

Academic Senate Minutes

3/4/04

Warren Auditorium and Commons 3:00-5:15

Abstract

Presentation on Green Music Center in Warren Auditorium. Agenda approved. Minutes of 2/5/04 approved. Early Childhood Education Certificate approved. Special Guests: Faculty Trustee Kathy Kaiser and Statewide Senate Chair Bob Cherny. Joint Doctoral Program in Education – Second Reading - approved. Provost Ochoa report

Present: Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Susan McKillop, Rick Luttmann, Robert Karlsrud, Victor Garlin, Marilyn-Dudley-Flores, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Elizabeth Martinez, Eric McGuckin, Heidi LaMoreaux, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Steve Cuellar, Bob Vieth, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Steve Winter, Charlene Tung, Myrna Goodman, Peter Phillips, Jan Beauly, Sandra Shand, Scott Miller, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Jason Spencer, Ephriam Freed, Amy Wingfield, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Brigitte Lahme

Absent: Phil McGough, Birch Moonwomon, Derek Girman, Robert McNamara, Ruben Armiñana, Greg Tichava

Guests: E. Sundberg, P. Fernlund

The first part of the meeting was held in Warren Auditorium for a presentation on the Green Music Center's Academic Vision and Instructional Mission by Jeff Langley, Floyd Ross and Eduardo Ochoa. The text of that presentation follows:

Report to the Academic Senate on the Green Music Center Part II: Academic Vision & Instructional Mission March 4, 2004

OVERVIEW (Jeff Langley)

The Donald and Maureen Green Music Center

Blending world-class performance with educational opportunities for people of all ages and backgrounds

**Aim high,
Reach wide.**

i.e. aspiring to the highest quality for the greatest number of people.

The Green Music Center will provide an architecturally elegant Central home and gathering place

For the University's cultural and intellectual life
And that of its extended community in the North Bay
Where the University plays an increasingly vital, visible and active role.

Building on the University's expanding complement of programs and facilities,
The Center will provide us the ultimate staging ground
For innovative summer institutes,
Conferences and Chautauqua-styled symposiums and festivals
Distinctly suited to SSU's trademark traditions
Embracing broad, open inquiry across disciplines.

Casual but elegant,
Warm and inviting,
Audience friendly, providing a way *in* to the arts and learning experience,
For people of all ages and backgrounds—at all levels of achievement.

Driven by education,
Connected to curriculum,
All about learning and discovery
And the making of connections.

Inclusive,
Innovative,
Up-close,
Hands-on,
Defying boundaries and hierarchies that often limit and exclude.

Growing out of a distinctly *western* perspective and experience,
Rooted in what *we* are and where *we* sit—
Here at the gateway to the Pacific Rim,
Cultural crossroads of West and East, North and South,
Where our traditions are diverse and dynamic,
In perpetual flux,
Shaped by the frontier,
Always pushing forward to the future—
Our perspective global and democratic.

Some have imagined the Center to be...

A 'continuous workshop' of arts and ideas.
Democracy in action.

A **concert hall** having architectural beauty and superb acoustics:

- A world-class stage appropriate for hosting the leading artists, writers and thinkers of our time;

- A state-of-the-art ‘classroom,’ rehearsal and performance facility worthy of the university’s rising reputation for excellence in the arts, humanities and sciences.

A meeting place for the democratic exchange of ideas:

- A gathering place for the university community,
- An intellectual and cultural hub for the region,
- A public showcase for our intellectual wares
- Revealing the many ways our disciplines overlap and inter-relate,
- Deepening everyone’s understanding of the work we do and its value,
- Bringing us greater visibility and an enhanced reputation.

A place of inspiration that embodies our reach toward excellence while transporting us to realms beyond the everyday.

OVERVIEW OF THE PHYSICAL STRUCTURE (Floyd Ross)

Current plans call for two phases.

Phase One includes:

- 1,400-seat Main Hall,
- Lobby,
- Ticket office,
- Founder's room,
- Dressing rooms,
- Backstage support facilities (storage, load-in, technical).

Conceptual plans for **Phase Two** are in development. Discussions have centered around a state bond-funded complex that could include:

- Recital or large lecture hall having modular seating for up to 350,
- Various music rehearsal and practice rooms,
- As many as 50 faculty offices,
- Additional instructional space, design and purpose yet-to-be-determined.

TYPES OF PRESENTATIONS FOR WHICH CENTER IS IDEALLY SUITED

(Jeff Langley)

Music

Chamber
Choral
Jazz
Popular/folk
Symphonic
Vocal
World

Performing arts

Lectures
Staged Performances
Dance

Spoken/written arts

Readings
Lecture Series

Visual arts

Exhibitions
Lectures

Education

Arts classes
Arts lectures

Arts seminars
Convocations
Humanities
Public affairs
Sciences

WAYS THE CENTER WILL BE USED—Overview (Eduardo Ochoa)

- Daily academic use for matriculated students:
 - Large performance ensemble classes of the Music Department
 - Large lecture classes (university-wide)
- University student and faculty-based events:
 - **Center for Performing Arts**—100+ annual faculty and student performances (primarily music)
 - **Associated Students** concerts, lectures and events
 - Special assemblies (commencement, convocations, alumni & recruitment events)
 - University conferences, institutes and symposiums
- Extended Education:
 - **Lifelong Learning Institute**
 - **Greenfarm**—arts education classes, workshops and ensembles for youth, teachers, pre-professional artists and adults
 - Special summer residencies and symposiums
- **Green Music Center Presents**—concerts and lectures by renown and emerging national and international artists, writers and thinkers (pending outside funding):
 - Academic year guest artist and speaker series—concerts, lectures, workshops, master classes
 - **Minds That Matter**—year-round university lecture series
 - Summer **Green Music Festival** of Arts and Ideas
- Home of the **Santa Rosa Symphony**:
 - Regular season concerts, rehearsals, special concerts—one week per month, September thru May
 - Resident orchestra, Green Music Festival

- Rentals to:
 - Local and regional performing arts ensembles
 - Local schools and non-profits (concerts, special events)
 - Community organizations (conferences, special events)
 - Regional outside presenters (concerts, special events)

CURRICULUM IMPLICATIONS: ENROLLMENT GROWTH

- Phase One's completion will increase campus enrollment capacity by an estimated 500 FTE. This increase will generate funds for instruction, academic support and institutional support, as allocated on the marginal cost formula.
- **Music and Theatre Arts** ensemble and lecture classes would contribute a little more than a third of this (168 FTES).
- Use of the Main Hall for **Non-Performing Arts lecture classes** in all subject areas would contribute the other two-thirds of this increase.
- **Music** (and possibly Theatre Arts) would expect some increase in their application rates within the first three years. How much not known.
- **Music** could expect a modest but immediate enrollment boost in its large ensembles (chorus, band) resulting from students' desire to perform in the new hall.
- **Theatre Arts** has a serious shortage of rehearsal space. When most of Music relocates to the Green Music Center, Ives 119 could provide the instructional space needed for Theatre's modest growth.

FTE BREAKDOWN AT OPENING OF PHASE ONE (Main Hall Only)

Daily academic use for matriculated students:

(All academic uses of Main Hall must accommodate SR Symphony rehearsals/performances.)

- **Large performance ensemble classes of the Music Dept.**
- **Large lecture classes (university-wide)**

PERFORMING ARTS

Large Music Ensembles Using Main Hall (Sept. thru May)

- University Chorus: 135 students @ 2 units = 270 WTUs
- Concert Band: 60 students @ 2 units = 120 WTUs
- Bach Choir: 50 members (15 students) @ 2 units = 30 WTUs

- Gospel Choir: 40 students @ 2 units = 80 WTUs

Total WTUs from Large Music Performance Ensembles: 500 WTUs = 33.3 FTE

(12 hours/week + set-up/strike time)

Large Performing Arts Lecture Classes Using Main Hall (Sept-May)

- THAR 101: 150 students @ 3 units = 450 WTUs
- THAR 200: 150 students @ 3 units = 450 WTUs
- MUS 101/301: 150 students @ 3 units = 450 WTUs
- MUS 150: 100 students @ 3 units = 300 WTUs
- MUS 270: 125 students @ 3 units = 375 WTUs

Total WTUs from Large Performing Arts Lecture Classes: 2,025 WTUs = 135 FTE

(15 hours/week + set-up/strike time)

TOTAL ESTIMATED FTE GENERATED BY PERFORMING ARTS = 168 FTE (33%)

NON-PERFORMING ARTS

Main Hall availability to non-Performing Arts departments:

FTE Target: 332 (67%)

332 FTE = 4,980 WTUs = 1,660 students enrolled in 3-unit lecture classes

Possible Lecture Class Configurations to Achieve 332 FTEs:

17 classes having 100 students (51 hours/week)

13 classes having 125 students (39 hours/week)

11 classes having 150 students (33 hours/week)

8 classes having 200 students (24 hours/week)

7 classes having 250+ students (21 hours/week)

3 classes having 500+ students (9 hours/week)

1 class having 1,000+ students (3 hours/week) without breakout sections would generate 200 FTE.

1 4-unit split lecture/seminar class of 1,000 students (broken into multiple small sections) would generate 2,000 WTUs or 133.3 FTE for the GMC lecture portion.

ACADEMIC FUNDING FOR THE GREEN MUSIC CENTER

- 500 FTES enrollment will generate SSU marginal cost funding from the CSU of \$3,748,000.
- The Academic Affairs portion will be \$2,953,424, of which \$1,671,145 will be for direct instructional costs.
- The remaining portion of the Academic Affairs allocation (\$1,282,279) will be available for academic support.

GMC ACADEMIC SUPPORT BUDGET (EST.)

POSITION

Administrative Manager
Director, Operations & Logistics
Marketing Coordinator
Graphic Designer
Volunteer Coordinator
Sound Engineer
Lead Performing Arts Technician II
Performing Arts Technician I (2 FTE)
Director of Ticketing Services
Ticket Center Permanent Staff (1 FTE)
Stage Management
Production Staff
House Staff
General Operating Expense
Ticket Center Hourly Staff (Students)
TOTAL — \$1,189,704

BALANCE OF CSU FTES FUNDING

- Based on the current GMC academic support budget, there would be an additional \$92,575 in academic support funding.
- The balance of enrollment growth funding (\$794,576) will be devoted to institutional support functions (see business plan for details).
- Plant operation support will be provided by the CSU for the new capacity space (\$419,852) and an incremental facilities fee added to ticket price.

Question and Answer period in Warren for the Green Music Center presenters:

K. Kaiser said she thought one of the issues for something that has multiple purposes is using something for normally scheduled classes starts to put you in a bind about when you want to bring in community activities at the same time. There's a tension about how to do both and that produces scheduling issues of how to reach out to the community and how you also host your events. It will be interesting to see how Davis' new music center is working in that context. She didn't know if the group had been in contact with them because they are trying to do the same thing – have a major music center that would be in an educational position as well. J. Langley answered that the original concept for the Center in Phase Two was that part of the Center would be the work horse in essence to address that exact problem. We're a little bit more challenged with just the one hall. Scheduling is going to be a challenge, but he's sure one of the good things about this hall is the turnover for set up. It's much simpler than in a theater where you have to move sets, and all sorts of things like that, it's much easier. E. Ochoa said to some extent there is complimentarity in the times of the day and the times of the year that some of major users of this facility are going to be using the hall - the symphony vs. us and all that. F. Ross said there's no question and that K. Kaiser's point is well taken in terms of the scheduling challenges. He thinks that those challenges will be relieved considerably with the construction of Phase Two. For him, as hopefully the person who will be scheduling this facility, it's going to be important as the academic plan develops for what goes there to be thinking in terms of just the scheduling realities. The biggest challenges, he thinks, are going to be those weeks when the Santa Rosa Symphony is in the building and he's already been thinking a little bit about how we might address some of those challenges. But K. Kaiser is correct. It has been very much on his mind how do we do all of this with, in his mind, just one room. Obviously, it's more than one room, but with Phase Two. . .he's very relieved that the bond issue passed.

N. Byrne said his question had to do with equity issues, that is, with regard to external equity and that's the context for what he wanted to ask about, is, of course faculty at all levels at this institutions are paid well below our comparable institutions, the COPLAC institutions and with regard to internal equity, he is struck by a Performing Arts Technician earning \$102,000, or Director of Ticket Services at \$106,000 or Directors of Operations and Logistics at \$106,000 seems to raise internal equity issues. F. Ross said the figures include benefits. N. Byrne said nevertheless. F. Ross said 35% of the figures are benefits. It was noted they were twelve month positions. It was determined that the salaries less benefits were in the range of \$70,000.

R. L. Thomas said it was mentioned earlier that there is detailed business plan and is that available for people to look at and review? E. Ochoa said there was a business plan developed by our CFO for particularly dealing with finalizing the support from our donors which clarified a lot of things, but he thinks that in preparing for the presentation we touched on this, but didn't see any reason to why this plan couldn't be generally available, but we had not anticipated distributing it until relatively recently, so we only have a few copies here. But we will make them available. We'll get one for the Academic Senate office and we see if we can find a way to distribute it more widely as well. R. L. Thomas said one could be put on Reserve in the Library.

R. Whitkus asked if other departments in other divisions are providing the instructional support to generate that 500 FTES, is any of that money going back to those other departments or divisions that are generating the FTES for you or as we've seen is it mostly going into the Music Center? E. Ochoa said that is really the heart of the matter. The academic support comes with the enrollment, so that's why it seemed appropriate that the bulk of it would be dedicated to supporting the facility that would make it possible to generate that enrollment by whatever department actually uses the facility. But clearly some of that staffing is specific to certain kinds of events and not others and so he's hoping we do have a little money left over up front and then over time as the facility expands its use by outside groups and other revenue generating, we can create a charge back mechanism where we can gradually ease off from the level of support we've budgeted here from academic support and that would make it more available for departmental support that's related to generating FTES but not totally tied to the physical facility.

R. Coleman-Senghor asked what would be the facility's impact of this increase in terms of the determination of any division of School to formulate its facilities needs. How will this facility drive the direction with respect to those needs, namely if we do an FTE growth that's tied to this artistic facility what happens to the sciences and the social sciences with regard to their needs? If we are looking at the question of growth, in a time in which we are not really allowed to grow, because we have the top of the FTE, how then are we going to justify the use of this facility and grow in an area that may not represent the needs of the students. E. Ochoa said the facility requires the university to grow by 500 FTES in order to generate the funding from the state that supports it. We don't need the FTE growth to get the facility itself because that's been supported by private dollars. But the fact is that we know that about 168 FTES is already anticipated to be tied directly to the performing arts and most of that is existing FTES that is going to be relocated over there. As that happens current space opens up and becomes available for growth in other programs without prejudging what those programs might be. There is some modest growth anticipated in the performing arts, particularly in music because the facility itself becomes a magnet for students. But it's relatively small in the context of the overall growth of the university or even the 500 FTES in question. So we leave open how we are going to grow in the space that becomes available as a result of Music and Performance Arts moving over there. The other question is are we going to grow. Here it is a good thing that it's going to take us two years to build this thing and open it up. Hopefully, in that two year plus interval of time, we hope we will be growing again as a university.

R. Karlsrud asked if the group anticipated any hires of those nineteen positions in the next year, in advance of the building being complete. F. Ross said not in '04-'05. There are some positions that have to be in place ahead to get ready to open the building, but not in '04-'05. R. Karlsrud said he was worried about where that funding would come from because as we all know positions follow growth and unless you get the building in place you won't have the growth to generate the funds for the positions so it sounds like there may be a gap in the funding. He was curious where those dollars would come from. E. Ochoa said if he has anything to do with it, it won't come from the Academic Affairs budget.

E. Freed said the group showed different levels of class size structures that could happen in the GMC, he's curious to know which seemed the most likely considering the needs of the Santa Rosa Symphony and various other groups. He asked for clarification about the Music department moving over there clearing space for other departments and would that happen when the second phase is completed or the first. He asked of the teachers present, how many of them felt that they could successfully teach a 500, 300 or 200 person class and how many of them were looking forward to interacting with the students in that way. E. Ochoa said the question of large classes needs to be looked at in the context of the budget picture that we're facing now. As we're trying to cope with the current budget cuts and as we contemplate the likely prospects for funding from the state in future years, departments and Schools are simultaneously coming to the conclusion that they need to factor in large classes as part of a mix in order to be able to maintain the smaller classes where they are curricularly needed in the major. So he thinks that this is an opportunity. This facility is going to give the campus more options than it now has and the precise mix that is going to be factored in there, he really couldn't tell at this point. It's going to be a combination of scheduling restraints with what makes the most sense pedagogically. He believes that it is possible to use large lectures that are part of a mix that is pedagogically and academically effective. Obviously, if that's all you do then there are big gaps in the modes of interaction between faculty and students, but if it is part of a mix that would allow you to do some other things you otherwise couldn't have done such as running small seminars then it's a net plus. It's one of the tools we need to be able to cope with the budget constraints we have now. J. Langley said when the Green Music Center was originally designed it was never thought that it was going to house departments, even the Music department. We've always known that music ensembles will be performing and rehearsing over there to some extent, but it's quite recent now that a new kind of discussion has been opened up around Phase Two which we don't know the specifics yet. One of the possibilities now, but this is a very new consideration, all of Music may go over there, but that was never his thought. Maybe half of Music would end up over there. So that still has to be determined. It was never really intended to have Phase Two, or be a place with classrooms for instance. So this is all a changing thing, but it may very well become true that much of the Music department will go over there. That could happen and then that would free up some space here in Ives Hall. But with Phase One, there's no way the Music department can move over there. It's really only efficient in terms of numbers for it's large ensembles to rehearse and perform over there. C. Nelson thanked the group for the presentation.

The Senate then moved over to the Commons.

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

Deferred to next meeting

Correspondences: None

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda – Approved.

Approval of Minutes - 2/5/04 emailed – Approved

Early Childhood Education Certificate

E. McDonald said she finds all the proposals coming out of the School of Education confusing and is always impressed by all the work they have to do all the time to change their programs constantly. They used to offer a Multiple Subject Credential with an emphasis in Early Childhood Education. The state took that designation away. The state will now not credential people with an emphasis in Early Childhood Education. But having something that says "I took these courses that give me extra education in early childhood education" is an important thing for our students to have. We have several students already going through our program that were expecting to get this credential. So instead what the School of Education is proposing is to have a Multiple Subject Credential and then students would take three extra classes to get a certification in Early Childhood Education. These three courses are already existing. They are already being taught. She thinks all this is a renaming. It's a certificate now instead of the Credential with an emphasis and they've restructured when they teach the courses to make it easier for the students. This certificate would be used for students who wish to teach at a pre-school, for instance, a state run pre-school. It was approved unanimously through all the committees. S. McKillop asked why in the Master Plan they are talking about having kindergarten required and the third and fourth grade being optional, why did the CTC take that away? M. Dreisbach said we are responding every year to changes at the level of the commission, so she can't really answer that, but definitely Early Childhood has been dropped as an emphasis under Multiple Subjects and it's a special certificate now. Perhaps to provide more specific training. S. McKillop asked if it is a certificate then do they have to pay like a certificate rather than go to school, a certificate sounds like something you do through Extended Ed. M. Dreisbach said the idea is that it is more specialized training within Early Childhood. The answer is no. *Approved.*

C. Nelson reported that her latest report on the Strategic Planning committee is on the Senate website.

Special Guests: Faculty Trustee Kathy Kaiser and Statewide Senate Chair Bob Cherny in the Commons T. C. 3:45

K. Kaiser said we call this the Kathy and Bob show. We were planning to wear black, but thank God the bond passed. So we could wear other clothing. It's important, of course, to recognize that we're not dancing in the streets and no one is. All this got us was back to ground zero, i.e. the Governor's budget as the best we can hope for. So what we like to do is give a brief overview, myself and Bob and then we are very pleased to take your questions and also comments. It is a two-way conversation. The Board is, of course as we all are, concerned with the budget. There is a great deal of negotiation going on in the Governor's office and the LAO about what the budget cut in terms of their specificity would mean. The Chancellor has

been using the Q word and she thinks that it is really important that we recognize that the continued depreciation of our budget will not allow us to offer quality and quality is the issue of the faculty and we need to make our students aware of how crucial that relationship is. Having access and affordability without quality is a pretty empty equation. The other aspect is the Board is moving ahead on a student fee policy that will be coming to the Board in March for a first reading. There is great concern with the Board that there is predictability and fairness, but no one assumes that means no increase in fees. There's a pretty clear consensus that California is the lowest in everything and that's not a good equation. We're the lowest in Presidential salaries, we're the lowest in faculty salaries, to continue to be the lowest in student fees is not really a reasonable nor sustainable approach. We're also getting ready to hear the introduction of a sustainability policy. She's proud to say the students have been the leaders in this. She thinks it is very important that we help the Chancellor's office staff come to a realization of a sustainability policy that we can all live with for the next 50 years and not the next budget cycle. There are really key aspects to that. The Board, as you may know, is faced with a dilemma that we are currently down five Trustees. In March two more of our long term Trustees will have finished their terms which means we are down seven and Governor Schwarzenegger has an incredible opportunity here to flavor the Board. The Board has always held very close the maxim that we are not about politics in the little p, i.e. Democrat, Libertarian, Republican, but politics in the big P standing up for the CSU. So it will be very important for us to norm the Governor's appointments as they come on to the Board to have that become an article of faith that all Board members hold to. It's very crucial for us to be able to function as a Board. She can tell the body that to a person the Board is committed to the CSU.

B. Cherny thanked K. Kaiser for her remarks and the Senate for the invitation. He's been to the campus before and always enjoyed coming here. He said it's nice to see a number of people he knows around the table, Peter who was on the Statewide Senate and Victor and Bob Coleman and of course your two Senators, Susan and Phil, who are both members of our Fiscal and Governmental Affairs committee. Phil has been working on the sub-committee on a fee policy for a faculty position on the fee policy and Susan has represented us on a lot of things, most recently following the Master Plan very closely. Thank you for sending us such good Statewide Senators. He mentioned a couple of things on the Statewide Senate's agenda for next week and will probably continue to occupy us until the end of the semester. One of them has been in front of us in one way or another for at least the last five or six years. That has to do with easing transfer problems. This is an issue that the Legislature has been drumming on for years. It's an issue that our administration has been drumming on for years. We've been trying to address this in several ways for the past several years, but they don't seem to have been sufficient to satisfy the Legislature. Legislation has been introduced by Senator Scott SB 1785 that would lay out some very elaborate rules about transfer procedures. Not coincidentally some of the things in that legislation resemble some of the things we've been talking about in the Statewide Academic Senate and between the Statewide Academic Senate and David Spence, the Executive Vice Chancellor. The thing that most closely resembles our conversation is the notion of a 45/15 transfer package and what that means is something like this. A student who wished to transfer from a community college to the CSU would get the highest priority for transfer if they present 45 units that could

apply either to general education or their major. There are 39 units of lower division general education, so for liberal arts majors, this would probably mean we would expect the student to complete all 39 units of general education at the lower division plus 6 units of classes that could be applied to the student's major. What this would obviously mean is that transfer students would have to declare a major. That would be part of the application process, to determine a major before they come to the CSU. What's underlying all of this in part is the fact that some significant number of students who come from community colleges have not yet fixed on a major in the CSU, much less taken lower division coursework at the community college that would secure them to enter upper division coursework when they came to the CSU. Which means that on arrival at the CSU instead of taking two more years of course work and graduating, they may end up taking more than that because they have to backtrack and take the classes that our entering freshman might have taken as freshman or sophomores. But the transfer students end up doing that with already 60 or 70 units. Students have complained to the Legislature that courses they have taken at the community college don't help them when they get to the CSU. They may take units that can't apply to their major even though they thought they would. For students that enter the CSU as first time freshman, we now expect that we will give them a very clear plan for what they need to do in their major. This has been called roadmaps, he didn't know what they called them on this campus, but each department and each major is expected have available a plan so that students know what to do in that major at various steps along the way so that they can make appropriate progress toward graduation in a timely fashion. The transfer students, however, don't have access to that kind of information for the time they spend at community college. So what's behind this proposal for requiring 45 units is to provide to community college students something like the kind of information we give our first time freshman. That we give them a very clear path to follow so that they arrive at the CSU well prepared to start upper division coursework. For Liberal Arts majors this might mean 39 units of general education and 6 units in a major. For Engineering or for the Sciences, it might mean fewer units of general education and more lower division coursework in their major because we know for some of the sciences students really need to start in their freshman year taking the set of courses they need to take because of the sequential nature of those majors. There's less flexibility in those majors than some of the liberal arts majors. But that's the notion behind the 45/15 requirement. Students bring us 45 units that can apply to general education or their major in a total of 60. That would give them the highest priority as transfer students. Students that did not have that would not be excluded, they would just not have the same priority. The implication of this, we all need to be very clear, is that we would look to each major in the CSU to agree on at least 6 units that could be accepted at any CSU campus in that major because that's the only way that this would work. Students can no longer be assured that they can apply to a single CSU and be admitted there. We know that there are eight impacted CSU campuses who are not accepting all CSU eligible students, either as first time freshman or as transfer students. So students who are applying to the CSU for transfer need to apply to more than one place. Which means if we are going to give them the best possible information about what they should be taking to prepare for their major, we need to agree among ourselves as faculty what those courses are so students would be able to apply to more than one CSU and know the courses they have taken would apply to a History major at San Francisco or Sonoma or Hayward, regardless

of where they might end up coming. That's one very big, very difficult issue that the Academic Affairs committee is going to be dealing with, has been dealing with and will continue to deal with and we hope to have some kind of a final resolution on this by May. What we're hoping is that we can get a lot of the detail taken out of the pending legislation, that SB 1785 will be amended to remove a lot of the detail and leave that up to us because we really do know more about this than the Legislative staff does. We know a lot more about what's involved with requirements for majors and the difficulties of transfer students. We have to be responsive to the Legislator's concern, but at the same time we need the flexibility to make sure that what gets enacted into law is not going to create more problems than it solves. So our goal as the Statewide Academic Senate is to get as much of the detail as possible taken out of that legislation.

Another issue that we are dealing with arises out of the Governor's budget. There is a provision in the Governor's budget that addresses excess units for graduation. What this means is a concern about the number of units that students take above and beyond the minimum required for graduation in a particular major. The idea is that the more students who take units above the minimum the more spaces that are closed off to CSU eligible students, so this is an access issue. It's also a financial issue. At one level it's a question of should the state subsidize students who take more units than what they need to graduate, that's one part of the issue. The other part of the issue is how can we encourage students to finish their degree and leave and open up space for CSU eligible students that we're going to be faced with turning away. It's in the Governor's budget as a reduction from our budget with the idea being we somehow are supposed to assess those students who have excess units as a way of making up the money that's being removed from our budget. We have to address this in some way or another. L. Furukawa-Schlereth and himself are both on a task force that has been established to address the issue of excess units and how to deal with the financial part of it. The Academic Affairs committee of the Statewide Senate is trying to develop a definition – what is an excess unit. That's a curricular question and properly a question for the Academic Senate to address and the process has begun now. The way it was defined in the Governor's budget was any unit more than 10% of the minimum needed in the degree program. He hopes they will come up with a more flexible definition than that. He said he thought they could count on them coming up with a more flexible definition than that. Those are the two really big items on our agenda. In addition to that we are going to be looking at a Senate recommendation on a CSU fee policy. Phil is really close to that. If you have questions or concerns on that maybe you can have Phil report to you on it.

S. Wilson said about the transfer things, it sounds like what we're going to have is students who will wind up declaring a major which will allow them to count 45 units and then change their major once they get here. But he really wanted to talk about access. We've been hearing for years talk about the Trustees cutting back on access if we don't get more money and this is actually a nationwide phenomenon, happening all over the country and so far it hasn't gotten very far here because there's so much of a demand for college education. Now the budget crisis comes along and we're forced to make this trade off. Can we get more quality if we restrict access? He also pointed out that the plans that we've been hearing around here

involve cutting access and decreasing quality, so we're not getting that trade off. There's all kinds of serious and compelling reasons for access. He heard Donna Arduin saying that there's the Governor's budget, but then there's the whole budget process. She was saying that if everything goes the way they want it, they are planning on keeping the general fund budget level until it got up the last Wilson budget would be if it was (unintelligible) by population and inflation. It sounds like there might be some hope for getting a better budget out of the Governor's office and this is hopefully something we should be working on. And about the additional units, what are the student paying extra fees for? To make them pay extra fees and cut down the number of units they can take doesn't sound right. K. Kaiser said the amount of money for higher education has been slowly going down. There are projections on how soon it will be before we reach zero state funding for higher education. It is not a California issue, it is a national issue. The context of this, and I wouldn't rely on Donna since there's quite a bit of dispute about whether she left Florida on her own volition or not, is that the state of California has an incredibly narrow window of discretionary dollars and agents for those dollars to distinguish between. So it's social services, prisons, highways and higher education. That's sort of the four horses of the apocalypse. You can't think that you're going to compete with children and the disabled and the elderly and she didn't think that should be tried. Where's your social conscience? That's leaves us with highways, prisons and us. Now our students might think we are a prison in some ways, but we're not nearly funded at the level, we don't make the salaries they do, we do not exercise the same political moxy that they do. We haven't had a recent Federal investigation yet, so that's on our side and we don't have the same flexibility with our accounting that they do. They have million dollar overruns and nobody seems to care. She thinks it's unduly optimistic that funding is going to come back anytime soon. She thinks the body needs to look at it as relatively flat plane for the visible future. So the question you ask yourself is where is Sonoma State and where is the CSU going to be in five to ten years and not assume there's a knight on the white horse riding to the rescue. That's a really different place, that's a really difficult place to be and she doesn't think we can escape some of the financial calculations which show our students paying the least fees of any system. FSU controlled it by saying ok, we're a state funded university and we have high quality, we take new freshman in and we're going to flunk out 25% guaranteed every year. Now that is an incredible motivator. She said her knees were knocking as a freshman, she was going to make sure she wasn't in the bottom 25%. Notice they didn't say those of you who make D's and F's, just said the bottom 25%. So every state has taken different pathways to give themselves access. She thinks that we have to look at how the CSU is going to have access to something more what? Why would we bring them here to not give them classes? We did that in the 1990's. Every campus that did that learned a bitter, bitter lesson. And the heads that are nodding in here will never go there again because they know how painful that was. A lot of this is politics, a lot of this is posturing, but there's a very real issue there. If you're not talking to your neighbors, if you're not talking to your politicians, if you're not talking to your local businessman and explaining to them how one dollar that we lose that we lose is \$5 to the community and it ripples out from there I don't think you're doing your homework. B. Cherny said last time he came to the Senate, he gave a report to the Senate that the Statewide Academic Senate had done called "The CSU in the Beginning of the 21st century." That report was an analysis of the ten years preceding

and projection of the ten years to come. Since that time he's continued to work on that some, his field is history, he does work on California history and a year ago did give a paper on the CSU any early 90's and it is going to be published as some point. He gave the conclusion. The Master Plan laid out three goals for higher education the California – quality, access and affordability. The highest possible quality, the widest possible access, every Californian would have access to some part of higher education. It would all be affordable, the state would pay for the cost of instruction, students would only paid incidental fees. That's the Master Plan. In the early 1990's every aspect of that was seriously eroded. The quality, the access and the affordability. It hasn't been restored and now were facing further erosion of all three of those Master Plan goals. In the early 90s, Bernie Goldstein was our faculty trustee at that time, Bernie liked to tell about the Taylor shop, the Taylor shop that had a sign that said we offer the best quality tailoring at the lowest possible prices with the fastest possible turnaround, pick any two. And in the early 90's that's what faculty joked about quality, access and affordability, pick any two. What happened of course was that all three were eroded and were going to face more of the same, we know that. We're not going to be able to preserve the level of quality that we had these past ten years, we know that. Student access is being reduced, affordability is being eroded and will continue to be further eroded. As faculty he'd like to suggest that it is our job to do what ever we can to protect quality. We need to form coalitions with students because the students natural goals here are going to be access and affordability. But we've got to form coalitions to try to protect as much of this as possible. But as faculty our special concern has to the quality. Now add the system level, we have a system budget advisory committee that brings together representatives of the Chancellor's office, the Academics Senate, CFA, various campus representatives, Vice Presidents, Presidents and so forth to consult about what's happening on the budget. This is the first year he's been a member of that body. He's been generally impressed with the extent to which this has been a body that actually made some proposals that have been accepted by the administration and the Trustees. This body strongly supported the needs based budget that the Trustees approved for whatever good that did. At least it was the principle that we weren't going to roll over and submit a budget that was less than what we thought was the minimum necessary. We at the Statewide Academic Senate, when we meet with the Chancellor have repeatedly said please tell the campus Presidents that they need to involve the faculty fully in campus budget decisions. The Chancellor has always assured us that yes, he does so because he knows that involving the faculty is necessary on campus budget decision making. So he encouraged all on the body to do whatever they can on the SSU campus to protect quality in the campus budgeting process. We're not going to keep the student/faculty ratio where it is now, we know that. But let's try to hold on to it as much as we can. He also addressed changes in major, that's where excess units comes in, right? If students come in with a major and completely change it and have to backtrack that's where the excess units matter. Transfer issues and excess unit issues are not separate matters. They are different parts of the same large pattern that comes back to some of these issues of budget again. So if students want to change majors and keep changing majors and accumulate enormous numbers of units, something has got to give there because the state is not willing to subsidize individual students indefinitely when there are students being turned away who are eligible to enter the CSU. It becomes really an access issue.

Joint Doctoral Program in Education – Second Reading

V. Garlin moved the question. No objection. Vote on Joint Doctoral Program in Education – Passed on voice vote.

Return to Questions/Comments for K. Kaiser and B. Cherny

P. Phillips said he was hearing what was being said and that quality is something that we're very concerned with here at Sonoma State. When K. Kaiser started out she said that the CSU and the UC's were the lowest cost universities in the country and that our Presidents were some of the lowest paid. He likes to think of it as California has taken a leadership position in quality education at a low cost for students and low cost for administrators. He understands the politics, but there's a glass half full and a glass half empty approach to this. He was a little taken aback by K. Kaiser saying that about the President's salaries. To him a quarter million dollar salary is more than adequate to get a very qualified President on any campus in this state. Are there any other campuses that are planning a scenario where all lecturers and all FERPs are going to be laid off in the Fall? K. Kaiser responded when we look historically at the last crisis and we map that, the response was to lay off the vast majority of lecturers in the CSU as a way to respond to the last crisis. The fall - it was just a free fall, in student enrollment that followed that graph line was dramatic. It almost crashed the system. Many, many campuses spent years trying to come back from that because we let go the people who taught the volume of students at the same time we kept admitting students, so the students had the worst of a bargain. They were admitted but they had no classes and that publicity drove many of them away, away to privates, away to other states. There were campuses that would brag that they could guarantee them classes and get them out in four years and they could laugh at the CSU. That was a very negative relationship. If you actually look at the language of the contract, you'll see that it is not true that you have to lay off all lecturers and then all FERPs. It is a program by program decision. So the question becomes do we cut everybody off at the ankles and then everybody off at the knees, that is a question for the campus through its Faculty Senate and through its administration to deal with. Many campuses are looking at that as an intolerable relationship because it will take them right back to where they were in '92 and they are talking about, again, looking at where we want to be in five years if funding doesn't return. And actually there's nothing to say funding will return, folks. The state hasn't honored its commitment for the last three years. We're not at the beginning of a budget crisis, we're in the third year of a budget crisis. The state has been paying us less and less money to educate more and more complicated people. Do you think Ephraim's question was that of a 18 year old? She thought he was pretty smart. If he's that smart, it will take more money to educate him. The state is actually paying us a sliding scale and it's sliding downhill. They say, hey, Ephraim cost us more three years ago, but last year he was little bit cheaper and this year he's a lot cheaper, well, next year I hate to think about how cheap it is going to be to educate Ephraim. And that's a scary thought. The last time that senior faculty had a pay raise you can't remember, which means you've been losing purchasing power every year. One comment we hear from some faculty is that faculty salaries are subsidizing the state's failure to fund students. Whereas you might want to argue

from your position that you think that you could hire a university President – it's a scramble, because we're being out bid, seriously out bid, by other institutions in other states. You're being out bid for your faculty. California is an expensive place to live. When we look at this our question is - we are not going to stay the same. She doesn't know how we're going to change. She's not in a position to tell the body that. The body will have to make that decision among themselves as a faculty Senate and in relationship to your administration. But it's very clear that we're not going to stay the same. And it's very clear, from everything she hears that no one is going to continue to support us not asking students to pay a greater percentage. There's a lot of argument about what that percentage will be penned on, but that students will still be expected to pay more. B. Cherny said did he know of any other campus that are talking about laying off all lecturers and FERPs – he's heard about that, yes. His own campus, the numbers he was told was that the Academic Affairs budget was \$9 million in shortfall and that the total amount of salary for all lecturers on both campuses was \$8.5 million. Which means that you could lay off all lecturers still not make up the shortfall. He called his campus today to see if their student fee proposal had passed because that would have reduced the shortfall from \$9 million to \$6 million for Academic Affairs. They didn't know the answer to that. There are campus Presidents around the CSU who are talking about the need to do both, layoffs of lots of lecturers and also narrow and deep cuts to eliminate programs which means not just laying off FERPs, but tenured faculty members. In the early '90's he thinks there was one tenured faculty member in the entire CSU that was laid off. At Chico he thinks we may see significantly more than that this time around.

R. Luttmann had a comment and a question. The comment had to do with the matter of quality, access, affordability, pick any two. As we've seen the extent of state support erode gradually over the last decade or so, it's essentially been the policy of the system to let that be taken out of quality and we have protected the interests of the state's citizens in coming to the CSU. Recently the Chancellor announced a change in philosophy that we were not going to let quality deteriorate any further and with regret we were going to have to restrict access. His view is that that is a very good idea. One of the first things the Chancellor has ever said that he agrees with. He's not sure if that's actually happened, but he wanted to put in a word for that as a way to deal with this crisis. The question he has is of great concern to us here at Sonoma State – our ability to reach groups of students that are traditionally under-represented in higher education and our great concern with the proposal from the Governor that EOP programs be discontinued and he wondered if they could comment on what they see in the immediate future for these programs. K. Kaiser said the first group she gives full credit to are the students. Students wrote the very first resolution supporting the maintenance of EOP. The Chancellor was second. He wrote a very strong letter. It is important to recognize that the Chancellor is now the senior higher education leader in the state and he put all his weight behind fighting for EOP and then the Senate. She has not seen anyone on the Board put down EOP. B. Cherny said he had not encountered anyone in our system administration who accepts that part of the Governor's budget. What they hope to accomplish is that all of those directed cuts will be rolled into one big unallocated cut, so that we'll have control over where the cuts come rather than having to do it in a way that the Governor's office specifies. If that's not successful, he's heard them saying things like we'll still protect EOP. Now part of the problem is that EOP is in

that category called outreach. And outreach sounds like recruiting. In fact, it's not, of course, what has to do with more than anything else is the adequate academic preparation and support of students. And if it were called that it maybe it wouldn't form such an inviting target as when it is labeled outreach. As far as he's concerned, he hasn't found any support anywhere in the CSU for following what the Governor's budget says on EOP. So he really doesn't think it will happen. EOP might very well take the same cut that everybody else takes, but he has not heard anyone saying anything about eliminating EOP.

R. Coleman-Senghor said one of the things that concerns him is that we have CAN agreements right now that go to the top of transferability. We have CAN agreements and it seems to him that, wouldn't we begin to talk about aligning courses so that the courses are in fact the same without broaching the autonomy of particular programs, why is it that our existing CAN and articulation agreements not sufficient for us to deal with the issue of transferability and then would the proposal coming out place the question of campus and program autonomy in danger? K. Kaiser asked if he'd ever had to do the lifeboat exercise. R. Coleman-Senghor said he'd been in the place where he had to get off. K. Kaiser said she thinks we're in the lifeboat. If CAN were working, so says the Legislature, why isn't anybody transferring. You have to look at the numbers. The numbers back in '92, when we took our first dramatic dip, we've only in the very recent past come back to that same exact numerical place. But the volume of students has tremendously increased. So transfer is being less successful than it was in '92 - '93. They perceive that this is not equitably spread across economic and social and ethnic components of society. So that some people make it out of the community college system better than others. The third issue is we've been struggling with CAN for a number of years. Faculty want greater responsiveness, greater visibility, greater accuracy and description. We've been trying to upgrade them through the Poll projects, get them more in tune with what faculty want, have a better system of reviewing them, but in fact, that's the struggle. So it used to be a student might say ok, I'm going to go to Chico, but Chico is impacted at the freshman level. Right now Pomona is talking about being impacted at the junior transfer level. With eight impacted campuses, a student can pick eight campuses in a row and not get in. So how are we being fair to that student by saying we want to maintain our autonomy and that student has no idea where they are going to go. We have to make a way for that student to have a reasonable sense that if they do their GE and they do at least 6 common units in their major and they declare a major, now they have a chance of 15 units to respond to the uniqueness of Sonoma or wherever. But the pressure of impaction is the lifeboat. It is not making it an even place. Students are finding themselves far down on the list on what they can do with an impacted campus, so the Legislature is counting every single transfer and what they see is that our report card does not read A, it does not read B, she didn't even think they think it reads a C. That's where the pressure is coming from. B. Cherny expanded on that thought. About three years ago he was part of a project to bring the History Chairs across the CSU together to see if we could find consensus on the lower division components in our major. We actually started out being very close to consensus, because we were all teaching history, so we were pretty much doing the same thing at the lower division level, but not quite. We made up a little grid that showed where there was consensus and where there was not and about two years ago he was at a legislative hearing and among other things we were

explaining this particular project and gave them the grid. Senator Scott picked up the grid, looked at it for about 30 seconds and said well, if I were student at X community college how would I know what to take? Pomona requires World History and won't accept Western Civ. Northridge requires Western Civ and will not accept World History. What's a community college student that is halfway in between supposed to take and prepare for upper division work in the history major. That's the politics that you face. To him there are two things involved here. One of them is certainly academic freedom. The other one is academic discipline. Because we're all part of an academic discipline. If we are in fact part of an academic discipline that implies that there is some consensus within our discipline about our subject matter, for methodology, the ways that we understand our discipline. What he hoped would come is that the faculty from each discipline are going to meet to thrash out the consensus as to what that discipline expects at the lower division level, that the faculty keep the ownership of the curriculum in that way and they express their autonomy and the uniqueness in the upper division parts of their major, but they come to some kind of agreement as to what that discipline expects at the lower division level.

E. Ochoa said that he wanted to clarify something raised before (unintelligible).

J. Spencer said there are four portions of the budget that are discretionary and he thinks the social consciousness that puts social services and the disabled at the top of the list needs to be addressed, but he thought K. Kaiser glanced over the million dollar cost overruns in the prison industry that go unchecked and no big deal and he hears the conversation internal, how are we going to deal with budget cuts, don't expect the night on the white horse to come and save us. How are we going to deal with providing a decent education, with fewer students? Any implications that has for the economy of the future of this state are bad. But I don't hear anywhere, he hears it somewhat from the students and it's difficult to get to everybody on board but his question of the people statewide here is why is it that the CSU is not going on the offensive and saying what are the state's priorities. The students in the UC system have taken this model of education not incarceration, one on one. The students in the CSU are asking to push that as well, but instead of trying to figure out how we're going to deal with less money, where is the education campaign going on for local communities – this is what CSU does for you, this is the importance of maintaining this and where this all comes from. He was too young at the time to pay attention and speak up, but the reading he has from listening to what happened in the mid '80s when we had a corrections budget that was half of that of higher education in this state and then moved in the direction with three strikes and other things, then in mid 90s we were spending as much for corrections as we were for higher education. Now we're expecting to spend 70 percent more on corrections then on higher education. And whereas we are their representatives of higher education, the people trying to preserve it, when are we going to go on the offensive and say let's turn this around, let's do something different or are we going to continue to say how are we going to educate with less when you have a program like EOP which is designed to go out there and reach out to under represented populations and bring them into higher education with the thought that it's much cheaper to educate someone and bring them into higher education then it is to institutionalized them once they end up turning to drugs or to selling drugs as a

means of survival. It seems like that is an easy umbrella offensive for the higher education community to go on, but doesn't hear anyone talking about that. He hears people saying what are we going to do when there's no money, where do we go from here when they privatize education, what are we going to do when students can't afford... we may be the cheapest now, tuition is one thing, but finding an apartment in Sonoma County or in Long Beach or in San Francisco makes education expensive. Unless you're going to a local CSU and living with your family. Living in California and being a student makes this way more expensive. He could go to Iowa and pay ten thousand dollars tuition but would only paid \$200 rent. So when you put the cost of living into the equation, we really are just as expensive as everywhere else. So saying that were just going to have to raise the fees so that we can compete on that level, then the students can't afford to live, can't afford to buy food and can't afford to have their children go the child care. It just doesn't make sense to him when no one is saying when are we going to force the state to focus on education and where are the Trustees and the Statewide Senate and the statewide representatives from the chancellor on down really taking a stand. And in his opinion it's our job at the grassroots level to really educate our local communities, to say we need you to support to the CSU. That means you have four things to choose from and disabled and social services go the top of the list and that two others really choose from are going to be education or corrections, what is going to be the choice of our state? When every one was saying it in the '80s, it happened. They predicted it. We ended up spending more and more and more on corrections and less and less on education. And where is that money going. We see it's in the Legislative Analyst report. K. Kaiser said there is state wide leadership and its approach is three fold. One is the state leadership group went to your legislators and that's just the start, knocking on the door and talking to them in Sacramento... you've got to embarrass them or educate them in their own backyard. Secondly, there is an organization that goes out and talks about the CSU in the community because once again she thinks you have to make the point of how much you're impacting the local community. If you want a history, we predicted back in the '80's the energy crisis and California did nothing. The Governor came into office and he cut everybody and didn't touch the prisons. They have cost overruns and nobody's touching them. You get a lot of stuff that's done that's based on fear. After all remember we passed an amendment that said we were going to fund drug education for first time offenders to try to get out of this cycle of the prisons and you may not have noticed it, but if you go down and talk to them they got their funding cut by fifty percent about to a month ago. All those pro things got cut and the institution with the walls are still standing. So this is a difficult to political process. You have to convince people to be proactive instead of reactive because when you talk about prisons they see fear. She said she thought J. Spencer was right and she thinks there are efforts and she thinks that it's got to be community-based. Your local legislator it is the one that's got to hear from your community. Come on, folks only 40% of people voted in this election and that was about getting the state out of the most severe financial crisis we have faced, so there is a big job ahead of us and she's thrilled to death to hear the students saying let's get active. B. Cherny said to add to that, it's not as though nothing has been done. Proposition 56 could have introduced an important new dynamic into the state budgeting process and lost. It's not as though people have been sitting around. As long as it is a zero sum game with no possibility of increasing taxes, we're going to be the losers because the way the Legislators think is who can't raise money on

their own. It's not the people who are the recipients of social services, it's not the prisons, it's Higher Education because we can always raise fees. Until we can change the dynamic in Sacramento and re-introduce taxes into the equation, he thinks we're always going to have a serious uphill struggle. Now there is, as most of you in the room know, there is an effort underway - the Save the CSU Coalition that CFA and other organizations have been building that is intended to reach out beyond the campuses to wider communities and find allies there. Within the CSU our legislative advocacy people have been reaching out to the alumni and trying to mobilize the alumni on our behalf. There are serious efforts going on to find those allies off the campuses and mobilize them on our behalf in Sacramento. But it's really an uphill struggle and it's an especially uphill struggle when you remove increased taxes from the equation.

V. Garlin said that one sacred cow in our discussions seems to be Administrative costs. When we talk about the K-12 and community colleges and financial exigencies, administrative costs are always on the table. In the CSU, it never seems to be on the table. We're putting it on the table on this campus. CFA is going to put it on the table on this campus because while we're not committed to any particular number, the idea that one part of the campus is exempt from discussion when it comes to reduction other than attrition seems to us to be unfair and inappropriate. He asked them to tell the body about what's going on from their perspective at the state wide level and on other campuses about administrative costs. On other campuses is only the academics side of the house that's expected to have less bodies there as a result of letters and not to attrition and he'd be very interested in their reaction to his reaction which is that administrative costs is something that needs to be put on the table statewide and on each every campus. B. Cherny said he could give two pieces of information. On his campus he sits on their University Budget committee. Our president's office is taking a one-third cut in its budget for next year which is much larger than any other unit on campus. V. Garlin said how did you get them to do that. B. Cherny said that was his choice. With the Chancellor's office they are taking, the last he heard, a 7.5% percent cut which is the same that the campuses are being asked to take. He knows this is happening because the Statewide Academic Senate gets its budget from there and we're facing a 7.5% cut and he does not know how they can operate at that level, frankly. They are telling us that they are going to restore some of that cut for the Academic Senate, which means that other parts of the Chancellor's office are going to be taking bigger cuts. He's been having conversations with some of the Assistant Vice Chancellor's who truly don't know how there are going to manage the cuts in their area because they have no program to cut, they have no lecturers to cut. They only have their own permanent staff. He doesn't know how they are going to accomplish it frankly. But they are taking the same cut as the campuses are. V. Garlin said and the MPP budget? Our MPP budget isn't taking a cut that's anywhere near.. in fact our MPP people who serve at the pleasure of the President are defined on our campus as permanent employees. It's as if political employees in Sacramento and Washington who are political appointees were defined as permanent employees. An MPP person serves at the pleasure of the President. That's not a permanent employee. Our President defines them as a permanent employee and puts them in the same category as tenured faculty and long term CSEA employees. B. Cherny said well, you'll have to take that up with your President. K. Kaiser said every campus is different. She

thought that most of our MPP people are actually tenured faculty who have retreat rights so if they were to come out of their MPP positions they would come into their faculty positions and the other thing, last year at Chico, we have a budget committee made up of the administration and the faculty senate and some deans and faculty and we all agreed that the way we would handle the cuts that were last years cuts to us, in order to protect instruction, was Student Affairs and Fiscal Affairs took twice the hit that Academic Affairs did, twice the hit. We can't do that again. We all know that we can't do that again. You can't have a classroom and not have bathrooms. There are just really essential services that are needed to function as a healthy unit. She doesn't know how they will do it this time, but last time it was a very open decision about what we were doing. She hasn't run into a campus yet that has open budgeting and looks at that together and thought it was a bad idea because once you open the books to everybody then the issue that somebody has more money than me and they're hiding it is, no, you look at the money, they may use it differently than you, but that goes back to that discretionary choice of that unit. There's no hidden pots of money. She hasn't seen any hidden pots of money. She thinks we're way past that, that's why its so scary.

Provost Ochoa report

E. Ochoa said he wanted to correct a statement that was made about this campus planning to lay off all lecturers and FERPs. What has been going on is that we've been trying to really get a grip on the magnitude of the challenge that we face by first identifying where our baseline capacity to deliver instruction is. By scoping out what can be delivered with the tenure-track faculty that we have. There was an inquiry to the departments via the Deans – tell us what your schedule would look like if you only had tenure-track faculty. That's just the starting point for identifying what the challenges we face are. It was not the intent for that to end up as any kind of viable scenario for handling the cuts. The other statement that was made was that Administration and Finance which is our administrative division hasn't been taking its share of cuts. The fact is that it has in the sense that on this campus the approach that has been taken is to follow basically the same formula it has used to add up the budget, to construct it, has been used to distribute it as well. So for example, the CSU's budget alternative to the Governor's line items sends cuts to the campus as 5% enrollment related and 5% are unallocated cuts. On this campus the same formula goes into constructing FTE enrollment growth dollars which was used to distribute it out, is now being used to pull it back in. So for that portion of the cuts, we took the lion share of the cut, just under 80% for the remainder of the cut, that was distributed on a pro-rated basis based on the size of our budget. So Administration and Finance is facing a cut of \$1.4 million dollars which they will try to make through attrition and other types of savings. They haven't necessarily fully identified how they are going to do it either, just like the Chancellor's office has had some difficulty in that area. Another statement that was made that he had to respond to was that this notion that MPPs are temporary employees. In addition to those of us who have retreat rights, he would put to the body that MPPs serve at the pleasure of the President is in fact a way of making that category of management employee much more accountable for performance. It's basically a legal construct that allows the President to terminate them if their performance is not satisfactory without having to get into an elaborate process that you would get involved in if

you are trying to do this with someone in a collective bargaining agreement. In fact if you terminate somebody in a capricious way, you find that this pleasure has serious legal limits. That is why MPP's who get fired take the route to sue. And one the last point, the open budget, he agreed and added on this campus in fact we do have an open budget, open books. The budget is reported in excruciating detail by our Chief Financial officer down to identifying every individual salary by name and this is available to anybody for themselves. He is aware that on other campuses there has been more, a more flexible attitude toward in the way the budget is constructed. SSU has adopted a more entitled approach and has tended to date to distribute both by increases and budget cuts strictly proportioned on how the budget is actually put together. Now beyond that he gave a brief update on where we are on the final for these cuts in Academic Affairs. This is a reminder – from before we even knew what the Governor's budget was, we were trying to get a handle on that based on capacity with just tenure track faculty, then we came up with two theoretical end points to arrange what we know was larger than where the true number would fall, but was certain to include the true number and that range was one in which all of the cuts came out of the colleges alone and another cut where the entire Academic Affairs division took a pro-rated cut. By the way the observation was made early on that even with just a sort of ball parking or a way of estimating the magnitude of what we're dealing with, we knew that the cut we were facing would not quite exhaust all of the temporary and FERP budget, in terms of dollars, as a way of sizing the cut, the cut will be about all of the part time budget and half of the FERP budget, so it wasn't quite the whole thing. We knew that the worst case scenario was for the Schools to take all of that and we have now backed out of that and collapsed these two scenarios into one that is becoming gradually more realistic that incorporates cuts that have been identified in ESAS, the Library and his office in addition to the Schools. So we have now some numbers that the Schools are getting so they can plan. We are hoping to identify additional cuts outside the Schools for additional resources that might bring them back a little further still. That's where we are at this point. The other piece that we're working on, starting with the baseline capacity we have, assuming that we change nothing about the way we do business, the way we deliver instruction. The next iteration is taking the dollars that we know we have, so we have a little bit more leeway, but also looking at ways of restructuring how we deliver instruction so we can stretch out the available resources. We know that we have to come in on target with our enrollment, because if we don't we do face the threat of losing money from the campus. So that's something we have to do. We know that even after departments make a good faith effort to leverage their instructional resources as much as they can, that there will be what we call "hot spots," where we will not actually be able to reach those targets and the limited resources for FERP and part time faculty that we will have as a result of these other cuts we have identified are going to have to be targeted to these hot spots. So this way it's a very, very intricate, complicated exercise that does exactly what you refer to, which tries to minimizes the degradation of quality that's ensuing from the cuts knowing full well there will be degradation. Further question for the Provost deferred to next meeting. C. Nelson said R. Coleman-Senghor will wrap things up for us.

R. Coleman-Senghor said that he has been a colleague at distance and close hand to Bob Cherny and he can tell B. Cherny that it was through him he learned a great

deal about the history of San Francisco, he read B. Cherny's books, listened to his lecturers, B. Cherny was one of the chief persons to introduce him to a particular historical approach. He has served the Senate and served us well and he wanted to extend his thanks to him because he is now leaving the Statewide Academic Senate, but he doesn't feel too sorry because he is going to be taking up the John Adams Chairs at the University of Leiden in The Neatherlands next Spring. R. Coleman-Senghor wished him well and thanked him very much for all his services.
(applause)

C. Nelson presented gifts as a token of appreciation for their visit to the guests on behalf of the Senate.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom