

## Academic Senate CSU

### Plenary Agenda

Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium

**Thursday**      March 17, 2011      10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Senate Social – Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee  
Hosting  
5:15 p.m. – 6:45 p.m.

**Friday**      March 18, 2011      8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of agenda
4. Approval of January 20-21, 2011 Minutes
5. Announcements
6. Presentations/Introductions
7. Faculty Trustee Candidates
  - 7.1. Presentations; Question and answer period (4:00 p.m. Thursday)
  - 7.2. Election of candidates for Faculty Trustee (10:00 a.m. Friday)
8. Reports:
  - 8.1. Chair
  - 8.2. Standing committees
  - 8.3. Other committees and committee liaisons
  - 8.4. Ad hoc Task Force on Senate Bylaws
  - 8.5. Ben Quillian, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer (Time Certain 1:00 p.m. Thursday)
  - 8.6. Gary Rhoades, President AAUP (Time Certain, 2:00 p.m. Thursday)
  - 8.7. Trustee Debra Farar (Time Certain, 1:00 p.m. Friday)
  - 8.8. Chancellor Charles Reed (Time Certain, 2:00 p.m. Friday)
  - 8.9. Ephraim Smith, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
  - 8.10. John Travis, CFA
  - 8.11. Neil Sanchez, CSSA Liaison
  - 8.12. William R. Blischke, ERFA Liaison

## 9. Committee Recommendations

- |       |  |   |
|-------|--|---|
| 9.1.  | Changes to the list of Faculty Trustee Nominees for the remainder of the 2009-2011 term ending June 30th 2011  | <u>AS-2969-10/EX</u><br>Second Reading                  |
| 9.2.  | Support for Intersegmental Collaboration in the Implementation of SB 1440  | <u>AS-2998-11/AA (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading            |
| 9.3.  | Support for Collaborative Faculty Development of Model Transfer Degrees (SB 1440)  | <u>AS-2999-11/AA (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading            |
| 9.4.  | Support for Adequate Resources for CSU Libraries   | <u>AS-3000-11/AA (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading            |
| 9.5.  | Support for a Three-Year Pilot Program of the Statway Curriculum as an Alternative for Establishing Proficiency in Quantitative Reasoning                | <u>AS-3001-11/AA/APEP (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading       |
| 9.6.  | Recognizing the Joint Committee Report on Student Evaluations of Teaching  | <u>AS-3002-11/FA (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading            |
| 9.7.  | Amending The Constitution of the Academic Senate, The California State University, to Include a Statement Upholding Academic Freedom                     | <u>AS-3003-11/FA (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading            |
| 9.8.  | Amendments to the Senate Bylaws for Direct Election of Standing Committee Chairs by the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU)       | AS-3005-11/Bylaws<br><u>Committee</u><br>Second Reading |
| 9.9.  | Support of the Development of a Consistent Methodology for the Analysis of Student-Faculty Ratio and Intra and Inter-Campus Expenditures on Instruction  | <u>AS-3006-11/FGA (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading           |
| 9.10. | Support for the CSSA Resolution Calling for the Standardization of Student Response Systems  | <u>AS-3007-11/AA (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading            |
| 9.11. | Comprehensive Strategic Plan for Reducing CSU Remediation Needs to Negligible Levels   | <u>AS-3008-11/APEP (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading          |
| 9.12. | Renewed Call for Establishment of a Task Force to Respond to Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code – Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses | <u>AS-3009-11/APEP (Rev)</u><br>Second Reading          |

## 10. Adjournment

# # **1** Agenda Item

AS-2969-10/EX  
September 16, 2010  
Second Reading

## **Changes to the list of Faculty Trustee Nominees for the remainder of the 2009-2011 term ending June 30<sup>th</sup> 2011**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU) continue to deplore the failure of the current Governor of California to protect the quality of the CSU by neglecting to appoint a Faculty Trustee to the Board of Trustees from the March 2009 Faculty Trustee Nominees furnished by the ASCSU in accordance with *California Education Code* section 66602-c-1.
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU remain committed to ensuring faculty representation on the CSU Board of Trustees in California in accordance with *California Education Code* Sections 66600-66609.
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize that of the two Faculty Trustee Nominees put forward in March 2009 after following the “*Criteria and Procedures for the Nomination of the Faculty Trustee*” (AS-1773-87/EX), only one of the two Faculty Trustee Nominees remains eligible to serve.
4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize the clear interpretation of California Education Codes 66602-66604 for the duration of the term of any Faculty Trustee Nominee starting before July 1, 2011 would yield a term that expires on June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

5. RESOLVED: That the names of the Faculty Trustee Nominees for the nominal 2011-2013 term, once selected, be given the option of being added to the list of Faculty Trustee Nominee(s) that could be appointed to fill the remaining term of the still-vacant role of Faculty Trustee for the 2009-2011 term.

**DISTRIBUTION:**

- The CSU Board of Trustees
- Chancellor Reed

RATIONALE: In spite of concerted effort on the part of the ASCSU, both formal and informal, the current Governor of California has failed to appoint a faculty member to the Board of Trustees from the list of names furnished by the ASCSU in March 2009 (California Education Code 66602-c-1). As a result, there has been an unprecedented lack of a Faculty Trustee for 15 months at a time when the CSU has facing serious challenges (both internal and external) that impact the access, affordability, credibility, and quality of the institution.

This resolution would allow the to-be-selected Faculty Trustee Nominees for consideration for appointment from July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011 (to June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2013) to be considered for the remainder of the 2009-2011 term (to June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011) alongside the current remaining Faculty Trustee Nominee. The logic of the addition is that, with the adoption of the January Nominee selection process spelled out in AS-XXXX-XX/EX, only four months would remain in the prior term in the case that a Faculty Trustee had not yet been appointed.

A new Governor will be inaugurated in January 2011. Following the procedures outlined in this resolution will provide the new Governor with an additional set of Faculty Trustee Nominees to supplement the sole remaining nominee resulting from the (presumably continued) inaction of the current governor.

This resolution adds the names of the to-be-selected Faculty Trustee Nominees for the new Faculty Trustee's term starting in June 2011 to a point where they could start at an earlier date. Any appointment starting after June 2011 would not include the current remaining Faculty Trustee Nominee unless they were selected by the ASCSU as one of the Faculty Trustee Nominees for the next term of the Faculty Trustee. Should a Faculty Trustee Nominee be offered and accept an appointment to fill out the remainder of the 2009-2011 Faculty Trustee term ending June 30, 2011, that will then qualify as serving one term as a Faculty Trustee. This resolution would replace the current sole eligible Faculty Trustee Nominee from the 2009-2011 slate as forwarded to the (former) governor in March 2009 with a (presumably) larger list available for immediate appointment.

Relevant portions of the California Education Code include:

*“66602 (c) (1) A faculty member from the California State University, who shall be tenured at the California State University campus at which he or she teaches, shall also be appointed by the Governor for a two-year term. In the selection of a faculty member as a member of the board, the Governor shall appoint the faculty member from a list of names of at least two persons furnished by the Academic Senate of the California State University.*

*(2) The faculty member of the board appointed by the Governor pursuant to this subdivision shall not participate on any subcommittee of the board responsible for collective bargaining negotiations.*

*(3) The term of office of the faculty member of the board shall commence on July 1, and shall expire on June 30 two years thereafter.”*

*“66604. The expiration of a trustee's term of office as a member of the State Board of Education or any earlier vacancy in that office shall create a vacancy in his trusteeship, unless the term ascribed thereto by lot has already expired. In case of any vacancy on the board of trustees, the Governor shall appoint a successor for the balance of the term as to which such vacancy exists.”*

*“66607. The California State University shall be entirely independent of all political and sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its trustees and in the administration of its affairs, and no person shall be debarred admission to any department of the state university on account of sex.”*

# #2 Agenda Item

AS-2998-11/AA  
January 20-21 2011  
Second Reading

## **Support for Intersegmental Collaboration for the Implementation of SB 1440**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) commend and support the current intersegmental collaboration with the Academic Senate of the California Community College (ASCCC) in the development, implementation, and oversight of Associate Degrees for Transfer on both the SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight Committee as well as the SB 1440 Academic Senate Work Group; and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU further encourage collaborative efforts with members of the University of California Academic Senate in issues related to student transfer and SB 1440 and be it further
3. 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,
  - Campus articulation officers,
  - California Faculty Association,
  - Academic Senate of the University of California,
  - Academic Senate of the California State University,
  - California Community Colleges' Board of Governors,

- University of California Board of Regents,
- Members of the SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight Committee

RATIONALE: SB 1440, the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act, was enacted and commencing with the fall term of the 2011-12 academic year, a student who earns an associate degree for transfer granted pursuant to subdivision (b) shall be deemed eligible for transfer into a California State University baccalaureate program when the student meets both of the following requirements:

1. Completion of 60 semester units or 90 quarter units that are eligible for transfer to the California State University, including both of the following:
  - a. The Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) or the California State University General Education-Breadth Requirements.
  - b. A minimum of 18 semester units or 27 quarter units in a major or area of emphasis, as determined by the community college district.

# #3 Agenda Item

AS-2999-11/AA  
January 20-21 2011  
Second Reading

## **Support for Faculty Collaboration in the Development of Model Transfer Degrees**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support and encourage the active participation of discipline specific faculty from both the CSU and California Community Colleges (CCC) transfer model curricula; and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU continue support for this faculty driven process of curriculum development; and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge campuses to provide the necessary funding to support discipline faculty participation in the development of Model Transfer Degrees and be it further
4. 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,
  - Campus articulation officers,
  - California Faculty Association,
  - Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges,
  - Academic Senate of the University of California,

- California Community Colleges' Board of Governors,
- University of California Board of Regents,
- Members of the SB 1440 Implementation and Oversight Committee

RATIONALE: Faculty in the CSU are working with CCC faculty in the CCC Discipline Input Group (DIG) groups, the mechanism currently in use for the development of CCC model transfer degrees with drafts of models transfer proposals being reviewed and considered for future CCC adoption.

# #4 Agenda Item

AS-3000-11/AA  
January 20-21, 2011  
Second Reading

## **Support for Adequate Resources for CSU Libraries**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University (ASCSU) acknowledge the recent findings of Linda Demmers, summarized in her report entitled “CSU Libraries: Revisiting the Standards,” submitted to the CSU Council of Library Directors on December 3, 2010. The key findings of this report include: that CSU libraries continue to be more heavily utilized by students and faculty than libraries at other intuitions; that CSU libraries remain seriously understaffed, with only one campus meeting the 2009 FTES staffing guideline; that seventeen CSU campus libraries lack adequate assignable square ft. as prescribed by 1991 guidelines; that system-wide collections remain at 64% of the size prescribed in 1991; and that only two libraries meet the 1991 collection standards based on current FTES, and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU reaffirm its commitment and support for adequate and sustainable funding of CSU Libraries e.g., AS-2535-01/AA “Support for Library Funding” and AS-2779-06 “Library Resource Needs for All Undergraduate and Graduate Programs”, and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU reaffirm the centrality of libraries to any system-wide effort at student retention and success, faculty development in teaching and scholarship, and advancements in outreach and service to our communities, with CSU Libraries serving not only as informational resources but also as physical environments where students, faculty and staff work collaboratively to promote learning and research, and be it further
4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU the Board of Trustees, the CSU Chancellor, CSU campus Presidents and provosts, Council of Library Directors and CSU Campus Senate Chairs

RATIONALE: A fully operational library lies at the very heart of the academic enterprise. CSU libraries must be properly staffed and properly supported if the CSU is to fulfill its mission of teaching, research, and community engagement.

Recent budget reductions have impaired the ability of CSU libraries to execute their strategic plans and to fulfill their daily obligations. Currently, 17 libraries have space deficits totaling nearly 1.2 million assignable square feet (ASF), a significant increase from a deficit of about 500,000 ASF in 1998. Although recent additions have increased system-wide collections by two million volumes, as of 2009 CSU libraries held 11 million volumes less than required by the formulas outlined in the 1991 Policies and Standards for CSU Campus Library Facilities. 63% of CSU libraries have fewer librarians than comparison institutions; and these staffing shortfalls are disrupting the ability of CSU libraries to provide information technologies and to support for learning management systems. Contrary to perceived wisdom, the proliferation of electronic resources does not diminish but in fact augments the need for qualified and available staff to assist students and faculty.

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2779-06/FGA (Rev)  
November 9, 2006

**Library Resource Needs for All Undergraduate and Graduate Programs**

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) reaffirm its ongoing concern expressed within *The California State University at the Beginning of 21st Century: Meeting the needs of the People of California* Report of 2001 about lagging funds for library resources in support of all programs and disciplines; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and campus presidents to seek increased funding to restore and improve print, electronic and other collections; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and campus presidents to seek increased funding to restore and improve student-librarian ratios consistent with or superior to libraries of CPEC comparison institutions and to address the state and national challenge of improving information competency; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU acknowledge the CSU's recent inclusion of library resource needs within short or long-term annual budget categories and urge a higher priority for these needs; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor's Office to collaborate with the Academic Senate CSU to advocate with the Legislature for restoration of the \$350,000 removed by the Governor from the CSU's proposed \$2.5 million line item increase for libraries in the 2007-08 budget, and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU send copies of this resolution to the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, campus presidents and provosts, the Council of Library Directors, and campus faculty senates.

*RATIONALE: The Academic Senate CSU 21st Century report from 2001 outlined various unmet core and support needs at that time and from many years prior as well as the deleterious effects on CSU educational quality in the future of not restoring and augmenting the pertinent resource budgets. Library funding shortfalls received due attention as a component of this report, and the situation has generally deteriorated in the five or more years since. CSU libraries and librarians have experienced greater difficulties in giving quality support to faculty and students from undergraduate and graduate programs across all departments and disciplines. Higher inflation rates for print and online research materials have damaged purchasing power along with static or otherwise insufficient collection funding. From 1972 until 2004, CSU Statistical Abstracts show a 39.5% decline in systemwide and campus expenditures for libraries when adjusted for inflation. In 2002 the NCES Academic Library Survey listed total CSU library expenditures per FTES at an average of \$356, or 42% below the \$619 figure for a group of 14 CPEC*

*libraries. Again during the 1972-2004 period, overall CSU library staffing decreased 53%. As of 2002 the NCES Academic Library Survey reports that our librarian/professional staff per 1000 FTES stood at 1.36 or 57% lower than at CPEC libraries. Since the 1970's and since our 2001 21st Century Report, the CSU overall has certainly experienced enrollment growth in numbers and percentages that we might represent as almost the 180-degree opposite of the library support declines outlined herein. While publication formats may have evolved considerably over these decades, the need for traditional materials has not disappeared in many disciplines even as efficient-but-expensive newer modes have grown popular in other subject areas. Furthermore, in many ways the rich proliferation of research sources old and new has greatly magnified the dire social need for librarians and colleagues to manage better our information resources and more effectively teach their best critical use.*

**Approved Unanimously – January 18-19, 2007**

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
of  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2535-01/AA  
May 10-11, 2001

**Support for Library Funding**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University support and applaud the current budget provisions that include augmentations to campus library base budgets of \$3 million as part of the partnership compact between the CSU and the Governor; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge that each campus library receive its full allocation as an addition to its base budget; and be it further

RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be sent to the Chancellor, each campus president, each campus senate chair, and each campus library director.

*RATIONALE: In 1998, the Academic Senate CSU adopted resolution AS-2429-98/AA (attached) in support of the findings of the systemwide Task Force on Library Collections. The report of the task force found that serious degradation in the quality of CSU library collections occurred as the result of funding cuts beginning in the early 1990s. A funding gap for library collections was identified by the task force, a gap which is now estimated to be \$12 million annually. This funding shortfall has been recognized by the CSU and the State as a structural budget deficiency in need of correction. The current, four-year "Partnership" agreement between the CSU and the governor provides for an additional 1% increase to the State General Fund base to phase in full funding to eliminate the annual budgetary shortfalls for libraries as well as building maintenance, instructional equipment, and instructional technology between 1999-00 and 2002-03. That agreement yielded an increase of \$3 million of base budget funding for systemwide electronic information resources in 2000-01. An additional \$4 million is budgeted for 2001-02 bringing the total addition to the base budget for libraries to \$7 million.*

*In 2001-02, \$3 million of the Partnership funding will be allocated directly to campuses for library collections. Allocations will be made on the basis of campus FTES. To close the funding gap, it is critical that each library receive its full allocation as an addition to its base budget.*

**APPROVED WITHOUT DISSENT – May 10-11, 2001**

**ACADEMIC SENATE**  
of  
**THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2429-98/AA  
September 10-11, 1998

**Support for the “Report of the Task Force on Library Collections” and  
Restoration of Funding for Library Collections**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University support the “Report of the Task Force on Library Collections” and urge the Chancellor, Board of Trustees and campuses to support the following budgetary recommendations:

- that the \$10 million one-time supplemental funds for library materials included in the 1998-99 general fund budget be “‘earmarked’ to assure that these funds are used to restore in part the library purchasing power lost since 1990-91.”; and
- that “every effort be made to add the \$10 million one-time supplement funding in 98-99 to the base budget in future years with adjustments for inflation and to assure that it is used for library acquisitions.”; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU commend the Task Force on Library Collections and the Council of Library Directors for preparing the “Report of the Task Force on Library Collections” and informing the CSU community of the drastic need to increase funding for library collections to enable the CSU to continue offering educational programs of high quality.

*RATIONALE: Since FY 1990-91, the support for the collections of the CSU libraries has declined disproportionately to all other aspects of the academic enterprise. The cuts began with the libraries under the notion that the budget would soon improve and sacrificing the libraries would be the lesser of other evils. When one considers that in 1990 the total expenditure for acquisitions (electronic resources, for the most part, were not purchased) for 19 libraries was \$24,024,731 and that in FY 96-97 the expenditures for acquisitions (including electronic resources) for 22 libraries was \$25,632,651—a mere increase of 4 percent—it becomes apparent that the libraries have not only suffered disproportionately, for a longer period of time, but also are not recovering on a par with other programs under the terms of the “compact.” For example, in FY 90-91 the total expenditures for 19 CSU libraries was 4.69 percent of all general fund expenditures, whereas in FY 96-97 the total library expenditures for 22 CSU libraries was only 4.15 percent of all general fund expenditures.*

*Additionally, the costs of library materials have risen more steeply than any other commodities purchased by the university in the nineties. Between FY 90-91 and FY 97-98, the price of library books increased by 29 percent. During the same interval, periodicals rose by 87 percent. The result is that eight years ago 19 libraries paid for 63,822 subscriptions while last year 22 libraries paid for 47,310; a cancellation rate of 26 percent. Eight years ago 19 libraries purchased 263,379 books while last year 22 libraries purchased 226,668—a reduction of 14 percent. Does this imply less work for librarians? Not so; during the same time staffing in 19 libraries was*

*reduced from 1,217 FTE positions (a ratio of 0.6 FTE position per 100 FTES) to 1,127 positions (a ratio of 0.43 FTE position per 100 FTES) in 22 libraries. The reduced staff was kept occupied by an increased demand for inter-library loans. Eight years ago 19 libraries borrowed 126,549 items from other libraries while last year 22 libraries borrowed 159,671 items from other libraries—an increase of 26 percent.*

*The rising disparity between the costs of library books and serials works to the disadvantage of the former. As a result, we are experiencing a decreasing proportion of contemporary publications in comparison to older publications within the subject areas. For example, in the dynamic field of computer science, the library holdings at San Jose State show that 21.1 percent of the books were published in 1988 while only 6.1 percent were published in 1996.*

**APPROVED WITHOUT DISSENT – September 11, 1998**

# #5 Agenda Item

AS-3001-10/AA/APEP  
January 20-21, 2011  
Second Reading

## **Support for a Three-Year Pilot Program of the Statway Curriculum as an Alternative for Establishing Proficiency in Quantitative Reasoning**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognize the findings of the Chancellor's General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) regarding the two-semester (or quarter equivalent) Statway curriculum as an alternative for achieving proficiency in quantitative reasoning; and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU support a three-year pilot project of Statway for the six identified California Community College (CCC) Districts (and their collaborating CSUs where appropriate). Students who successfully complete the Statway curriculum will earn three semester units (or the equivalent in quarter units) of baccalaureate credit, all of which may be applied to General Education (GE) Breadth in Quantitative Reasoning ("GE Area B4"); and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that these Statway courses be temporarily exempted from the usual requirement that any Quantitative Reasoning (Area B4) course carry a prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra; and be it further
4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage the collection (by those offering the course) and careful evaluation of pertinent data produced by the pilot project in order for GEAC to assess the effectiveness of the use of Statway; and be it further
5. That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to The Board of Trustees of the CSU, Campus Presidents and Provosts, CCC Presidents and Provosts, the GEAC and the CSU GE Interest

Group listservs, CSU Campus Senate Chairs, CSU Math Council, and the California Intersegmental Articulation Council

**RATIONALE:** Statway offers a two-semester, statistics-based alternative to the existing four-semester developmental pathway to successful completion of Area 4B of the GE Breadth requirements. For students enrolled in California Community Colleges and California State Universities, the current developmental math pathway can be a roadblock to degree completion. Nationally, 60% of students are placed in developmental math, while the figure rises to 90% among low income and minority students; moreover, only about 30% of students placed in the developmental pathway complete the sequence. Most of those who fail to complete the math pathway do so by attrition not actual failure; while two-thirds of those who do not complete the developmental math sequence nevertheless pass all courses in which they were enrolled. Most students in developmental math do not intend to pursue STEM careers, but bridge courses may accommodate this need.

The Carnegie Foundation developed learning outcomes for Statway in consultation with developmental mathematics and statistics representatives from both two and four-year institutions as well as from ASA, MAA, AMS, AMATYC, and NCTM; reviews of student learning outcomes by related professional organizations are ongoing. Members of GEAC whose disciplines require the study and use of statistics will also provide ongoing advice and oversight during the pilot period.

The six participating California College Districts are:

1. Foothill-De Anza Community College District
2. Los Angeles Community College District
3. Mount San Antonio Community College District
4. Los Rios Community College District
5. San Diego Community College District
6. San Francisco Community College District

# #6 Agenda Item

AS-3002-11/FA  
January 20-21, 2011  
Second Reading

## **Recognizing the Joint Committee Report on Student Evaluations of Teaching**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm its commitment to academic and instructional excellence; and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU acknowledge and commend the representatives of the CSU, the ASCSU and the California Faculty Association (CFA) who prepared a comprehensive Report on Student Evaluations of Teaching; and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU support the general recommendations of the report that calls for the use of student evaluations as but one of many measures to evaluate teaching effectiveness and for their use to be formative rather than summative; and be it further
4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, the California Faculty Association, and the members of the Joint Committee on Student Evaluations of Teaching.

RATIONALE: Section 15.19 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the CSU and the CFA of 2007 recognized unresolved concerns regarding student evaluation and practices. As a result, the parties agreed to form a joint committee to study “the best and most effective practices for the student evaluation of teaching effectiveness.”

In the execution of its charge, the joint committee, with representatives from the CSU, the CFA, and the ASCSU, exercised due diligence in evaluating the extant literature on the best

practices of student evaluation of teaching, as well as data from all CSU campuses

concerning local practices in reaching its conclusions. This resulted in the Joint Committee

Report on Student Evaluations of Teaching.

# # 7 Agenda Item

AS-3003-11/FA  
January 20-21, 2011  
Second Reading

## **Amending the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University, to Include a Statement Upholding Academic Freedom**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) endorse the following amendment to Article I, Section 1. (a) of The Constitution of the Academic Senate, The California State University (proposed amendment underlined):

It shall be the purpose of the Academic Senate of the California State University to promote academic excellence in The California State University; to uphold and preserve the principles of academic freedom and protect freedom of inquiry, research, expression and teaching both inside and beyond the classroom, as set forth in the American Association of University Professors 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* and its subsequent interpretations; to serve as the official voice...etc.;

and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU, in accordance with Article VII of the Constitution of the Academic Senate, The California State University, forward this amendment to individual campuses for a vote and initiate a systemwide referendum for its ratification; and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU commit itself to continually engage, and encourage individual CSU campuses to participate, in carefully monitoring those events, activities

and/or interpretations that influence the evolving understanding of the meaning of academic freedom and how they might affect CSU faculty.

RATIONALE: The Preamble, The Constitution of the Academic Senate, The California State University, specifies that the Constitution is adopted by the faculty of the CSU “in order to exercise its rights and fulfill its responsibilities in the shared governance of the University.” In setting forth these rights and responsibilities in subsequent Articles, at no point does the Constitution reference the important role of the ASCSU in safeguarding and preserving the principles of academic freedom for the faculty it serves throughout the CSU system. The purpose of this amendment is to remedy this serious omission in the Constitution.

The American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* and its subsequent interpretations provide the most widely accepted and understood statement of academic freedom for higher education. In 1966 the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities jointly formulated a Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities which was formally recognized by the executive bodies of each group. That statement incorporates by reference the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*. In addition Section 3561(c) of the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) encourages the free exchange of ideas among faculty, students and staff, and goes on to state: “All parties subject to this chapter shall respect and endeavor to preserve academic freedom in the...California State University.” Given the recognized

importance of preserving and safeguarding academic freedom within higher education, this principle must be articulated within the Constitution of the ASCSU and regularly monitored as circumstances generate new interpretations.

# #8 Agenda Item

AS-3004-11/Floor (Soni)  
January 20, 2011  
Second Reading

## **Amendments to the Senate Bylaws to Limit the Appointment of Senate Specialists to Academic Senators**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) amend Bylaw 4 (Committees and Specialists), Section (c) (Specialists), paragraph (2) as follows:

(2) These specialists shall be appointed from the current membership of the Senate by the Chair of the Senate, with the approval of the Executive Committee.

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

- the Chancellor,
- campus Senate Executive Committees, and
- Provosts

RATIONALE:

# #9 Agenda Item

AS-3005-11/Floor (Soni)  
January 20, 2011  
Second Reading

## **Amendments to the Senate Bylaws for Direct Election of Standing Committee Chairs**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) amend Bylaw 4 (Committees and Specialists), Section (a) (Standing Committees), with a new paragraph (2) (and re-numbering of subsequent paragraphs) and modifications to subsequent paragraphs:

(2) Election of Chairs

The Chairs of standing committees shall be annually elected by the Senate, at the same time as the time of election specified in Bylaw 2 c, and according to the same election procedures specified in Bylaw 2 d, immediately after the officers of the Senate have been elected. The chairs of the standing committees shall serve until regularly succeeded, but for no more than two years consecutively in the same office.

(23) Appointments

The ~~Chairs and the~~ Vice Chairs of standing committees will be appointed annually by the Chair of the Senate, with the approval of the Executive Committee and the elected chair of the standing committee. When the standing committee Chair's position is vacated due to resignation or other reasons, the Vice Chair of the standing committee shall assume the title and responsibilities of the chair of the standing committee.

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to:

- the Chancellor,
- campus Senate Executive Committees, and
- Provosts

RATIONALE:

# # 10 Agenda Item

AS-3006-11/FGA  
January 20-21 2011  
Second Reading

## **Support of the Development of a Consistent Methodology for the Analysis of Student-Faculty Ratio and Intra- and Inter-Campus Expenditures on Instruction**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) commend the Data Reconciliation and Analysis Subcommittee of the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee at California State University, San Marcos for the thorough analysis of student-faculty ratio (SFR) and instructional expenditures; and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize the importance of the information and methodologies presented on pages 1-4 and 20-31 of the *Three-Year FIRMS Comparison Study: Final Report* (see [http://www.csusm.edu/aa/documents/firms\\_report-augrevise.pdf](http://www.csusm.edu/aa/documents/firms_report-augrevise.pdf); See Hot Topics - bottom two items) for isolating intra and inter-campus expenditures on instructional and non-instructional units; and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU endorse the report *The Student Faculty Ratio and Related Issues* (see [http://www.csusm.edu/aa/documents/sfr\\_report\\_08\\_31\\_2010.pdf](http://www.csusm.edu/aa/documents/sfr_report_08_31_2010.pdf) See Hot Topics - bottom two items) and acknowledge the need to accurately determine student-faculty ratio (SFR) across campus units and across CSU campuses; and be it further
4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor's Office and the campuses to use more standardized methodologies such as those described in the attached reports to analyze and report SFR and instructional expenditures across the CSU; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, campus Presidents, campus Provosts, and campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: The CSU has long acknowledged the problems of comparing instructional expenditures and SFR across campuses. The reason frequently given is that each campus has unique methods for calculating these important management data. The purpose of this resolution is to encourage the CSU and campuses within the CSU to develop a consistent methodology for calculating these data.

# # 11 Agenda Item

AS-3007-11/AA  
January 20-21 2011  
Second Reading

## **Support for the CSSA Resolution Calling for the Standardization of Student Response Systems**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU) support the efforts of students to contain the cost of classroom supplies by containing the proliferation of student response systems (2010-2011 *CSSA Resolution in Support of the Standardization of Student Response Systems*); and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU further support standardization of student response systems (“clickers”) by faculty members at each campus as a cost saving strategy for students who may be required to purchase multiple devices; and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU support the CSSA recommendations urging CSU administrators, faculty, bookstore and or relevant auxiliaries, and students to research and establish processes for the standardization of student response systems; and be it further
4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to
  - the Board of Trustees
  - the Chancellor
  - campus Presidents and provosts
  - Campus Bookstores and relevant auxiliaries
  - Campus Senate Chairs.

RATIONALE: The 2010-2011 CSSA Resolution in Support of the Standardization of Student Response Systems (see attached) speaks to the need for campus standardization of student response systems (“clickers”). Current practices frequently require students to

purchase multiple devices that many times are used for one class and then not used again.

The costs associated with the single use of these instructional technology devices is

increasing and creating a burden for students required to purchase these supplemental

educational materials. Standardization of such devices on individual campuses would serve

to reduce student costs while improving IT support services to students,



**CSSA-17-10**  
**November 7, 2010**

**Resolution in Support of the Standardization of Student Response Systems**

**WHEREAS**, the California State Student Association (CSSA) is the single recognized voice for the students of the California State University (CSU) System; and

**WHEREAS**, the mission of CSSA is to maintain and enhance the accessibility of an affordable quality education for the people of California; and

**WHEREAS**, the CSU has long been recognized as a national leader and innovator in the development of high-quality, digitally delivered content; and

**WHEREAS**, the result of the significant increases in student fees in the past decade, cause many CSU students face economic challenges for completing their CSU degrees; and

**WHEREAS**, the 2008 California Bureau of State Audits Report indicates that the average CSU student pays an estimated \$812 per year for textbooks<sup>1</sup>, which is a significant percentage of students' total cost for their education; and

**WHEREAS**, student response system, or "clickers"<sup>2</sup> are being increasingly utilized in the classroom and students purchasing multiple devices drives up the costs of supplemental materials required for all their classes; and

**WHEREAS**, the student response systems are often bundled with book packages that require the student to buy duplicate devices for classes that utilize the same device; and

**WHEREAS**, the student response systems or "clickers" implemented in the CSU provide an active learning formula that promotes student engagement and interaction through technology; and

---

<sup>1</sup>California State Auditor, January 2008

<sup>2</sup>A student response system, or "clicker" is an instructional technology tool composed of a proprietary software application that is installed on the facilitator's computer, a wireless receiver, and hand-held, remote control-like transmitter that have been assigned to students to record their responses to multiple choice or yes/no questions.

1 **WHEREAS**, students having multiple student response systems creates problems for staff and  
2 IT on campuses because they cannot share similar technical experiences or support one another  
3 to solve issues, which often leads to the student having to manage all of their devices on their  
4 own<sup>3</sup>; and

5  
6 **WHEREAS**, training new staff, teachers, and IT professionals with multiple devices will be  
7 different for every classroom, which can be detrimental in the implementation of Student  
8 Response Systems; and

9  
10 **WHEREAS**, some campuses in the CSU have already standardized to a single student response  
11 systems by having a universal manufacturer and distributor in their campus bookstores and/or  
12 auxiliaries; and

13  
14 **WHEREAS**, standardized features and hardware will improve technical support from IT  
15 departments or from the manufacturer themselves, that allow staff and students to maintain their  
16 own Student Response Systems devices; and

17  
18 **WHEREAS**, the training and implementation of a single student response system will be  
19 streamlined into one device so that more faculty will be able to utilize the technology in their  
20 own classroom; and

21  
22 **WHEREAS**, the utilization of applications in concert with the student response systems should  
23 be considered in the standardization process; and

24  
25 **WHEREAS**, the campuses that do not utilize student response systems will potentially be  
26 subject to selecting one in the future and would benefit from other CSU campus models to  
27 standardize a device; and

28  
29 **WHEREAS**, the Affordable Learning Solutions Campaign goal to reduce the costs of  
30 instructional content by 50% for the CSU within the next five years will be supported by the  
31 standardization of Student Response Systems; therefore, be it

32  
33 **RESOLVED**, that the CSSA urges each CSU campus to standardize a student response system  
34 or “clicker” to reduce the cost of supplemental materials for their classes; be it further

35  
36 **RESOLVED**, that the CSSA urges each CSU campus administration, faculty, bookstore and/or  
37 relevant auxiliary, and Associated Students to research, establish a process and pursue the  
38 standardization of a single student response system for their respective campus; be it further

---

<sup>3</sup> Julius, Jim; Murphy-Boyer, Linda; Twetten, Jim M.K. (2007). *Educase Quarterly* Vol. 30, #4. *Successful Clicker Standardization: Standardizing on a single clicker system enhances pedagogical support while reducing logistical support issues and student costs*. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.educause.edu/EDUCAUSE+Quarterly/EDUCAUSEQuarterlyMagazineVolum/SuccessfulClickerStandardizati/162274>

1 **RESOLVED**, that the CSSA urges that the selection process of a student response system at  
2 each CSU campus must meet the ADA requirements to ensure unrestricted access to all students;  
3 be it further  
4

5 **RESOLVED**, that members of student leadership of the 23 CSU campuses will act to support  
6 and promote the standardization of student response systems on their campus; be it finally  
7

8 **RESOLVED**, that this resolution be distributed widely, including, but not limited, to the  
9 Campus Bookstore Auxiliaries, the Chancellor's Office, CSU Board of Trustees, System-wide  
10 and campus Academic Senates, Directors of Academic Technology, Directors of Information  
11 Technology, CSU Presidents, CSU Associated Students, and the California Faculty Association.

# # 12 Agenda Item

AS-3008-11/APEP  
January 20-21 2011  
Second Reading

## **Comprehensive Strategic Plan for Reducing Remediation Needs to Negligible Levels for Entering California State University Students**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recommend the development of a strategic plan that would identify the *comprehensive system of strategies* that would be needed to reduce to negligible levels the number of students accepted to California State University (CSU) campuses who would require developmental work in Reading/Writing and Mathematics; and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request the establishment of a strategic planning group to include representatives of constituencies essential to both the development, implementation and ultimately the success of such a comprehensive plan: and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that the constituencies include, but not be limited to the following:
  - English Council
  - Math Council
  - *Remediation Group* (name?)
  - Community College – Basic Skill Initiative Faculty and Administrators
  - Campus level faculty and administrators currently partnering with area high schools in the implementation of developmental strategies
  - Office of the Chancellor administrators involved in any of the current initiatives intended to reduce the need for remediation

- Early Start Implementation Task Force

And be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that this strategic planning group clearly define the scope of issues that will be addressed and specify the goals that would need to be met to ensure success of each strategy; and be it further
5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that the *comprehensive system of strategies* be used as a roadmap of long-term strategies that should be undertaken, but realize that such efforts are constrained by both the availability of resources as well as an infrastructure of support necessary to implement, assess and adapt each strategy as needed; and be it further
6. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to
  - Chancellor Reed
  - CSU Board of Trustees
  - Math Council
  - English Council
  - CSU Remediation Group
  - Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges
  - California Superintendent of Public Instruction
  - California Board of Education

RATIONALE: To date, efforts intended to address the “remediation” problem have been well-intended but have been developed in a piecemeal fashion. Each effort has dealt with some facet of the problem, but has not been able to provide for significant results in the

aggregate levels of remediation of needs of incoming students. This resolution requests that the CSU undertake a comprehensive strategic planning process that will identify not only the scope of the macro-level issues that must be addressed, but also identify a plan that will comprehensively address all of what must be done to reduce remediation needs to negligible levels.

The ASCSU is encouraged by and appreciative of the comprehensive analysis provided by Executive Vice Chancellor Smith, Assistant Vice Chancellor Young, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor Blackburn and Director Forbes in the Early Start report (“Update on Implementation of the California State University Early Start and Early Assessment Program”) to be presented to the Board of Education at its January 25-26 meeting. The report identifies the range of issues that must be addressed if the intended goals associated with the Early Start initiative are to be achieved. This systematic approach identifies areas that must be addressed if the Early Start initiative is to have any chance at successfully meeting its goals. This parallels the intent of this resolution, namely, to take a similar approach in developing a systematic strategic plan that would address our remediation needs.

Clearly, all segments (K-12 school districts, California Community Colleges, and the California State University System) live with the reality of limited resources along with the lack of infrastructure needed, in most cases, to support solutions to the various problems that each face. It is in this context that these recommendations are made. The ASCSU does not expect that this plan would serve as a mandate (unfunded or otherwise) to any of the segments. The ASCSU does realize, however, that such a systematic approach is necessary if we are to achieve the goal of reducing remediation needs to negligible levels. The ASCSU

also understands the need to engage in close collaboration with representatives of all stakeholder groups who are a necessary and integral part of the solution.

# # 13 Agenda Item

AS-3009-11/APEP  
January 20-21 2011  
Second Reading

## **Renewed Call for Establishment of a Task Force to Respond to Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code – Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses**

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reiterates the call specified in AS-2933-10/APEP *Establishment of a Task Force to Respond to Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code – Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses* for the creation of a Task Force to identify and implement a process for developing and approving state mandated criteria for identifying high school CTE courses that would meet the category “g” requirement for the admission of high school graduates to the California State University (CSU); and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the defined process, the plan for implementation and the timeline for work required to meet the January 1, 2014 state mandated deadline for Board of Trustee approval of ASCSU approved and recommended criteria be submitted to the ASCSU by May 1, 2011; and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to Chancellor Reed, Jim Blackburn, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support, CSU Board of Trustees, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Ephraim Smith

RATIONALE: At its January 21-22, 2010 Plenary, the Academic Senate of the California State University unanimously approved AS-2933-10/APEP, which requested the creation of a Task Force to establish a process for implementing the provisions specified in Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code. As specified in the resolution, the provisions

called for the development of model curriculum criteria to be used to identify CTE courses that would meet the category “g” requirement for admission of high school graduates to the CSU. According to California Education Code these criteria are to be developed by “CSU faculty, approved by the ASCSU” and then submitted to the Board of Trustees for review and approval by January 1, 2014. While state law requires the CSU to take the lead in establishing these criteria, AS-2933-10/APEP recommended that the process be developed in consultation with the University of California. This resolution reiterates the need for a task force to begin the work as specified in AS-2933-10/APEP and approved in January 2010.

Considerable time will be required for ASCSU and the Office of the Chancellor to establish and implement a process that will produce the criteria to be approved by the Board of Trustees before the January 1, 2014 deadline. To ensure there is adequate time to complete the work, this resolution requests that a proposed process and a timeline for meeting the state mandated “delivery date” for implementing the requirements specified by state law (Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code) be submitted to the ASCSU by May 1, 2011.

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2933-10/APEP  
January 21-22, 2010

**Establishment of a Task Force to Respond to Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code – Career Technical Education (CTE) Courses**

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) call for the creation of a Task Force consisting of CSU faculty to study, in consultation with Office of the Chancellor administration, Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code and to submit to the ASCSU by May 1, 2010 a proposal for implementing the requirements specified in the law; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That of the two options provided in Section 66205.8 (“1. Criteria adopted pursuant to subdivision (b), or 2. Model uniform academic standards for career technical education courses adopted pursuant to Section 66205.5”) the ASCSU recommend that the Task Force, in consultation with representatives from the University of California, propose an implementation plan based on the first option: “criteria adopted pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 66205.8”; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Chancellor, campus Presidents, campus Provosts, and campus Senate Chairs.

*RATIONALE: In October 2009, Section 66205.8 of the California Education Code was signed into law. The law requires that the CSU develop and implement a procedure for allowing a high school student to meet the category “g” requirement for admission to the CSU by completing a career technical education (CTE) course. The law provides two options: 1) follow criteria adopted pursuant to subdivision (b) of the law, or 2) accept the model curriculum standards established by the Superintendent of Public Instruction as the criteria for identifying courses that are acceptable for the purpose of admission to the CSU campuses. If the CSU has not developed criteria to be used for developing and submitting CTE courses for approval by January 1, 2014 (the first option), the second option will prevail.*

*Subdivision (b) of the law provides that a model curriculum for acceptable CTE courses be developed by CSU faculty, approved by the ASCSU, and forwarded to the Board of Trustees for review and adoption.*

*In 2006, the CSU and UC worked together to enable implementation of earlier CTE legislation that created Section 66205.5 of the California Education Code. At that time, it was determined that it was in the best interest of both systems to have one set of standards for CTE courses for both university systems. After the initial cooperation of the two systems to establish the current admissions standards for CTE courses, the CSU deferred to the UC regarding the*

*establishment of specific course criteria and review. Because some of the more recently developed CTE courses designed by high school faculty are closer to discipline areas within the CSU than the UC, recent collaborative efforts have taken place between the two systems regarding development of CTE course criteria. What is now needed is the formalization of a process by which the CSU plays a more active leadership role in the creation of CTE course criteria. The alternative is for the CSU to create its own course criteria and course review process. Having two separate review processes would be both expensive and confusing to high school students who may enroll in either a CSU or UC campus.*

**Approved Unanimously – January 21-22, 2010**