AGENDA Academic Senate CSU

November 3-4, 2005
Thursday, 10:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Social hour, 6:00-7:30 p.m. (Chancellor’s Home)
Friday, 8:30 a.m.-noon (est. time)

Dumke Auditorium, CSU Headquarters
401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, CA

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of agenda
4. Approval of minutes
5. Announcements/Communications
6. Presentations/Introductions
7. Reports:
   7.1. Chair
   7.2. Standing committees
   7.3. Other committees and committee liaisons
   7.4. John Travis, President, CFA (Time certain (3:00 p.m., Thursday)
   7.5. Charles Reed, Chancellor (Time certain 3:30 p.m., Thursday)
   7.6. Keith Boyum, Assoc VC, Academic Affairs (Time certain 4:30 p.m., Thursday)
   7.7. Craig Smith, Faculty Trustee
   7.8. Hironao Okahana, CSSA Liaison
8. Committee Recommendations:
   8.1 Double Major Across Two Different Degree Programs AS-2717-05/AA
          Second Reading
   8.2 Support for Campus-specific “Repeat Policies” AS-2718-05/AA (Rev.)
          Second Reading
   8.3 Continued Support for CSU/UC Joint Doctorates AS-2719-05/AA
          Second Reading
   8.4 Reaffirmation of Early Declaration of Major AS-2720-05/AA
          Second Reading
8.5 Campus Autonomy in Establishing their Academic Calendar

8.6 Ongoing Efforts to Shape Curricula in Institutions of Learning

8.7 Providing Newly Recruited Faculty with Necessary Support

9. Adjournment
Double Major Across Two Different Degree Programs

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) believe that a student’s diploma should accurately reflect the baccalaureate accomplishments of that student; in particular, if a student simultaneously completes the requirements for two (or more) baccalaureate degrees prior to graduation, both (or all) of these programs should be listed on the student’s diploma: and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to direct the campuses of the CSU to issue diplomas that reflect these students’ efforts.

RATIONALE: The Chancellor’s Office asked the Academic Senate CSU to provide guidance on the issue of recording and recognizing “double majors” for students who complete baccalaureate degree requirements in two or more programs, particularly when two different types of programs are involved; e. g., a Bachelor of Arts (BA) program and a Bachelor of Science (BS) program.

Double majors are very common in U.S. universities: students who in the course of one undergraduate career complete the requirements for two majors (e.g., History and English) that lead to the same type of degree (in this example, the BA) and typically receive a single bachelor’s degree - a BA with majors in History and English. However, some universities ask the student to choose a single major to list on the diploma, while the transcript does acknowledge
both majors. In some cases, a student completes the requirements for two majors (e.g., English and Music Performance) that have different types of bachelor’s degrees (in this example a BA and a Bachelor of Fine Arts [BFA]). Another example is the student who majors in English and Mathematics, earning a BA in English and a BS in Mathematics.

The Academic Senate strongly believes that diplomas, as well as transcripts, should reflect the accomplishments of the student. Thus we believe that diplomas for double majors should list all of the work that the student completed. The above examples, the diplomas would read:

Bachelor of Arts in History
Bachelor of Arts in English
Bachelor of Arts in English
Bachelor of Fine Arts in Music Performance
Bachelor of Arts in English
Bachelor of Science in Mathematics

The student should be consulted as to the order of listing on the diploma.

SECOND READING – November 3-4, 2005
Support for Campus-specific “Repeat Policies”

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge campuses to adopt policies that address the eligibility of students to repeat courses; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campuses to consider policies which may include: limits in the maximum grade earned in the original course to qualify for grade forgiveness, limits in the number of times an individual course can be repeated for grade forgiveness, or other limits appropriate to campus needs; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend that campuses consider policies that limit the number of times a student can repeat a course under state funded support; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend that campuses consider policies that give higher enrollment priority to students who are not repeating a course; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recognize that, while there may be legitimate reasons for a student withdrawing from a course, such withdrawals do result in the potential of another student being denied a seat. Hence the Academic Senate CSU urge that campus policies regarding repetition of classes should work towards reducing repetitions due to withdrawals.
RATIONALE: An efficient use of scarce resources, namely state supported student instruction, is of paramount concern to the campuses of the CSU. Campus resources are impacted by course repetition both fiscally as well as potentially limiting enrollment possibilities for students who would otherwise have been able to take the course. Policies on repetition of course work should be well defined on each campus and reflect the individual needs of particular disciplines. The development of policies which address repetition of courses should facilitate graduation and promote timely progress towards degree.

SECOND READING – November 3-4, 2005
Continued Support For CSU/UC Joint Doctorates

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge the CSU and University of California (UC) systems to continue their support for successful and viable CSU/UC joint doctorates.

RATIONALE: SB 724 as introduced by Senator Scott authorizes the CSU to independently offer Education Doctorate Degree Programs that prepare administrative leaders for California public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges. Earlier joint doctoral programs are partnerships between CSU and UC, which build on the strengths of the participating campuses to generate specialized programs in a variety of disciplines.

Such programs meet the needs of the students in a manner appropriate to the educational mission of the systems that produces a high quality of education without unduly causing regional displacement of the student as they progress through their degree program.

The first CSU/UC joint doctoral degree was established in 1965, a doctoral program in Chemistry between San Diego State University and the University of California San Diego. As of July 2005, a total of 26 CSU/UC joint doctoral programs are in operation, and another is in the planning phase.
Reaffirmation of early declaration of major

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) reiterate its support for early declaration of major as an effective component of encouraging timely advising and progress towards degree; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reiterate "the following guidelines for campuses to use for adapting or developing campus policies" regarding advising, which are found in AS-2690-05/AA (Actions Needed to Improve the Quality of Academic Advising in the CSU) and in AS-2646-04/AA "Definition of Sanctionable Units and Recommendations and Guidelines for Campus Facilitation of Progress to the Degree,":

   “Require a timely declaration of major. In general, require that students declare a major after completing 25% of their total program (e.g., 30 semester units for a 120 semester-unit program, 45 quarter units for a 180 quarter-unit program) and before completing 40% (i.e., 48 semester units, 72 quarter units) in the example above.”

RATIONALE: The Board of Trustees (May 2005) has indicated a strong interest in various initiatives that relate to both systemwide and campus-level management of progress towards degree. Many of the initiatives in the 22 items fall within the purview of the faculty. This resolution is in partial response to the Chancellor’s Office “Implementation Guidelines and Requests” produced following the original Board of Trustees item. The intent is to note prior
and continuing activity of the Academic Senate CSU in meeting its responsibilities as defined regarding faculty control of the curriculum and commitment to shared governance in facilitating appropriate measures to ensure a high quality educational experience while also seeking to ensure efficiency in students’ pursuit of appropriate educational outcomes.

SECOND READING – November 3-4, 2005
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2690-05/AA
March 10-11, 2005

Actions Needed to Improve the Quality of Academic Advising in the CSU

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) re-affirm the recommendations regarding advising in AS-2646-04/AA, March 11-12, 2004, “Definition of Sanctionable Units and Recommendations and Guidelines for Campus Facilitation of Progress to the Degree,” and AS-2598-03/AA, January 23-24, 2003, “Recommendation on the Report from the Joint Provost/Academic Senate, California State University Task Force on Facilitating Graduation: Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree”; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reiterate “the following guidelines for campuses to use for adapting or developing campus policies” regarding advising, which are found in AS-2646-04/AA:

1. Advising:
   A. Require a timely declaration of major. In general, require that students declare a major after completing 25% of their total program (e.g., 30 semester units for a 120 semester-unit program, 45 quarter units for a 180 quarter-unit program) and before completing 40% (i.e., 48 semester units, 72 quarter units) in the example above.
   B. Require students to develop a personal graduation plan based on the declared major. Students should work with a faculty advisor in their major to develop a personal graduation plan permitting timely completion of the degree. If the personal graduation plan is not completed by the time the student completes 75% of the program, there should be a hold placed on registration until the plan is completed and approved by the appropriate advisor.
   C. Perform a degree audit in the semester or quarter when a student reaches 75% of the program and inform the student and the student’s advisor of missing requirements.
   D. Implement an automated degree audit system as soon as possible.
   E. Put in place requirements such that when a student reaches 100% of the units needed for the degree program and does not graduate there are specified and progressively more stringent procedures that the student must follow until, at an appropriate point, the student is disenrolled for failing to make adequate progress toward the declared degree objective.
   F. Campuses should provide adequate funding for both major and general-education advising.

2. Departmental plans and schedules:
   A. Each program should regularly review and, as necessary, revise its “academic road map” to ensure a clear and expeditious path to degree.
   B. Each program should offer, as resources allow, required courses and stipulated electives regularly and on a predictable, published schedule.
C. For higher-unit sequential degree programs, the program faculty should develop alternative plans to assist students who take courses out of sequence; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU request the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees for a timely report on the current status of the implementation of these recommendations; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the CSU to seek supplemental funding for these important initiatives.

RATIONALE: At the January 2005 Board of Trustees meeting, Board members asked for a resolution on advising from the Senate. This resolution highlights the previous actions taken by the Academic Senate CSU, as recently as May 2004.

According to the Collective Bargaining Agreement and long years of practice in the CSU, it is one of the roles of the tenured and probationary faculty to do advising.

As the following graph shows, the number of students per tenured or probationary faculty member has risen substantially (approximately 25%) over the last decade, and especially in the last few years, reflecting the failure of the system to hire tenured and tenure-track faculty commensurate to the number of additional students:

The Crisis in CSU Advising: Number of Students per Faculty Advisor - CSU Systemwide

Source: CSU Statistical Abstract, 2002-03, Tables 33, 166

APPROVED WITHOUT DISSENT – March 10-11, 2005
Definition of Sanctionable Units and Recommendations and Guidelines for Campus Facilitation of Progress to the Degree

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) accept the definition:
Sanctionable Units: units in excess of 20% over the student’s current degree/credential program including all CSU eligible units transferred and all CSU baccalaureate-level units attempted and excluding units accumulated prior to completion of the summer immediately following high school graduation.

; and be it, further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge, rather than using the above definition of sanctionable units as a means to penalize CSU students or campuses, that the Task Force on Excess Units recommend and the CSU Board of Trustees approve campus review and action in the following areas to facilitate students in their progress to graduation:
1. Each campus will conduct a careful survey of possible impediments to the progress to the degree.
2. Each campus will review its advising procedures with the goal of creating improved and mandatory advising that is the best fit for the campus’s own calendar and particular mix of majors.
3. Each program that offers a degree or credential will review its plans for advising majors and for scheduling required courses and stipulated electives.
4. Each campus academic senate should review campus policies on repeating courses, changing majors, and registration to ensure those policies encourage students to graduate in a timely fashion; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend the following guidelines for campuses to use for adapting or developing campus policies:
1. Advising:
   A. Require a timely declaration of major. In general, require that students declare a major after completing 25% of their total
program (e.g., 30 semester units for a 120 semester-unit program, 45 quarter units for a 180 quarter-unit program) and before completing 40% (i.e., 48 semester units, 72 quarter units) in the example above.

B. Require students to develop a personal graduation plan based on the declared major. Students should work with a faculty advisor in their major to develop a personal graduation plan permitting timely completion of the degree. If the personal graduation plan is not completed by the time the student completes 75% of the program, there should be a hold placed on registration until the plan is completed and approved by the appropriate advisor.

C. Perform a degree audit in the semester or quarter when a student reaches 75% of the program and inform the student and the student’s advisor of missing requirements.

D. Implement an automated degree audit system as soon as possible.

E. Put in place requirements such that when a student reaches 100% of the units needed for the degree program and does not graduate there are specified and progressively more stringent procedures that the student must follow until, at an appropriate point, the student is disenrolled for failing to make adequate progress toward the declared degree objective.

F. Campuses should provide adequate funding for both major and general-education advising.

2. Departmental plans and schedules:
   A. Each program should regularly review and, as necessary, revise its "academic road map" to ensure a clear and expeditious path to degree.
   B. Each program should offer, as resources allow, required courses and stipulated electives regularly and on a predictable, published schedule.
   C. For higher-unit sequential degree programs, the program faculty should develop alternative plans to assist students who take courses out of sequence.

3. Policies:
A. Campuses should develop policies that discourage late changes in major.
B. Campuses should develop policies that discourage excessive course repetition.
C. Campuses should, to provide access to courses for the greatest number of students, develop policies that discourage registration for more than a full load of courses.
D. Campuses should give careful consideration to the role of "gateway" courses and inform students that inability to make the required grade in the courses indicates a different degree program choice.
E. Develop financial aid policy to encourage students to take degree-appropriate units and finish their programs expeditiously.

RATIONALE: The proposed definition was developed by the Academic Affairs Committee in response to a request for a definition from the Task Force on Excess Units. Application of the definition would provide a basis for penalizing campuses for allowing students to take units well beyond those required for a baccalaureate degree program and/or to penalize students for those units. During a time of budget pressures combined with increased demand for access to the CSU, it may not be unreasonable to assert that at some point beyond the units necessary to complete a degree program, units may be deemed excessive. The definition of sanctionable units is a curricular matter and should be determined by the faculty.

The most effective action toward facilitating progress to the degree, however, is for each campus to build on the plans developed in response to Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree (2002). Only by identifying the relevant issues will the campus be able to move most effectively to resolve those issues. Results of campus surveys of impediments are likely to vary; while Facilitating Student Success identifies some possibilities, it is unlikely that one size fits all. Further, each program that offers a baccalaureate degree should review the material in the report and adopt or adapt those best suited for its own situation.

APPROVED – May 6-7, 2004
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2598-03/AA
January 23-24, 2003

Recommendation on the Report from the Joint Provost/Academic Senate, California State University Task Force on Facilitating Graduation:  *Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree*

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) receive the report and commend the collaborative process by the Joint Provost/Academic Senate CSU Task Force on Facilitating Graduation that produced:  *Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree* (http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/E-Senator/Reports/Facilitating Graduation.pdf); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU endorse the principles and recommendations of the Joint Provost/Academic Senate CSU Task Force on Facilitating Graduation with the following stipulations:

- Given that many of the factors that affect graduation rates are outside the control of the CSU, only incremental improvement in graduation rates can be expected.
- Any plan to improve graduation rates must be constrained by Principle 1 of the report: “The primary goal of the academic enterprise is to provide a high quality, productive, meaningful academic experience for students.”
- The implementation of the Task Force recommendations will be severely constrained by the lack of funding necessary for faculty, staff, degree audit, and improved advising processes.
- That the California State University Board of Trustees (1) review, in consultation with the Academic Senate CSU and the Chancellor’s Office, the data on improving graduation rates and determine what further research, if any, should be engaged. Any additional policy options that may be considered, based upon this review, should be developed through ongoing consultation with the Academic Senate CSU and the campus senates; and...
(2) ensure that individual campuses of the California State University system, through the shared governance process, retain autonomy in their efforts to design institutionally tailored programs guided by the principles and recommendations articulated in the Report from the California State University Task Force on Facilitating Graduation, to facilitate student success in achieving the baccalaureate degree.

RATIONALE: The committee structure and process that developed the report, Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree, was a model for shared governance. It was a joint committee of provosts and faculty, selected by the Senate, and supported by staff from the Chancellor’s Office. Members of the Board of Trustees were involved in early drafts of the report and the final report is a product of all three groups. The report is being presented to the Board of Trustees on a time line that allows the Academic Senate CSU and the campus senates to respond.

The Joint Provost/Academic Senate CSU Task Force on Facilitating Graduation has produced a report grounded in a large data set, with a good review of the literature, that provides a wide range of policy options. The principles recommended by the report emphasize that facilitating student success toward achieving the baccalaureate degree must be achieved within a framework of academic excellence and program quality. Moreover, the report recognizes that the CSU has only limited influence over the most important factor determining graduation rates: “exposure to a rigorous curriculum in secondary school.” In addition, the diversity of our student body and its “priorities of family, work, and school” are not within system control. Because of this, we can expect to have only limited impact on graduation rates by focusing on those things which the system can control.

At the local level, the recommendations emphasize campus autonomy by asking each campus to develop a plan “based on local institutional research, to improve graduation rates.” Many of the Task Force recommendations for CSU campuses require increased faculty, staff and equipment resources. “Developing a plan, based on local institutional research,” requires that campuses have the resources to conduct this research. Developing “graduation roadmaps” and “improving advising practices” requires additional time by the permanent faculty whose numbers are steadily diminishing. Assuring that courses will be available “during specified terms” requires that campuses have the budgets to offer these courses.
It is important that the California State University Board of Trustees both recognize and acknowledge the need for individually tailored campus efforts to facilitate student success in achieving the baccalaureate. The diversity in institutions, programs, campus cultures, and student populations within the CSU makes it doubtful that any single formula or programmatic structure will address the needs of students on all campuses.

At the system level the California State University Board of Trustees is asked to “assess improvements in graduation rates, and to consider if more incentives and disincentives are needed for both students and institutions.” Because graduation rates are affected by a wide variety of complex issues, it is important that the California State University Board of Trustees and the Chancellor’s Office work closely with the campuses, through the shared governance process, and the Academic Senate of the California State University in developing further policy options.
VII. Principles and Recommendations

After reviewing local, state, and national information on graduation rates, strategies for helping students achieve the baccalaureate, and the range of additional policy options discussed in the body of this report, the CSU Task Force on Facilitating Graduation identified several principles to which it was committed and which would undergird the recommendations that the Task Force made.

A. Principles of the Task Force

1. The primary goal of the academic enterprise is to provide a high-quality, productive, meaningful academic experience for students.
2. One of the great gifts and strengths of the California State University is the diversity of the student body in terms of age, native language, race, ethnicity, parents’ educational levels, socio-economic status, and career and educational goals.
3. While recognizing the diversity of both our students and the campus environments and missions that influence how students progress to a bachelor’s degree, the CSU has an overarching commitment to facilitating graduation.
4. Students as well as faculty, staff, and administrators share a responsibility in making sure that students graduate in a timely manner.
5. In undertaking new initiatives to help facilitate graduation, the CSU will focus on things that it can control.
6. The CSU has a responsibility to the state, to its students, and to the taxpayers to make sure that state funds are spent effectively. It is necessary to strike a balance between the wishes and desires of individual students and the wise use of fiscal resources.

B. Recommendations of the Task Force

In making these recommendations, the Task Force has reviewed the research on degree completion and the many different kinds of policy options listed in “Section II: On the Path to the Baccalaureate Degree.” We understand that we have limited influence over the most important factor: exposure to a rigorous curriculum in secondary school. We understand that, given a diverse student body, imposing standardized requirements—such as full-time enrollment—is not possible. We understand that we cannot markedly affect students’ decisions about the relative priorities of family, work, and school. Hence, in offering these recommendations, we focus on aspects of students’ experiences and aspects of the CSU that are realistically subject to intervention and change and recommend only some of the policy options listed earlier.

For CSU Campuses:
Develop a plan, based on local institutional research, to improve graduation rates. The plan should include these actions:

1. Develop 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year graduation roadmaps for all academic degree programs. These roadmaps should be term-by-term depictions of the courses in which students should enroll over the entirety of their academic careers (general education and major) and should address both day and evening programs when program size is sufficient to support both patterns. After the plans have been developed, they should be accessible to students at feeder community colleges and high schools.
2. Develop and implement projected campus master class schedules designed to accommodate these roadmaps and ensure that required courses will be available during the specified terms.

3. Require a mandatory progress-to-degree audit at a specific checkpoint (such as when a native freshman accumulates 65 semester units or upon entry for a transfer student), followed by the requisite advising and regular updates on the audit.

4. Improve online and hard-copy university catalogues so that they are well designed, well organized, readable, and useful.

5. Use summer term to promote student progress to degree by analyzing student course needs so as to offer a class schedule that enables students to enroll in bottleneck courses and required courses in GE and the major.

The plan should include other strategies appropriate to the individual campuses. These could include such strategies as:

6. Offer new students an intensive first-year experience.
7. Expand faculty professional development for improved instructional effectiveness.
8. Improve advising practices.

For the CSU System:
9. Ensure that there is an infrastructure and funding to allow each campus to establish on-demand, online graduation progress reports and progress-to-degree audits.
10. Sponsor multi-campus workshops for the sharing of effective strategies for facilitating graduation.
11. Convene a group to consider the need for CSU systemwide policies on course drops, withdrawals, incompletes, and repeats.

For the CSU Board of Trustees:
12. Review campus plans and progress annually.
13. After four years, assess the improvements in graduation rates, and consider if more incentives and disincentives are needed for both students and institutions. These might include fee surcharges for excess units, fee incentives for students who graduate with close to the minimum number of semester-credits needed to earn the degree, fee rebates for graduating students who attended summer school, mandatory summer school attendance, and performance funding based on campuses’ internal improvements in graduation rates.
14. Consider budgetary augmentation to implement recommendations.
Campus Autonomy in Establishing their Academic Calendars

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) strongly reaffirm the principles and policies stated in Principles and Policies: Papers of the Academic Senate of the CSU (1999) that campuses have the right and responsibility of controlling their academic calendars in consultation with their academic senates; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recognize that the campuses of the California State University are 23 distinct universities, each with their own individual missions; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the January intersession provides an opportunity for faculty to engage in intensive research, provides short courses for students who wish to give their full attention to a particular subject, and offers non-traditional educational opportunities such as travel courses. Furthermore, intersession facilitates progress towards degree.

RATIONALE: Principles and Policies: Papers of the Academic Senate of the CSU (1999), Section II, Responsibilities of Academic Senates within a collective bargaining context, Campus Senate / Council Participation in Campus Governance “joint decision making and consultation between administrators and faculty is essential to the performance of the educational mission of the CSU…” and further (from subsection D)“The Academic Senates/Councils shall be consulted by the campus presidents concerning: (i) the academic calendar and policies governing the scheduling of classes…”
Each individual CSU campus has individual needs. These needs take into consideration (i) different feeder school academic calendars, (ii) different employment opportunities for students (e.g., ski resort through January [Northern California schools]), (iii) a general opportunity for necessary remediation or acceleration of meeting major requirements in the service of facilitating graduation, and (iv) individual educational needs and desires of students.
Campus Autonomy in Establishing their Academic Calendars

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) strongly reaffirm the principles and policies stated in *Principles and Policies: Papers of the Academic Senate of the CSU (1999)* that campuses have the right and responsibility of controlling their academic calendars in consultation with their academic senates; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recognize that the campuses of the California State University are 23 distinct universities, each with their own individual missions; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the January intersession provides an opportunity for faculty to engage in intensive research, provides short courses for students who wish to give their full attention to a particular subject, and offers non-traditional educational opportunities such as travel courses. Furthermore, intersession facilitates progress towards degree.

RATIONALE: *Principles and Policies: Papers of the Academic Senate of the CSU (1999)*, Section II, Responsibilities of Academic Senates within a collective bargaining context, Campus Senate / Council Participation in Campus Governance “joint decision making and consultation between administrators and faculty is essential to the performance of the educational mission of the CSU…” and further (from subsection D)“The Academic Senates/Councils shall be consulted by the campus presidents concerning: (i) the academic calendar and policies governing the scheduling of classes…”
Each individual CSU campus has individual needs. These needs take into consideration (i) different feeder school academic calendars, (ii) different employment opportunities for students (e.g., ski resort through January [Northern California schools]), (iii) a general opportunity for necessary remediation or acceleration of meeting major requirements in the service of facilitating graduation, and (iv) individual educational needs and desires of students.
Ongoing Efforts to Shape Curricula in Institutions of Learning

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) strongly reassert the principles of academic freedom as contained in the 1940 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, including the 1970 Interpretive Comments, and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU affirm that these principles both underlie and reflect the fundamental mission of the University--to discover and disseminate knowledge; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm that the faculty have primary responsibility for determining the content of the curriculum and what is to be taught in university classrooms; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That such a mission demands that a scholar have primary responsibility for determining what is appropriate for instruction, discussion, publication and other forms of disseminating knowledge; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU object to and deplore recent actions by external constituencies such as publishers, and legislative and citizens’ groups, to impose
irrelevant standards on and to change or insert content into published materials and/or university curricula without authors’ or faculty approval; and be it further

6. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU send this resolution to the members of the Board of Trustees of the California State University.

RATIONALE: Strict adherence to the principles of academic freedom and to the roles and responsibilities of faculty, in particular those in post-secondary institutions, is critical to ensure the integrity of higher education’s contribution to the common good. Basic academic freedom includes the ability to research and publish, the freedom to teach and the freedom to communicate extramurally without constraints other than those defining the highest scholarly standard of an academic discipline.

While this issue is certainly not new to the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU), as mostly recently affirmed by AS-2675-04/FA and AS-2649-04/FA, current events across the nation necessitate, once again, a re-affirmation of the principle that faculty determine curricular content. Such recent events include, but are not limited to: the ideological pressuring of Glencoe/McGraw-Hill Publishers by the Texas State Board of Education to change language in their health texts from “married partners” to “husband and wife;” the vote by a Pennsylvania school board to require high school biology classes to hear about “alternatives” to evolution, including the theory referred to as “intelligent design,” currently being heard in the United States.
District Court (Kitzmiller et al. Dover Area School District); and the cancellation of a publication by Haworth Press of the book *Same-Sex Desire and Love in Greco-Roman Antiquity and in the Classical Tradition of the West* due to the “controversial” scholarly input of one author (San Francisco Chronicle 09/26/2005). The potential for similar efforts in post-secondary institutions is very great, as evidenced by sustained efforts in various states, and now in the US Congress, to determine the content and presentation of classroom matter so they conform to criteria set by members of the public and, perhaps unintentionally, circumvent the shared governance processes by which curricular decisions are normally made.
Providing Newly Recruited Faculty with Necessary Support

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) again call attention to the difficulty experienced by campus hiring committees in recruiting, and by departments in retaining, the numbers of well-qualified faculty the CSU needs to preserve the high quality of classroom instruction for which it has earned renown; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reiterate its concern about the high costs that faculty face when relocating to California from lower cost-of-living regions of the United States; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus administrations to ensure, as a matter of principle, that all faculty, including new recruits, be provided with the office space, technology, equipment, and other facilities and materials necessary for them to begin their academic duties upon the agreed-upon date of their employment; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU also urge campus administrations to compensate new faculty in a timely manner through salary advances or other mechanisms to ensure that they can meet basic living expenses immediately upon their arrival and adapt to their new environments and positions as members of the faculty; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Vice-Chancellor for Human Resources to discuss this matter with appropriate campus officers; and be it further
6. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU send this resolution to the campus senates for action as appropriate on the campuses.

RATIONALE: That there is a crisis in faculty recruitment and retention is obvious to all involved. At the same time that the CSU is preparing to handle another "Tidal wave" of students, large numbers of faculty members are reaching retirement age, especially on the campuses which had huge growth in the 1960s and 1970s (AS-2497-00/FA - May 4-5, 2000).

The CSU hires t/tt faculty from a national pool and therefore faces serious competition for new faculty members. The CSU faces serious constraints on its ability to recruit and retain faculty of high quality during the coming decade because of

- The serious and continuing lag of CSU salaries behind those of comparable institutions
- Excessive California housing costs


Recruiting and retaining faculty continue to be major challenges in the CSU. In many disciplines, new colleagues choose to join the CSU at salary levels significantly below national averages while moving to a region with substantially higher-than-national-average living costs; in many instances, these new faculty colleagues are asked to begin their academic duties in August and wait until the October pay period to receive their first paychecks and for their health insurance coverage to be activated.
In some disciplines, there are more positions available than new faculty ready to fill them. By virtue of the lower salaries and higher costs of living it offers, the CSU starts out at a competitive disadvantage. Arriving on campuses ill equipped to properly welcome them only compounds the financial hardships new faculty colleagues are asked to shoulder and makes a poor first impression on new colleagues.

A great deal of effort goes into hiring good faculty colleagues. Therefore, it is in the CSU’s interest to retain them. A poor first impression resulting from the lack of the basic means of both financial and professional support upon arrival may compromise the CSU’s ability to retain these faculty.

While there is little that the CSU can do about living costs and while salary gaps will take a long time to close, there are some things that campuses can control in the short run that will make new colleagues feel more confident in their decisions to join our faculty. Campuses need to ensure that every effort is made to provide new faculty hires with the basic necessities for doing their jobs. Campuses should also be encouraged to ensure that arrangements are made to allow new hires to receive adequate income to sustain themselves and their families from the date of hire through the date of their first paychecks.