Message from the Chair
John Tarjan (Bakersfield)

Welcome back to the new academic year. It certainly has been an interesting year so far, given the state of the State. I would like to highlight a few developments that impact faculty across the system.

Budget Developments
As we are all aware, the CSU continues to be underfunded. This underfunding will magnify the need on campuses to depend on increasing faculty and staff workload with the resulting decrease in the quality of the education we can provide for our students. That being said, the CSU fared better than most state agencies in the current fiscal year. The Governor’s proposal to cut 10% from the budget of each state agency was applied to the CSU only after Compact funding increases were applied to our base budget for 2008-09. In May, approximately 30% of that cut was returned to our base budget. Thus the new state budget provides the CSU system with essentially the same level of state support as was provided during the 2007-08 fiscal year. While this is reason to feel some relief and to acknowledge the good work of so many on the campuses, particularly the CSU Coalition, it still leaves the campuses and the system in a precarious financial situation. We expect to continue to enroll thousands of students for which the State provides no funding and to continue to fall behind in essential areas including the restoration of an appropriate proportion of tenure-track faculty, enhancement of student support services, maintenance and upgrading of technology, maintenance of the infrastructure, and support for curricular initiatives and research. Given this unfortunate state of affairs, what can faculty do to advocate for our mission?

- We must continue to communicate to policy makers, particularly at the local level, the message that “The CSU is the Solution”. It is important to stress to representatives in your area how underfunding the CSU affects the quality, breadth and access of academic programs on your campus. This has been a very effective approach when all members of the CSU family (students, faculty, labor and administration) have been united. Many elected leaders have commented that this unity has given them the leverage to protect the CSU budget during this trying year.

- Continue to be involved in budgetary decision-making on your campus. In this regard, it may be useful to review the Board of Trustees statement on collegiality which, in part, states that, “The collegial process also recognizes the value of participation by the faculty in budgetary matters, particularly those directly affecting the areas for which the faculty has primary responsibility.”

Legislation Impacting Admissions Standards and Curriculum
It is likely that legislation related to Career and Technical Education (CTE) and other similar legislation will be considered again this year. CTE-related legislation which would have had the effect of separating CSU and UC admissions standards,
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was narrowly defeated during the summer due, in no small part, to faculty lobbying efforts. An Academic Senate CSU task force has been formed to monitor developments in this area.

Master Plan for Higher Education
Once again, several groups are considering potential revisions to the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. One recent revision was the authorization for the CSU to offer Doctorates in Education. A bill authorizing the CSU to offer Doctorates in Nursing Practice was defeated this year due to funding concerns. The Senate Education Committee and a group headed by former long-time state legislator, John Vasconcellos, are undertaking broad-ranging reviews. Academic Senate CSU representatives are monitoring these initiatives. At this point it is difficult to predict what direction these initiatives will take, but potential legislation could profoundly impact the mission of the CSU.

Transfer Initiatives
Work continues on two efforts to improve transfer. The Lower Division Transfer Patterns (LDTP) project requires the continued participation of discipline faculty to develop and approve course descriptors for lower-division courses in the major and to review course submissions from community colleges. A call is also going out to solicit discipline faculty participation in a complementary effort headed up by our community college colleagues called the Course Identification (C-ID) project. It is important to support these efforts to ensure that our transfer students come to us with the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in their major studies.

Information Security
Campus faculty and other groups will be asked to review proposed policies related to information security (acceptable use) and to undergo related on-line training. Both campuses and individuals are at risk if appropriate procedures are not followed. In an age when identity theft is all too common, we must all be informed and able to apply the most effective measures to protect our students, faculty and staff.

REPORTS

Faculty Trustee
Craig Smith (Long Beach)

Budget Vetoed by Governor

Full reports from the Board of Trustees meeting can be found at www.calstate.edu/BOT. The public committee meetings were held with, among others, the CSU presidents, the Lieutenant Governor, the Superintendent of Instruction, and members of the Academic Senate CSU Executive Committee in attendance.

Personal Note: I notified the Academic Senate CSU and the Board of Trustees that I would not be seeking nomination for another term as the Faculty Trustee. I will serve out my current term to July, 2009, ending my four years on the Board.

The Committee on Finance reviewed the support budget request. The alliance was successful in holding the support budget cut to a minimum for the CSU. However, the Governor vetoed the budget, which consists of 30 bills, arguing that it was irresponsible because it passed the deficit forward, did not provide safeguards for the “rainy day fund,” and borrowed against lottery funds. $45 million of the lottery funds that come to the CSU is protected in the legislation and the $45 million will grow in terms of inflation and FTES increases. No tax increases were included in the budget bills; however, accelerated tax collection and increased withholding was included. The faculty pay raise scheduled for July 1st will be paid retroactively once a budget is finally approved. Even if the budget is approved over the veto, the Governor still has the right to veto certain line items in the budget.

The Committee then moved on to next year’s budget (2009-10). The proposal for next year’s budget restores lost funds and fully funds the compact. It includes funding for deferred maintenance, ACR 73, and the usual items over the compact funding that we need in terms of nursing, math readiness, and special education teachers. These requests amount to $157 million.
The Committee approved $383 million in bonds for student housing facilities for Fullerton and Humboldt, a technology park building for San Luis Obispo, and a recreation center for Sacramento. Seismic plans were approved for various construction on various campuses. The Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds heard reports on capital outlays for a parking structure at Fullerton, the Simpson-Strong Tie Building and a technology park building for San Luis Obispo. In terms of environmental impact, the Committee heard about the approved ceilings in FTES at Bakersfield (18,000), San Diego (35,000), San Francisco (25,000), and Long Beach (31,000). The Seismic Safety Program was also reviewed. The Committee then approved acquisition of 369 acres for Channel Islands, and 7 acres of parcels for San Diego. It accepted donated interests in real estate for San Bernardino.

The Committee on Institutional Advancement approved the naming the Clayes Performing Arts Center at Fullerton, the Osher Center at San Bernardino, and the Lamden School of Accountancy at San Diego. The Committee then celebrated the Hearst/Trustees’ scholars, one from each campus who has overcome great personal difficulties to complete their degrees.

The Committee on University and Faculty Personnel heard the final reading for a proposed amendment to Title 5 regarding athletics employees with MPP status and paid administrative leave for MPP employees. The Committee also approved changes in the compensation rules for Vice Chancellors and those in the Transition program.

The Committee on Audit heard follow-up reports on various internal campus audits. A report on construction expenditures on six campuses was also heard.

The Committee on Education Policy approved five Fast Track programs, and heard reports on the Teacher Preparation Program Evaluation under the auspices of a Carnegie Grant, the status of the Ed.D. programs, and the California State University Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Initiatives. Instead of assessing our placed teachers based on the satisfaction reports by their employers, the Carnegie Grant allows the examination of actual learning outcomes and correlates them with our placed teachers.

The Committee on Governmental Relations heard report number 11. Legislation approving a change in Cal Grants and a Doctorate of Nursing is dead due to expense of the programs and budget fiascos. Other bills are in trouble given the Governor’s statement that he won’t sign any bills until he gets a better budget. These bills are described in the Agenda of Board of Trustees available online. Of particular concern is Senator Scott’s legislation (SB 325) which attempts to provide a framework for future bills related to education. There are propositions, such as 1A, 5, 12, on the November ballot that would increase the state’s debt and its debt service payments, thereby impacting the state budget negatively. Less general fund money would be available to the CSU and the UC. After the election in November there will be at least 39 new members of the legislature (11 in the Senate; 28 in the Assembly are termed out). Educating them on our issues will be critical to our future and future budget battles.

After public comments and constituency reports during the general board meeting, the above recommendations were affirmed and the reports were accepted.

Board Committee Chairs:
Melinda Guzman, Chair, Audit
Robert Linscheid, Chair, Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds
Lou Monville, Chair, Collective Bargaining
Herbert Carter, Chair, Educational Policy
William Hauck, Chair, Finance
Carol Chandler, Chair, Government Relations
George Gowgani, Chair, Craig Smith, Vice Chair, Institutional Advancement
Craig Smith, Vice Chair, Organization and Rules Debra Farar, Chair, University and Faculty Personnel
Executive Committee (EX)
Bob Buckley (Sacramento), Vice-Chair

At the September Plenary, questions were raised about the lack of faculty input in the drafting of the Access to Excellence Accountability Plan. As we reported, members of the Executive Committee had been “assigned” to each of the eight Commitments * as Chancellor’s Office staff began the process of identifying the scope of issues associated with each commitment and the data that might be useful in assessing the status of the CSU in each of these areas. Our involvement over the summer was very informal, meeting in most cases one-on-one with the assigned “Commitment” leader. As Executive Vice Chancellor Gary Reichard indicated, the product of this work resulted in a document, fifty-plus pages in length. This document was then reduced in length and published as the September 8th Access to Excellence Accountability Plan.

The scope of the work implicit in this twenty-page document is astounding. The plan proposes 46 system level actions (Section I) as well as 43 campus level actions (Section III) to achieve Access to Excellence Goals. Each of these 89 actions would require a significant amount of work. In addition, there are 18 indicators (Section II) to be used to gauge success in achieving the Access to Excellence goals represented by the proposed 89 proposed actions. Each indicator has associated metrics (Attachment 2). The total includes 84 metrics along with 42 additional “suggested” indicators (16 indicators are continuing Cornerstones Accountability Indicators, 48 are identified as NASH “Access to Success” Initiative Indicators, 20 are additional indicators, and 42 additional suggested indicators to assess institution-level progress).

What would seem to be obvious feedback on the Accountability Plan as specified is the inability to imagine how its implementation could be managed. Typically, strategic plans involve work on a limited and therefore manageable number of high priority goals.

Subsequently, Executive Vice Chancellor Reichard has suggested to Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) Chair John Tarjan that ASCSU be involved with the authoring of a number of “white papers” that would help focus and limit the work associated with this Accountability Plan. Such an effort could provide faculty with direct involvement with the planning and implementation of Access to Excellence. Executive Vice Chancellor Reichard and ASCSU Chair Tarjan will be discussing this approach between now and our November Plenary. Clearly, any effort to realistically limit the enormous scope of work laid out in the Accountability Plan document would seem to be a high priority.

The Eight Commitments:
1. Reduce Existing Achievement Gaps
2. Plan for Faculty Turnover and Invest in Faculty Excellence
3. Plan for Staff and Administrative Succession and Professional Growth
4. Improve Public Accountability for Learning Results
5. Expand Student Outreach
6. Enhance Student Opportunities for “Active” Learning
7. Enhance Opportunities for Global Awareness
8. Act on the CSUs Responsibilities to meet post-baccalaureate needs, including those of working professionals

Academic Affairs (AA)
James Postma (Chico), Chair

The horizon is still a bit hazy for the Academic Affairs Committee as it heads into the 2008-2009 academic year. In a nutshell, our charge is to oversee and help to guard the quality of the academic programs in the CSU. The biggest causes of this “morning haze” are the State and System budgets which continue to put tremendous pressure on the quality of our enterprise.

At our first meeting we put forth a resolution which supports a more streamlined curriculum approval process for minors, concentrations, emphases, and concentrations. We believe that this proposed structure achieves savings, especially in time, without threatening our quality-control systems.

We plan to study the issues of course fees (and other, similar fees) in the CSU. These seem to be proliferating in proportion to the red ink in Sacramento, but obviously have significant implications for access (and quality).
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Several of the items that we will be considering have significant overlap with the Faculty Affairs Committee or the Academic Preparation and Educational Programs Committee. These include an analysis of student evaluation of teaching and the health of various transfer programs, such as the Lower Division Transfer Program (LDTP).

Many hope that the use of technology will bring efficiencies to the student learning process that will help ease budget pressures (and pay dividends on our investments in technology.) The Academic Affairs Committee heard reports on the Compass Project (a joint project of the CSU with the state university systems in Oregon and Wisconsin) and will be evaluating the CSU’s Transforming Course Design projects (along with the Faculty Affairs Committee). It’s fair to say that our committee is broadly representative, including skeptics and proponents (but no Luddites, as far as I can tell).

Academic Preparation & Education Programs (APEP)
Steven Stepanek (Northridge), Chair

The APEP Committee launched its first full year of activities under its new title and Academic Senate CSU Bylaw responsibilities with a new dual focus on both academic preparation and education programs. During the 2008-09 academic year the Committee will be discussing such academic preparation issues as freshmen preparation, admission policies, LDTP and other transfer issues, early assessment activities, general education requirements, and student outreach and recruitment. In the area of education programs, the Committee will be discussing issues related to teacher preparation, doctoral degree programs, professional development for school administrators and counselors, as well as policies, legislation and regulations related to teacher education and credentialing.

During our first meeting of the academic year, the Committee was informed that the CSU Remediation Conference will occur on Oct 30 and 31. The primary intent of this conference will be the sharing of best practices within the system. The Troops to College initiative is also moving forward with outreach as the most important element.

AT&T has provided funding to sponsor The Road to College Bus Tour, a statewide outreach effort to students, parents, teachers and counselors on the importance of a college education. AT&T arranged for a customized 40-foot biodiesel bus to travel to high schools and college fairs to provide information about the CSU campuses, admissions and financial aid.

The current slow progress of acceptance of the LDTP Project by the California Community Colleges (CCC) was discussed and a resolution (AS-2866-08/APEP) was sent to and passed by the Academic Senate CSU in an effort to re-engage conversations between the CCC and CSU Academic Senate leadership and encourage CCC senate support for this program.

The impact of California Department of Education approved 8th Grade Algebra Initiative was discussed. It was announced that Executive Orders 1033 (GE Breadth, replacing EO 595) and 1036 (Admission Eligibility, replacing EO 365) have been signed and are now in affect systemwide.

We anticipate an exciting year of challenges and opportunities as the CSU moves forward with its student recruitment and retention efforts, community college outreach efforts, and new doctoral degree programs.

Academic Senator
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- A resolution in support for faculty development across the CSU system
- Compile a summary of areas of overlap between the CFA contract and Academic Senate CSU responsibilities

Additionally, Faculty Affairs will be meeting regularly with representatives from the Office of the Chancellor and the California Faculty Association (CFA). Our first meeting included the following reports:

- John Travis (CFA representative) reported on the Alliance for the CSU and the current concerns confronting CSU faculty should the Compact not be funded and the administration request a re-opening of the contract on faculty salaries.
- Lorie Roth (CO liaison to Faculty Affairs) reported on the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)/Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) and presented preliminary data on Cal State Northridge
- Beth Ambos (CO, Research Initiatives and Partnerships) presented a draft document titled “Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (RSCA) Report” which is a first-of-its-kind, systemwide survey of RSCA awards. Twenty of the twenty-three campuses have submitted data; a final report will be available after all twenty-three campuses are included.

Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (FGA)
Buckley Barrett (San Bernardino), Chair

FGA continued our traditional monitoring and advocacy efforts away from Long Beach throughout the Summer, and we look forward to a productive new year. Senators Krbacher, Hornbeck, Hood, and Soni provided yeoman service in closely watching and reporting activities in Sacramento from May through September and in advocating for the CSU during this active period when legislators struggled with the state budget and with various bills of interest.

We convened our first meeting of the new academic year on September 11, 2008 at the Chancellor’s Office. In addition to briefing each other on the budget and enrollment situations at each campus, FGA also spent time communicating with visitors regarding fiscal and legislative matters for the ending 2007-08 and approaching 2009-10 terms of the Legislature. We drafted two resolutions for consideration by the entire Academic Senate CSU.

Executive Vice Chancellor Robert Turnage spoke with us about the extraordinarily-extended state budget negotiations in Sacramento. He stressed that, thus far, all variant proposals for Fiscal Year 2008-09 provided relative protection for the CSU at the level of the May Revise -- that we would receive a $215 million cut instead of the $313 million reduction first suggested by the Governor in January 2008. John Travis from CFA discussed a number of issues with us and emphasized that the union has not given up hope on the CSU recovering some of the Compact dollars as previously promised. Wess Larsen (CO, Advocacy and Institutional Relations/AIR) visited with us via teleconference and summarized non-budget legislation. One key area of concern for 2009 deals with the likely resumption of efforts addressing Career Technical Education (CTE), faculty control of a-g admission courses, and greater enrollment of CTE teacher candidates.

Assistant Vice Chancellor Allison Jones called in from Washington, DC. He also emphasized the CTE challenges of the coming year, and described the need for legislation to decentralize Cal Grant management to the campus level for greater responsiveness and efficiency. FGA introduced two resolutions in September, both dealing with the budget. AS-2863-08/FGA concerns CSU budget priorities for 2009-10 and urges the Board of Trustees to request full funding for enrollment growth, plus original Compact dollars for this year and next, plus monies for designated additional challenges. This item received second-reading waiver and was approved unanimously. The second resolution, AS-2864-08/FGA, covers budget advocacy marketing and strategy and encourages a greater official role for Academic Senate CSU. This item will return in November for second reading and discussion.

As Academic Year 2008-09 unfolds, FGA will scrutinize events in Sacramento to gauge risks and opportunities within the developing dynamics of the legislative environment. We will watch and report on bills of interest and on budget matters in collaboration with Academic Senate CSU, its Executive Committee, and campus colleagues. We will provide faculty expertise and insight to the entire Senate and to the Office of the Chancellor as
appropriate. And, as in years past, we will strongly advocate official positions of Academic Senate CSU with the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, the Legislature, and the Executive Branch.

**Lower-Division Transfer Patterns (LDTP)**

Mark Van Selst (San José), Chair

At the most recent plenary meeting of the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU), a resolution was passed recommending that representatives from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate CSU and an academic administrative representative from the Office of the Chancellor meet with their equivalent counterparts from the Community College system. This resolution/request for a meeting arose out of concern regarding a growing lack of support for LDTP on the part of the California Community Colleges (CCC) as evidenced by the decision of at least several California Community College Articulation Officers to independently elect to not participate in LDTP-related processes (including course articulation, publication, and utilization of advising processes) and the active solicitation of others through a statewide intersegmental articulation officer listserv to join in this failure to participate.

In “A Memorandum of Understanding Between The California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor and The California State University, Office of the Chancellor” (August 9, 2005), authorized representatives from both systems stipulated that:

“The California State University Office of the Chancellor and the California Community Colleges Office of the Chancellor support student transfer from community colleges to the state’s four-year public universities as central to providing accessibility to a baccalaureate education for the people of California. Building on collaborative efforts of the past decade, the California State University and the California Community Colleges agree to expand transfer opportunities between the California Community Colleges and the California State University by implementing the provisions of this Memorandum of Understanding.” (page 1, preamble);

“All California State University and California Community Colleges will include descriptions of both the LDTP and Dual Admission Programs in their electronic and paper catalogs, class registration information, and all other appropriate publications identified by each system and campus. In addition, transfer centers as well as counselors and academic advisors will provide this information as they advise students. Information will also be posted to [www.californiacolleges.edu](http://www.californiacolleges.edu) and [www.csumentor.edu](http://www.csumentor.edu)” (page 7);

“CSU has committed to articulating all systemwide and campus-specific courses identified in the LDTP with all community colleges, and CSU will do all that is necessary to achieve this goal, including devoting sufficient staff. CSU faculty will identify course descriptors for all systemwide and campus-specific courses in each LDTP. Therefore, California Community Colleges will no longer be articulating a specific course with a specific CSU campus for LDTP majors. Rather, California Community Colleges will articulate a specific course to a course descriptor for that course that will be acceptable at all CSU campuses that offer that course. Articulation will be achieved in a variety of ways including the following.

“A course with a current CAN descriptor not being used for a statewide LDTP will be accepted as a campus-specific LDTP course within a major by those CSU campuses that have previously agreed on the CAN course descriptors for that campus-specific course until the course descriptors are refreshed and elaborated. Campuses that have not included that course for a campus-specific LDTP may articulate that course with community colleges either to fulfill other campus-specific LDTP requirements or for elective credit at that CSU campus. For courses that do not have a CAN descriptor, CSU will implement an articulation process similar to the IGETC course review process.

For the statewide LDTP courses, CSU faculty will identify a course descriptor for each course. All California Community Colleges will be invited to forward existing and new course outlines for review as fulfilling the CSU LDTP statewide course descriptor. If the CSU faculty determine the community college course outline satisfies the CSU course descriptor, the course will be accepted for articulation as a statewide major course for the relevant major.

For campus-specific LDTP courses, CSU faculty at campuses that have identified a campus-specific course common to their campuses will identify a course descriptor for the campus-specific course. All California Community Colleges will be invited to forward new and existing
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course outlines for review as fulfilling CSU campus-specific course descriptor. If the CSU faculty determine the community college course outline satisfies the CSU course descriptor, the course will be accepted for articulation as a campus-specific course at those CSU campuses that have identified that campus-specific course common to their campuses. Campuses that have not included that course for a campus-specific LDTP will accept that course for elective credit at that CSU campus.” (page 9-10).

Not surprisingly, several CSU departments had made the decision to adopt the descriptors developed through the LDTP process as the descriptor against which major-preparation courses should articulate. At this point, in the interests of efficiency, at least one department from each of two separate CSUs have adopted an explicit requirement that courses transferring in as major preparation courses must carry certified Transfer CSU (TCSU) course articulations.

Interestingly, a group of articulation officers within the CCC system have elected to not participate in submitting discipline course descriptors to the LDTP process for TCSU certification. Apparently this decision is based on a belief that (a) individual articulation officers are authorized to make the campus decision on whether or not to submit courses for LDTP, (b) that individual CSU departments do not have the curricular authority to establish requirements for their curriculum (including transfer courses), and (c) that individual CSU departments must provide course-to-course articulation even when those departments have explicitly identified the appropriate course content as identical to that of the TCSU course descriptor.

GEAC will hold its first meeting of this academic year on October 9. Two of the important items on its agenda are reports on the Compass Project, and the Troops to College Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the University of Maryland, University College (UMUC).

GEAC will also receive a report from members of the Steering Committee for the CSU’s participation in the Compass Project. This initiative involves three state systems, California, Oregon and Wisconsin. The project, funded by a Carnegie Corporation grant and guided by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, is to be faculty driven and focuses on strengthening the quality of learning by historically underserved students.

GEAC will also receive a report on the Troops to College Initiative from James Blackburn, Director of Enrollment Management Services for the Chancellor. Mr. Blackburn has created a preliminary draft of the proposed articulation patterns and will be seeking input from GEAC’s members.

General Education (GE)
Kevin Baaske (Los Angeles), Chair

Last year the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) recommended modest changes to Executive Order 595, the EO outlining the General Education Breadth Requirements for the CSU. These recommendations have been accepted by the Chancellor and he has issued a new EO 1033. One of the most important elements of this new EO is the identification of learning outcomes for GE. Each CSU campus is to define its GE within the framework of the four Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) essential outcomes:

- Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World
- Intellectual and Practical Skills
- Personal and Social Responsibility

Integrative Learning
Within this framework, campuses may identify more specific learning outcomes. The EO provides examples of specific outcomes that a campus may choose to utilize.

GEAC will receive a report from members of the Steering Committee for the CSU’s participation in the Compass Project. This initiative involves three state systems, California, Oregon and Wisconsin. The project, funded by a Carnegie Corporation grant and guided by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, is to be faculty driven and focuses on strengthening the quality of learning by historically underserved students.

GEAC will also receive a report on the Troops to College Initiative from James Blackburn, Director of Enrollment Management Services for the Chancellor. Mr. Blackburn has created a preliminary draft of the proposed articulation patterns and will be seeking input from GEAC’s members.
Ed.D. Faculty Consultation Group and CSU Doctorate of Education Advisory Committee
Darlene Yee-Melichar (San Francisco), Chair and Co-Covener

During the past year, the Ed.D. Faculty Consultation Group working with Dr. Christine Hanson (State University Dean, Academic Program Planning) reviewed three new Ed.D. program proposals: CSU East Bay, CSU Northridge and CSU Stanislaus. These programs were approved and have accepted their first complement of students for Fall 2008. During the Fall 2008 semester, the Ed.D. Faculty Consultation Group will be reviewing four additional Ed.D. program proposals: CSU Bakersfield, CSU Dominguez Hills, CSU Los Angeles, and San Jose State. These programs project implementation during AY 2009-10. During the September Board of Trustees meeting, Dr. Gary Reichard (Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer) highlighted the common features of CSU Ed.D. programs which include: rigor and excellence in professional preparation; partnerships with local P-12 schools and community colleges; involvement of expert practitioners; and focus on reforms that address regional educational problems. It is important to note that any campus with a previously approved independent Ed.D. degree, may add a specialization (P-12; Community College) by informing the CSU Office of the Chancellor their intention to do so and by going through the WASC review process.

A new committee, the CSU Doctorate of Education Advisory Committee was formed and met for the first time during the summer to address issues of systemwide concern. This committee worked with Dr. Beverly Young (Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs) to consider the following issues and actions:

• Endorsed the name change for the CSU Faculty Ed.D. Consultation Group. The new designation for this committee: CSU Ed.D. Proposal Review Group.

• Reviewed the launch schedule for new program proposals and the need for faculty review of Ed.D. implementation proposals.

• Recommended the membership of this new advisory committee (15 members consisting of 4 Ed.D. program faculty, 2 Ed.D. program directors, 4 Academic Senators, 1 provost, 1 graduate dean, 1 education dean, and 2 Office of the Chancellor liaisons).

• Received an update on the CSU independent Ed.D. programs to date, including applications, admissions and enrollments.

• Noted the approaching legislative reporting requirements for CSU independent Ed.D. program with evaluation due on or before January 1, 2011.

• Noted the CSU involvement in the national Carnegie Program on the Education Doctorate.

• Received information on system facilitation of grants to support research.

During the recent Board of Trustees meeting on September 16, 2008, Drs. Gary Reichard and Beverly Young shared Ed.D. student enrollment and student diversity information. This information was summarized in the following three tables:

### Ed.D. Enrollments on “First-wave” Campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>P-12</th>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ed.D. Enrollments on “Second-wave” Campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>P-12</th>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity in the 10 CSU Ed.D. Programs – Fall 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- American Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Asian American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other/Declined to state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation, Part I
Bob Buckley (Sacramento)

After years of hearing references to consultation by both faculty and administrators in Senate and Committee meetings as well as discussions in open forums, I was struck by the variety of meanings and uses that were inferred, many of which seemed to have little to do with the purpose and function of consultation. I thought a shared common understanding of what was meant by consultation could greatly enhance the process of shared governance. I must admit now, a quite naïve thought on my part.

I did spend some time reading what others, far and wide, had to say about consultation and how it was dealt with – or not – on other campuses across the country. In my search, I was struck by the following quote by a professor at Emory University, which seemed to capture one side of the misunderstanding and ambiguity often heard when references are made to consultation.

“… What it shouldn’t be is a set of luncheon forums with selected faculty in which an administrator meets them on kind of an ad hoc basis, and then comes up with a decision and says, “I’ve consulted.” If you have an unstructured consultation, where you meet with a world of groups, then you get to choose what you actually heard and didn’t hear. And even more importantly, the groups aren’t able to hear each other.”

Combining comments and policy statements from other institutions along with the experiences on my campus, I prepared a “Statement on Consultation” which was presented to the CSU Sacramento Senate and approved in the spring of 2006. The following excerpts are taken from that document.

“Shared governance is realized through the process of consultation. Without established formal consultative processes, university constituencies cannot effectively deal with issues of major concern or develop solutions to major problems. The Faculty Senate and its elected leadership are the body of representatives through which faculty exercise its powers as specified in the Constitution of the Faculty of California State University, Sacramento. The faculty’s role and responsibility in ensuring effective and appropriate participation in this process of consultation are vested in the faculty’s Senate and its leadership…

Policies and procedures developed by the Faculty Senate’s four policy committees are examples of consultation and, as such; do involve close collaboration between faculty and administration. The responsibility of the policy committees is to produce clearly articulated proposals for consideration by the Faculty Senate and for the President, in those cases where the Senate recommends approval by the President of these proposals…

The challenge and consequently the tension that develops between faculty and administration occur in those cases when proposed action is announced by administration with no formal consultation. In those cases where consultation is expected, existing committees or the establishment of new committees, permanent or temporary, could (and should) provide the venues in which such consultation would take place.”

There are a number of questions that represent concerns that both faculty and administrators have over the process of consultation… such as:

What types of issues and/or problems call for consultation with the faculty?
What prevents faculty in their consultative role from attempting to micro-manage the implementation of the manner in which issues are proposed to be dealt with, and the problems are proposed to be solved.
How can the consultative process ensure that responses are provided in a timely manner?
How does the university benefit from consultation?

In the next installment, I will provide some of the answers that were included in our statement.
Academic Senate CSU resolutions can be found at the following URL
www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions

RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AT THE SEPTEMBER 11-12, 2008 MEETING

AS-2863-08/FGA
CSU Budget Priorities for 2009-2010

AS-2866-08/APEP
Efforts to Encourage California Community College (CCC) Participation and Collaboration in the Lower Division Transfer Patterns (LDTP) Project

The following items were introduced at the September 11-12, 2008 meeting and will be acted upon at the November 12 -13, 2008 meeting.

AS-2864-08/FGA
Advocacy for the California State University

AS-2865-08/AA
Support for Policy Changes on Sub-Programs: Minors, Options, Concentrations, Special Emphases