Minutes of the Meeting of April 2, 2004

Members Present:
Dana Edwards, Kris Erway, Karina Garbesi, Armando Gonzales, Bill Langan (Chair), Eleanor Levine, José A. López, Nancy Mangold, Saeid Motavalli, Don Sawyer, Don Wort

Members Absent:

Guests:
Dee Andrews, Bob Brauer, Cal Caplan, Stanley Clark, Bill Dinehart, Myoung-ja Lee Kwon, Michael Leung, Julia Norton, Arthurlene Towner,

Meeting convened 9:32 (after BAC meeting).

Agenda approved as is.

Minutes March 5, 2004, approved as corrected. Minutes for March 12, 2004, approved as is.

Chair’s report.
Langan: Fall schedules are being prepared now and are based on worst case scenarios (even worse than scenario just shared by Erway and Metz in BAC meeting). This is a problem because scheduling happens 6 months in advance. We may well therefore be offering fewer classes than we need to in order to maintain FTES.
Norton: Intelligent planning can make adjustments (cut or add sections in later quarters).
Lopez and Sawyer: This does not work readily in programs that admit cohorts of students.
Clark: Provost’s Office has not asked the deans to schedule based on worst-case scenarios.
Leung: College of Science did plan on 15% cuts (worst case), but asked chairs to identify sections that can be added online. Science can make adjustments later in the year because it does not have the cohort problem.
Levine: Is the fall quarter critical for enrollment?
Clark: Fall is traditionally the biggest enrollment quarter. Fall enrollments have been used as a barometer of changes in enrollment.
Wort: Departments have been operating on maintaining high enrollments for fall, fearing cuts for winter and spring.
Clark: Deans have asked departments to determine annualized schedules attempting to maximize enrollments in sections.
Rees: The effect of the number of sections offered on total FTES should be moderated by changes in practices to be implemented.
Towner: Her college is mostly graduate, they did complete their annual schedule by March to try to maximize their contribution to the budget reduction.

Langan: ULC made other recommendations besides just increasing overall SFR.

Levine: You cannot continue to increase class size and continue to do the same job. You cannot teach writing well in large courses. Multiple choice exams go up. This will effect the quality of our graduates.

Langan: The statewide senate recommended holding the line on SFR because of these kinds of concerns. But some classes can be increased in size without large impacts.

Garbesi: Impacts might be more trackable if we consider the impact on general education, specifically those courses that require writing. Our GE program and educational philosophy is based on learning writing ‘across the curriculum’. Lifting caps on these courses will have a significant adverse impact on our ability to teach students to write well.

Levine: We want to make sure that it is explicitly acknowledged that the proposed cuts will increase SFR and impair the quality of education.

Leung: Science is attempting to modify the impacts of SFR increases by considering impacts on a department-by-department basis. But there is only so much subsidizing that can occur without sinking the College as a whole.

Wort: Each program should document the quality compromises that are occurring as a result of cuts. Otherwise we appear to be doing more for less.

Rees: We have to be very careful about how we track and discuss reductions in quality lest they further reduce enrollments.

Langan: Wort might want to develop a proposal for the Senate. Reimonenq has expressed frustration that FTES targets are ineffective because there are no costs of not meeting them. Dollar-based budgeting was stopped half way. Departments never got any advantages of better budgeting.

Andrews: Supports Langen’s view that departments be given more leeway to achieve targets.

Langan: There should be an incentive of an increased allocation for departments that increase their FTES.

Clark: You cannot do annual scheduling and then cut some departments in order to compensate others for enrollment increases. This is better accomplished by having Academic Affairs set aside funds at the outset for increased allocations to departments where merited.

Other discussion.

Wort: Were there any ideas on managing cuts from the Statewide senate meeting?

Levine: How are we doing relative to others?

Norton: SFS Engineering is being closed down and Athletics is being eliminated. Some campuses have more reserves than we do that can be cut.

Langan: How far along are we in achieving COBRA’s goals for AY 03/04?

Lopez: It may make sense now to establish a subcommittee of COBRA to develop proposals for how to evaluate all of the data that we have gotten.

Rees: Would be a waste of time to do that before May 28th meeting.
Sawyer: Wants to learn more. For example, he’d like to learn more about subunits of ABA. For example, we might benefit from hearing about Human Resources (Gregory Poe), Facilities Management (Ricardo Sanchez), and Neal Hoss (Accounting and Financial Services), and Risk Management (Rick Thompson).

Garbesi: Can President Rees tell us if there are particular units that are particularly hard stressed?

Rees: They all are.

Mangold: Agrees with Rees that it does not make sense to analyze the data now, while the numbers are still changing.

Langan: Summing up: He will seek input from Poe, Hoss, and Sanchez.

**Upcoming meetings scheduled for April 16, April 30th, and May 7th**

These must suffice to prepare us for the May 28th BAC meeting and our report to the Senate.

**Meeting adjourned:**

Respectfully submitted,

Karina Garbesi, Secretary