

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

Minutes of the
ACADEMIC SENATE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, November 24, 1992
UU 220, 3:00-5:00pm

Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:16pm.

- I. Minutes: none
- II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none
- III. Reports:
 - A. Academic Senate Chair: none
 - B. President's Office: none
 - C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: none
 - D. Statewide Senators: none
- IV. Consent Agenda: none
- V. Business Item(s):
 - A. **Budget Planning - to what extent should the Academic Senate be involved in future budget decisions?** Handouts were distributed for this discussion. The Chair proposed having meetings with various administrators to learn about the activities of their areas. This information would be helpful when looking at budget allocations for the entire university. Kersten felt this was timely. He did not feel the Senate should try to micromanage the budget, but it would be good to talk about overall changes on campus along functional lines. We should also know where ALL our resources come from and what options are available for obtaining funds. Then we can comment on what areas should absorb cuts and the degree of same. Maybe some programs should be moved out of state-supported areas and put elsewhere where they could be supported by other than state-supported funds. We will also need an overview of how the different areas allocate their funds. Brown felt it would be good to know what kinds of changes have been/will be made in the budget and how this affects departments' functioning.

Peach commented it may not be possible to compare accounting systems between the numerous areas of campus. There probably isn't a standardized method. Koob confirmed this by stating that last year one committee tried to review the budget for Information Systems, and it took one year just to agree on a reporting system (not the numbers) in which the information would be presented. It will be very important to decide on how we want to look at the budget before commencing its review. Peach added we would need a time line and context to put the information into. At what point in the process can we effectively influence the distribution of funds? Koob replied the university would receive information about next year's budget around January 8/10, 1993. There would be about seven weeks from that time to make the decisions in order to stay a year ahead of any changes created by budget reductions. Kersten emphasized the need for deciding on a coherent review mechanism immediately and being ready to make recommendations by the first of February 1993. These would probably be general versus specific recommendations.

Koob stated the range for planning (until the governor's budget is announced) is an anticipated reduction between 0 and 10 percent from this year's budget. Dana asked to what degree would the Senate's review duplicate what the Budget Committee is doing? Kersten suggested including the Budget Committee members in the Senate review and using it as a resource body. He further suggested having the university's budget staffs provide the materials the Senate would be looking at so they would be available in January to begin deliberations.

In order to determine what information will be needed and in what form it will be needed, a motion was M/S/P (unanimously) to ask senators to provide their ideas in writing at the December 1 and 3 Senate meetings. These will be collected and the Executive Committee will meet to draft a plan before the end of fall quarter. The Chair asked the Executive Committee to have their ideas to the Senate office by Wednesday, December 2.

Mueller felt historical information for the past five years would be necessary otherwise the numbers being looked at would have no context. However, separating out the same information from each different accounting system would be very hard to sort out. Kersten commented there was no scientific way to do the review, but we would have to make the best subjective decisions we could. Johnston felt the Senate's general philosophy regarding reduction decisions should be discussed. Some basic things should be considered before we start looking at the numbers. Vilkitis stated possibly asking ourselves what we want the university to look like in two to three years might establish the mindset to make decisions from. Koob reminded the committee to keep "balance assumptions" (support vs. instructors) in mind when making its comments.

- B. **Academic Senate vacancy to the Program Review and Improvement Committee:** James Bermann (Agricultural Engineering Department) was elected to fill the at-large vacancy on this committee for the remaining 1992-1993 term.
- C. **Nominations to the Student Throughput Committee:** In discussing the formation of this committee, Koob stated that "enrollment management" would be the key management consideration with regard to future budget planning. He suggested having Jim Maraviglia give a one-hour presentation on enrollment management to the Executive Committee. The following nominations were received:

CAGR Ken Scott (AgBus)
CAED none
CBUS Mary Beth Armstrong (Actg)
CENG Russ Cummings (AeroEngr)
Ron Mussulman (MechEngr)
Ed Nowatzki (C/EEngr)
CLA Hernan Castellano (ForLangs)
Red Heesch (GraphCom)
Dan Levi (Psys&HD)
John Mendenhall (Art&Des)
CSM none
PCS none

The selection of nominees will be postponed until CAED, CSM, and PCS have submitted their nominations.

- D. **Strategic Plan:** The following changes were suggested to the recommendations made to the Strategic Plan by the Executive Committee: (1) remove the previous recommendation made by the Executive Committee to Goal 1.1.1. and (2) add small-letter designations to the bullets for easier reference.

VI. Discussion:

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



Recorded by: Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate

MEMORANDUM

Date: November 18, 1992

Copies: Warren Baker
Glenn Irvin
Robert Koob

To: ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

From: Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate

Subject: Executive Committee Meeting of
November 24, 1992, 3-5pm, UU 220

RE M I N D E R

The Academic Senate Executive Committee will be meeting this Tuesday, November 24, to continue discussion of the caucus responses to the Strategic Plan. Please bring your copy of the Strategic Plan to this meeting.

Smins - Exo 11/24/92

State of California

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Memorandum

To: Caucus Chairs
W Mueller, Crop Sci
H Johnston, Const Mgt
L Burgender, Bus Adm
C Dana, Comp Sci
B Mori, Soc Sci
R Brown, Physics
B Andre, Student Life

Date: Nov 20, 1992

Copies: J Wilson, M Engr
J Jen, Dean Ag
J Culver, Pol Sci
J Murphy, I T

From: James R. Vilkitis, Statewide
Academic Senator

Subject: News From Statewide

Hi Folks! The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) and Academic Senate met in Long Beach November 11/14, 1992. The following are highlights of those meetings. If you or your faculty have questions regarding this information or would like me to carry your concerns to statewide, please contact me at my office (1262).

- Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC):

-Chancellor Munitz has requested 'Opinion and Editorial' pieces from the faculty (campuses) concerning their view or vision of the system (CSU) they serve. The intent is to communicate the faculty perspective by publishing selected pieces in local or regional newspapers. Here is a chance to voice your concerns!

-FAC has been given direction by the Academic Senate to revise the 1971 Statement on Professional Responsibility (faculty). A draft will be coming forth during the spring quarter. As this information becomes available, I will forward a copy.

-Project Delta has been receiving considerable attention statewide. One major concern of the academy is that there is very little faculty representation in the planning and analysis of this project on a statewide basis. Project Delta will sponsor a two day meeting in Sacramento (January 22/23, 93) which is designed to have three faculty representatives from each campus. FAC would like faculty representation that do not have a vested interest in the project so that an unbiased assessment can be made for the academy. Contact the Academic Senate office (1258) for information on how representatives will be selected. Costs will

be covered by Project Delta. The budget for the two day conference is \$98,050.00 and involves 130 participants! The attached resolution (passed) expresses the academy's concern about the cost.

-The resolution for the "Censure of President Day" has been revised. It went to the floor as "Budget Reductions and Layoff Notices at SDSU". The resolution was revised provide be more constructive criticism. It is attached for review.

-Two other resolutions of interest are "Protecting the State's Investment in the CSU Faculty", and "Note-Taking Services in the CSU". Both are attached for review.

- Academic Senate: The following resolutions came to the floor and were passed. If you have an interest in reviewing them please contact me.

- Effects on School Personnel of Implementation of Duplicate Degree Tuition

- Project Delta Proposal: Course Offerings

- Draft Policy Statement on Diversity of WASC

- Library Planning in the CSU

- GE&B note:

Executive Order No XXX which supersedes EO 338 and 342 has not yet been issued. There was no explanation for the delay. The new executive order has not been changed; it is the same as was distributed last fall. I have a copy for review.

- Meeting with Chancellor Munitz: The Chancellor met with the Academic Senate and provided the following information.

Budget: At the October 22, 1992 Board Meeting a budget was prepared and forwarded. That budget was 13% higher than last year. The increase would cover 10,000 FTES enrollment gap; price increases; and compensation increases. The latter includes salary adjustments, faculty professional development, etc. This is the third year that faculty have not received a cost of living (salary) adjustment. The budget is a statement which identifies our need, and tells Sacramento that we need funding. The budget did not ask for a fee increase.

MSA's are not included in the 93/94 budget. Compensation money will address this issue. There has not been a policy decision to withhold MSA's.

Again Chancellor Munitz requested 'Opinion and Editorial' pieces from the faculty (campuses).

RECEIVED

NOV 16 1992

Academic Senate

DRAFT - FY 93 Budget Distribution - (ACC1012.XLS)

BASE
for
93-94
2

Recovery
fund

	INITIAL FY 93 Phase 1 Budget	Budget Profile Adjustments	FY 93 Phase 1 Budget	8% Reduction Target (approx. 7.8%)	Campus Contingency	Salary Savings (approx. 1.6%)	Revised Budget for FY 93	APRF Allocation	Total Available for Expenditure
INSTRUCTION									
CAGR (4)	9,435,437	933,199	10,368,636	(806,797)	0	(169,803)	9,392,037	25,000	9,417,037
CAED	7,082,942	417,532	7,500,474	(583,621)	0	(122,832)	6,794,021	138,605	6,932,626
CBUS	5,578,526	1,313,352	6,891,878	(536,266)	0	(112,865)	6,242,747	135,500	6,378,247
CENG <i>~ 14.2M - 5%</i>	13,505,357	674,701	14,180,058	(1,103,368)	0	(232,221)	12,844,469	195,000	13,039,469
CLA	13,197,438	3,417,038	16,614,476	(1,292,794)	0	(272,088)	15,049,594	180,000	15,229,594
SPS	5,835,643	(5,159,002)	676,641	(52,650)	0	(11,081)	612,910	(262,910)	350,000
CSM	12,627,064	1,757,804	14,384,868	(1,119,305)	0	(235,575)	13,029,988	323,000	13,352,988
STE	2,058,793	28,500	2,087,293	(162,415)	0	(34,183)	1,890,695	11,500	1,902,195
SUB-TOTAL	69,321,200	3,383,124	72,704,324	(5,657,216)	0	(1,190,647)	65,856,461	745,695	66,602,156
INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT									
ATHLETICS	1,316,736	20,187	1,336,923	(104,028)	0	(21,894)	1,211,001	0	1,211,001
LIBRARY	4,627,900	619,080	5,246,980	(408,274)	0	(85,928)	4,752,778	0	4,752,778
ESS	2,378,188	207,921	2,586,109	(201,228)	0	(42,352)	2,342,529	0	2,342,529
WRIT. SKILLS	71,345	6,743	78,088	(6,076)	0	(1,279)	70,733	0	70,733
COL. FARM	1,325,779	97,938	1,423,717	(110,781)	0	(23,316)	1,289,620	0	1,289,620
AA ADMIN.	1,355,000	0	1,355,000	(105,434)	0	(22,190)	1,227,375	0	1,227,375
AA OTHER (5)	5,662,966	(4,067,774)	1,595,192	(124,124)	(65,102)	(26,124)	1,379,842	0	1,379,842
SUB-TOTAL	16,737,914	(3,115,905)	13,622,009	(1,059,946)	(65,102)	(223,082)	12,273,879	0	12,273,879
APRF	2,881,450	(267,219)	2,614,231		(1,823,454)		790,777	(745,695)	45,082
AA TOTAL	88,940,564	0	88,940,564	(6,717,162)	(1,888,556)	(1,413,729)	78,921,117	0	78,921,117

10/26/92

Assigned to
APRF
reference
Saino - Spec
11/11/92

Smin - Exec Com "12/4/9

MEMORANDUM

Date: November 24, 1992 **Copies:**

To: **ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

From: Jack D. Wilson, Chair *JDW*
Academic Senate

Subject: Budget Planning

The first meeting of PACBRA (President's Advisory Committee on Budgets and Resource Allocation) was held on November 19, 1992. Vice President Koob described budget planning as having three elements.

The first is implementation of this year's budget. He described it as a series of successive approximations due to the fact that the legislature is always late in approving a budget and then there is the time required for the Chancellor's Office to determine what the campus budget allocations will be. It was the middle of October before this was accomplished for this year. Even then, there will be further adjustments due to exigencies. Because of all the uncertainties in 1991-92, the campus missed their final budget target by 2.5 percent. The implementation process for the current budget will continue well into 1993.

The second element is budget development for 1993-94. This process is under way. The administration is asking the Academic Senate, among other constituencies, for the kinds of inputs it feels it should have into this process. The Program Review and Improvement Committee report from this past summer will constitute part of the input. The Strategic Plan will obviously provide some direction. There are about 6-8 weeks for this input to occur. In other words, whatever input we are to have will have to occur by the middle of January, 1993.

Timelines for development of the 1993-94 budget for the campus are as follows: (1) the January meeting of PACBRA will involve discussion of the Governor's proposed budget, (2) the budget plan must be in place by the end of March so that if layoff of tenure or tenure-track faculty is necessary (due to a severe budget deficit) for the 1993-94 academic year, at least the minimum 120 days plus 30 days for meet-and-confer required by the bargaining agreement can be affected to accomplish reductions in the 1993-94 budget by September 1, (3) layoff notices will be sent out on April 1, and (4) a May revise (second iteration).

The third element of budget planning is planning beyond the 1993-94 academic year. That is something the Academic Senate is already involved with through the program review process and will of course be influenced by the Strategic Plan. The Senate may want to be involved further.

Other comments made by Vice President Koob include that the administration would not try to adjust sizes of colleges this coming fiscal year. He referred to this as the "distribution profile". That is, it deals with how funds will be distributed among colleges in the future.

The administration is asking for input on: (1) possible changes in the budget profile for the university, and (2) plans for shrinkage and growth of the budget "pie".

Vice President Koob emphasized that there is faculty concern that budget reductions have reached an unacceptable level of support. Examples given included: (1) student advisement, (2) the library, (3) operating and expense monies, and (4) support from such entities as Audiovisual and Plant Operations. A substantial percentage of the nearly 20 percent budget reductions that have occurred over the past two years has been absorbed in these areas. At the same time, faculty and staff are concerned about jobs.

I'm not certain whether Bob Koob said this or if I wrote it down, but I made a note "sensitivity to the tough times we are in." If it wasn't Bob's, I'll take credit for it. Are all the campus constituencies ready to grapple with the tough decisions that have to be made in these tough times? If we had a crystal ball our job would be easier. When will the recession end? What effect will the structural changes taking place in business have on funding for higher education?

What follows are a few of my thoughts on how the Executive Committee might be involved in the budget planning for 1993-94: In order to make intelligent recommendations to the President concerning the 1993-94 budget and beyond, we must know where we are now and something about where we've been. We must take time to consider and be educated about the current distribution of the budget among Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Information Systems, and Business Affairs. To do that we will have to understand what these entities do and their importance to the overall big picture that we call education. That will require a substantial commitment of time over the Christmas break. Are we willing to make that commitment?

State of California

RECEIVED

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

NOV 23 1992

MEMORANDUM


Academic Senate

TO: Ed Carnegie, Chair
Academic Senate Budget Committee

DATE: November 19, 1992

FILE NO: ASBC

COPIES: R. Koob
F. Lebens
C. Crabb
~~A. Wilson~~
D. Marple
K. Ikeda
ASBC Membership
(All with attachments.)


FROM: Rick Ramirez, Director
Budget Planning and Administration

SUBJECT: General Fund Budget Information

Attached in reply to your request, are four exhibits that provide budget and expenditure information for Cal Poly's General Fund.

Attachment

Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo

General Fund, Final Budget Comparison: 1991/92 and 1992/93

	1991/92 Final Budget (July 1991)		1992/93 Final Budget (November 1992)		Variances	
	Person- Years	Dollars	Person- Years	Dollars	Person- Years	Dollars
Personal Services	2123.4	122,099,362	1805.1	101,589,408	-318.3	-20,509,954
Student Aid Grants	0.0	2,632,171	0.0	4,168,876	0.0	1,536,705
Library Volume Acquisitions	0.0	1,308,825	0.0	1,222,925	0.0	-85,900
Utilities	0.0	2,653,948	0.0	1,898,458	0.0	-755,490
Operating Expenses & Equip.	0.0	9,437,356	0.0	7,609,573	0.0	-1,827,783
Unidentified Reductions	0.0	-10,798,181	0.0	0	0.0	10,798,181
Totals, Expenditures	2123.4	127,333,481	1805.1	116,489,240	-318.3	-10,844,241
Receipts ? <i>misreported?</i>	0.0	-19,738,437	0.0	-22,619,043	0.0	-2,880,606
Net, State Support	2123.4	107,595,044	1805.1	93,870,197	-318.3	-13,724,847

Date: 11-18-92

Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo

FY 1992/93 General Fund, Final Budget (After Permanent Budget Cuts)
Recapitulation of Mandated Budget Reductions and Initial Campus Allocations

	Permanent Reductions to Phase 1				1992/93 Initial Budget (after cuts)	% of Acad. Affairs	% total budget
	Initial 8% (BP 92-20)	Additional (BP 92-44)	A.R.F. Allocation	Totals			
Academic Affairs	-5,388,806	-1,328,356	2,881,450	-3,835,712	82,285,701	70.6	(what - 1.1 this is actually mandated)
Student Affairs	-813,656	-133,797		-947,453	12,367,976	15.0	10.62
Information Systems	-598,022	-104,544		-702,566	6,109,952	7.43	5.25
University Relations	-28,897	-5,053		-33,950	616,680	0.95	0.58
Human Resources	-44,134	-6,313		-50,447	754,156	0.92	0.65
Business Affairs	-1,219,322	-199,194		-1,418,516	15,453,195	18.8	13.27
Unallocated/Exec Mgt		-1,679,124		-1,679,124	1,098,420	-	0.94
Totals, Expenditures	-8,092,837	-3,456,381	2,881,450	-8,667,768	116,489,240	Σ	99.98 = 100%
Receipts & Revenue (student fees)					-22,619,043		
Net, State Support					93,870,197		

Date: 11-19-92

This is it
for general
funds.

FY 1992/93 General Fund, CSU Final Budget (November 1992)
Initial Budget and University Reallocations
(After Permanent Reductions)

	Initial Budget Allocations (after permanent cuts)							University Reallocations		1992/93 Final Allocations	
	Person- Years	Salaries & Wages	Staff Benefits	Salary Savings	Personal Services <i>Σ previous 3 columns</i>	Oper. Exp. & Equip.	Totals	Contingency Budget	Receipts, Utilities, etc.		
Academic Affairs	1248.9	61,578,660	15,910,821	-1,357,166	76,132,315	4,796,220	80,928,535	-1,916,655		79,011,879	67.45
Student Affairs	161.9	6,365,683	1,685,633	-271,283	7,780,033	4,316,660	12,096,693	-180,090		11,916,604	10.17
Information Systems	82.5	3,399,652	853,620	-148,826	4,104,446	1,243,904	5,348,350	-141,378	612,776	5,819,749	4.97
University Relations	11.0	442,821	133,444	0	576,265	40,415	616,680	-7,792		608,888	0.52
Human Resources	11.5	523,488	157,751	0	681,239	72,917	754,156	-9,808		744,348	0.64
Business Affairs	275.8	8,580,048	2,585,596	-390,696	10,774,948	4,274,271	15,049,219	-271,047	1,315,536	16,093,708	13.74
Executive Management	13.5	1,038,317	312,897	0	1,351,214	155,445	1,506,659	0		1,506,659	1.29
University-Wide ?	0.0	167,133	28,666	-6,851	188,948	0	188,948	2,526,769	-1,276,056	1,439,661	1.23
Totals, Expenditures	1805.1	82,095,802	21,668,428	-2,174,822	101,589,408	14,899,832	116,489,240	0	652,256	117,141,496	Σ 100.0
Receipts							-22,619,043		-652,256	-23,271,299	
Net, State Support	1805.1						93,870,197	0	0	93,870,197	

Date: 11-19-92

Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo

General Fund Expenditures
Summary of Past Years Actual Expenditures and 1992/93 Budget

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Salaries & Wages</i>	<i>Staff Benefits</i>	<i>Personal Services</i>	<i>Operating Expenses & Equip.</i>	<i>Totals Expenditures</i>	<i>Salary Savings</i>	<i>Receipts</i>	<i>Net, State Support</i>
1988/89*	75,143,392	18,614,594	93,757,986	13,872,618	107,630,604	n/a	-14,099,167	93,531,437
1989/90*	81,940,600	20,914,378	102,854,978	15,354,363	118,209,341	n/a	-15,640,494	102,568,847
1990/91*	87,618,534	20,415,102	108,033,636	14,892,605	122,926,241	n/a	-17,321,800	105,604,441
1991/92*	87,514,755	23,141,788	110,656,543	16,596,421	127,252,964	n/a	-19,693,036	107,559,929
1992/93**	82,095,802	21,668,428	103,764,230	14,899,832	118,664,062	-2,174,822	-22,619,043	93,870,197

* Actual year-end expenditures as of June 30th.

** CSU Final Budget allocation to SLO.

Date: 11-19-92