that we were expecting reductions in the budget for the 2002-2003 academic year, due to the shortfall in revenues expected at \$12.5 billion. Instead of a reduction the budget was increased by \$117 million and provides full funding for enrollment and 1% provision for compensation increases and also takes into account some health benefits premiums. Specifically for Cal Poly it means that we will have full funding for enrollment which will be about 200 less students for next year. Fee increases are independent from the budget since we do not have an allocation of funds that is adequate to meet the needs of the curriculum and the reason for that is that we have an unusually high percentage of high cost programs. We are over enrolled partly because we were under enrolled for two years in a row. Essentially we have said that it needs to be a three-way partnership if we are going to solve the problem of under funding. Our support comes from private funding, student fees, and additional funding from the legislature. The private funding is substantial but it does not come uniformly distributed across campus. Funds raised for the 2001 calendar year were \$58 million, which is an all time record in the CSU system. The only students fees that are tolerable politically in Sacramento are those that students support themselves in referendum.
 - C. Provost: None.
 - D. Statewide Senator: None.
 - E. CFA Report: (Fetzer) we have been in search of a fact finder. There is a general meeting tomorrow at 5pm at the Pavilion where all faculty are invited to attend and discuss responses to our current contract negotiations. (Foroohar) Finally, CFA has found a fact finder that is agreeable to both parties and hopes to start the one-month process soon.
 - F. ASI Report: (Kipe) I'm glad to see that the commencement issue has come to a close and she will prepare a report for the Board of Directors so they can prepare a resolution and start

publicizing it to students. (Hunt) Last Wednesday the Board of Directors passed a resolution in response to the September 11 attacks and in support of tolerance for students of all religious backgrounds, ethnic backgrounds, etc, and also have a meeting with student leaders and Trustee Goldwhite immediately following this meeting.

G. Other Reports: **CSU Trustee Harold Goldwhite**

(Please logon to the Academic Senate we site at www.calpoly.edu/~acadsen for full transcript.)

Introduction - Trustee Tsakopoulos could not be here today but I will try to get him here before the end of the academic year. I am a Professor of Chemistry at Cal State Los Angeles in my 40th year of services and have worked my way thru various level of faculty governance, was chair of campus senate, chair of statewide Academic Senate, and have been on the Board of Trustees for about three years. The most productive thing I can do is to listen.

Budget – President Baker presented a review of the current budget situation. Until the May revision of the Governor’s budget, we will not really know where we are but in general, in the past the budget that the CSU has received has been extraordinarily close to the Governor’s budget. The Board of Trustees will have, in addition to its regular meetings, a retreat in early March. This is a very interesting meeting because is relatively unstructured, there is a broad agenda and the Board for once gets to talk at a policy level about things that are important to the CSU.

Discussion with Senators

There is a constituency in Sacramento, lead by John Burton, which is philosophically opposed to high fees in California public higher education. They believe that public support of higher education is at a level where we do not need to increase student fees. The Board of Trustees has gone on record with its public policy and it says that the CSU should work towards a situation where the students bear 1/3 of the cost of education and the state pays 2/3.

The Chancellor and Board members have said publicly that there will not be an imposition. The CSU maintains that management has never imposed on the CFA or anyone.

Essentially 100% of the money that comes to the CSU is spent on instruction. The problem is that as instruction becomes more complex, much of it takes place outside the confines of classroom-student interaction. There is an allegation that administration has grown out of control. President Baker gave a very interesting comment at a recent meeting of the Board of Trustees in which he suggested that the increase in administration on this campus has been almost exclusively in the area of development.

The process of the evaluation of the Chancellor, included a call for letters to be submitted to the chair of the Board. The process of analysis was as follows: all the letters were read directly by the chair and vice chair of the Board, then sent to an agency completely outside and independent of the CSU, which made them anonymous. There are quite a lot of letters in positive support of the Chancellor and not all from administrators. The data was presented to the Board of Trustees with a review by the chair of the Board. The Board then voted on a single question, which was whether we support the continuance of Charles Reed as Chancellor of the California State University. The Board voted unanimously in favor of that motion. The one area in which I am quite uneasy about my conduct and the conduct of the rest of the board is that we gave full control to the Chair and Vice Chair to write the letter that was to be released to the CSU community summarizing the actions of the Board. There were many questions raised of the Chancellor in the interactions with him and points made about future behaviors and target conducts and things to do. Those points, in turn, were reduced to a very short list of rather oblique comments in the letter that everyone saw. In my interaction with Chancellor Reed, most of the time I have heard nothing but supportive comments about both the quality and conduct of the faculty in this institution. Much of what we hear on those occasions when Charles Reed has been negative of the faculty is the result of his interpretation of bargaining and other interactions with the bargaining agent.

It was requested by Harvey Greenwald that the Board of Trustees evaluate how it looks at things of value such as thru-put and find a way to reward campuses and secondly that Trustees consider a balance between resources and enrollment.

The Board of Trustees adopted a set of accountability measures and part of it was thru-put but at the request of the campuses. The Board of Trustees was not supposed to compare campuses or distribute resources based on any accountability measures. If students were to vote a fee increase by referendum and within current CSU policy, it is acceptable. Our fees are still so low, that we do not have the advantage of tapping into a number of federal programs that are fee support programs.

Goldwhite – Let me clarify that the majority of the comments about the Chancellor were not negative. However, the majority of comments from the faculty were negative. Many supportive comments came from administration and some faculty. The Board is committed as a group, to pay for performance and looking at their background, many of them come from private industry. I think that the majority of the Board of Trustee is supportive of some component of the compensation structure for all CSU employees being given for performance.

Recruitment and retention is significantly difficult for the CSU. Compensation and workload are very negative points that new and incoming faculty look at when they look at the CSU. I feel that the service step increases would cost the CSU very little and would be an enormous improvement for our beginning faculty. I have discussed this with the chair of the Board who felt that the cost was too much.

IV. Consent Agenda: None.

V. Business Items:

- A. **Resolution on Budget Principles and Strategies:** Greenwald, Budget and Long Range Planning Interim Chair, first reading. This resolution provides the administration with a list of guidelines and recommendation should budget cuts take place and asks that faculty members be involved in making those decisions. M/S/P to move to a second reading.

VI. Discussion Items: None.

VII. Meeting adjourned 5:00PM

Submitted by,



Gladys Gregora,
Academic Senate