Plenary Agenda
Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium

Thursday, November 8, 2007 – 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Friday, November 9, 2007 – 8:30 a.m. – noon

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of agenda
4. Approval of minutes
5. Announcements
6. Presentations/Introductions

7. Reports:
   7.1. Chair
   7.2. Standing committees
   7.3. Other committees and committee liaisons
   7.4. Senator Jack Scott (Time certain 4:00 pm, Thursday)
   7.5. Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
   7.6. John Travis, CFA
   7.7. Craig Smith, Faculty Trustee
   7.8. Roberto Torres, CSSA Liaison

8. Committee Recommendations
   8.1. CSU 2008-2009 Budget Priorities
   8.2. Textbook Affordability
   8.3. Opposition to the “Community College Governance, Funding Stabilization, and Student Fee Reduction Act”
   8.4. Drops, Withdrawals, Incompletes, and Repeats
   8.5. Support of Internationalization of CSU Educational Programs
   8.6. Board of Trustees and Chancellor Office Attention and Response to Faculty Votes of No Confidence
   8.7. Distinctive Universities: The Protection of the Autonomy of Individual Institutions as a Board Responsibility in the Governance of a Multiversity

9. Adjournment
Resolution Regarding CSU 2008-2009 Budget Priorities

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU) urge the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to adopt the following as their highest budget priorities for 2008-2009:
   
a. adopt the position that the CSU will not accept additional enrollment without a commensurate increase in funding;
   
b. seek from the Legislature monies above the Compact for an additional 1% compensation for faculty.
   
c. adopt ACR 73.

RATIONALE: At its August 2007 meeting, the CSU Systemwide Budget Advisory Committee (SBAC) established 2008-2009 budget priorities to recommend to the Board of Trustees. This resolution is the ASCSU’s response to those recommendations.

According to the CSU, 2007-2008 enrollments are very close to 2008-2009 targets. Additional enrollment would jeopardize the quality of instruction by placing unreasonable demands on a faculty already under great workload pressure. For that reason, the Legislature should not expect the CSU to accommodate additional students without additional funds to pay for the increase. In addition, the recent collective bargaining agreement has not entirely closed the salary gap for faculty; further (because of increased enrollment) faculty are already carrying additional responsibilities without additional compensation. The additional 1% above the Compact for compensation will help close the salary gap and compensate faculty for the work they are already doing. Larger numbers of permanent faculty would also help alleviate workload pressure, and
strengthen the CSU commitment to a quality education for all students. ACR 73, which calls for the CSU to work toward a 75%/25% tenure-track/lecturer ratio, would help meet those goals. In addition, the administration is contracted in the current collective bargaining agreement to join the California Faculty Association in seeking funds to implement ACR 73.
Textbook Affordability

1. **RESOLVED**: That the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) support the spirit of the Report of the CSU Textbook Affordability Taskforce (attached;) and be it further

2. **RESOLVED**: That the ASCSU reaffirm the principles espoused in AS-2747-06/FA *Faculty Role in Mitigating the Costs of Textbooks*, particularly high quality education, academic freedom, and the faculty’s right to set and deliver curriculum; and be it further

3. **RESOLVED**: That the ASCSU recommend that the Chancellor’s Office work with the ASCSU and campus senates, students, and Associated Students to use the Taskforce Report as a guide to develop best practices, and be it further

4. **RESOLVED**: That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor’s Office to work with textbook publishers in pursuing new revenue models that have the potential to significantly reduce the cost of textbooks to students; and be it further

5. **RESOLVED**: That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to pursue the sales tax relief option as described in the report.

**RATIONALE**: In the spring of 2006 the ASCSU passed a resolution which encouraged CSU faculty to work with campus bookstores to help mitigate the rising costs of textbooks and course materials. That resolution espoused a series of principles to govern such efforts. A CSU task force has recently released a report that outlines in more detail some of the mechanisms which have potential for cost savings in this arena.
This resolution calls for campus-based analysis of these mechanisms and the adoption of those that meet the essential criteria. This resolution also urges the Chancellor and Board to pursue the statewide goal of sales tax relief for course texts and materials. The CSU Academic Senate continues to be concerned about textbook affordability and urges campuses to address the issue, in concert with students, staff, and others. The Senate notes that many of the developing alternatives show promise for cost-reduction while simultaneously meeting the needs for accessibility.
Faculty Role In Mitigating The Costs Of Textbooks

RESOLVED: That consistent with the fundamental right and responsibility of faculty to select course materials, the principles of academic freedom, and the goal of providing high quality education, the Academic Senate California State University (CSU) reaffirm the fundamental right and responsibility of the faculty to set curriculum and select those materials, either traditional or alternative, that are pedagogically most appropriate for delivering that curriculum; and be it further

RESOLVED: That consistent with these principles, which ensure the academic and intellectual soundness of course materials, the Academic Senate CSU encourage CSU faculty to consider—when appropriate, pedagogically sound and feasible -- selecting course textbooks and materials that minimize the cost to students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend that the campus academic senates, where necessary, work with bookstores to arrive at mutually acceptable timelines for text adoption; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU encourage faculty to submit their textbook requests within these timelines to ensure the availability of textbooks through the campus and other local bookstores; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU encourage faculty to notify their campus bookstores as early as possible about re-adoptions of previously used textbooks to allow current students who wish to sell their copies back to the campus bookstore, which would also provide a larger quantity of cheaper, used textbooks for future students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU encourage faculty and campus bookstores to communicate clearly with publisher representatives about textbook pricing concerns and options; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm the fundamental right and responsibility of faculty to select traditional textbooks, alternative formats, and ancillary items with intellectual content and teaching effectiveness as the prime considerations.

RATIONALE: The Academic Senate CSU recognizes that the high cost of certain textbooks and ancillaries can adversely affect the affordability of higher education for CSU students; it also recognizes that the California State Student Association (CSSA) and the California legislature have expressed ongoing concerns about the rapid rise in textbook prices for CSU students and about associated cost factors such as the bundling of textbooks with sometimes unneeded supplements. These problems have received attention in the national media and in other legislatures as well. In 2004, the California Legislature and the Governor approved legislation
(AB 2477) urging book publishers to offer lower-price textbook options whenever possible and encouraging campus faculty and bookstores to do likewise and to generally pursue more economical textbook pricing practices. Among options available to faculty are

- adopting the least expensive edition of books they wish to use;
- using the same book and edition as long as it remains appropriate pedagogically;
- telling students the probable cost of books and materials for their class(es);
- reviewing textbook adoption timelines and procedures with the campus bookstore;
- working with publishers and bookstores if bundles are necessary to ensure that they are economically sound;
- adopting texts and materials in a manner that allows students to buy parts of a bundle;
- developing coursepacks (course readers),
- using e-reserves.

While the Academic Senate CSU recognizes that course packs and e-reserves help reduce costs to students, it also urges faculty to remember that content included in such delivery mechanisms must follow federal fair use and copyright guidelines.

Even though they understand the financial constraints with which many students are faced, the Academic Senate CSU and the CSU must also protect the academic freedom necessary for and inherent to effective and independent faculty selection of textbooks. This resolution proposes that faculty can develop ways of both maintaining their professional and curricular integrity and helping students contain the cost of their education.

APPROVED— May 4-5, 2006
Opposition to the “Community College Governance, Funding Stabilization, and Student Fee Reduction Act.”

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognize the need for a reliable and adequate system of funding all segments of higher education in California, including the California Community Colleges (CCC); and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That, while acknowledging this need, the ASCSU nonetheless oppose passage of the “Community College Governance, Funding Stabilization, and Student Fee Reduction Act” as a means of achieving this goal for the following reasons:

   a. It reduces budget flexibility and places undesirable constraints on the state budget process.

   b. It fails to identify revenue sources to offset the increased costs that will be created by key provisions in the initiative, specifically the reduction in revenue as a result of student fee cuts and the requirement that the state backfill any future tax revenue shortfalls local community college districts may experience.

   c. General fund support for California State University (CSU) is likely to be hurt by the initiative in that the monies required to meet these additional costs will have to come from the discretionary portion (8%) of the state budget from which the CSU receives its own support.
d. Higher student fees for CSU students are a likely consequence of the increased competition for state general fund resources.

e. Higher CSU student fees and reduced state funding to accommodate enrollment demand may indirectly hurt California college students by making it more difficult for them to transfer to the CSU due to higher costs and possible CSU campus impaction.

; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor to work with the CCC and the University of California (UC) to seek a mechanism for providing stable and adequate funding for all segments of California Higher Education.

RATIONALE: If approved by the voters, the “Community College Governance, Funding Stabilization, and Student Fee Reduction Act” initiative will do three things. It will 1) modify the constitutional status and governance structure of the CCC, 2) reduce community college student fees, and 3) change the mechanisms by which the community colleges are funded. The second and third provisions hold potentially negative consequences for both the state budgeting process and future funding of the CSU.

Currently, California’s community colleges are funded through a combination of general fund monies as provided for under Proposition 98 (Prop 98) and local tax revenues. The initiative would alter this in two ways:

a. It would change the formula to guarantee the community colleges a fixed and larger portion of Prop 98 funds than they have generally received in the past (with
associated funding formulas that would, in effect, guarantee that this percentage would never decrease and very possibly increase over time).

b. It would require the state to backfill any budget shortfalls a community college district might experience due to declining tax revenues.

No revenue sources are identified in the initiative to offset the costs such changes would produce. It is estimated that the provision to reduce community college student fees from $20 to $15 per unit will cost the state $71 million.

While these changes would be of direct benefit to CCC, they are likely to have a detrimental effect on both the state’s budgeting process and on the stability of future funding for the CSU as these increased costs would place an additional burden on the discretionary portion of the state budget. The discretionary portion of the state budget, which funds the CSU, the UC, Health and Human Services, and Corrections, among others, is estimated at only 8% of the total state budget. The constitutional budget requirements contained in the initiative would reduce this, placing even further pressure on those agencies, including the CSU that are funded from it. A spokesman for the CCC has acknowledged that this will make it harder for the CSU as compete for its share of the State general discretionary funds.

One consequence of this is that, during times of a state budget downturn, the CSU would be forced to raise its own student fees even further than it might have to otherwise, due to the reduced general fund availability.

In addition, the initiative will make it extremely difficult for the state to change any of the provisions of the new funding formula once it is in place. The initiative would require in the
future a supermajority vote (4/5’s) of the Legislature, for example, to raise community college fees above the newly mandated $15 level. In the words of one analyst, such “ballot-box budgeting” would lock the state into a flawed spending formula.

It is important that all segments of higher education in California have access to stable, reliable and adequate funding. This needs to be accomplished, however, in a way that does not further complicate an already cumbersome state budgeting process, and that does not advantage one segment of higher education at the expense of another. This initiative does not meet those standards.
Drops, Withdrawals, Incompletes, and Repeats

1. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) acknowledges the work of the *CSU Taskforce on Drops, Withdrawals, Incompletes, and Repeats* and thanks the Taskforce members for their work; and be it further

2. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU **supports** the advice of the Taskforce:

   a. To inform and enforce current policy regarding Incompletes.

   b. To limit course withdrawals to a maximum of 18 semester units (27 qtr.) for courses taken in the CSU.

   c. To record course withdrawals beyond the 18 unit maximum as grades of “F” or “WU”.

   d. To allow campuses to be more restrictive on course withdrawals than the maxima listed above.

   e. To limit repeats to a maximum of 24 semester units repeated (36 qtr.)

   f. To create a mechanism where courses could be repeated beyond this limit through Continuing Education or other full-cost mechanism.

   g. To limit repeats with no GPA consequences (aka Repeat-with-Forgiveness) to no more than 16 units (24 qtr.)

   h. To allow courses to be repeated (under state funding rates) only if the preceding grade was lower than a “B.”
i. To allow campuses to be more restrictive on course repeats than the maxima listed above. And be it further

3. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU **does not support** the Taskforce Recommendations which propose:

   a. Counting the withdrawal from a full semester of coursework as 6 of the 18 withdrawal units. The ASCSU recommends that withdrawal from a full semester of coursework should not count **at all** toward the any limit on course withdrawals because current processes contain sufficient disincentives and protections against abuse and such mechanisms are valuable accommodations for students going through significant medical, emotional or other academic traumas.

   b. Counting withdrawals prior to transfer as part of the allowed 18 withdrawal units. The workload to implement this recommendation is significant as are the consequences for students who have “violated” this requirement unknowingly. The number of students disqualified from university admission or graduation by this proposed requirement would far exceed those who might react to this disincentive to withdraw.

   c. Counting repeats prior to transfer as part of the limit on repeated units. Once again, the workload to implement this recommendation is significant as are the consequences for students who have “violated” this requirement unknowingly. The number of students disqualified from university admission or graduation by this proposed requirement would far exceed those who might react to this disincentive toward “repeats.” And be it further;
4. **RESOLVED**: That the CSU campuses work rapidly to implement electronic systems which give students and advisors timely, ongoing advice on progress toward a degree or approaching curricular deadlines or limits which might threaten efficient completion of curricular requirements; and be it further

5. **RESOLVED**: That the ASCSU recommends that a reasonable phase-in period or delay be specified for these important policy changes to take effect.

**RATIONALE**: Assuring the success of our students while conserving the limited resources which are provided to the CSU can create conflicts and policy dilemmas and the policy arenas of Drops, Withdrawals, Incompletes, and Repeats are full of such tradeoffs. The DWIR Taskforce has proposed a series of recommendations which, in general, move toward the “conserve resources” side of this balance.

The Academic Affairs committee, as part of its deliberations, contacted faculty, students, and staff, especially those persons most directly involved in student advising, to get their reactions to the impact of the proposed changes. Their advice was nearly unanimous that limiting the number of full-semester withdrawals and pre-transfer course repeats or withdrawals would create an onerous workload on advising and articulation staff, produce irreversible “dead ends” for students, and block pathways to graduation. In summary, sufficient disincentives already exist for these actions and thus protect University resources.

Some of the groups and individuals that we consulted were opposed to any limit on repeating or withdrawing form courses but often did not address the fiscal and academic consequences of the current environment. They rightfully critique the Report’s lack of data to support its
recommendations but with few exceptions (Thank you CSUC!) provided their own data to support their opinions.

We believe that the generous limits on repeats (almost one full year of normal college work) and withdrawals (roughly a semester and a half) provide a reasonable beginning limit on these activities. Requiring that students bear the full cost of repeated courses beyond the limit leaves open the door to student success while conserving limited University resources.
Date: December 16, 1974

To: Presidents

From: H. E. Brakebill
Executive Vice Chancellor

Subject: Academic Renewal, Executive Order No. 213

Enclosed are five (5) copies of Executive Order No. 213 implementing academic renewal policies adopted by the Board of Trustees November 26, 1974. Both the Board and the Chancellor have indicated that this policy is to be implemented in a manner which does not erode academic standards and quality. Extreme care should be taken in establishing campus procedures to ensure that the intent of the program is upheld.

Careful record of actions taken under this Executive Order should be maintained since periodic reports will be required.

HEB:mb
Enc.
This Executive Order is issued pursuant to Section 40402 of Article 5 of Subchapter 2, of Chapter I, of Part V of Title 5, of the California Administrative Code and is effective immediately.

I. Repetition of courses: In computing grade point averages required for graduation with a baccalaureate degree, units attempted, units passed (if any) and grade point (if any) for previous attempts shall be excluded when the following conditions are met:

1. The student formally requests permission to repeat the course(s).

2. The request is in compliance with such additional requirements and limitations as the campus may establish.

3. The request is approved by a campus official designated by the President.

In the case of a course completed at another institution, repetition may be accomplished by complying with the above requirements with regard to a course offered by the campus which is determined by the approving official to be essentially equivalent to that course.

III. Removal of previous term(s) work from degree consideration:
Under certain circumstances, the campus may disregard up to two semesters or three quarters of previous undergraduate coursework taken at any college from all considerations associated with requirements for the baccalaureate degree. These circumstances are:

1. The student has requested the action formally and has presented evidence that work completed in the term(s) under consideration is (are) substandard and not representative of present scholastic ability and level of performance; and

2. The level of performance represented by the term(s) under consideration was due to extenuating circumstances; and
3. There is every evidence that the student would find it necessary to complete additional units and enroll for one or more additional terms in order to qualify for the baccalaureate if the request were not approved.

Final determination that one or more terms shall be disregarded in determination of eligibility for graduation shall be based upon a careful review of evidence by a committee appointed by the President which shall include the Vice President for Academic Affairs and consist of at least three members. In the case of the Consortium, the Committee shall include the State University Dean of Academic Affairs. Such final determination shall be made only when:

1. Five years have elapsed since the most recent work to be disregarded was completed; and

2. The student has completed at the campus since the most recent work to be disregarded was completed, 15 semester units (22 quarter units) with at least a 3.0 GPA, 30 semester units (45 quarter units) with at least a 2.5 GPA, or 45 semester units (67 quarter units) with at least a 2.0 GPA. Work completed at another institution cannot be used to satisfy this requirement.

When such action is taken, the student's permanent academic record shall be annotated so that it is readily evident to all users of the record, that no work taken during the disregarded term(s) even if satisfactory, may apply toward baccalaureate requirements. However, all work must remain legible on the record ensuring a true and complete academic history.

III. Admission from other colleges: In the cases of admission from other colleges where course repetition and removal of work from degree consideration has occurred, the following procedures shall be utilized:

1. Repeated courses: The policy of the college where the course was repeated shall be followed. If it is not possible to determine the nature of such policy, the policy of The California State University and Colleges shall be followed.

2. Removal of previous work from degree consideration: If another college has acted to remove previous work from degree consideration, such action shall be honored in terms of its policy. However, elimination of any work
in a term shall reduce by one term the one-year maximum on work which may be disregarded at the college to which the applicant seeks admission.

Dated: December 16, 1974

Glenn S. Dumke
Chancellor

Executive Order No. 213
Academic Renewal
November 12, 2001

MEMORANDUM

To: CSU Presidents

From: Charles B. Reed Chancellor

Subject: Grading Symbols, Assignment of Grades, and Grade Appeals – Executive Order No. 792

Attached is a copy of Executive Order No. 792 which updates policies related to grading symbols, assignment of grades, and grade appeals. This executive order supersedes Executive Order Numbers 268 and 320.

In accordance with the policy of The California State University, the campus president has the responsibility for implementing executive orders where applicable and for maintaining the campus repository and index for all executive orders.

CBR:nces

Attachment

cc: Executive Staff, Office of the Chancellor
    Academic Senate of the CSU
Executive Order No. 792

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4210

(562) 951-4700

Executive Order: 792
Title: Grading Symbols, Assignment of Grades, and Grade Appeals
Effective Date: September 1, 2002
Supersedes: Executive Order Nos. 268 and 320

This Executive Order is issued pursuant to Sections 40104 and 40104.1 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations and Chapter III, Sections 1 and 2 of the Standing Orders of the Board of Trustees of The California State University and is effective with the Fall 2002 academic term (semester or quarter).

This executive order establishes administrative grading symbols, minimum standards governing the assignment of grades, and provisions for appeal to ensure that the rights and responsibilities of faculty and students are properly recognized and protected.

Administrative Grading Symbols

The administrative grading symbols AU, I, IC, RD, RP, W, and WU along with the definitions, rules, and procedures governing their application shall be utilized as circumstances require on all California State University campuses. Use of the symbols AU and RD are optional with each campus, except that where utilized, the definition and circumstances of application shall be as provided herein. No other grading symbols except the traditional grades of A, B, C, D, or F; or the non-traditional grades of A, B, C, NC; or CR-NC (where specifically authorized) shall be employed without the express prior approval of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer. To the extent permitted by Section 40104.1 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, each campus may use plus and minus designations in combination with traditional letter grades of A, B, C, and D.

1. AU (Audit). The following catalog statement reflects the minimum requirements for enrollment as an auditor. Authority to permit enrollment in this status rests with each campus. When audit status is permitted, students may not change from credit
Executive Order No. 792

to audit later than the census date. If enrollment as an auditor is permitted, the following statement together with any further campus requirements shall appear in the campus catalog:

Enrollment as an auditor is subject to permission of the instructor provided that enrollment in a course as an auditor shall be permitted only after students otherwise eligible to enroll on a credit basis have had an opportunity to do so. Auditors are subject to the same fee structure as credit students and regular class attendance is expected. Once enrolled as an auditor, a student may not change to credit status unless such a change is requested no later than the last day to add classes. A student who is enrolled for credit may not change to audit after the _____ week of instruction. (Insert appropriate number for campus.)

2. I (Incomplete Authorized). The "I" symbol shall be used only when the faculty member concludes that a clearly identifiable portion of course requirements cannot be met within the academic term for unforeseen reasons. An Incomplete shall not be assigned when it is necessary for the student to attend a major portion of the class when it is next offered. An Incomplete is also prohibited where the normal practice requires extension of course requirements beyond the close of a term, e.g., thesis or project type courses. In such cases, use of the "RP" symbol is required. The conditions for removal of the Incomplete shall be reduced to writing by the instructor and given to the student with a copy placed on file with the appropriate campus officer until the Incomplete is removed or the time limit for removal has passed.

An Incomplete shall be converted to the appropriate grade or symbol within one year following the end of the term during which it was assigned provided, however, an extension of the one-year time limit may be granted by petition for contingencies such as intervening military service and serious health or personal problems. Where campus policy requires assignment of final grades on the basis of numerous demonstrations of competency by the student, it may be appropriate for a faculty member to submit a letter grade to be assigned in the event the Incomplete is not made up within one year. If the Incomplete is not converted within the prescribed time limit, or any extension thereof, it shall be counted as a failing grade in calculating grade point average and progress points unless the faculty member has assigned a grade in accordance with campus policy.

The following statement shall appear in the campus catalog:

The symbol "I" (Incomplete Authorized) indicates that a portion of required course work has not been completed and evaluated in the prescribed time period due to unforeseen, but fully justified, reasons and that there is still a possibility of earning credit. It is the responsibility of the student to bring pertinent information to the
attention of the instructor and to determine from the instructor the remaining course requirements which must be satisfied to remove the Incomplete. A final grade is assigned when the work agreed upon has been completed and evaluated.

An “I” must normally be made up within one calendar year immediately following the end of the term during which it was assigned.

This limitation prevails whether or not the student maintains continuous enrollment. Failure to complete the assigned work will result in an “I” being converted to an “IC” symbol, unless the faculty member assigns a specific letter grade at the time the Incomplete is assigned, which would replace the “I” in the student’s record at the end of the calendar year deadline.

3. IC (Incomplete Charged). The “IC” symbol may be used when a student who received an authorized incomplete “I” has not completed the required course work within the allowed time limit. The “IC” replaces the “I” and is counted as a failing grade for grade point average and progress point computation.

4. RD (Report Delayed). The “RD” symbol may be used where a delay in the reporting of a grade is due to circumstances beyond the control of the student. The symbol may be assigned by the registrar only and, if assigned, shall be replaced by a substantive grading symbol as soon as possible. An “RD” shall not be used in calculating grade point average or progress points. Although no catalog statement is required, whenever the symbol is employed an explanatory note shall be included in the transcript legend. The registrar shall notify both the instructor of record and the department chair within one week of the assignment of RD grades.

5. RP (Report in Progress). The “RP” symbol shall be used in connection with thesis, project, and similar courses in which assigned work frequently extends beyond a single academic term and may include enrollment in more than one term. The “RP” symbol shall be replaced with the appropriate final grade within one year of its assignment except for master’s thesis enrollment, in which case the time limit shall be established by the appropriate campus authority. The president or designee may authorize extension of established time limits.

The following statement shall appear in the campus catalog:

The “RP” symbol is used in connection with courses that extend beyond one academic term. It indicates that work is in progress but that assignment of a final grade must await completion of additional work. Work is to be completed within one year except for graduate degree theses. (Insert campus statement describing the time limit for theses.)
6. W (Withdrawal). Withdrawal from a course (or courses) may be permitted, without restriction or penalty, during a time period established by the campus. However, this time period shall not extend beyond the census date. No symbol need be recorded in such instances. In connection with all other approved withdrawals, the "W" symbol shall be used.

Withdrawals after the census date and prior to the last twenty percent of instruction may be assigned only for serious and compelling reasons. Permission to withdraw during this time shall be granted only with the approval of the instructor and the department chair and/or dean as described by campus policy. All requests to withdraw under these circumstances and all approvals shall be documented as prescribed by the campus. The requests and approvals shall state the reasons for the withdrawal. Records of such approvals shall be maintained in accordance with the campus record retention policy.

Withdrawals shall not be permitted during the final twenty percent of instruction except in cases, such as accident or serious illness, where the cause of withdrawal is due to circumstances clearly beyond the student's control and the assignment of an Incomplete is not practicable. Withdrawals of this sort may involve total withdrawal from the campus or may involve only one course, except that course grade and credit or an Incomplete may be assigned for courses in which sufficient work has been completed to permit an evaluation to be made. Requests for permission to withdraw under these circumstances shall be handled and filed as indicated in the preceding paragraph, except that such requests must also be approved by the academic administrator appointed by the president to act in such matters.

A "W" shall not be used in calculating grade point average or progress points.

The following statement shall appear in the campus catalog:

The symbol "W" indicates that the student was permitted to withdraw from the course after the ___ (day/week) of instruction with the approval of the instructor and appropriate campus officials. It carries no connotation of quality of student performance and is not used in calculating grade point average or progress points.

In addition to this statement, the campus catalog shall include a description of the procedures to be followed in withdrawing from a class or from the campus. Such procedures shall be consistent with all applicable provisions of this executive order.

7. WU (Withdrawal Unauthorized). The symbol "WU" shall be used where a student, who is enrolled on the census date, does not officially withdraw from a course but fails to complete it. Its most common use is in those instances where a student has not completed sufficient course assignments or participated in sufficient course activity to make it possible, in the opinion of the instructor, to report satisfactory or
unsatisfactory completion of the class by use of the letter grade (A - F). The instructor shall report the last known date of attendance by the student. The symbol "WU" shall be identified as a failing grade in the transcript legend and shall be counted as units attempted but not passed in computing the grade point average. In courses which are graded Credit/No Credit or in cases where the student has elected Credit/No Credit evaluation, use of the symbol "WU" is inappropriate and "NC" shall be used instead. The following statement shall appear in the campus catalog:

The symbol "WU" indicates that an enrolled student did not withdraw from the course and also failed to complete course requirements. It is used when, in the opinion of the instructor, completed assignments or course activities or both were insufficient to make normal evaluation of academic performance possible. For purposes of grade point average and progress point computation this symbol is equivalent to an "F."

If local campus policy prescribes other instances where this symbol may be used, the foregoing statement shall be extended to cover such instances.

Assignment of Grades and Grade Appeals

The following principles support the minimum standards governing the assignment of grades and provisions for appeals:

1. Faculty have the sole right and responsibility to provide careful evaluation and timely assignment of appropriate grades. (Administrative grading symbols may be assigned only in accordance with the provisions of this executive order.)

2. There is a presumption that grades assigned are correct. It is the responsibility of anyone appealing an assigned grade to demonstrate otherwise.

3. In the absence of compelling reasons, such as instructor or clerical error, prejudice or capriciousness, the grade assigned by the instructor of record is to be considered final.

4. Students who believe that an appropriate grade has not been assigned should first seek to resolve the matter informally with the instructor of record. If the matter cannot be resolved informally, the student may present his/her case to the appropriate campus entity, have it reviewed and, where justified, receive a grade correction.

5. If the instructor of record does not assign a grade, or if he/she does not change an assigned grade when the necessity to do so has been established by appropriate campus procedures, it is the responsibility of other qualified faculty to do so.
6. "Qualified faculty" means one or more persons with academic training comparable to the instructor of record who are presently on the faculty at that campus.

7. Each campus faculty senate has authority and responsibility for providing policy and procedures for the proper implementation of the foregoing principles.

8. Each campus president is responsible for ensuring that the policies and procedures developed by the faculty senate are in conformance with the principles and provisions of this executive order and for ensuring that such established policies and procedures are carried out.

Each campus shall implement policy and procedures covering the assignment of grades and grade appeals which include at least the following provisions:

1. The time and manner of reporting course grades including provisions for assuring that such grades have been assigned by the instructor of record.

2. Circumstances under which the instructor of record may change a grade once assigned, and procedures for making such changes.

3. A means for preliminary review of potential appeals that may resolve differences before initiation of formal proceedings.

4. Grounds for which a grade appeal is permitted.

5. One or more committees for hearing grade appeals which shall provide safeguards to assure due process for both student and instructor. Such committees shall include student membership. Student members shall not participate in assignment of grades.

6. Procedures whereby grades are assigned by other qualified faculty in circumstances where the instructor of record does not do so, including those instances where a grade change is recommended by a grade appeals committee and the instructor of record does not carry out that recommendation.

7. Specification of time limits for completion of various steps in the appeal process and of the time period during which an appeal may be brought.

8. Description of the extent of the authority of appeal committee(s), including provisions which clearly limit grade changes to instances where there is a finding that the grade was improperly assigned.

9. Limitation of committee authority to actions which are consistent with other campus and system policy.

10. A statement that there is a presumption that grades assigned are correct. Thus, the burden of proof rests with the individual who is appealing.
11. Procedures for dealing with allegations of improper procedure.

12. Assignment of authority to revise policies and procedures for grade appeals to the campus faculty senate. The campus president is responsible for ensuring that such revisions conform to the principles and provisions of this executive order.

13. Provision for annual reporting to the campus president and campus faculty senate on the number and disposition of cases heard.

These policies and related procedures shall be published in a manner that ensures that all faculty and students have an opportunity to be aware of them (in class schedules, faculty manuals, student handbooks, etc.). While it is not necessary that policy and procedures be published in their entirety in generally circulated documents, such publications shall ensure that the students are aware that policy and procedures exist and where they may be obtained.

Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Dated: November 12, 2001
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Proposed Revision of CSU Academic Policies on Course Credits: Incompletes, Withdrawals, and Repeats

I. Introduction

In December 2002, a CSU Task Force on Facilitating Graduation released a report entitled “Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree.” In addition to reviewing preparation for college study, student engagement, and student services, the task force also recommended a review of academic policies, specifically on drops, withdrawals, incompletes and repeats (DWIR).

This recommendation took on added energy when Clifford Adelman, formerly Senior Research Analyst at the U.S. Department of Education, released, in 2006, a follow-up to “The Toolbox Revisited” (1999). The new report, “The Toolbox Revisited: Paths to Degree Completion from High School through College,” demonstrated clearly that students who accumulated excessive withdrawals and repeats cut in half their chances of earning a degree. According to Adelman:

Both the original Tool Box and The Toolbox Revisited revealed that one of the most degree-crippling features of undergraduate histories is an excessive volume of courses from which the student withdrew without penalty and those the student repeated. . . . The withdrawals counted here are not “drop” grades that apply during standard drop-and-add periods at the beginning of terms. They are the result of institutional policies that allow withdrawals without penalty after the drop-and-add period. No-credit repeats are standard fare in remedial courses, but when they reach destructive levels the question arises as to how many times an institution allows a student to repeat a course. Think of it this way: Every non-penalty withdrawal and no-credit repeat means that a seat in a course is not available to someone else. Add those seats up, and admission to an institution may not be available to someone else. Excessively lax withdrawal and repeat policy, then, ultimately blocks general access. And in terms of degree completion, such policies do students no favors.

Generally, CSU policies have not been restrictive and punitive. We have embraced second chances – as well as third and fourth and fifth. This relaxed approach works well when money flows freely and when all qualified students who want to be enrolled can be enrolled in the CSU. However, in 2007, that condition doesn’t exist. Today students who accumulate excess units via withdrawals and repeats are also denying a spot in the CSU to other qualified students.

To address the issue of drops, withdrawals, incompletes, and repeats, the CSU Chancellor’s Office convened a task force of faculty, students, student services administrators, provosts, and C.O. staff to review CSU academic policies. In addition, the Task Force chose to look at fees as a way of encouraging student progress to a degree.
The Task Force reviewed two key documents: (1) “Executive Order No. 792, Grading Symbols, Assignment of Grades, and Grade Appeals” (November 12, 2001), and (2) “Executive Order No. 213, Academic Renewal” (December 16, 1974). The general consensus of the committee was to give CSU campuses as much flexibility as possible while trying to develop system policy recommendations that could serve as a framework for campus policy.

II. Regarding Incompletes

The Task Force agreed that the policy is sound, but that the policy is likely to be unevenly enforced. Administrators and faculty should work together to ensure that system and campus policies are understood and enforced.

The Task Force proposed that this statement be added to E.O. 792, Item #2: “A student cannot re-enroll in a course for which he or she received an "I", until the "I" is converted to a grade.”

III. Regarding Withdrawals

The Task Force agreed that the policy is sound but may be unevenly enforced.

The Task Force proposed that E.O. 792, Item #6, be revised to include these statements:

A. Students may withdraw from no more than 18 semester units (27 quarter units).

B. In only one semester (quarter) term, students may withdraw from multiple courses and can elect to have that term count for at most 6 semester (9 quarter) units of withdrawals.

C. Withdrawals accumulated at other colleges by transfer students will count towards this limit, but only up to a maximum of 10 semester units (15 quarter units).

D. Withdrawal from a course beyond the limits specified will result in a grade of “F” or “WU.”

E. This policy specifies CSU system maximums only. CSU campuses are free to develop more restrictive policies if they choose to do so.

IV. Regarding Course Repeats

“E.O. 213, Academic Renewal,” promulgated over 30 years ago puts no limits on the number of courses that students can repeat. The Task Force agreed that this was perhaps an overly lenient and tolerant policy, especially from a public policy point of view. Today students who accumulate excessive repeats are denying a spot in the CSU to other
qualified students. With this in mind, many CSU campuses have limited the number of units or courses that can be repeated. CSU repeat policies, as described in campus catalogs, show that there are basically two types of repeats:

*Repeats with grade forgiveness:* Students can repeat a course with the intention of earning a higher grade. In most cases, the original grade is deleted, and the repeat grade is used in calculating the GPA. This is sometimes called “repeat and cancel,” “repeat and delete,” “repeat with grade substitution,” “academic renewal,” and “discounting of a grade.”

*Repeats with grades averaged:* A student repeats a course. Both the original grade and the repeat grade are calculated into the student’s overall GPA.

The CSU Task Force studied CSU campus policies as well as the policies of more than 20 peer universities across the nation. On the basis of this work, the Task Force recommends that the language below replace the text on repeats in E.O. 213:

A. This policy does not apply to certain courses such as independent study, practicum, or other courses specified in the catalog as “may be repeated for credit.”

B. The policy specifies CSU system maximums only. CSU campuses are free to develop more restrictive policies if they choose to do so.

C. Undergraduate students may repeat up to 24 semester-units (36 quarter-units) on a state-supported basis. Beyond these limits, students would not be eligible to enroll in the class by paying the normal state-assisted fee.

D. The campus can determine the appropriate balance between “grade forgiveness” repeats and “grades averaged” repeats, so long as there are no more than 16 semester-units (24 quarter-units) with grade forgiveness. (See F.1)

E. Undergraduate students may repeat courses only if they earned grades lower than B-.

F. Course repeats with “grade forgiveness”:

1. Undergraduate students may repeat no more than 16 semester-units (24 quarter-units) with grade forgiveness.
2. Undergraduate students may repeat an individual course for grade forgiveness no more than two times.
3. In computing grade point averages, only the most recently earned grades and grade points will be used for the 16 semester-units (24 quarter-units) repeated.
4. Courses repeated at other colleges before transferring to a CSU campus count toward the 16 semester-units (24 quarter-units) maximum.
5. A grade awarded as a result of academic dishonesty cannot be repeated for grade forgiveness.

G. Course repeats with “grades averaged”:

Beyond the allowable units for grade forgiveness, the repeat grade shall not replace the original grade; instead all grades shall be calculated into the student’s overall grade-point average.

V. Enforcing Existing Policy

In reviewing the CSU policies surrounding DWIR, the Task Force noted that, with the exception of the academic renewal policy, the current policies on drops, withdrawals, and incompletes are sound. The Task Force also found that these sound policies were sometimes unevenly enforced, perhaps because faculty and students did not fully understand the meaning of an “I” or a “W.” For example, the “I” should be used when students cannot complete work “for unforeseen reasons.” Similarly, a withdrawal after the census date and prior to the last 20 percent of instruction is granted “only for serious and compelling reasons.” That these grading symbols are sometimes misunderstood and misused is no surprise. Executive Order 792 consists of seven single-spaced pages, and few faculty and students would want to pore over the document. Therefore, a few CSU campuses have developed “plain English” ways to educate faculty, staff, and students. At CSU Chico, for example, at the end of every semester, the registrar sends to faculty members a “plain English” explanation of the grade options for students who never withdrew from class but stopped attending during the term.

VI. Considering Incentives and Disincentives

In order to serve future students, all current students will have to be more focused and purposeful in their coursework. To encourage these behaviors, the CSU might consider the possibility of incentives and disincentives. For example, the CSU could give a financial reward to students who complete their studies without incurring any withdrawals or repeats. Or, on the other hand, students who drop a course could be charged a fee.

VII: Conclusion: Considering Public Policy

Academic policies that involve course credits pose true dilemmas for university faculty and administrators. On the one had, we want students to succeed, and we want them to have the freedom to choose majors and the initiative to be ambitious and over-achieving
in their course-taking. Therefore, if the students do overextend themselves, the punishment for these lapses in judgment is fairly gentle; the penalty for drops and withdrawals is no course credit awarded—a statement of “no harm done.” On the other hand, we have to be good stewards of faculty time and university facilities. When faculty teaching a course see the same faces reappear term after term, year after year, because these students have dropped or withdrawn or are repeating to get better grades, these professors are increasing their workload and circumscribing their freedom to teach other classes. In addition, a student who sits in a course until midterm only and then withdraws effectively prevents another student from sitting in that same seat for the entire term and earning credit. The balance between “no harm done” and the stress on faculty and physical resources must be considered.

*Attachments: Executive Orders - Grading Symbols, Academic Renewal*
Resolution in support of internationalization of CSU educational programs

1. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate, California State University (ASCSU) urge the Chancellor and the Access to Excellence Steering Committee to include appropriate language in the new strategic plan that promotes international education for all CSU students; and be it further

2. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU encourage the CSU campuses to include appropriate language in their mission statements, learning objectives and campus strategic planning that promotes internationalization of CSU’s educational programs; and be it further

3. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU encourage the Chancellor’s Office and campus administrative leaders to allocate necessary resources for internationalization efforts, such as curricular review and reform, international exchange, global partnerships, and support system for international students and faculty; and be it further

4. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU encourage the CSU faculty to integrate language learning and other components of international education in the curricula, whenever feasible; and be it further

5. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU encourage faculty and administrators to review Retention, Tenure and Promotion policies and recognize and reward faculty’s international experience and accomplishments in the areas of research and scholarly activity, curricular planning, service, and professional development.
RATIONALE: In today’s world, individuals, businesses and organizations must collaborate and compete not only locally, but globally. As a public university serving the people of California, the CSU must think and act strategically in response to the challenges posed by the international mobility of knowledge, labor, technology, and capital. As the CSU plans for a new and more diverse generation of students, the CSU must prepare those for a new world of work – one that is cross-cultural and globally interdependent. Internationalization enhances the value and quality of the baccalaureate and enables the CSU to educate people who are better prepared professionally and personally for work and life in a globalized society. International research opportunities and exchange programs offer faculty members opportunities to pursue their interests on a broader stage and to enhance the reputation of the CSU nationally and internationally.

Both the system and the individual campuses have roles to play in internationalization. While recognizing the primary role that campuses play in international education, working together collaboratively can bring benefits to the campus as well as the whole. In general, the system can play an important role—funding, facilitating, information gathering, and collaboration, while the campuses carry out international activities, develop programs, provide services and encourage research.
Board of Trustees and Chancellor Office Attention and Response to Faculty Votes of No Confidence

1. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm its support for AS-2305-96/FA “Investigation of a Vote of No Confidence;” and be it further

2. **RESOLVED:** That in the spirit of the 1996 AS-2305-96/FA resolution, the ASCSU urge the Chancellor to report to the campus Academic Senate the results of investigations into votes of no confidence in presidents on CSU campuses, including those that occurred in Spring 2007; and be it further

3. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU request that the Chancellor’s Office report to the ASCSU what actions, both immediate and in the long term, will be taken in response to investigations of no-confidence votes, including those that occurred in Spring 2007; and be it further

4. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU express its serious concerns over public statements by the Board of Trustees or others in CSU system leadership positions that could be construed as both dismissive and condescending toward those faculty members who express no confidence in their administrative leadership, as occurred in Spring 2007; and be it further

5. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU encourage the Chancellor’s Office to develop a systematic assessment of faculty satisfaction with their administrative leadership across all CSU campuses in an effort to mitigate the need for the extremely serious measures reflected in a vote of no confidence.

**RATIONALE:** The rationale for AS-2305-96/FA, “Investigation of a Vote of No Confidence,” clearly sets forth the seriousness of a no confidence vote, and its potential
negative impact on the integrity of campus educational programs and campus morale.

Subsequent to adoption of that resolution, the Chancellor’s Office did conduct investigations on votes of no confidence and shared results of those investigations with the ASCSU.

In spring 2007 votes of no confidence occurred at two CSU campuses, both of which were supported by a significant majority of faculty. Subsequent to these votes, statements were made by certain members of the Board of Trustees that appeared to dismiss and even denigrate faculty and their concerns before any reasonable fact-finding had occurred. (Board of Trustees Public Comment, May 16, 2007; “CSU Trustees Express Support for Campus Presidents at Sacramento and Sonoma,” Press Release California State University, Public Affairs, May 16, 2007; “SSU Faculty Approves ‘No-Confidence’ in President” Santa Rosa Press Democrat, May 19, 2007.). The faculty on both campuses still await an informed response from the Chancellor’s Office to their concerns, one that fairly represents the perspectives of all constituencies.

The Academic Senate, therefore, calls upon both the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to reflect upon the seriousness of concerns expressed by faculty in the recent votes of no confidence and those that subsequently may occur, to investigate such votes of no confidence prior to public statements being made, to report findings to the campus community and the ASCSU, and to consider any actions which may be taken to address those concerns. In addition, given the seriousness of a vote of no confidence and the negative impacts it may have on the campus programs and community, we urge the Chancellor’s Office to consider strategies for assessing faculty satisfaction on individual campuses with the goal of resolving,
whenever possible, disputes between faculty and administration before they reach the level of a no confidence vote.
Distinctive Universities: The Protection of the Autonomy of Individual Institutions as a Board Responsibility in the Governance of a Multiversity

1. **RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate, California State University, (ASCSU) endorse the statement adopted by the American Association of University Professor’s (AAUP) Council in 1978 that “[Governing bodies of multi institutional systems] bear particular responsibility for protecting the autonomy of individual campuses or institutions under their jurisdiction and for implementing policies of shared responsibility;” and be it further

2. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees (BOT) and the Chancellor to honor this tenet to the fullest extent possible consistent with the mission of the CSU; and be it further

3. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge the BOT to include explicit language in our new strategic plan “Access to Excellence”1 addressing this matter that is at least as comprehensive and forceful as that in Principle 10 in the predecessor strategic plan “Cornerstones”2; and be it further

4. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU itself continue ever mindful of this principle in its own deliberations and actions; and be it further

5. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge the BOT to use its substantial influence as a prominent leader among the governing boards of America’s multiversities to lead The American Council on Education (ACE) and The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and

---

2 [http://www.calstate.edu/Cornerstones/reports/implment.html](http://www.calstate.edu/Cornerstones/reports/implment.html)
Colleges (AGB) in endorsing the AAUP 1978 note 3 to the 1966 joint (AAUP, ACE, and AGB) policy “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities;”\textsuperscript{3} and be it further

6. **RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU forward this resolution to the BOT and the Chancellor.

**RATIONALE:** The CSU BOT is currently engaged in generating a strategic plan for the upcoming decade: “Access to Excellence”. Our predecessor strategic plan, “Cornerstones”, included “PRINCIPLE 10: The California State University campuses shall have significant autonomy in developing their own missions, identity, and programs, with institutional flexibility in meeting clearly defined system policy goals.”

The solicitation of input to the current process explicitly directed attention to the future with regard to “Campus / System Identity”. One point in that framework expressed the goal of “Ensuring the distinctive missions of individual campuses, and envisioning those distinctive missions within the CSU essential identity.”

The preface of the current first draft of our new plan states “… (T)his plan recognizes the value and importance of the twenty-three universities that comprise the CSU, each with distinct strengths, and serving distinct communities. California is a complicated and diverse state, and it needs and deserves a system of universities that can match that complexity and diversity.”

No moment could be more propitious than this for the ASCSU to adopt this resolution and take advantage of this opportunity for substantially advancing shared governance and collegiality. No time could be better than this, when our BOT is in the process of adopting our new strategic plan, for it to proclaim its endorsement of this crucial 20th and 21st century

\textsuperscript{3} http://www.calstate.edu/acadaff/System_Strategic_Planning/docs/StatementGovCollegesUniv.pdf
principle of shared governance—that of appropriate institutional autonomy for the universities that the CSU comprises. This is a wonderful opportunity for our BOT to once again assume a principled leadership position among America’s supra–campus governing bodies. Let us all embrace this opportunity.

The 1966 “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” was “jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB).

Note 3 of that document states “Traditionally, governing boards developed within the context of single–campus institutions. In more recent times, governing and coordinating boards have increasingly tended to develop at the multi–campus regional, systemwide, or statewide levels. **As influential components of the academic community, these supra-campus bodies bear particular responsibility for protecting the autonomy of individual campuses or institutions under their jurisdiction and for implementing policies of shared responsibility.** [Emphases added] The American Association of University Professors regards the objectives and practices recommended in the “Statement on Government” as constituting equally appropriate guidelines for such supra-campus bodies, and looks toward continued development of practices that will facilitate application of such guidelines in this new context. [Preceding note adopted by the AAUP’s Council in June 1978.]

The California State University through its BOT is a full member of both ACE and AGB. Inasmuch as most of the members of ACE and AGB are boards of single–campus institutions, one may speculate that members of both the ACE and AGB await the initiation by one or more major “supra–campus” boards in enacting organizational endorsement of this
proposition. This presents the opportunity for the CSU BOT not only to reinforce the institutional aspiration articulated in domain 6 of the CSU’s strategic planning guidelines but to do so as a clear leader among American multi-institutional governing boards.