



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

MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, November 6, 2007  
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

- I. Minutes: none.
- II. Communications and Announcements:
- 3:10 III. Reports:
  - A. Academic Senate Chair:
  - B. President's Office:
  - C. Provost:
  - D. Statewide Senate:
  - E. CFA Campus President:
  - F. ASI Representative:
  - G. Caucus Chairs:
  - H. Other:
- IV. Consent Agenda:
- 3:30 V. Business Item(s):
  - A. **Academic Senate and University committee vacancies:** (p. 2).
  - B. **Resolution on Faculty/Staff Dining Area:** Harris, chair of Ad Hoc Committee on Conference Center and Faculty Club (p. 3).
  - C. **Resolution Endorsing Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2814-07/AA/FGA/FA "Call for Consultation on Professional Fee for Graduate Business Degrees":** Executive Committee (pp. 4-11)
  - D. **[CLOSED SESSION]: consultation re honorary doctorate degrees:** Ogren, Vice President for University Advancement (materials to be sent electronically).
- 4:30 VI. Discussion Item(s):
- 5:00 VII. Adjournment:

## **ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES VACANCIES 2007-2008**

### **COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN**

#### **Faculty Affairs Committee**

### **COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**

#### **Curriculum Committee (2007-2009 term)**

### **COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS**

#### **Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (2007-2008 term)**

### **COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATH**

#### **Grants Review Committee (2007-2008 term)**

Tony F. Garcia, Physics

I am an associate professor of geology in the Physics Department. I have been able to sustain a research program since being hired at Cal Poly in 2001 (4 journal articles published since arriving at Cal Poly and 1 presently in review). The first research project I completed at Cal Poly was funded by internal grants, so it is appropriate for me to serve on the Grants Review Committee for at least two reasons: (1) I am grateful for the support I was awarded early in my career at Cal Poly, and I would like to repay the system by helping award grants to eligible faculty; and (2) I understand what is possible and what is required to conduct research at Cal Poly and meet teaching responsibilities, therefore, I am qualified to review grant proposals. I look forward to my serving on the Grants Review Committee.

### **PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES**

#### **Research and Professional Development Committee (2007-2008 term)**

## **UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITTEES**

#### **Information Resources Management Policy and Planning Committee**

(3 Representatives/2 Vacancies (07-09 and 07-08) – must have professional interest and expertise in information system)

#### **Intellectual Property Review Committee**

(2 Vacancies, CENG and CSM )

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS- \_\_\_\_-07**

**RESOLUTION ON  
FACULTY/STAFF DINING AREA**

1 WHEREAS, Cal Poly faculty and staff once enjoyed the exclusive use of the Staff Dining  
2 Room in the Dining Complex (Building 19); and  
3

4 WHEREAS, The Staff Dining Room was the locus of an informal, cross-disciplinary social  
5 life, bringing together people from different parts of the campus from breakfast  
6 time through lunch until afternoon coffee break time; and  
7

8 WHEREAS, This social life disappeared when the Cal Poly Corporation Campus Dining  
9 management converted the Staff Dining Room into the Veranda Café, which  
10 serves students, faculty, and staff; and  
11

12 WHEREAS, No equivalent plans or arrangements have been made since the conversion to the  
13 Veranda Café for the special needs of faculty and staff; and  
14

15 WHEREAS, A new Director of the Cal Poly Corporation is being recruited; and  
16

17 WHEREAS, A new Director of Campus Dining has been hired along with a new executive  
18 dining staff; and  
19

20 WHEREAS, The Campus Dining organization is at a moment of transition and will be  
21 preparing a new strategic plan; therefore be it  
22

23 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate requests that Campus Dining address in its strategic  
24 planning activity the exclusive needs of the faculty and staff; and be it further  
25

26 RESOLVED: That by the end of this academic year the new Director of Campus Dining should  
27 report to the Academic Senate on the status of how this request is being addressed  
28 within the Campus Dining strategic planning activity.

Proposed by: Ad Hoc Committee on Conference Center  
and Faculty Club

Date: October 29, 2007

Adopted:

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA**

**AS-\_\_\_\_-07**

**RESOLUTION ENDORSING  
ACADEMIC SENATE CSU RESOLUTION AS-2814-07/AA/FGA/FA  
“CALL FOR CONSULTATION ON PROFESSIONAL FEE FOR  
GRADUATE BUSINESS DEGREES”**

- 1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse Academic Senate Resolution AS-
- 2 2814-07/AA/FGA/FA entitled “Call for Consultation on Professional Fee for
- 3 Graduate Business Degrees” as attached.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Date: November 1, 2007

## Call for Consultation on Professional Fee for Graduate Business Degrees

**AS-2814-07/AA/FGA/FA**

### ATTACHMENT TO AS-2814-07/AA/FGA/FA

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) call on the CSU administration in consultation with the ASCSU executive committee to initiate a process of thorough and broad consultation with faculty and students across disciplines in the CSU regarding the proposal to initiate a professional fee for students in graduate business programs; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the CSU administration circulates the complete report of the task force on this proposal to the ASCSU, campus senates, and CSSA representatives; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU call on the CSU Board of Trustees to postpone taking action on this proposal until such consultation has been completed.

*RATIONALE: The proposal to initiate a professional fee for graduate business programs will be presented as an information item to the Board of Trustees at its September meeting. This proposal has potentially serious implications for the entire CSU and its mission. However, the report of the task force that recommended the fee has not yet been circulated broadly and there has not yet been an opportunity for faculty and students to consider the proposal. It is CSU policy that any new or increased campus-based fee can be enacted only after wide student consultation. Such consultation and consultation with the ASCSU and campus senates should precede any final decision on this proposal.*

**Approved – September 7, 2007**

[Academic Senate Home](#) | [Calendar](#) | [Search](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Helpful Links](#)



Academic Affairs  
401 Golden Shore, 6th Floor  
Long Beach, CA 90802 4210

[www.calstate.edu](http://www.calstate.edu)

**Gary W. Reichard**  
*Executive Vice Chancellor  
and Chief Academic Officer*  
562 951-4710 / Fax 562 951-4986  
E-mail [greichard@calstate.edu](mailto:greichard@calstate.edu)

September 18, 2007

Dr. Barry Pasternack, Chair  
Academic Senate, CSU  
The California State University  
401 Golden Shore, Suite 139  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

Dear Barry:

RE: September 5-6, 2007 Senate Resolutions

Thank you for forwarding the packet of resolutions adopted by the Academic Senate of The California State University at its meeting on September 5-6, 2007. Noting that only one resolution was adopted, I am pleased to provide the response below.

AS-2814-07/AA/FGA

Call for Consultation on Professional Fee for  
Graduate Business Degrees

CSU seeks views and input from many constituents when approaching the always-difficult topic of student fees. In the current instance, ASCSU members who are business faculty sat on the task force which proposed a special fee for students enrolled in professional graduate business programs. Additionally, the proposal was provided to CSU business deans, provosts, vice presidents for business & finance, and presidents. It was provided also to the System Budget Advisory Committee, on which the ASCSU is represented. Upon the senate's request during the September 5-6 meeting, we provided all of the items called for in this resolution.

It is worth noting that the resolution references a "complete report of the task force." We have already clarified for you that there is no such item. The lengthy paper that the Task Force reviewed is a staff report to the Task Force, and is not a "report of" the Task Force.

**CSU Campuses**  
Bakersfield  
Channel Islands  
Chico  
Dominguez Hills  
East Bay

Fresno  
Fullerton  
Humboldt  
Long Beach  
Los Angeles  
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay  
Northridge  
Pomona  
Sacramento  
San Bernardino  
San Diego

San Francisco  
San José  
San Luis Obispo  
San Marcos  
Sonoma  
Stanislaus





Dr. Barry Pasternack  
Page Two  
September 18, 2007

We think that the circulation of the items as referenced in the resolution is effectively now accomplished. We have no objection to the Senate in its normal course of business circulating any of the provided items further, but our office does not plan to "circulate the complete report of the task force" – there being none – "to the ASCSU, campus senates, and CSSA representatives" – this already having been effectively accomplished.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gary".

Gary W. Reichard  
Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

c:     Chancellor Charles B. Reed  
        Executive Vice Chancellor Richard West  
        Interim Vice Chancellor Gail Brooks  
        Associate Vice Chancellor Keith Boyum



A campus of The California State University

---

Office of the Academic Senate • One Washington Square • San Jose, California 95192-0024 • 408-924-2440 Fax: 408-924-2451

**SS-F07-3**

At its meeting of October 22, 2007, the Academic Senate passed the following Sense of the Senate Resolution presented by Michael Kaufman for the Curriculum and Research Committee.

**SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION**

**SJSU Response to the Proposed Differential Fee Increase for Graduate Business Degrees in the CSU**

Whereas, at the Board of Trustee's meeting in September the issue of a graduate fee for M.B.A. students of \$210 per semester unit was on the agenda as an information item with the expectation to become an action item at their January meeting; and

Whereas, the reasons for the implementation of the professional fee for M.B.A. students are fiscal challenges that affect practically all programs in light of insufficient state support; and

Whereas, the implementation of differential fees would be precedent setting and have far broader implications on the mission of the CSU than merely meeting the fiscal exigencies of a single program; and

Whereas, consultation regarding the M.B.A. differential fee increase has taken place almost exclusively among business faculty, deans of business schools and colleges, and the top leadership of CSU campuses; be it therefore

Resolved, that the Academic Senate CSU in conjunction with the Chancellor's Office convene a Task Force including faculty members from a variety of disciplines to analyze the crisis of insufficient funding for Undergraduate and Graduate programs in the CSU; and be it further

Resolved, that the Task Force evaluate the impact of differential fee increases by discipline or program on the mission of the CSU; and be it further

Resolved, that the Task Force be charged to evaluate how student fees are raised, what criteria are employed to determine what categories or disciplines have differential increased fees imposed, and if imposed how are the fees returned to the campuses and academic programs; and be it finally

Resolved, that the SJSU Academic Senate recommends that the Board of Trustees not approve any differential fees until after the Task Force completes its report; be it further

Resolved, that this resolution be sent to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor's Office, the Academic Senate CSU, the California State Student Association, and all CSU campus senates.

Approved:	October 1, 2007
Present:	Michael Kaufman, Bob Cooper, Wynn Krohn-Schultz, Malu Roldan, Elba Maldonado-Colon, Lennon Prothro-Jones, and María Romo.
Absent:	Bill Nance, Dominique Von Hooff
Vote:	10/0/0
Financial Impact:	Borne by the CSU AS and Chancellor's Office
Workload:	Borne by the CSU AS and Chancellor's Office



- 9 -

**Margaret Camuso**

---

**From:** campussen-owner@calstate.edu on behalf of Baaske, Kevin [kbaaske@calstatela.edu]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 24, 2007 12:57 PM  
**To:** campussen@calstate.edu  
**Subject:** RE: MBA Fee Resolution  
**Attachments:** Statement Opposing the Fee Proposal.doc

Hi All,

Next week the Acad Sen at CSULA will hold an open meeting to discuss the MBA fee increase. In preparation for that meeting, and so that my faculty have some pro and con side arguments, I sent the faculty the information item presented to the BOT, a link to the full Task Force Report, and a two page summation of arguments already raised against the proposal. This latter document I wrote, but I drew upon the email Hank sent to us and from comments made by members of our Exec Comm. I have attached that doc for your use. Feel free to share it, excerpt it, or ignore as you see fit.

Kevin  
CSULA

10/24/2007

## **Objections to the Proposed Professional Business Graduate Fee**

Disclaimer: These objections do not necessarily represent the views of the Executive Committee of the CSULA Senate or its members. Rather, they reflect some concerns already expressed to members of the Executive Committee and they are provided to you to help identify some of the issues that might be discussed at the Senate meeting.

1. The proposal sets a dangerous precedent.
  - A. The argument for additional fees for MBA faculty can easily be made for other specialized professional disciplines. Why address only these needs?
  - B. If professional business graduate fees are increased for this rationale, it will inevitably lead to fee increases for numerous other disciplines.
  - C. Such increases will endanger enrollments, especially for disadvantaged students.
2. A fee increase will hurt our students.
  - A. The report says that currently 25% of professional business degree graduate students receive financial aid. What kind of financial aid do these students receive? If it is loans, do we really wish to burden our students with a debt they may struggle to repay? The report notes that MBA students expect annual salaries of \$167,000 five years after graduation, but these are national statistics. What do CSU students earn five years after graduating?
  - B. Currently, few students of color pursue the MBA in the CSU (7% are Latino and Blacks account for less than 4.5%). Will a fee increase adversely affect these limited numbers? Even the 25% set-aside for financial aid called for in the proposal does not assure increased access.
  - C. Student fees are scheduled to rise until students are paying for a third of the cost of their degree. Will the proposed fee increases be in addition to this across the board increase? What percent of the costs of their education will MBA students pay if the proposal is approved?
3. Superior alternatives exist.
  - A. Increase state support for high-cost programs.

The state legislators and the Governor have recognized that nursing is a high-cost program and have provided additional marginal cost dollars for these programs. Wouldn't it be a superior solution to have the state pay directly for all of the higher cost programs?
  - B. Increase state support for STEM programs.

If increased access is the goal, wouldn't it make more sense to increase funding for the STEM disciplines (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math)? Students of color lag behind their peers in these disciplines. Closing

this achievement gap will lead to a more diverse student body pursuing all professional graduate degrees.

C. Achieve the ACR 73 goals.

Both the CFA and the CSU agreed to jointly pursue the funds necessary to raise tenured and tenure-track faculty levels to at least 75%. Raising the salaries of faculty in MBA programs by raising student fees would remove any incentive for the state to fund ACR 73. This jeopardizes programs across the Academy.

D. Close the CPEC salary gap for all faculty.

It is true that faculty teaching in graduate business programs make less than faculty at comparable institutions, but this problem is not unique to business faculty. This is true of all CSU faculty. As long as faculty compensation continues to lag behind comparable institutions, all disciplines will continue to face challenges recruiting and retaining outstanding faculty members. Resorting to a fee increase to close the salary gap for one discipline will undercut the ability of the CSU to obtain the funding necessary to close the gap for the other disciplines.

E. Reduce the workload for all faculty.

The Report argues that it is difficult to hire faculty to teach in the business courses because the workload is heavier than at comparable institutions. This is not only true for faculty in business, but for all CSU faculty. Fifty years ago expectations for professional achievement activities were low. They are now much higher in all disciplines. Reducing faculty workload in business professional graduate programs by raising fees reduces the likelihood that workload will be reduced throughout the campus.