

## **Minute - m03-30-04**

**TUESDAY, March 30, 2004**

**2:00 - 4:00 p.m.**

### **Senate Members Present:**

Aaron, Eunice	Gemello, John	Nichols, Amy
Alvarez, Alvin	Gerson, Deborah	Noble, Nancy
Avila, Guadalupe	Gonzales, Dan	Palmer, Pete
Bartscher, Patricia	Gregory, Jan	Pong, Wenshen
Bernard-Powers, Jane	Guerrero, Jaimes	Rocchio, Jean
Bernstein, Marian	Heiman, Bruce	Shrivastava, Vinay
Boyle, Andrea	Houlberg, Rick	Smith, Brett
Carrington, Christopher	Irvine, Patricia	Smith, Miriam
Chelberg, Gene	Jerris, Scott	Steier, Saul
Chen, Yu Charn	Kassiola, Joel	Stowers, Genie

Cherny, Robert

Langbort, Carol      Suzuki, Dean

Colvin, Caran      Liou, Shy-Shenq      Ulasewicz, Connie

Daniels, Robert      Mak, Brenda      Van Dam, Mary Ann

Edwards, James      McKeon, Midori      Vaughn, Pamela

Fielden, Ned      Meredith, David      Williams, Robert

Garcia, Oswaldo      Morishita, Leroy      Yang, Nini

**Absent:**

Batista, Natalie; Bohannon,

Tara (excused); Contreras, A. Reynaldo; Corrigan, Robert (excused); Fung,

Robert (excused); Hom, Marlon (excused); Klironomos, Martha (excused); Otero,

Aina J.; Scoble, Don (excused); Terrell, Dawn

**Visitors:** Bebee,

James; Benton, Peggy; Bomar, Kit; Buttlair, Dan; Collier,

James; Gangi, Ahmad; Garcia, Velia;

Giardina, Richard; Griffith, Ellen; Guerrero, A. J.; Hallum, Ann; Holden,

Michael; Krishnan, V. V.; Linder, Martin; McClear,

Sheila; Rood, Jonathan; Saffold, Penny; Shahnasser,  
Hamid; Stec, Loretta; Veeder,  
Jane; Whitaker, Gail

**CALL TO ORDER:2:10 p.m.**

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chair**Edwards**

announced that the CSU Statewide Academic Senate would be meeting on campus this Thursday and Friday, while the Campus Chairs would be meeting here on Thursday only.

## **CHAIR'S**

REPORT

Chair**Edwards** briefly

commented on the March 10 summit at Long Beach regarding CSU budget issues. Included at the meeting were the Chairs of the

campus senates, campus Presidents and Presidents of the campus? Associated Students. He reported that some

interesting concepts were raised and that the prior Director of the Department of Finance, Russell **Gould**, analyzed

current problems and compared our current budget situation to the budget crisis of the early 1990s. At that time there

were issues caused by the loss of jobs and tax revenues, a situation that

righted itself with an economic recovery and the return of revenue. Presently, the job loss is only one third of

that in the past, and now is more directly related to the general fund, which

supports the infrastructure. By 1999 the general fund tax revenues were 25% of the fund, which by 2000 had and are now indefinitely gone.

Chair **Edwards** invited State Senator **Cherny** to supply more details.

Senator **Cherny** noted that Russell **Gould's** presentation was as good as far as it went, and emphasized capital gains tax as the main source of revenue. He was disappointed however, that **Gould** did not go far enough with his analysis of the state's budget history.

The recession of the early 1990s was a regular cyclical occurrence but also coincided with the end of the Cold War resulting in a drastic restructuring of the California economy. California received the lion's share of military spending and of federal funding in general; funding sources that have now largely disappeared. Since the early 1990s California has had a higher unemployment rate than the rest of the country, and what **Cherny** described as a "disappearing middle class" syndrome. Early 1990s economic changes that did not go way meant that the middle class has been shrinking - a phenomenon that is not altogether understood. A large reduction

of stable blue-collar jobs has occurred in California - the former good-paying union jobs have gone

elsewhere. Job growth in 1990s was primarily

in the service and high tech sectors, with the former characterized as poor

paying and unstable employment. Another

part of the middle class moved upward, but California has ended up with a very different tax structure. This has been artificially

buoyed by stock options and high tech growth, which raised expectations for

education funding. Some of the money

went to long-term energy contracts. So

the current conclusion is that these changes now mean a return of the situation

to a pre-dot com state, a return with no relief in sight. We have never really

recovered from earlier downturns. Cuts

made now will not go away and this is has become our new reality.

### **AGENDA ITEM #1 - APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA FORMarch 30,**

2004

**Houlberg,**

Steier m/s/p

### **AGENDA ITEM #2 - APPROVAL OFMINUTES**

FOR **March 9, 2004**

**Palmer,**

Shrivastava m/s/p

### **AGENDA ITEM #3**

-REPORT?JOHN M. GEMELLO, PROVOST & VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS and

## LEROY MORISHITA, VICE PRESIDENT ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE - BUDGET SITUATION

Chair

**Edwards** introduced Provost **Gemello** and Vice President of Finance **Morishita** asserting that they are striving to keep the budget process as transparent as possible. He encouraged senators to ask questions, either from their own personal perspectives or those from those of their constituents.

**Morishita** distributed a handout explaining the campus budget and a three-page document from the University Budget Committee that was shared with the Senate Executive Committee that morning. These may be revised by taking into account any revenue changes. The figures have been based on the Governor's budget with \$8 million coming from increased fees. The Governor has proposed one set of increases while the CSU has countered with a different plan. Reductions total \$14 million this year; this is a transitional budget.

The far right column addresses the 2003-04 reduction to the budget before the Governor's budget. It shows how we will address the shortfall. There remains a \$13.9 million problem for next year. This does not include the student fee increase, endorsed by the students but still awaiting the Chancellor's signature, a situation that is hopeful but not yet definite.

Senator **Houlberg** noted the beginning of the

?bloodletting? and asked when the campus would know more.

Chair

**Edwards** suggested waiting until the end of the talk for discussion questions, unless there were clarification issues.

Senator **Steier** asked what the acronym SEVIS meant in the document.

**Morishita** was not sure but indicated

that it tracked the international students' data. [Official title is Student & Exchange Visitor Information System -

recorder's note.]

**Morishita** noted that the second sheet

of the Operating Budget hand out showed the campus response to permanent reductions. There was a CMS reduction, a

Master Card reduction, and a classroom improvement reduction. The third column

showed a savings of \$11.8 million. On

the Cabinet Area Reduction Summary the column in blue is based on the

Governor's proposed budget. SFSU has

taken \$1 million out of deferred maintenance, which will need to be replaced,

but not immediately. In executive areas,

there were cuts in student assistants, as well as the close of the Office of

Human Relations, which by consolidation has saved \$400,000. The work study match is reduced. All these have reduced general fund, but there

is still more to do.

**Gemello** noted that **Morishita**

had pointed out ways that we have to reduce the \$10 million shortfall. He wanted to outline where we are for planning

purposes.

Two

planning processes exist: a long range plan, which will address what would be best for the university in terms of its

programs, and also a short range plan that would be similar to this year,

involving across the board cuts although of greater magnitude. The university will possibly apply some

short-term reductions to get through the year and the long-range plan would be

for fall 2006.

**Gemello** thought the goal was to

have a plan by the end of April and wanted to know if senators found that

feasible and presented an outline of the plan.

The

university has identified \$800,000 coming from units reporting directly to the

Provost. A second stage would be the phase-out of general fund remedial courses

by fall 2006. We might offer classes through

continuing education or through the community colleges. We will need to wait two years for this phase so there will be adequate

time for testing.

The

remainder of the reductions would come from programmatic reductions, and he

reminded senators of the broad vs. deep and narrow approaches, and the administration's preference for the latter. He pointed out that some units could not handle the reductions. The campus administration has decided, with input from a variety of campus bodies, how to continue with the reductions. He has met with College Deans, the Senate Executive Committee, the Senate and Department Chairs, as well as conducting Town Hall meetings each month, and everywhere there has been some discussion.

The

current plan is for the Deans to meet during the following week and then provide their proposals. The Deans would make their cases, and then he and the President would make a plan to bring before the University Budget Committee.

No programs would be identified before then, but for unusual reasons, two programs have been named already.

The

College of Business has some plans to move some degrees to a self-support system. One reduction approach is to reduce the general fund, and another approach is to keep programs but fund them differently and not from the general fund. He commented that the College of Business has a better chance to go to self-support than any other unit and so had been given a larger than proportionate reduction. He mentioned a \$2.3 million target had been proposed to the Dean, who would discuss this with the departments to see if and how that could happen.

He

noted that the other program made public was the proposed consideration for reduction or discontinuance of three of the engineering degrees - civil, mechanical, and electrical. He asserted that there have

been no decisions about any programs for discontinuance at this time.

Engineering has not been on the table but will be considered. Several factors led to this status. There were

four tenure-track searches in that department that needed offers, and he did

not want to make any offers until more sure of the future. It did not make sense to continue. The Dean then told faculty what was up. He

emphasized that he was not playing semantic games - and that contrary to rumor,

no decision had been made that Engineering was targeted or ?on a list.?

When

Deans had come to meet with the President and himself, they proposed different

things to save money, but the results were not sufficient. He thought that it was not possible to solve

the crisis by finding small programs to shed, when we need programs of

significant size, which was why making bold decisions was important.

He

expressed a desire to hear about the feelings of the group on this plan, when

it is formulated. He thought it prudent

to provide a proposal, and have it work its way through senate, with the

understanding that any changes to it would need to be balanced. Another alternative might be creating a

proposal that has more reductions than necessary and then alter it to fit

circumstances.

Senator

**Houlberg** indicated that **Gemello** had just answered his first

question but had a second question about the operating budget. He noted that the retirement rate increase had

approached 250% and wondered why its increase was so dramatic.

**Morishita** responded this reflected

that the university was being charged more. Benefits now comprise \$41 million

of our \$225 million budget. Wages and benefits together comprise \$176 million

of the budget.

Senator **Houlberg** thought that the golden

handshake might put some of the burden back on PERS.

**Morishita** indicated that the "golden

handshake" was on the Governor's desk but that he has not signed it yet.

Senator

**Daniels** indicated that looking at the senate discontinuance policy there

were three decision variables: importance to the institution, quality of the

program and demand for the program. He

asked if we have any data on program costs and whether it could be made public.

**Gemello** indicated that we do not

have it all yet, but it would be gathered.

Senator

**Williams** noted the \$9.7 million deficit, and it sounded like there might be another \$5 to \$7 million more a year from now. He wanted confirmation of these numbers. He also questioned whether we should be providing a plan that can account for a \$14 million deficit. He encouraged senators to speak up.

**Morishita** indicated that while we do not know the true extent of next year's budget, it would be worse by a minimum of \$7 billion for the state next year.

**Gemello** commented on the possibility of next year having more reductions, another reason for deep and narrow now. The uncertainty of the future has driven the university to consider deep and narrow cuts.

Senator

**Stowers** asked about the fiscal status of CEL, whether they are truly contributing a \$1 million to the university and if they continue to contribute department and college shares to the university.

**Gemello** noted that Gail **Whitaker** had worked hard to turn CEL around and is definitely moving towards self-support activities and should be very valuable for the university in the future.

Senator

**Stowers** indicated that her college of BSS had made recommendations, and that whatever administration decided, she noted that the BSS recommendations

were totally faculty developed, and hoped that they would be considered carefully.

**Gemello** expressed thanks to departments and colleges for their input.

Senator

**McKeon** expressed some surprise to learn that the Provost would meet with the Deans next week. Her college council meeting was occurring this Thursday, which would not give enough time for the Department Chairs to consult with their faculty. She asked if the Provost would consider replacing the timeline so that faculty could collectively consider proposals.

**Gemello** hoped that the Dean had picked a time that would work and take into account council meeting input.

Senator

**Shrivastava** thanked the Provost for multiple, informative presentations. He asked that, similar to budget reduction plans, if there were parallel plans for raising more funding from other sources.

**Gemello** responded that indirectly the answer was yes. The university was limited in the ways it could round up additional revenue. There are two main sources: Research and Sponsored Programs has done good development and has generated external funding through grants, and the advancement office has been productive. The third potential source

is self-support.

Senator

**Shrivastava** observed that there were several hiring processes in progress and asked if these would be frozen.

**Gemello** responded in the negative,

indicating that the hiring pools were currently very strong. The university was in a budget crisis now, but

it would remain a university for long time. If it could hire outstanding new faculty now, it should do that. He had urged Deans

and Chairs to take excellent people, but not make marginal hires. He estimated that probably only a third of

projected hires would be made offers.

Senator **Shrivastava** asked about the status of administrative searches.

**Gemello** indicated that the searches

had pretty well run their course and there would be no real savings by halting them.

Senator

**Ulasewicz** posed two questions. She

asked what would be cut, and if there was a reorganization plan, whether it was being offered to people.

**Gemello** indicated that he and the

President had asked the last six Academic Senate Chairs for advice. He felt that they had

given some thought to

consolidating colleges and commented that any reorganization plan would have to come to the senate.

Senator

**Ulasewicz** provided some feedback on the timing, expressing a preference for knowing sooner rather than later and that if the university needed to make a cut of  $x$ -million dollars, she would prefer a longer range option.

Senator

**Pong** asked about the criteria used to identify the Program of Engineering, noting its great record of hiring minority students. What were the criteria? Would you reconsider the narrow and deep approach as over 50 faculty members would be affected.

He thought there would be great damage from that action.

**Gemello** could not provide criteria yet as it had not been developed, but he affirmed that Engineering had been identified as a potential program. He noted that when programs were identified, the proposal would come to senate, and would need to meet the established criteria. He did not think that 50 tenure-track faculty would be affected.

Senator

**Krishnan** asked about the nature of deep vs. across the board cuts. He was unconvinced that all options had been taken. Looking at deep cuts means talking about programs, and that three numbers had been mentioned: student/faculty ratios,

faculty size, and student body size, where in fact it was important to go beyond that. Questions such as 'is the program good for the university?' and 'what affect does the program have on the university?' need to be asked. He related how the department faculty had come to hear about the news, and that the Dean had 'told them their rights?' and that it was a complete surprise, and hoped for more transparency in the future.

**Gemello** indicated that in a variety

of venues he had never really advocated for across the board cuts. His major point was that across the board cuts

do not work in a sustainable fashion. Is

this fair? He indicated some of the

problems that come with across the board cuts. He said that administration had made the decision to go deep and narrow. He was

unsure of whether to stick with figures when considering programs - the criteria had not been developed yet. As

to whether the department was good, he commented that every program on the list was going to be a good program. Thirdly

he indicated that one reason that the Engineering Department had gotten short notice was that the Dean himself had received short notice. This had been the administration's idea, not

the Dean's. The Dean had not been told

that Engineering would be cut, only that that was a possibility.

Senator **Daniels** asked about the implications

of more immediate cuts on lecturer faculty in the short term.

**Gemello** responded that he was not

sure what each college would do, but that the university could expect significant reductions in lecturer dollars. This would be a college decision.

Senator

**Chen** commented that in the past, there had been talk about college and department mergers. It was a huge shock to hear about the potential discontinuance of Engineering. He urged considering proportional cuts as an option.

**Gemello** responded that to him ?proportional? meant across the board. He indicated that the term ?program? was meant the same way it was used in senate policy - it could be a department, an undergraduate or graduate degree or a concentration.

Senator

**Alvarez** observed that programmatic cuts seemed inevitable, but were not defined yet. What would happen to faculty? He asked what would faculty options be within those programs - reassignment, elimination, etc. and what were the criteria about the status of faculty affected.

**Gemello** responded that for faculty in individual programs, it would depend. Lecturers would probably not be rehired. Tenure-track faculty had guidelines in the collective bargaining agreement that covered this situation. Layoffs would mean mitigations - the university would talk to other campuses with other programs. Possibly faculty skills might transfer to other departments, and the university would work with faculty.

Senator

**Gregory** observed that the senate body was distressed and that it could become itself a source of rumors. She urged senators to think before speaking and of the need to make sure of the veracity of facts disseminated. She noted that the university is not in layoff mode yet. She noted that the Faculty Rights panel would field any questions about potential employment issues.

**AGENDA ITEM #4 --**

JONATHAN ROOD, ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - NEW PROCEDURE

FOR FILTERING SPAM FROM CAMPUS EMAIL ACCOUNTS -INFORMATION ITEM

Jonathan

**Rood**, Associate Vice President for Information Technology, began by observing that everyone on campus at this point was aware of the problems with spam. He noted that 50% of 200,000 the incoming emails per day to campus is now spam. The real solution is legislation, and California has a good anti-spam plan in place, although the federal legislation, effective January 1, was a watered-down solution. Laws will help but we still need more and better ones. Spoofing, the deceptive practice of stealing email addresses and attaching them to email, is a real problem. It serves no purpose, and the university sought to identify and block spam before it hit campus inboxes. Until now spam blocking has been user controlled. Many people however, still complain and want more. We want to talk about a path to remove the most aggressive spam before it hits our door.

Senator

**Gregory** attempted publicly to share responsibility for the resolution with Senators **Fielden** and **Cherny**, as well as Vice President **Rood**.

**AGENDA ITEM #5 -**

RECOMMENDATION from the EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - RESOLUTION on BLOCKING SPAM - a *consent*

item - 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> readings

Chair

**Edwards** noted he had asked for humor in preparation of this from Senator **Gregory**.

**Nichols,**

Jerris m/s/p

Senator **Jerris** read the resolution.

Senator **Steier** ruefully but indignantly noted that if spam were restricted, his ability to redress certain personal anatomical deficiencies would be obliterated.

Senator **Carrington**

asked about the nature of the criteria used for identifying spam. Some of these methods use the same mechanisms

employed to protect children from the Internet. He wanted to know how our system will operate

and did not want us to move too far in the wrong direction.

## **Rood**

indicated that the criteria would be no different from current criteria, only changing whether the user would receive the mail or not. The spam ?rule set? is generated by words, with different triggers. He mentioned ?spam assassin? as the university?s open source solution. If a rule set is blocking material inappropriately, there were ways to modify and fine-tune the software.

Senator**Carrington** still expressed concern about the effect this might have on academic study.

**Rood** suggested multiple solutions and expressed willingness from his office to work with faculty.

Senator**Cherny** indicated that he had a similar question, now answered.

## **SenatorWilliams**

asked whether there might be some technical language that could be put into resolution to give it more meaning.

## **Rood** noted

the constantly changing world of spam and how rules would change, then the spammers would change, and that it was difficult to pin down terminology.

## **Morishita**

seconded the notion of the threshold?s capacity for modification. It was possible to make arrangements to allow certain addresses through.

Senator **Houlberg**

wanted to know what the meaning of sending the resolution to the local media outlets was in the last resolved clause.

Senator **Gregory** responded that this is a traditional response to items of public interest.

Senator **Houlberg** was unconvinced that it was a good idea to broadcast this apparently frivolous resolution to the media.

**AGENDA ITEM #10?Adjournment?4:00 p.m.**

**Meeting Date (Archive):**  
Tuesday, March 30, 2004

---