

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

Minutes of the ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, February 8, 1994  
UU 220 3:00-5:00pm

Preparatory: The meeting opened at 3:19pm.

I. Minutes:

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

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair:

B. President's Office:

C. Vice President for Academic Affairs:

Koob: The timetable for next year's budget planning process is as follows: January-governor announces the budget, February through May-campus involved in budget planning process: vertical/horizontal cuts/additions, etc., June-legislature passes budget.

The most probable assumption regarding budget resources for the coming year is a 10 percent fee increase and that the governor's budget will pass--\$56 million more state funds than this year. However, \$51 million is already spent to cover negotiated salary increases. Additional increased system costs of about \$40 million would mean reduced purchasing power of 1 to 2 percent for Cal Poly next year. The only way we will see new money in terms of purchasing power is if the student fee is increased to 24 percent (about \$500,000 in new money for the campus). This isn't likely. The worst case scenario would be to get no additional money over last year's budget, no increase in fees, and all mandatory costs increase. This would be about a 6 percent reduction in purchasing power.

The biannual reallocation of resources among colleges last took place in 1992-1993 and a 'leverage' reallocation model for 1994-1995 has been proposed by the college deans. The model proposed features each college 'putting up' a small percent of their budget which has the potential of 'leveraging' an increase in a college's budget. Under this proposed model the maximum percent reallocated to a college would depend upon the total budget for Academic Affairs. The table below indicates the percentage as a function of the Academic Affairs budget.

<u>Academic Affairs budget with respect to 1993-1994</u>	<u>reallocate</u>
constant	2%
cut	no change
increase	3%

The three criteria which would drive the decision to reallocate are: (1) whether the college can double the amount of money it put up for reallocation through outside sources; (2) if it has made successful efforts to increase the ethnicity/diversity of its faculty; and (3) if the college can leverage its money in a way that benefits the instructional program of the college, special consideration should be received. Proposals will go to the deans for their decision.

D. Statewide Senators:

E. CFA Campus President:

F. ASI representatives:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:

VI. Discussion:

**How will the Academic Senate provide input into the budget allocation process for 1994/95:**

Koob: The Academic Senate should be an independent route of decision making into the budget process. The problem within the CSU system is that the timetable for making necessary decisions is so short that it's difficult to create the kind of input people feel comfortable with. I don't see how the Senate can move as quickly as needed unless it can identify a "trusted representative group" to act on its behalf in bringing recommendations to the Senate to forward. Kersten: I agree that's so on a micromanaging level, but on broad policy questions, I don't think it's impossible to have meaningful input. What makes the process credible, however, is whether those recommendations are taken seriously and results follow. It might be helpful to form a special subcommittee with four or five members of the Academic Senate Executive Committee to make recommendations directly to the Vice President's office. Lutrini felt members from the Budget Committee should be included in this subcommittee. M/S/P unanimously (Kersten/Bertozzi) that a subcommittee of four or five individuals, including a representative of the Budget Committee, look at horizontal and vertical cuts, biased cuts, and the leverage tax issue. It is to report back to the Academic Senate immediately to present its recommendations for meeting budget reductions. It is to report back to the Academic Senate within a couple months to report its recommendations regarding the leverage tax on colleges. Chair Wilson will make the appointments.

**Calendaring:** Chair Wilson reported that President Baker will be present at the February 15, 1994 Academic Senate meeting to discuss the calendaring resolutions. The agenda will be rescheduled placing the calendaring resolutions first on the agenda.

**Relocation of Engineering Technology (ET) faculty within the CENG:** Last spring, the Academic Senate recommended that ET's report--which recommended that ET not be discontinued--be approved. President Baker replied that due to conflicting advice from the Deans' Council and the Academic Senate on this matter, he would request supply-and-demand information for this program from CPEC. Koob: The Chancellor's Office has informed us that CPEC would not be able to respond until June 1994. M/S/P that the Executive Committee urge the President to delay sending any further layoff notices until CPEC submits its report.

M/S/P that administrators be urged to respect the feelings of individuals under layoff in terms of office space and resources, and that faculty under layoff be regarded as full faculty members.

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:02pm.

FILE COPY

State of California

California Polytechnic State University  
San Luis Obispo, California 93407

**M E M O R A N D U M**

Date: February 2, 1994  
Copies:  
To: ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
From: Margaret Camuso  
Academic Senate  
Subject: Academic Senate Executive Committee Meeting  
Tuesday, February 8, 1994, UU 220, 3-5pm

**R E M I N D E R**

The Academic Senate Executive Committee will continue its deliberation of the February 1, 1994 agenda on Tuesday, February 8, from 3 to 5pm, in UU 220.