Attendees: Bob Cherny, Marshelle Thobaben, David McNeil, Lynne Cook, John Tarjan, Cristy Jensen

Visitors, September 8th: Lori Roth, Keith Boyum, Cheryl Jung, Ted Anagnoson, Barry Pasternack, Bob Snyder (via phone), Unny Menon (via phone), Ann Peacock, David Spence

Visitors, September 9th: Ted Anagnoson, Kathy Kaiser, Jan Gregory, Ann Peacock, Marvin Klein, Hank Reichman

Visitors: Ann Peacock

CO Staff at Agenda Setting, September 10th: Chancellor Reed, David Spence, Keith Boyum, Jackie McClain

1. Approval of agenda

2. Minutes
   2.1. Approval of minutes of August 19, 20 ex com meeting
   2.2. Two copies of notes will come out of our meetings
       2.2.1. Notes for internal usage
       2.2.2. Minutes for posting on the web site

3. Announcements and Reports:
   3.1. Chair's report
   3.2. David/John will draft a message from the Chair for the newsletter

4. A summary of issues/concerns for this year could be useful for campus senate reps, other usages—we will try to draft something.

5. Visitors/Presentations
   5.1. Lorie Roth
       5.1.1. Introduced Cheryl Jung, ITL Staff, Exchanges Editor
5.1.2. Harold Goldwhite will be returning soon to ITL
5.1.3. There have been large budget cuts but AA will try to maintain *Exchanges* and regional faculty workshops
5.1.4. The annual Teacher-Scholar Summer Institute is on hold for the time being
5.1.5. The next ITL Regional meeting will be held on September 18th at the Maritime Academy with the theme “Scholarship of Teaching and Learning” presented by Carol Holder. It is being organized by Bunny Paine-Clemes.
5.1.6. There are many new campus faculty development directors coming on board.
5.1.7. On September 17th the ITL Board will get together to brainstorm about the direction, priorities for the ITL into the future.
  5.1.7.1. Evolving faculty roles
  5.1.7.2. What is the role of the ITL in the future? (Only to facilitate teaching?)
5.1.8. Cheryl has researched the functioning of similar units in other university systems.
5.1.9. January 28th Board Meeting—will be looking at national trends.
5.1.10. There is a trend nationwide towards hiring faculty specialists (focusing exclusively on teaching or research).
5.1.11. Service Learning is under the mandate of ITL—got added to ITL rather than developing another group to oversee it.
5.1.12. One issue to be considered at the January meeting is the feasibility of seeking outside funding for ITL.

5.2. Keith Boyum
5.2.1. Communication with the campuses continues to be a top priority.
5.2.2. Is working closely with Marshall Cates and Ted Anagnoson on the LDTP project
  5.2.2.1. November 13th: Orientation of discipline leaders—ExComm invited to attend.
  5.2.2.2. Ethnic Studies majors were added to the initial list of majors.
  5.2.2.3. December 4th, 11th: about half of the programs will meet at LAX.
  5.2.2.4. January 29th: remaining disciplines will meet in the north—coincides with the IMPAC SF meeting.
5.2.3. There is a strong desire to have the CO maintain lists of department chairs throughout the system.
5.2.4. We need to keep both department chairs and senates involved in the LDTP.

5.3. Student Fee Working Group
5.3.1. Conversations have been held between CO Sacramento staff, CSSA and senate work groups but all 3 groups have never met together at one time.
5.3.2. The senate Student Fee Work Group consisted of McGough, Jensen, Menon, Anagnoson and Pasternack.
5.3.3. The major issues involved are the appropriate burden on students of the cost of instruction and the phase-in (ramp-up) period.
5.3.4. The senate passed 2 resolutions last year regarding student fees—we supported a 25% cap and an 8-year ramp-up.
5.3.5. The group had access to data this summer to help guide decision-making.
5.3.6. CSSA has been closely involved with AB 2710.
  5.3.6.1. It puts a limit of a 30% support burden on CSU students (even though they had been hoping for a 25% cap that we supported).
  5.3.6.2. It puts a ceiling of 8% per year on fee increases.
5.3.7. There are tradeoffs between fees, state support, quality, access and equity for CSU employees.
5.3.8. Determining the “cost of instruction” can greatly impact upon student fees, regardless of the target student burden.
5.3.9. Other systems charge significantly more—but they do not have a Master Plan
5.3.10. There are side effects of a low fee policy with liberal financial aid.
   5.3.10.1. Subsidizing middle class citizens who can afford to pay.
   5.3.10.2. Lost monies in Pell grants (shifting the burden from the federal to the state government).
5.3.11. We need to have a clear position on fee targets, graduate differentials and ramp-up times when dealing with the BOT and the legislature.
5.3.12. This is a very difficult area to come up with sufficient information to support one stance over another—also, the Senate is somewhat divided.
5.3.13. Karen Zamarripa is in a difficult position—trying to develop a united front with the Senate, CSSA, BOT.
5.3.14. The Board definition of the cost of education includes fees, state funding and “budget deficiencies” but excludes any consideration of capital costs.
5.3.15. How can we get a sense of the Senate? Resolution? —Potential points:
   5.3.15.1. Adhering to the Master Plan
   5.3.15.2. Public Good
   5.3.15.3. Predictable and Gradual Fee Increases
   5.3.15.4. Numbers for Caps, Ramp-up
5.3.16. A fee policy should not be considered without considering financial aid—we should focus on how to fund the cost of a high quality education.
5.3.17. Perhaps we can take a general stance on funding/fees and remain silent on fee targets.

5.4. David Spence
5.4.1. Will be with early assessment coordinators/California performance review group tomorrow.
5.4.2. Spence will discuss the following at the California Performance Review meeting at LA tomorrow.
   5.4.2.1. The CSU opposes fee waivers in lieu of Cal grants.
   5.4.2.2. We oppose CCs offering BAs.
   5.4.2.3. Transfer/the need for transfer AAs.
   5.4.2.4. Accountability measures—we support adopting the current CSU approach as the standard.
5.4.3. Question: Does the proposed community service requirement have legs?—We will take the prior approach of mandating presidents to make opportunities available to all students desiring it.
5.4.4. A Graduate Education Task Force should be initiated.
   5.4.4.1. Joint Provosts, Grad Deans, Senators
   5.4.4.2. Will address funding
   5.4.4.3. Will address workload
   5.4.4.4. Could look at accountability measures
5.4.5. Ed Leadership Item on BOT Agenda—we can ensure appropriate faculty consultation through the development of specific objectives/procedures for these programs—TEKR to draft a resolution acknowledging receipt/praising the
5.5. New senators orientation – Cherny Presentation

6. Discussion:

6.1. Planning for ATAC meeting (September 30 in San Francisco)
6.1.1. ATAC sets policy and makes recommendations re the funding of technology projects.
6.1.2. Gerry Hanley and David Ernst are the CO leads for technology initiatives.
6.1.3. It would probably be easier for campus faculty to react to potential projects rather than having them try to initiate ideas.
6.1.4. Hanley has not done detailed cost/benefit analyses but has had a great deal of input from various sources.
6.1.5. There needs to be faculty input in developing/prioritizing projects.

6.2. Planning for ICAS meeting (September 17)
6.2.1. We will send 5 representatives.
6.2.2. David should discuss the LDTP
6.2.3. We should add the Student Bill of Rights.
6.2.4. CAN—we need to get the implementation plan draft from Judy Osman/Allison Jones ASAP before the meeting next week.
6.2.5. CAN—relationship with LDTP, IMPAC (should discuss with Osman/Jones next Tuesday).
6.2.6. We should encourage UC to participate more fully in Intersegmental initiatives.

6.3. Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee (SBAC) (to meet October 7)
6.3.1. Rethinking compensation

6.4. Disciplinary leads for IMPAC
6.4.1. In the past participants (and often leads) have self-selected to participate in IMPAC and hence may not necessarily be the best persons to become a lead. We may want to vet the names of potential leads through councils/CSU faculty.
6.4.2. Naming of rotating discipline leads.

6.5. BOT/Ed Policy Agenda Item 3: Recommendations of Presidents’ Task Force on Ed Leadership Programs
6.5.1. Very prescriptive on the content, pedagogy of the programs.
6.5.2. May set a poor precedent on process since there was minimal faculty review/input/approval (likely to not cause problems on content—it is a process problem).
6.5.3. Lots of the consultation in this area takes place through the Education deans rather than with faculty.

6.6. California Performance Review
6.6.1. 12,000 items of suggested actions
6.6.2. 80% would require legislative actions
6.6.3. 20% could be accomplished through executive order
6.6.4. CC offering of Bas to be discussed next week at ICAS.

7. We should develop a written, electronic list of pending legislation to hand out to Senators, communicate to all CSU faculty.
8. Karen Zamarripa’s reports to the BOT go a long way towards shaping Board perceptions, actions plans. Faculty Affairs needs continue to “stay on top of” issues in conjunction with ExComm.

9. Federal Funding
   9.1. Eisenhower grants have concluded
   9.2. $8m in new funding will be available—CPEC to administer
   9.3. CO is interested in helping students to transition to the next level through teacher development.

10. Lower Division Transfer Project (LDTP)
    10.1. We have not yet started naming facilitators.
    10.2. ExComm will name the facilitators, not the discipline group.
    10.3. It may be awkward to be both a facilitator and a campus representative.
    10.4. There may be some problems with naming a facilitator that is not a part of the group.

11. Communications from CSU faculty to chairs, systemwide committees may increase dramatically with the publication of the new newsletter.
    11.1. Chairs, liaisons may be able to forward inquiries to appropriate staff at the CO.

12. Discussion of Senator preferences for committees, the need to staff committees, the principle of spreading Senators across campuses.

13. Agenda Setting with Standing Committee Chairs
    13.1. At what time will liaisons attend committee meetings?
    13.2. Academics Affairs—Ted Anagnoson
        13.2.1. Keith Boyum & Marshall Cates will update LDTP.
        13.2.2. Remediation—inappropriate labeling of students.
        13.2.3. Community Service Learning
            13.2.3.1. CSU position: we will provide opportunities for all but not make community service a mandate.
            13.2.3.2. Could this have the unfortunate consequence of substituting free labor for paid labor?
        13.2.4. Cost of Textbooks
        13.2.5. Inter-CSU Student Transfer Priority
        13.2.6. Resolution on Athletics (no post-season participation unless the team has a 50% 6-year graduation rate)
            13.2.6.1. We may prefer a less prescriptive approach
            13.2.6.2. A recent study has shown no relationship with athletic performance and donor giving
            13.2.6.3. Nation-wide graduation rates for athletes are higher than for the college population as a whole
        13.2.7. Ted has researched the Pew initiative on use of alternate technologies. The Liu bill with an unfunded mandate for us to explore the technologies has not made it out of the legislature.
        13.2.8. Community College Offering of BAs
        13.2.9. Update on SB 1785, SB 1415 by ExComm Liaisons?
    13.3. Faculty Affairs—Jan Gregory
        13.3.1. Will meet with Jackie McClain, John Travis.
13.3.2. Will not meet with Blaine Wright at this plenary.
13.3.3. Business Program Migration to Extended University
13.3.4. Morrow Bill (Student Bill of Rights), Grievance Policies, Student Rights & Responsibilities Statements
   13.3.4.1. Jan Gregory has developed a 2-page overview of campus policies, websites. Improvements are needed.
   13.3.4.2. Perhaps we should research further—item for next campus chairs meeting? Jan could attend with a time certain.
   13.3.4.3. Campus chairs were alerted to this at the last meeting in August.
   13.3.4.4. We should set a timeline so that we have sufficient information to present in Sacramento when this comes in front of the legislature next March.
      13.3.4.4.1. Existence of policies.
      13.3.4.4.2. Usage of procedures.
   13.3.4.5. It is difficult to come up with a remedy for non-grade-related student complaints. This impinges on collective bargaining matters. It should be discussed with John Travis.
13.3.5. Working relationship with AAUP
13.3.6. Graduate student relationship with UAW—we should have a joint CO/CFA briefing at a plenary on this.
13.3.7. Intellectual Property
13.3.8. LDTP—faculty control over curriculum
13.3.9. ACIP (international programs)—do members need to be faculty members?
13.3.10. Background Checks

13.4. Fiscal & Governmental Affairs—Hank Reichman
   13.4.1. Review of Pending Legislation
      13.4.1.1. SB 1785, SB 1415, AB 2710, AB 242, Textbook bills
   13.4.2. Federal Legislation Tracking
   13.4.3. Report from Patrick Lenz on Budget
   13.4.4. Report from Karen Zamarripa on Legislation
   13.4.5. Student Fees
   13.4.6. California Performance Review
      13.4.6.1. BAs by CCs
      13.4.6.2. Reorganization of Higher Education Bureaucracy
   13.4.7. Resolution on Intercollegiate Athletic Post-Season Participation

13.5. Teacher Education & K-12 Relations—Marvin Klein
   13.5.1. No Current Resolutions
   13.5.2. Will review a report from Beverly Young
   13.5.3. Review of California Teacher Education Report
      13.5.3.1. Bill Wilson or David Ray will eventually report
   13.5.4. CSET Test

14. Pre-Agenda Setting
   14.1. Student Fees
      14.1.1. Never had all groups together in the same room
      14.1.2. CO position, strategy

15. BOT Agenda
   15.1. Student Fees—we have a resolution in hand.
   15.2. Graduation Initiative Update—information only?
15.3. Early Assessment—timely receipt of test score needed. Programs need to be in place before scores come in. How will students be made aware of the resources available to them to bring them up to CSU standards?

15.4. Fast Track Program Development (3 programs)

15.5. Education Leadership Report
   15.5.1. We have a resolution
   15.5.2. Lynne will get a list of campuses with education leadership programs; we will forward our resolution, the BOT resolution and the URL for the report to all senators from the campuses that have these programs.

16. Meeting with Chancellor, Vice Chancellors. The following issues were discussed:
   16.1. Fee structure
   16.2. Naming of facilities
   16.3. Presidents Report on Educational Leadership
   16.4. Update on collective bargaining
   16.5. Budget
      16.5.1. Outlook
      16.5.2. Climate for higher education in Sacramento
      16.5.3. Above, below line requests

17. Pending Agenda Items
   17.1. Faculty Trustee Nominations
   17.2. Alumni Council meetings
   17.3. Development of guidelines/principles for making system-wide appointments
   17.4. Standing Committees web page update

Respectfully Submitted
John Tarjan
Secretary, Academic Senate CSU