
Members absent: Paul Bassen, Chastity Cansino, Alex Cassuto, Evette Castillo, Nancy Fegan, Alison Germaine, Terry Jones, Michael Lee, Marco Marquez, Sue Opp, Evelyn Padua-Andrews, Sylvia Ramos, Carl Stempel, Steve Ugbah, Veronica Vasquez


Senator Caplan made a general announcement that the CSUH Women’s Volleyball team achieved their first ever NCAA III Western Regional championship. The team will travel to St. Louis on Saturday, November 23 to play Washinton University in a semi-final match.

The meeting began with a Visit with Chancellor Charles B. Reed.

Chancellor Reed addressed the Academic Senate on matters relating to the CSU budget. The March 2004 ballot will carry an amendment to Proposition 47 for an additional $12.5 billion. He speculated that the current budget situation was probably the worst the State has ever faced. He remarked that the State now has fewer people in the prison system and less people on welfare than in the early 1990's and that this was good news. The bad news for the State is that Medical and Medicare spending has increased and that K-12 funding will level off and not grow at the rate it was growing at three to five years ago. The CSU System experienced a 6.9% growth this past year and 3,500+ students were not funded through the budget. The CSU growth bubble is expected to continue through 2008. While the CSU has not built student fee increases into their budget thus far, in May, with the Governor’s revised budget, all issues will be on the table for discussion. Student fees may need to be increased. While there are differing opinions on the possibility of a mid-year cut for the CSU, the Chancellor indicated that if there had not been any cuts made by the Christmas holiday that there would be no cuts. The Chancellor also commented that he, along with 95% of the other state agencies, did not support the Golden Handshake because an agency agreeing to the retirement package would have had to pay up front the last two years of an employee’s stipend and the agency would have to permanently delete the positions and return the money from each position to the state. The Chancellor explained that he could not cut positions and turn money back to the state while the CSU continues to experience growing enrollment.

Tom McCoy asked the Chancellor to explain the latest budget proposal in terms of endorsing the CPEC salary gap. The Chancellor responded that all faculty will receive a 3.64% pay increase this year; in addition to the 1% for faculty, the CSU was committed to honoring the 2.64% built into the base per the 2nd year of the Unit 3 CBA.
Hank Reichman urged the Chancellor to go with the CFA and the CSU Academic Senate to the state legislature in the spirit of ACR 73. He expressed that in light of the most recent CSU Trustee budget proposal that it makes it more difficult for the aforementioned units to work together. Reichman pointed to the UC’s budget which, in partnership with their board, asked for a 4.5% increase. Reichman also pointed to the fact that the UC CPEC salary gap was less than the CSU’s. The Chancellor responded that the UC’s raised student fees by 6.5% for all student groups.

Emily Stoper asked why the CSU does not increase student fees. The Chancellor responded that in the Governor’s May Revised budget that everything will be up for negotiating and that if the CSU raises student fees it would ask that 1/3 of the increase be set aside for financial aid.

Mike Schutz remarked that it appeared that in the recent past less funding has been going to instructional costs while administrative costs have been rising in the CSU. The Chancellor did not fully agree with this statement and explained that more money is going to administer student services proportionate to instructional costs. In addition, more staff in University Advancement has been hired across the campuses in the last decade and that these administrative costs are necessary if campuses are to successfully secure more private funding.

The Chancellor was asked if the administration is aware that some CSU faculty resent the agency shop imposed by the CFA. The Chancellor responded that he was aware of the sentiment. As a follow up, Reed was also asked whether the health care flex benefit would increase as health care costs increase. The Chancellor responded that the administration has no control over health care costs and benefits and that this information comes from PERS directly without CSU influence.

One attendee remarked that campus maintenance was taking quite a hit and that students appear to be at the top of the new computer food chain on campus while the faculty seemed to be at the bottom. Provost Martino remarked that faculty are actually in the 2nd tier of the computer food chain, 2nd to students. The Chancellor agreed that the State of California was very stingy on maintenance.

Karina Garbesi queried whether accepting fewer students next year was a real possibility for reducing costs. The Chancellor confirmed that this was a proposal being examined.

Cal Caplan expressed that new young faculty hires face an intolerable economic situation in California and questioned what kind of statewide coordination was in place to help campuses hire and retain new hires. The Chancellor remarked that the CSU encourages campuses to build housing and is working with Citicorp and Bank of America on mortgage supplements. The System is examining and pursuing property purchases throughout the system and that a $200 million housing project at SJSU was just approved.

The Chancellor was asked about the one in, one out practice of faculty replacement. This has resulted in a decline of the student faculty ratio. Reed responded that the administration does not micromanage each campus and leaves hiring decisions up to each campus.

Hank Reichman stated that for all but one year in the past decade the raw number of faculty has declined and that it appeared that the marginal funding rate is inadequate. The Chancellor responded that the administration is working to amend the marginal funding rate formula. In addition, the CSU has a 72-78% success rate in tenure-track hires which is not far off of the national average. He also commented that the CSU faces a systemic problem in retaining new hires.

1. **Approval of the Agenda**

   **M/S/P** (Reuter/Schutz) to approve the agenda.
2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of October 8, 2002

M/S/P (Stoper/Sawyer) to approve the minutes with one correction to the Chair’s report.

3. Reports

A. Report of the Chair
Chair Wort:
- Announced that Connie Sexauer will retire at the end of December and will not be attending any more meetings. He was asked if there are any retirement party plans and he replied that information would be made available at a later date.
- Reported that November 26, December 3, and January 7 are all planned for ExComm meetings. The next likely Senate meeting will be on January 14, 2003.
- Announced that we will have a Special Senate meeting January 21, 2003, with a single topic. It will be an “ACR73 Presentation”. He explained about the Task Force and announced that Gary Hammerstrom, CSU administration(SFSU), George Diehr, CFA representative presenter (San Marcos), and he, as representative of the Statewide Academic Senate would do a joint presentation followed by Q&A.

B. Report of the President
No report

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
Senator Reichman reported:
- The summary of the CSU Senate meeting was emailed by Senator Caplan to the Senate, so there is no need to go into a full report. The major event of the meeting was the Call for Reconsideration of the Trustees Budget. He thinks there are flaws. It also seems to put unions against each other. There was a 3 hour debate on the Statewide Academic Senate floor and there was only 1 vote against the resolution, for reasons which were not clear.

D. Report of CFA
CFA President McCoy
- No formal report. CFA doesn’t agree with Chancellor Reed’s analysis of the salary gap reported by CEPC. There is some fuzzy math in the Trustees budget and some questions about the use of salary savings. He noted that while CSU instructional funding is decreasing its administrative costs are increasing. He also wanted to point out that CSUH is one of the better campuses with regard to “administration costs” in the CSU.

E. Report of Student Government
AS President Fabiola Camarillo:
- reported that Associated Students has an Inner Core Council – a networking system for clubs and events.
- AS is filling positions for the election committee for Spring ’03 elections.
- A Homecoming Committee is working on the event, which will be on January 24, 2003.
- They have had good response on the Education Fund for 9-11 victims and over $2,700 has been raised.
- Two students have been appointed to committees regarding tech fees.

F. Mark Karplus reported that the Lecturer Reception by the Office of Faculty Development was a successful event. It was a diverse group. The next reception is on Friday January 17, 2003 from 3-5 PM and all are encouraged to attend.
4. 02-03 CIC 1, Proposed Alternative Methods for Students to Satisfy the University Writing Skills Requirement

M/S/P (Caplan, Warriner)

- Emily Stoper read the Action Requested statement to be sure everyone had the wording that was changed at ExComm. (or rather than and). It should read: That the Academic Senate Approve an Essay Score of 4.5 or Higher on the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) for graduate students or a Score of 53 or Higher (High Pass) on the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), effective Fall Quarter, 2002.

- Bruce Trumbo asked if there was a mechanism built into the document for future changes. Alison Warriner suggested an amendment be made that the Writing Skills Subcommittee will revisit this issue every five years to be sure the scores are still good passing scores. This was a friendly amendment, suggested as a mechanism to review the standards should ETS re-norm the GRE.

5. Resolution endorsing the Statewide Resolution “Call for Reconsideration of Trustee’s Budget”

M/S/P (Reichman/Caplan) to approve

- Hank Reichman said that the importance of this resolution is that it is a statement of the Trustee’s priorities even though no one expects this budget to be the final budget. This says volumes.

- Items under the 3rd “resolved” were discussed by Reichman and Lowenthal.

- The staff got a retroactive increase last year. The faculty opted not to receive retroactive pay, but to get more in the following year. Now the Chancellor is giving higher increases to staff to match the overall faculty increase. So now the faculty is still behind by the amount of the retroactive increase. Merris pointed out that parity has not been a historical issue. You’re accepting parity at face value.

- Lowenthal asked if the Chancellor had to find the money. The reply was that there is no evidence that the $29.9 million is a new cost.

- The Partnership Agreement was discussed. The CSU and the government agreed at 4% increase plus whatever enrollment increase happened. They also agreed about backfunding for fees, which we’ve never received.

- It was noted that the Legislature could turn down the $30m on the budget, but the contract has been signed.

- Lowenthal suggested adding “ambiguities which we regret” to the resolution, but it was not seconded.

Passed unanimously as presented. Reichman requested that the unanimity of the vote be conveyed to the Trustees as well.

6. Adjournment

M/S/P (Sawyer/Evuleocha) to adjourn

Respectfully Submitted

Jennifer Laherty, Acting Secretary