Senate Chair’s Report – March 2011

Our Fiftieth Anniversary

The historians among us have informed me that the 50th anniversary of the Senate is approaching. By some accounts, the moment of conception occurred on April 6, 1961 when the Board of Trustees resolved that “… a representative faculty body be established at each state college for the purpose of participating in the determination of educational and professional policy.” Eventually a Statewide Academic Senate was formed, meeting for the first time in September, 1963. I’ve asked John Tarjan to organize our efforts to celebrate the occasion.

The CSU and Senate Budget

We are a bit beyond the Governor’s deadline for budget approval which was to include tax-continuance measures on a June ballot, but efforts to implement that plan are still underway in Sacramento. That means that little is known about our budget beyond the Governor’s proposal in January to cut ~$500 million in State support to the CSU.

The timing of the State and CSU budget process makes it difficult to have Senate discussions about the Senate’s budget, but the executive committee has initiated such discussions nonetheless, desiring input from Senators while recognizing the awkward nature of the discussions. Given the number and type of issues on our agenda for today and tomorrow, there will not be much plenary time for budget discussions beyond those that occurred in committees yesterday, but we will continue the dialog and add information and specificity as it becomes available.

The Faculty Trustee 2009-2011

We were recently informed by the Governor’s staff that a Faculty Trustee will not be appointed prior to the May Board of Trustees meeting, which makes the appointment of a faculty member to the 2009-2011 term a moot issue. As you know, today and tomorrow we will be determining the candidates for the 2011-2013 term.

The Early Start Initiative

Letters should be going out shortly from the Implementation Team to the campuses in response to their Early Start proposals. The Implementation Team has decided that a common fee of ~$160 per unit is necessary to make the required financial aid transactions feasible. (That does not mean that campuses must charge for Early Start experiences, but if they do, the fee will be the current State University Fee divided by 30 units ≈$160/unit.) In addition, each campus was told to make available a one-unit-minimum Early Start experience in math and in English for students so that the commitment would be met that all students would have a local opportunity to meet the Early Start requirements. The English and Math Councils have provided good leadership toward instituting curriculum that meets the needs of students and the Early Start specifications. A CSU-developed curriculum for a high school course known as ERWC (Expository Reading and Writing Curriculum) is featured in a significant number of campus
plans and meets the goal of having students finish high school without remediation needs. The math faculty have similar plans in place and in development.

**SB 1440 Implementation**

Faculty efforts are beginning to bear fruit in the efforts to implement SB 1440 (The Transfer Bill.) The Transfer Model Curriculum for Psychology, Sociology, and Communications have been finalized (thanks to significant efforts by Senators Nishita, Kaiser, and Baaske, respectively.) These Models have been sent to the community college campuses to be used as the templates for the design of their Transfer Associate Arts degrees and the Models went to the discipline faculty (and articulation officers and undergraduate deans) at the CSU campuses for determination of their workability. While the question is often framed in terms of “is the TMC similar to our BA degree?” the actual question is, “With the preparation described by the TMC and the General Education package of SU Breadth or IGETC, can a student finish a BA degree with an additional 60 units of coursework?” A significant number of our degrees are a match (although the political focus has been on the few “No” answers.)

Another series of TMCs are queued up and should be approved in the next few months, including many popular degrees. Good things generally happen when discipline faculty get together to discuss their curricula, and that is the case with the SB 1440 efforts. To their credit, faculty want to answer the questions, “What would be good preparation for our students?” rather than “What is the minimum needed to get by?” but the latter is closer to the intent of SB 1440. Issues that have not mattered much in the past, such as unit discrepancies in courses between systems and campuses are suddenly significant obstacles.

Significant efforts have also been expended to meet the goals of SB 1440 for priority admission to the CSU. With the State unable or unwilling to fund this commitment, issues of impaction (campus and program) create a lot of thorny issues that faculty and staff, led by Eric Forbes and Ken O’Donnell, are working through.

Senators have played important leadership roles in most of the SB 1440 curriculum efforts and there may be no better example of the need for significant involvement of faculty with knowledge of the System, commitment to their discipline, and insightful political skills; all hallmarks of Academic Senators.