Plenary Agenda
Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium

Thursday January 21, 2010 11:00 a.m. — 4:00 p.m.
4:00-5:00 Standing Committees reconvene (if needed)

Senate Social — Academic Preparation & Education Programs Committee Hosting
5:15 p.m. – 6:45 p.m.

Friday January 22, 2010 8:30 a.m. — 3:00 p.m.

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. Gail Brooks, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources (Time certain 1:00 p.m. Thursday)
   7.5. Ben Quillian, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer, (Time Certain 1:00 p.m.,
       Friday)
   7.6. Chancellor Reed (Time Certain 10:00 a.m. Friday),
   7.7. John Travis, CFA
   7.8. Dunixi Guereca, CSSA Liaison

8. Committee Recommendations
   8.1. Addition of a Second Faculty Trustee to the CSU Board of Trustees AS-2916-09/EX
       Second Reading
   8.2. In Support of Reinstating Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Awards for 2010-2011
       AS-2917-09/FA
       Second Reading
8.3. Revisiting Campus-based Program Suspension and Elimination Policies

8.4. Call for Adequate and Sustainable Funding in Support of Public Higher Education

8.5. Dealing With the Impact of Funding Shortfalls on Transfer Students

8.6. Requesting Modifications in SB 48

8.7. Improving the Effectiveness of the Early Assessment Program (EAP) in Increasing the Academic Readiness of Graduating High School Seniors

8.8. Support of Legislation to Authorize the Offering of the Doctoral of Physical Therapy (DPT) Degree in the CSU

8.9. Establishment of Campus level “Presidential Enrollment Management Advisory Groups” as Specified by CSU Enrollment Management Policy and Practices

8.10. Recommendations Regarding the Implementation of Mandatory Early Start Programs

8.11. Support of the ICAS Statement on Competencies in Mathematics

8.12. Shared Governance in Enrollment Management and Facilitating Graduation for High Unit Students

8.13. Continuing Support for Efforts Facilitating Transfers Between Community Colleges and the CSU


8.15. Protecting the Rights and Entitlement of Contingent Faculty to Participate in Shared Governance

9. Adjournment
Addition of a Second Faculty Trustee to the CSU Board of Trustees

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) request that the CSU Board of Trustees consider recommending to the Governor the addition of a second faculty trustee to the Board with a term of appointment staggered with that of the current faculty trustee.

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees and campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: The addition of a second faculty trustee with a staggered term would allow faculty trustees to benefit from the same mentoring received by other appointed members of the Board representing either the people of California as a whole or the students. It would also provide for a second perspective on faculty issues which are numerous and diverse in a system with over 23,000 faculty. Additionally, it would eliminate situations where a vacancy due to a delay in the appointment of a single faculty trustee, or any other reason, would mean the Board would not benefit from the wisdom and perspectives of any current faculty member.
A Resolution in Support of Reinstating Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Awards for 2010-2011

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) acknowledges the significant and devastating reduction of the budget for the CSU and that this reduction resulted in many unprecedented cuts; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU considers the suspension of all the funds for the 2009-2010 Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities (RSCA) awards is contrary the stated values of the CSU including the master plan and access to excellence; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU further notes that the California legislature specifically intended that RSCA funds be provided help attract, develop, mentor, and retain junior faculty in disciplines for which there are few external sources of funding and that the Academic Affairs 2008 report on the use of RSCA grants in 2006-2007 reveals that 63 percent of the grants were awarded to Assistant Professors and should continue to be used as the legislature originally intended; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: The RSCA awards are vital to the intellectual life of the institution and that suspending these grants also jeopardizes effective learning; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That mortgaging the future of the CSU by disinvesting in the faculty may have repercussions in the long term that far exceed the damage of this year’s devastating budget cuts; and be it further

6. RESOLVED: That the RSCA awards be re-instated by Fall 2010; and be it further
7. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, the Chancellor, campus Presidents, Provosts, and campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: The 2009-2010 Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA) awards were suspended by the Chancellor’s Office in its attempt to save a relatively small amount of money in the 2009-2010 budget. However, such a small savings exacts a disproportionately large cost on the intellectual life of the university.

RSCA awards were established by the California state legislature in recognition of the inexorable link between professional achievement and effective teaching and learning and that in addition, the Legislature intended that these funds “ensure that faculty (1) remain current in their disciplines, (2) pursue new ways to enrich student learning and (3) contribute to knowledge that will strengthen California socially, culturally and economically.” And the Legislature explicitly called for the CSU to allocate the “$2.5 million for research, creative, and scholarly activities in a manner which affirms the commitment of the faculty to the instructional mission of the system.”

These funds have been exceedingly effective. An Academic Affairs division report summarizing the use of these awards in 2006-2007 documented that through mini-grants of up to $5,000, summer stipends and semester/quarter leaves, faculty have produced work that resulted only one year later in presentations (52%) and/or the writing of proposals for additional funding (38%). Most importantly, 74% of faculty report that these awards have led directly to improvements in teaching and curriculum. Sixty-two percent of the faculty receiving RSCS grants reported using these funds to work directly with students, while 41
percent used the awards to collaborate with other faculty. All of these achievements support the teacher-scholar model embraced.

Lean budget years inevitably lead to painful cuts, but suspending this program for one year significantly and adversely affects faculty professional achievement. The teacher-scholar model demands on-going faculty engagement in professional achievement and recognizes that research, scholarship and creative activities improve teaching effectiveness.

Faculty, especially younger faculty, needs support as they develop programmatic research, scholarship and creative activities. Suspending this support risks sacrificing the long term success of the professoriate in order to solve a short term financial crisis.
Revisiting Campus-based ProgramSuspension and Elimination Policies

1. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognizes that the dramatic reduction in state-support for Higher Education produces pressure on the campuses of the CSU for program suspension and Elimination; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge all campus senates of the CSU to review and, if necessary, update their policies concerning program elimination and/or suspension as called for in AS-2891-09; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognizes that “emergency measures” may appear to be justified by the magnitude of the crisis, but that such measures should not eviscerate the primary role of faculty in control of the curriculum; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU reaffirm its commitment, as outlined in recent ASCSU resolutions on: Faculty Consultation in Budget Decisions (AS-2876-09/FGA); to documenting and reporting the impact of budget reductions on faculty and programs at both the campus and system levels (AS-2835-08/FGA); and to due process and active faculty consultation on program suspension, discontinuation, and/or dissolution (AS-2596-03/FA); and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage campus senates to consider inclusion of an emergency measures clause that protects the faculty role in the curriculum. Any such process should have a “trigger” under which an abbreviated and/or expedited process be applicable; and be it further

6. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that particular care be given to consider maximally specifying terms and procedures (e.g., what is meant by consultation vs. notification, etc.) in order to
outline as completely as possible those processes to be followed when program elimination or suspension is considered (e.g., which stakeholders should meet and in what venue). These considerations apply to both a campus’s regular Program Review Processes and for any potential emergency/abbreviated process.

RATIONALE: While the ASCSU acknowledges the need for academic planning to match available resources, it does not mean that faculty should not be involved in the “hard” decisions (e.g., across the board vs. narrower but deeper cuts to some programs and divisions).

There exists the perception of some groups that budget (or other) crises provide “cover” for action on the part of various elements of campus administration that may not be in accordance with faculty desires, or, more importantly with sound academic principles. Without accepting the merit of any such belief, it is clear that program discontinuation (and sometimes even suspension) is not an easily rectified event in the context of improved resources. For this reason, program discontinuation should be (rightly) seen as a very dramatic step.

Any decision to suspend or discontinue academic programs and/or dissolve a department should be made with the same care and thorough review accorded the creation of new programs. Moreover, there is the additional need to provide due process and reasonable consideration for any students, staff, and faculty affected by such decisions.
Call for Adequate and Sustainable Funding in Support of Public Higher Education

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (Academic Senate CSU) decry the continuing failure of the State of California to provide adequate and sustainable funding in support of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU ask the citizens of California and their elected leaders to reconsider the consequences of undermining the State’s long-standing social contract with the people of the state seeking public higher education; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU ask the citizens of California and their elected leaders to recognize the long-term consequences to the state's fiscal well-being of limiting access to the public higher education that drives the state's economy; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm its commitment to the important principles of affordability, access and quality contained in the Master Plan for Higher Education in California; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the California Legislature and the Governor to enact necessary legislation to guarantee adequate and sustainable funding to restore the social contract between the State and its citizens, thereby moving the state to its once-premier stature in the world economy; and be it further
6. RESOLVED That the Academic Senate CSU forward this resolution to the Governor of California, legislative leaders in the State Assembly and Senate, and media throughout the State as well as the CSU Chancellor, the CSU Board of Trustees, the CSU campus Presidents, and the CSU campus Senates.

RATIONALE: Prior resolutions by the Academic Senate CSU (e.g. AS-2906-09/FGA) and Campus Academic Senates (e.g. RS04-227/SFSU) have well articulated the need for adequate funding in support of public higher education. This resolution calls for both adequate and sustainable funding in support of public higher education. Adequate and sustainable funding will allow the CSU to enact the California Education Code. The respective roles of government and individual citizens in any state are defined by a social contract that explicitly or implicitly specifies the expectations and responsibilities of each.

For nearly fifty years the state of California has included in its social contract promises defined in the Master Plan for Higher Education (1960). As a result of the access to public higher education assured by the Master Plan for Higher Education, the California State University (CSU) has provided the state with many hundreds of thousands of well-educated and well-trained professionals who have contributed their expertise to California, thereby contributing to the status of this state in the world economy and generating by virtue of their work many hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue for the State.

The State of California is at present experiencing a budget crisis so great that the survival of its social contract with its citizens is in jeopardy. One specific effect of this crisis is that California has been unable to maintain its commitment to providing opportunity for California’s diverse population to attain a moderately priced and high quality university
education. In 2003-2004, because of reduced funding, the California State University was unable to enroll 5,000 qualified students, and in 2004-2005 further budget reductions resulted in denial of access to the CSU of an additional 20,000 students.

Now in 2009, the CSU has been forced to declare unprecedented systemwide impaction. The economic and social future of California will be profoundly and for many decades jeopardized by the inadequacy of proposed funding levels for the state’s institutions of public higher education for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 and their resulting inability to educate the multitude of students whose expertise has built California’s role in the world economy. Proposed funding levels are so limited and sustainable funding sources are almost non-existent that they threaten to diminish the quality of teaching and learning in the CSU, further eroding the economic and social well-being of the state.

Consequently, for the public record, the Academic Senate CSU calls upon the California Legislature and the Governor to enact both adequate and sustainable funding to restore the social contract between the State and its citizens, thereby moving the state to its once-premier stature in the world economy.
Dealing With the Impact of Funding Shortfalls on Transfer Students

1. RESOLVED: That the California State University has had to deal with an unprecedented cut in State funding of over 500 million dollars in the 2009-10 academic year; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the California State University, in order to cope with this funding cut, had to increase student fees, reduce classes, furlough most employees, and curtail enrollment of transfer students in spring 2010; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That while curtailing enrollment of transfer students in spring 2010 may have been unavoidable, this is not a strategy that should be repeated in the future; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That if State funding is insufficient to meet the academic needs of native and transfer students, the CSU should devise strategies other than a blanket ban on transfer students; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That this resolution be sent to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, campus Presidents, and campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: The California Education Code Section 66202 states that after continuing CSU students, transfer students from California Community Colleges who have successfully concluded a course of study in an approved transfer agreement program or who met all of the requirements for transfer have a higher priority for admissions over all other groups. While the academic leadership of the CSU may have felt that the system had no other choice than to deny admission to eligible transfer students in spring 2010 in order to deal with its unprecedented funding cut, denying admission to eligible transfer students appears to run counter to the State’s Education Code. More importantly, denying admission to this group of students will have the effect of delaying their
graduation from a CSU and may result in many potential students opting not to continue on to obtain a baccalaureate degree in the CSU. Other strategies that do not single out a group of students who have been “following the rules” and making progress towards their degrees are preferable and should be carefully investigated.
Requesting Modifications in SB 48

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) commend Senator Alquist for her authoring of SB 48; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request Senator Alquist to consider introducing additional legislation that would specify that the electronic version of the textbook provided by publishers as required by SB 48 be in electronic form in a format that is compatible with commonly used Braille translation, screen reading software, and other ADA compliant forms; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request Senator Alquist to consider introducing additional legislation that would modify SB 48 so that its provisions take effect no later than January 1, 2015; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That this resolution be sent to Senator Alquist, the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, campus Presidents, campus Senate Chairs, and the Association of American Publishers.

RATIONALE: The ASCSU is grateful to Senator Alquist for authoring SB 48. We note that the ASCSU has passed a number of resolutions dealing with textbook accessibility and affordability. In 2006 the ASCSU passed AS-2730-06/AA. This resolution called on publishers to provide e-text versions of course materials at the time such materials are adopted “in a format that is compatible with Braille production, screen reading software, and other ADA compliant forms”. While existing legislation requires publishers to make this material available upon request, delays in getting the material prepared can seriously disadvantage students who need such materials at the start of the academic term. While SB 48 specifies that publishers provide text materials in electronic format,
there are electronic formats which do not support Braille translation or screen reading software or other ADA compliant forms.

Also in 2006 the ASCSU passed AS-2747-06/FA. This resolution encouraged faculty to select “course materials that minimize cost to students”. As pointed out in the Report of the CSU Affordability Taskforce (see http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/Textbook_Affordability_Taskforce_report.pdf) electronic versions of textbooks have the capability to reduce student costs, the ASCSU supports an earlier implementation of the provisions of SB 48. We believe that, from a technical perspective, publishers should be able to comply with this law within the next five years.
Agenda Item

Improving the Effectiveness of the Early Assessment Program (EAP) in Increasing the Academic Readiness of Graduating High School Seniors

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recommend that the Chancellor charge the EAP Advisory Committee to assess and analyze the current effectiveness of the EAP and to develop a plan designed to make 90% of all CSU eligible high school graduates college-ready, as referenced in [reference needed]; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU suggest that the California Department of Education be consulted, as appropriate, during the development of this plan; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU suggest that the authors of the “Postsecondary Preparation and Remediation: Examining the Effect of the Early Assessment Program at California State University”¹ be consulted as well during the development of this plan; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the EAP Advisory Committee provide the Senate with a report detailing their data, analyses, and the proposed plan; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, the Chancellor and the California State Department of Education.

RATIONALE: The Early Assessment Program (EAP) provides students with an “early indicator” of their level of college preparation. However, the percentage of students that utilize this information to make more informed decisions that would increase their knowledge and skills while still in high school and thereby avoid failure and the need for remediation in their entry level college experience

¹ Jessica Howell, Michal Kulander and Eric Grodsky
is low. Both the importance of, and the expectations associated with the EAP are significant. Jack O’Connell, the Superintendent of Public Instruction in a presentation to the Board of Trustees on “Closing the Achievement Gap in California” made reference to EAP as an important component in attempts to close this “Gap”. In addition, the California American Diploma Project, established by Achieve, the non-partisan, non-profit reform organization, has identified EAP as an important tool in ensuring that high school graduates are fully prepared to undertake college level work.

The ASCSU continues to believe that Early Assessment Project is one of the most important outreach activities that the CSU has undertaken and, the EAP continues to garner most favorable interest and comment at the national level, as states struggle to align their K-12 and higher education interests. By utilizing a shared assessment instrument, high school learning outcomes expectations in English and mathematics are directly related to the CSU's expectations for incoming freshman in an unequivocal fashion. The professional development opportunities in English and mathematics, and curriculum modules in English, have addressed a long-standing disjunction between high school and college writing and have allowed the CSU to emphasize the role that critical analysis plays in English and mathematics at the university level. While some of the impediments that have limited the effectiveness of EAP have been addressed, there still remains much that must be done to ensure that EAP includes the appropriate incentives to greatly increase student participation followed by the appropriate counseling that will lead to students taking the courses necessary for them to achieve proficiency prior to graduation. The intent of this resolution is to urge the EAP Advisory Committee to systematically identify the impediments currently inhibiting the effectiveness of the program. Furthermore, to provide the ASCSU with an idealized plan that would maximize the effectiveness of EAP, which could result in 90% of the high school students coming to CSU campuses to be fully proficient in reading/writing and mathematics and thus fully prepared to do college level work.
It is important to note that California public schools do not have the resources necessary to refocus efforts on graduating college ready students. It is also the intent that this idealized plan could be used to better inform the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the variety of K-12 support organizations how best to direct efforts towards graduating students better able to fulfill their higher education goals.

Update: The number of high school juniors taking the CSU's Early Assessment Program (EAP) tests in English and mathematics proficiency increased for the fourth consecutive year. A record 369,441 eleventh-grade public school students took one or both of the tests in spring 2009, an increase of 3.7 percent, or 13,272 students, since last year. The EAP tests let students know if they are proficient enough in English and math for college entry.

This year's EAP results also showed an increase in the number of students eligible to take the EAP math test—nearly 22,000 more students qualified and took the test than in 2008. In order to take the math test, students need to have progressed to Algebra II by their junior year.

First-time freshmen at the CSU must demonstrate readiness for college English and mathematics by showing proficiency in the EAP tests, passing the CSU's placement test, or obtaining a qualifying score on the SAT or ACT test. Unfortunately, 60 percent of the CSU's first-time freshmen do not show proficiency.
Support of Legislation to Authorize the Offering of the Doctoral of Physical Therapy (DPT) Degree in the CSU

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) recognize that for existing physical therapy programs nationwide, the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education is poised to mandate the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) degree for all accredited programs by December 31, 2013, and this doctoral degree would therefore be necessary for students to achieve professional standing; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU encourage the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to develop a legislative proposal for the 2010 legislative session that would seek authorization for the CSU to offer an independent three-year Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) degree; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU affirm that DPT degree programs offered by the CSU must be developed and approved by faculty through regular academic program review and approval processes (including individual campus academic senates) at all individual campuses; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That all proposed DPT programs be developed in accordance with all appropriate national standards for such applied doctoral programs; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the CSU to secure funding sufficient to implement and sustain DPT programs until they can become self-supporting through student fees.
RATIONALE: The demand for physical therapists throughout California is strong. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the California Employment Development Department, California exceeds the national growth rate of jobs for physical therapists (30% vs. 27%), and it is estimated that California will experience a 30% increase in physical therapy jobs between 2006 and 2016. The demand for physical therapists in the Northern California region is especially significant since, according to the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, 19 areas in the region are designated as medically underserved and/or with underserved populations. Data from the Physical Therapy Central Application Service reveals that, even as applications and enrollments in California physical therapy programs continue to increase, CSU campuses provide 38% of the new graduate workforce in physical therapy each year.

So while the demand for physical therapists grows, state law currently prohibits the CSU from offering an independent Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) degree. This is problematic because the education model for physical therapy is now a 4-year baccalaureate degree followed by a 3-year entry-level professional DPT program. As of June 15, 2009, 94% of the 212 accredited physical therapy programs in the United States are approved to confer the DPT degree, and 100% of programs that are in development plan to offer the DPT. Only 11 programs nationwide offer a Master’s of Physical Therapy (MPT) and not the DPT; 5 of them are CSU programs. The DPT has become the national standard, and partnerships for joint DPT programs with University of California (UC) schools have not materialized in any significant way. UC San Francisco, despite having the authority to offer an entry-level doctorate, offers a post-professional DPT only. UC has signaled its disinterest in partnering
with CSU beyond current arrangements in place with San Francisco State University and 
CSU Fresno. Moreover, the joint DPT programs in place are not achieving graduation rates 
that will keep pace with demand. For instance, the CSU Fresno joint DPT program with UC 
San Francisco graduated only 8 students in 2008 and 2 in 2009, and only 2 students are 
currently enrolled.

Allowing CSU campuses to offer independent doctorates in physical therapy will help 
address the ongoing shortage of physical therapists in California. The cost for such programs 
would be more affordable than private schools or joint programs with UC. Access to the 
profession would be maintained for students from historically underrepresented groups and 
those with socioeconomic barriers. And, using the model for the EdD, it appears to be 
possible to offer such programs on a self-sustaining basis within three years. A legislative 
solution allowing CSU to offer the DPT degree has received the strong support of the 
Establishment of Campus level “Presidential Enrollment Management Advisory Groups” as Specified by CSU Enrollment Management Policy and Practices

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) urge that the 1992 statement on “The California State University Enrollment Management Policy and Practices”¹ be used to guide and inform decisions regarding campus level enrollment management policy and practices; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU remind campuses that the consultative body charged with campus implementation of enrollment management policy and practices must conform to the following CSU guidelines:

   “Presidential Enrollment Management Advisory Groups

   • To assist the campus in the identification of effective enrollment management policies, new or existing, that address the education needs of the local, regional, and state student population in terms of outreach, admission, and enrollment, each campus president shall appoint and consult with a presidential advisory group.

   • The members of the presidential advisory group shall include faculty, students, administrators, representatives of educational institutions from the campus’s local region, and local community leaders representing broad community interests.

   • In selecting members of the presidential advisory group, sensitivity to the cultural diversity of the campus and participants’ cultural competence will be essential.”; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urges the campus Senates on campuses, which do not currently have such a consultative body, to work with administration to establish such an advisory group guided by the CSU statement on “Enrollment Management and Policy and Practices”; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, campus Presidents, and campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: The CSU plans to reduce enrollment by 40,000 students over the next two years, and has limited enrollment for winter and spring 2010. The limitation is necessary in order to enroll only as many students as the state provides funding for. Targets for campus level reductions were included in 2009-10 budget allocations to the campuses. The 1991 statement provides the framework in which campus level decisions should be made.

The methods available to reduce enrollments should be carefully analyzed to ensure that strategic decisions are made so that the impacts on programs are understood and supported by campus priorities. Such an effort requires consultation with representatives of the stakeholder groups that will be affected by these decisions. The 1992 statement prescribes that the “President shall appoint and consult with a presidential advisory group”.

The intent of this resolution is to inform each campus of the process to be used in recommending the enrollment management approaches, and that this process should be consultative in nature and exemplify the value of collaboration and principles of shared governance. For those campuses in which no such process exists, the ASCSU urges the campus Senate to work with their campus President to establish the type of advisory group specified in the 1991 statement.
1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reiterate the commitments embodied in AS-2895-09/APEP/AA in support of "diverse campus approaches to moving fully qualified first-time freshmen (FTF) who require additional skill acquisition (remediation) in English or mathematics to achieve proficiency either prior to, or during, their first year of enrollment"; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU also recognize the regional character of individual campuses and the diversity of their student populations, cautioning the CSU System against a "one size fits all" approach to remediation programs as it moves toward the goal of proficiency; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge that the CSU ensure that serious attention be paid to the financial consequences --both to campuses and to individual students--resulting from the various "early start" approaches; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That tests, such as the EPT, originally designed as placement instruments, not be deployed to either grant or deny otherwise-qualified first-time freshmen (FTF) admission to the CSU; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU acknowledging that it is within the purview of the faculty to develop, deliver, and assess curriculum, urge that CSU faculty be fully engaged in the planning, teaching, and evaluating of any “early start” pilot programs; and be it further

6. RESOLVED: That such “early start” pilot programs supplement but not supplant already existing, successful models of proficiency attainment on the various campuses; and that the success of the
pilot programs themselves be assessed over time to determine their effects upon such factors as retention rates and progress toward degree before the CSU considers mandating adoption of any “early-start” models system-wide: and be it further

7. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, campus Presidents, Provosts and Senate Chairs, the Chair of the English Council of the CSU, and the Chair of the Mathematics Council of the CSU

RATIONALE: Following up on the Board of Trustees’ resolution authorizing the pilot testing of “early start” programs, a Task Force, headed by the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, (and consisting of?) has been charged by the Board with presenting a statewide plan for “early start” programs by March 2010. The ASCSU, while recognizing the urgency of this mandate from the Board, wants to ensure that access to fully qualified students will not be denied and that faculty will be involved in the design, the implementation, and the assessment of such “early start” pilots before any decision is made to adopt any “early-start” program system-wide.
Opposition to Impending Implementation of Mandatory Early Start Programs

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognizes the value of diverse campus approaches to moving fully qualified first-time freshmen (FTF) who require additional skill acquisition (remediation) in English or mathematics to achieve proficiency either prior to, or during, their first year of enrollment; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU oppose the implementation of “early start” programs as a pre-condition for enrollment at any CSU campus until such time as a number of concerns, including but not limited to:

- the (1) unilateral implementation by campuses which are “already moving toward requiring”\(^1\) FTF to engage in remediation and (2) doing so prior to Fall 2009 enrollment;
- the legality of denying admission to fully qualified FTF;
- the limitation of access to economically disadvantaged students;
- the financial aid implications for students;
- the potential hardship for out-of-area students;
- the shift of mandatory instruction to a non-traditional instructional session;
- the presumed desirability of identifying a single or limited number of “early start” programs for the CSU system;
- the paucity of evidence-based, longitudinal data on the effectiveness and social impact of “early start” programs;

are addressed in the context of shared governance at both the local and systemwide levels; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees, the CSU Office of the Chancellor, and campuses of the CSU, to explore other means to improve FTF proficiency, including but not limited to Directed Self Placement and credit-bearing stretch courses; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That this resolution be sent to the following CSU entities: the Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, campus Presidents, Provosts and Senate Chairs, the Chair of the English Council of the CSU, and the Chair of the Mathematics Council of the CSU.

RATIONALE: The Board of Trustees of the CSU has an on-going commitment to require all fully eligible and admitted First Time Freshmen (FTF) to demonstrate college level proficiency in both English and mathematics no later than the end of their freshman year. The CSU has achieved this goal to a roughly 85% compliance rate but continues to seek more efficient approaches and identify best practices to assist students in their efforts.

---

\(^1\) Committee on Educational Policy. “Proficiency in English and Mathematics Before the First Year.” Board of Trustees Agenda Item 3, May 12-13, 2009: p. 2 of 2.
Faculty leadership has led campuses to invest in a number of “early start” programs to assist students in their efforts to demonstrate proficiency before the start of their freshman year. However, Agenda Item 3 of the Committee on Education Policy for the Board of Trustees’ May 12-13, 2009 meeting features a resolution focusing on “Proficiency in English and Mathematics Before the First Year.” The resolution authorizes the pilot testing of “early start” programs, including those considering mandatory involvement of FTF students anticipating matriculation in the fall of 2009, who have not demonstrated readiness for college work in either mathematics or English, or both. The resolution requires the CSU, by March of 2010, to use the reported results of these pilot tests to establish policies requiring a full-scale implementation of such pre-matriculation programs with a timetable throughout the CSU.

Approved – May 7-9, 2009
Support of the ICAS Statement on Competencies in Mathematics

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support the ICAS Statement on Competencies in Mathematics for incoming freshmen to the CSU.

2. RESOLVED: That the Teaching Credential programs of the CSU embrace this report and ensure that students earning a California Credential in mathematics be properly prepared.

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU send copies of this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, the California Superintendent of Schools, the Deans of the College of Education in the CSU, the Superintendent of Community Colleges of California and the Superintendents of the California School Districts.

RATIONALE: The recommendations in this report will facilitate the CSU’s desire to increase graduation rates and to decrease remediation classes. The clarity of the expectations presented will allow California high school mathematics departments to put into place curriculum constant with CSU expectations. High school counselors will be better prepared to make their presentations to middle school students and college-bound high school students.
Shared Governance in Enrollment Management and Facilitating Graduation for High Unit Students

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) acknowledge the reality that the reduction in the full time equivalent student (FTES) capacity of the CSU inherently means a reduction in access to state-supported higher education opportunities for the citizens of California; and be further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize that one of many ways to partially preserve access to a legitimate higher education experience for more of our potential student pool in the context of massive cuts to state-support for education is to limit the education available to individuals. In this vein, having policies that restrict second baccalaureate students from matriculation and that discourage late-in-degree changes of major which would unreasonably increase the number of units to degree should be considered as legitimate (albeit potentially distasteful) academic policies; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU reaffirm AS-2908-09 (*Mitigation of the Impact of Systemwide Enrollment Management Policies on Graduate and Post baccalaureate Credential Program*) and in particular its’ acknowledgement and support for “efforts to manage enrollment in order to align, more appropriately, the numbers of students enrolled at campuses in the CSU with the available resources necessary to ensure the quality of education needed to serve these students;” and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU endorse campus-based processes, such as targeted intrusive advising (e.g., mandated advising), where those processes were developed and supported via legitimate
shared governance, developed to facilitate the appropriate graduation of those students who have attained exceptionally high numbers of baccalaureate level units of coursework without having attained the baccalaureate degree; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU reaffirm and note the applicability of its stance on shared governance and facilitating graduation presented in AS-2598-03/AA “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.” The ASCSU recommend the processes or procedures implemented to facilitate access for our potential incoming students, and in particular those designed to open access by facilitating graduation, be developed via legitimate shared governance and that the effectiveness of these policies be assessed.

RATIONALE: California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 40411 (Modified June 5, 2009), in part, grants campus presidents the authority to graduate students who have completed their degree requirements but have not yet applied for graduation. In some cases, students are pursuing post-baccalaureate experiences required for attaining a higher level in the workforce (e.g., post-baccalaureate work required prior for licensure in accounting or pre-medical preparation), in other cases, students are pursuing a second bachelor’s degree or have chosen to remain in school for a multitude of possible reasons. The difficulty faced by the CSU as a whole, and many campuses individually, is the trade off necessitated by the wholesale reductions made to the CSU budget by the government of State of California. The CSU is at a point where it cannot fiscally and responsibly meet its mission. Clearly, the idea that the CSU can “encourage and provide access to an excellent education to all who are prepared for and wish to participate in collegiate study” cannot be met with the current funding realities. Similarly, the CSU is not capable of honoring the ‘commitments’ it spelled out for itself in the Access to Excellence planning document. In the current context, the
CSU is placed in the unenviable position of having to decide which potential students get to attend and which do not.

AS-2598-03/AA “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,” in part, requests:

“That the California State University Board of Trustees

6. 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

7. 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.”

It is noted that the shared governance policy development and implementation requests within Coded Memorandum AA-2005-21: Facilitating Graduation are congruent with the current resolution. Even where formal policy-promulgated processes were not followed, there are examples within the system of effective consultation and outreach despite the requirement for quick implementation of policies to protect the CSU from being further over-extended in its mission.

An example of a process used to facilitate graduation for those students with exceptionally high baccalaureate units completed is the process as implemented at San Jose State University (SJSU). The SJSU Student Success Committee largely wrote the presidential directive on ‘graduation and change of major’ with input from Undergraduate Studies, the Registrar, and Student Services. The SJSU Presidential directive, in part, states “This directive is issued in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, the President's Advisory Committee on Enrollment,
and the Advising Council. This directive will remain in effect until the president signs into effect a replacement policy developed by the Academic Senate.” The consultation during the development of the directive and the explicit recognition of the role of the Academic Senate in setting curricular policies that occurs throughout the document are hallmarks of effective shared government despite the time pressures generated by the need to preserve resources.
Mitigation of the Impact of Systemwide Enrollment Management Policies on Graduate and Post baccalaureate Credential Programs

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) both acknowledge and support the Chancellor’s efforts to manage enrollment in order to align, more appropriately, the numbers of students enrolled at campuses in the CSU with the available resources necessary to ensure the quality of education needed to serve these students; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU express its concern to the Chancellor that the establishment of November 30, 2009 as the closure date for “priority” admissions for graduate applications will have an adverse impact on graduate and post baccalaureate credential programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage the Chancellor to consider extending the “priority” admission deadline on a campus-specific, case-by-case basis; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage campus senates to establish mechanisms whereby programs can request, through campus Academic Affairs procedures, a variance from the Chancellor of the admissions deadline for graduate and post baccalaureate credential programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage campus senates to consider ways to mitigate the impact of enrollment management policies on graduate and post baccalaureate credential programs, including the possibility of programs requesting a variance of the deadline from the Chancellor when deemed appropriate in order to maintain program viability and quality.

RATIONALE  Application deadlines for graduate and post baccalaureate credential programs in the California State University have historically been mid-spring for the following academic year. Applicants for graduate and post baccalaureate credential programs have historically made their decisions about attending graduate school later than applicants to undergraduate programs. Consequently, the hastily announced and little publicized establishment by the Chancellor of November 30, 2009 as the closure of “priority” admission of graduate students for the Fall 2010 term has the potential to shrink graduate and post baccalaureate credential enrollments to a much greater degree than undergraduate enrollments. In addition, the nature of graduate admission decisions is such that potential graduate students would be evaluated for admission at the beginning of their senior year, potentially prior to the ability to conduct an adequate assessment of their promise as advanced degree candidates, especially for transfer students. Furthermore, many graduate programs rely on balanced fall and spring enrollments in order to allow for more systematic and responsive offering of classes, and to sustain cohort models. Such reductions could threaten the viability of existing programs that currently have adequate and sustainable enrollments.
For campuses to make the case for an exemption to the prescribed deadlines, each campus must also ensure that the reduced enrollment targets established for 2010-11 will not be exceeded. Such a case would allow campuses to be more strategic in the decisions that will need to be made as enrollments decline.

Approved Unanimously – September 10-11, 2009
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; 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 recourses. “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.

APPROVED – March 6-7, 2003
have returned to school after a long absence and earned degrees as septuagenarians. The CSU embraces the tenacity, the complexity, and the richness in the lives of these people who take unusual or roundabout routes to a college degree. Similarly, the CSU welcomes the young prodigy who graduates with a bachelor’s degree at age 16. Most people, however, do not fall into either one of these extremes on the continuum. Most enter college in their late teens or early 20s intending to get a degree. What that degree will be and how it will be earned—these are sometimes mysteries to entering students who have uncertain direction, who need to be inspired to intellectual curiosity, or who have dreams too vast or too uncircumscribed to be realized. The job of CSU faculty, staff, and administrators is to provide direction, give good counsel, balance the interests of students with the interests of the citizens of California, and help students achieve what most of them want when they enter college: a university degree of high quality.

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.
Continuing Support for Efforts Facilitating Transfers Between Community Colleges and the CSU

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) encourage CSU academic programs to continue to accept Transfer-CSU (TCSU) based articulation agreements through Summer 2012 while TCSU courses descriptors transition to the C-ID system; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage CSU academic programs to support the cooperative efforts of the CSU and California Community College (CCC) to make the C-ID system successful; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge CSU discipline faculty to participate actively in C-ID course descriptor development and review; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the CSU Chancellor’s Office to maintain currency in identifying campus based discipline faculty leadership as contacts for communication; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, the Chancellor, campus Presidents, campus Senate Chairs, campus Senate Executive Committees, Provosts and campus articulation officers.

RATIONALE: The Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) project is transitioning for integration with the CCC sponsored C-ID project. During this transition period, existing TCSU course descriptors and their accompanying articulation agreements will be remain valid through Summer 2012.
2012. It is the intention of the CCC to fast-track consideration of TCSU course descriptors for adoption as C-ID course descriptors.
Establishment of a Change Control Process for Authorizing Customizations to the Common Management System (CMS) in Response to Changes in Policy and Practices

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) supports the Chancellor’s efforts in requiring cost/benefit assessments for newly proposed projects and or purchases; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That in the case where proposed Executive Orders will require significant expenditures for implementation, the fiscal impact of such Executive Orders be assessed and alternative implementations be developed and considered; and be it

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that alternative non-CMS implementation options be considered in those cases where the proposed implementation of an Executive Order will involve requests for customization to the Common Management System (CMS) and the cost for such customization is significant,; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend to the Chancellor and campus presidents that the assessment and approval or disapproval of proposed customizations to CMS be the responsibility of a consultative body that includes non-CMS management representatives as well as representatives from the effected stakeholder groups; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognizes that the limitations inherent is the software systems, both systemwide and on individual campuses, not dictate the type and form of implementation of policy and practices; and be it further

6. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, the Chancellor, members of the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC),
the Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC), campus Senate Chairs, campus Senate Executive Committees, Provosts, and campus Presidents,

RATIONALE: In response to the issuance of EO 1037, the campus Registrars identified major difficulties in the implementation of the oversight needed to monitor student compliance to the policy changes affecting drops, withdrawals, incompletes, and repeats. At the request of a representative group of Registrars meeting in a number of face-to-face meetings, CMS personnel have been working on implementing customizations to CMS. The work is expected to be completed in time for implementation in the 2010-11 academic year.

Apparently, there was no consideration of alternative, non-CMS options nor was there involvement of the user community of faculty and students in the form and design of the agreed upon changes to CMS. “Best Practices” associated with the maintenance of large scale software systems involve the use of a highly consultative change control system. Prior to making decisions about proposed changes, both the problem and the proposed solution are analyzed and alternatives considered.

In the case of EO 1037, apparently the decisions on the form and content of the changes were negotiated between the Registrar’s group and CMS personnel and carried out in the absence of recognized “best practices”. The intent of this resolution is to recommend that such “best practices” be used at both the system level and on individual campuses in assessing the efficacy of requests to customize CMS.

15 Agenda Item

Protecting the Rights and Entitlement of Contingent Faculty to Participate in Shared Governance

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support the right of all lecturer faculty to participate in shared governance activities at the local campus and statewide level.

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU support the right of all lecturer faculty to be fairly and equitably compensated for performing such participation on behalf of the university.

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor’s office and campus administrations to implement policies and procedures governing the compensation of lecturers for their participation in shared governance, that do not penalize lecturers’ present or future workload and entitlements within their departments, schools, colleges, or the university.

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge that system-wide and campus policies and procedures governing the compensation of lecturers that may adversely affect the lecturer-recipient’s present or future workload, or future entitlement, be immediately reviewed and revised to mitigate any such deleterious consequences.

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage the Chancellor’s Office and local campuses to allow part-time lecturers accepting compensation for participation in shared governance be allowed to receive such compensation, as WTU, without relinquishing any part of their part-time workload, up to full-time status, without increasing or decreasing their existing entitlement.
6. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution and advise the Chancellor’s Office and all relevant campus administrations and offices (e.g. Human Resources, Academic Personnel, Deans and Chairs) to take any measures necessary to ensure that the workload, entitlement, and future employment of all lecturer faculty involved in compensated or uncompensated shared governance is protected, and not adversely affected in the short-term or long-term, by the consequences of performing this vital and valuable service to the university.

RATIONALE: The majority of CSU faculty, measured both in terms of headcount and FTE, (up to nearly 70% on some campuses according to 2009 data) are employed on contingent work contracts. These faculty face terms and conditions of employment which render them most vulnerable to the deleterious effects of budget cuts, course cancellation, program cutbacks and program consolidation. Contingent faculty are the first to experience the results of such cutbacks, with ensuing consequences often including decreased faculty workload, loss of healthcare benefits, and potential layoff. In an effort to encourage all faculty (including contingent and non-contingent lecturers) to participate in shared governance activity, and, specifically, to afford lecturer faculty an unencumbered opportunity by which to voice their significant concerns during these challenging times for the CSU, the ASCSU urge that the workload, entitlement, and future employment possibilities of all lecturer faculty are not adversely affected in any way by their participation in shared governance activity inclusive of both short and long-term assignments. Additionally, if compensation is granted for such activities, all appropriate campus and statewide offices assure that this compensation can be fairly received by lecturer faculty for performing shared governance
activity without any adverse effect upon present or future employment for the CSU.

Addendum: As verified by Chancellor’s Office representatives from Human Resources on 11/5/09, each campus is responsible for the establishment and implementation of procedures governing the receipt of compensation when available, by lecturers, for shared governance activities. These policies do not fall within the purview of the California Faculty Association, and so it is the purview of individual campus administrations to establish and adhere to a fair and equitable policy for each campus. The resolution addresses the need to review and revise the unintended deleterious consequences of some current campus policies.