

**ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**of**  
**THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
400 Golden Shore, Suite 132      Long Beach, California 90802-4275  
562-985-2613

**MINUTES**  
Meeting of May 8-9, 1997

**CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 1:20 p.m. on Thursday, May 8, 1997, by Chair James Highsmith.**

**ROLL CALL:** Senators and alternates (\*) attending the meeting were: (Bakersfield) Jacquelyn Kegley, Ernie Page; (Chico) Kathleen Kaiser, James Postma, Paul Spear; (Dominguez Hills) Hal Charnofsky, Dick Williams; (Fresno) Jacinta Amaral, James Highsmith, Lester Pincu; (Fullerton) Vincent Buck, Albert Flores, Barry Pasternack; (Hayward) Judith Stanley, Don Wort; (Humboldt) Elmo Moore, Marshelle Thobaben; (Long Beach) Gene Dinielli, Barbara Franklin, Simon George; (Los Angeles) Harold Goldwhite, Dorothy Keane and \*Marshall Cates, Rosemarie Marshall; (Maritime Academy); (Monterey Bay) J. Ken Nishita; (Northridge) Elliot McIntire, Gerald Resendez, Mary Lee Sparling; (Pomona) Peter Clark, Edward Fonda, Rochelle Kellner; (Sacramento) Cristy Jensen, Sylvia Navari, Louise Timmer; (San Bernardino) Walter Oliver, J. Paul Vicknair; (San Diego) Annette Easton, Dan Whitney; (San Francisco) Eunice Aaron, Robert Cherny, Gary Hammerstrom; (San José) Charles "Buddy" Butler, Allison Heisch, David McNeil; (San Luis Obispo) Reginald Gooden, Tom Hale, Timothy Kersten; (San Marcos) Lionel Maldonado; (Sonoma) Susan McKillop, Robert Tellander; (Stanislaus) Richard Levering, Jere Wade; (Chancellor's Office) Charles Lindahl.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

During the course of the meeting the Chair introduced:

Campus senate alternates: Marshall Cates, Los Angeles; Robert Dowling, Dominguez Hills.  
Charles "Buddy" Butler, New Senator from San José  
Bernard Goldstein, Faculty Trustee and Professor of Biology, San Francisco State University  
Leonard Mathy, Professor Emeritus, Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association  
representative to the Academic Senate  
Eric Mitchell and Jill Murphy, Cornerstones  
Donald Moore, Consultant, Association of California State University Professors  
Diane Vines, Vice President, Academic Development, CSU Institute

Also present were:

Frank Medeiros, Academic Affairs, Chancellor's Office  
Lorie Roth, Director, Academic Services and Professional Development

Jhonna Anderson, Technical Assistant, Chancellor's Office  
Deborah Hennessy, Executive Director, Academic Senate CSU  
José Lopez, Clerical Assistant, Academic Senate CSU  
Margaret Price, Staff Assistant - Documents, Academic Senate CSU  
Sally Yu, Interim Staff Assistant - Budget, Academic Senate CSU

## ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

### Announcement of Times Certain

Thursday, May 8, 1997

3:00 p.m. Barry Munitz, Chancellor

Friday, May 9, 1997

9:00 a.m. Cornerstones Discussion

1:30 a.m. Organizational Meeting - 1997-98 Senate

\* \* \* \* \*

### REPORT OF CHAIR JAMES HIGHSMITH

**Transitions:** As our academic year draws to a close, we need to note a number of transitions that are occurring. Sally Yu has joined our staff temporarily as we search for an assistant for Deborah Hennessy. Sally is doing a terrific job of helping with budget and administrative matters in the office. Please take time to introduce yourselves and say hello. Very shortly our Cornerstones staff member Eric Mitchell will be leaving us for other employment. Eric has been a great colleague and also a tremendous asset to the Senate in working with the baccalaureate study and with the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates. We thank him and wish him only the best in all his endeavors and in his graduate program. He has become for me a superb example of the type of graduate the CSU aspires to prepare for life.

This is the time of year when we say thank-yous and good-byes to many colleagues we have worked with over the years. It is never easy to say farewell to friends who have worked so hard on behalf of the university and students, but it's something we must do. We recognize them for their commitment and their efforts here, and wish them each the greatest success in their professional endeavors.

It is also a time to welcome new senators, to extend our greetings, and to provide assistance to them in learning about the Senate.

**Administrative Transitions:** As we all know, Molly Broad has accepted the presidency of the University of North Carolina system and will be leaving this summer. Molly was to have addressed the Senate at this meeting, but she is visiting the 16 North Carolina campuses before their graduations. Molly's departure coupled with the earlier retirement of June Cooper and with no appointment of a permanent senior vice chancellor for academic affairs are cause for reexamining the organization of the system's senior leadership. Chancellor Munitz is consulting with the executive council and the Board of Trustees on these matters. The executive committee has provided advice based on the sentiments expressed by the Senate in the past. Chancellor Munitz has not yet shared with the executive committee his current thinking on these matters except to indicate that for the

time being Interim Senior Vice Chancellor Lindahl will continue to provide leadership for academic affairs.

**Cornerstones:** The Cornerstones members have been visiting campuses since our last meeting and will continue to do so until the end of May. These visits have provided an opportunity for members to hear first hand the concerns of campus faculty, staff, and administration about issues discussed in the Cornerstones documents. I think the comments we have received indicate that revisions, refinements, and additions are in order. Campus responses we get by the end of the month will provide guidance to us along with the Monterey input, campus visits, and senate comments. In an interesting parallel, the state system of Pennsylvania has gone through a similar planning exercise and reached conclusions which align with some in Cornerstones. Their report is being reproduced for you because it provides an interesting comparison worth examining. It appears to me that their experience can help inform us.

**Baccalaureate Study:** Our baccalaureate study is in the hands of the campus chairs, many of whom have distributed it on their campuses. Please encourage consideration of the report and responses to us in the early fall.

**Budget and Compact II:** As was reported in March, the leaders at the CSU (and UC) are exploring the creation of a new compact or partnership (Compact II) with the state to deal with coming enrollment demand and to provide predictability to university funding and student fees. (The current Compact between the public universities and Governor Wilson calls for a 4% increase in general funding over the next two years. Wilson has also agreed to provide sufficient funds to avoid a state university fee increase in 97-98.)

At least three pieces of legislation (AB 1318, AB 1415 and AB 530) embody portions of what could become Compact II. There is a possibility that a blending of these bills might occur to achieve modest annual increases in our operating budget over the next two years (tied to the increase in per capita California personal income), a reconnection of funding and enrollment, a two year freeze in student fees with the state providing additional funding in lieu of any increase, and modest and more predictable fee increases thereafter capped both at the system and campus level by the same percentage increase as the increase in California per capita personal income.

The state budget is still a long way from being settled for the coming year but legislative committees by and large have supported our requests over the recommendations of the legislative analyst.

**Virtual University Developments:** At the April meeting of the California virtual university design team (headed by Joe Rodota of the Governor's office), it was clear that May is no longer a critical date in continuing discussions of how this marketing approach for California higher education might evolve. The Governor has found enough money (about \$1 million) to support an office that could carry on the development of this venture until at least the fall when decisions about financing would have to be made. Several work groups are meeting to work through issues related to academics, marketing, and finance. What our campuses and their extended education office will offer continue to be key to the course content provided.

Discussions relating to the CSU VU effort have continued the trend of viewing this approach as a way to enhance distributed teaching and learning of all kinds that might be offered by CSU campuses. I expect a next iteration of the document examining the key considerations involved to be available next week and it will be mailed to you. Those people who have volunteered to work on aspects of the document need to not only examine it, but also continue to provide suggestions for addition and refinement. It is not clear when a “decision” will be made to go forward and, if so, under what organizational structure. What is clear is that the campuses remain the key to what this becomes and how our efforts unfold. I believe coordination will be possible only when enough of the key questions or considerations are dealt with to the satisfaction of the faculty who will be creating the content for any distributed learning efforts.

**Activities on the Technology Front:** Dick Williams, who serves along with Annette Eastin, on the **System Internal Partnership (SIP)**, will be providing us with an update on the group’s efforts to reach out to the private sector for assistance in building our technology infrastructure. Dick is our representative on the negotiating team and will be serving in this capacity during the summer. The voluminous materials we received dealing with the invitation to companies to negotiate a partnership raised a number of questions which could affect academic programs, the work of faculty, and obligations owed our students. We have raised these questions with Tom West who has responded. We will continue to address our concerns as these discussions unfold. I will leave it to Dick to impress upon you the speed with which this is moving and the seriousness of the venture.

**CLRIT** will meet May 16 to consider the **CLRIT program committee’s** budget recommendations for academic initiatives: roughly \$1.275 million for library initiatives related to sharing resources, \$1.25 million for other academic initiatives in distributed teaching and learning, \$236,000 for academic opportunity fund proposals, \$210,000 for social science and business databases, and \$250,000 for consultants.

**International Education:** The Senate’s special committee on international education chaired by Marshelle Thobaben has met several times this spring and has provided a report including recommendations. The system’s Globalization Task Force has begun meetings but will not meet during the summer. The Senate will have an opportunity to consider those recommendations as the Task Force’s work unfolds next fall and spring. We have urged implementation of the Senate’s earlier recommendations regarding budget support for international programs and reduction of student fees while the Globalization Task Force deliberates during the coming year on a broad set of issues. Administrative leadership for the international programs office during the coming year will be announced shortly by academic affairs.

**Faculty Compensation:** The Board of Trustees will hold a joint committee meeting next week of Collective Bargaining, Finance and University and Faculty Affairs to address the issue of faculty compensation. Let us hope that this is a step toward the development of a realistic plan to provide fair and competitive compensation to CSU faculty in relation to their peers nationwide. This is essential to maintain the quality of CSU’s education through the replacement of the highly qualified faculty who will retire over the next decade.

There is also renewed hope for the settlement of compensation issues for the coming year under our collective bargaining contract. We are told that a 4% compensation package is on the table together with certain additions dependent on our final budget for 97-98. Committees may be formed to look at the merit pay process and at long term compensation issues. In the meantime, our own merit pay task force examining alternative incentive systems has been very active this month and will continue to work toward recommendations to the Senate in the fall. Hal Charnofsky, chair of the task force, will report tomorrow on the work of this important group. I view this effort as addressing the concerns the Senate has had regarding the PSSI process as expressed in our two resolutions this year.

**Thanks:** The Senate's work cannot be accomplished by one or a few people. You all deserve a great measure of thanks for working in the Senate's academic enterprise to make this the best possible university for our students and our colleagues. To a certainty, the Senate could not function well without excellent committee chairs. Neither could the Senate chair do a good job without the commitment and work of excellent executive committee. I take this opportunity to thank Paul Spear, Dorothy Keane, Cristy Jensen, Allison Heisch, Kathy Kaiser, Dick Williams, Marshelle Thobaben, Hal Charnofsky, Gene Dinielli, Gary Hammerstrom, and Harold Goldwhite for providing leadership throughout the year and making the Senate's achievements possible.

Finally, our staff--Deborah Hennessy, Margaret Price, Jose Lopez, and Eric Mitchell--really are the people who make our work possible. I and we owe them more thanks than we have time to express. They have never said "that can't be done." They make it happen in a hundred ways every week and we owe them our deep respect and sincere gratitude.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **Standing Committee Reports:**

**Academic Affairs Committee** Chair Paul Spear thanked the members for their excellent work and in particular mentioned the names of some of his committee colleagues who were retiring from the Senate. The committee has a first reading item on the agenda dealing with high school course pattern changes for admission to the universities. The committee is recommending the termination of the Sonoma State admissions experiment because the university has failed to provide information about the process, the criteria used, and the value added. The committee reviewed a bill which would require one assessment test for all subjects (Firestone); the committee opposes the bill.

They also reviewed the SIP initiative and were concerned over the cost of participation by the CSU. They are recommending that the "fair use" document be distributed by the Executive Committee to all campus senates for campus dissemination.

The issue of pay-for-use web sites came to the committee's attention and they are recommending that the Executive Committee examine the issue. They are also requesting the Executive Committee to work on the Vasconcellos bill which would require placement of students in community service. They believe it is unreasonable to expect all students to

do such service, so the committee wants the focus of such assignments to remain with the faculty who are in the best position to make determinations about community service.

**Faculty Affairs Committee** Chair Allison Heisch reported that the committee enjoyed lots of merriment while examining Cornerstones, especially section 3. We also discussed faculty flow and the committee will prepare a report in the fall. We have a “use of part-time faculty” resolution on the agenda. *For-pay* web sites is under review.

**Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee** Chair Cristy Jensen reported that the committee met with Senior Vice Chancellor West concerning the 1997-98 Budget and its progress through the Legislature. The development of the 1998-99 CSU Budget priorities for presentation to the May 9 plenary session and a review of “Compact 2” legislative alternatives (AB 1415 and AB 1318).

Don Wort and Jim Postma reported on their work on the Campus Budget Advisory Committee Survey. We have received over 90 responses with good representation from both faculty and administration. The Committee expects to have a report ready for Senate review by November.

The review of current legislation focused on SB 917 (Vasconcellos) which requires 30 hours annually of community services from CSU and UC students. Because the bill has been put over to Interim, we have urged the Executive Committee to appoint a committee to work with the author on revisions during the interim.

Finally the committee articulated priorities for 97-98 as follows:

- 1) Complete campus budget advisory committee report
- 2) Financial aid reform
- 3) Fiscal implications of Compact 2 legislation.

**Committee on Teacher Education and K-12 Relations** Vice Chair Dick Williams reported that no resolutions are on the agenda. Cornerstones was discussed, especially Task Force 4. The committee also reviewed several bills including one related to tuition savings accounts which would be tax-free. They also discussed recruitment of teachers which had been the focus of a recent conference in Berkeley.

**Systemwide Internal Partnerships (SIP) - (Williams)** The CSU did not go to business and industry to ask for a handout, a procurement, or even a service contract. CSU sought no training. It did ask industry for its help with the technology we need and in return we offered our expertise. Senator Williams is a member of an eight-person development team to read proposals. He cautioned the Senate to insist that faculty be consulted every step of the way.

**General Education** Chair Kathy Kaiser reported there is a stable number of approximately 600 courses coming through each year, and the committee is pleased with the improved quality of them. They studied possible merger of CAN with certain parts of GE. They are still concerned over the large number of exemptions granted for GE coursework, especially in high-unit majors. The UC is gradually dropping out of articulation agreements with four-year colleges, although it still uses CAN.

**ACTION**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Senator Dinielli moved (Wort seconded) approval of the minutes of March 13-14, 1997. The minutes were approved.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Senator Williams moved (Hammerstrom seconded) approval of the agenda. The agenda was approved.

**AS-2359-97/EX  
SECOND READING**

**ACADEMIC SENATE CSU CALENDAR OF 1997-98  
MEETINGS**

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the following schedule for the 1997-98 academic year:

<u>1997</u>		<u>Location</u>
September 10-12	Committees/Plenary	Headquarters
October 3	Interim	Headquarters
November 5-7	Committees/Plenary	Headquarters
December 5	Interim	Headquarters
<u>1998</u>		
January 21-23	Committees/Plenary	Headquarters
February 13	Interim	Headquarters
March 4-6	Committees/Plenary	Headquarters
April 3	Interim	Headquarters
May 6-8	Committees/Plenary	Headquarters

; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate of the California State university be authorized to change the schedule of meetings approved, with adequate notice to the Academic Senate CSU, if the Trustees alter their schedule, or if budgetary constraints require a change.

*RATIONALE: The California State University Board of Trustees is considering the adoption in May 1997 of the following schedule for Trustee meetings in 1997-98:*

<u>1997</u>	<u>Location</u>
<i>July 15-16</i>	<i>Headquarters</i>
<i>September 16-17</i>	<i>Headquarters</i>
<i>November 11-12</i>	<i>Headquarters</i>
<u>1998</u>	
<i>January 27-28</i>	<i>Headquarters</i>

March 17-18  
May 12-13

Headquarters  
Headquarters

**AS-2359-97/EX motion was approved.**

**AS-2360-97/EX                      BYLAWS APPROVAL  
SECOND READING**

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University approve the amendments to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate which are attached hereto.

*RATIONALE: The Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University was revised in 1996 by a Constitutional Revision Committee appointed by the Senate to accomplish that task. The Board of Trustees of the California State University subsequently approved the revisions recommended by the Academic Senate. Now, the Senate Bylaws must be amended to make them consistent with the changes in the Constitution. In addition, several Bylaws are out of date or reflect policies or procedures that the Senate no longer follows. Hence, the attached amendments are proposed.*

<p><b>Academic Senate of the California State University Bylaws</b></p>
---

Revised November 1995

**Bylaw 1 Definitions and Amendment Procedures**

**a. Definitions**

The rules and regulations of the Academic Senate, beyond those already specified in the Constitution and its amendments, shall be designated by *Bylaws, Rules of Order* and *Standing Rules*.

- (1) *Bylaws* are those rules and regulations pertaining to organization (including officers, major committees, and other agencies authorized to conduct business in and for the Senate), duties of said officers or agencies, and other such matters as may be specifically required by the Constitution and its amendments.
- (2) *Rules of Order* are such rules and regulations concerning parliamentary procedures not covered in *Robert's Rules of Order (Revised)* or direct amendments thereof.
- (3) *Standing Rules* are those rules and regulations which cover all other matters pertaining to the conduct of the business of the Senate. (*Robert's Rules of Order* provides for such temporary changes of procedure.)

**b. Amendment Procedures**

- (1) *Bylaws* shall be amended by presentation of the text of the proposed amendment at one meeting and approval by an affirmative vote of a majority of those present at the next regularly called meeting.
- (2) *Rules of Order* shall be amended by presentation of the text of the proposed amendment at one meeting and approval by an affirmative vote of a majority of those present at the next regularly called meeting.

- (3) *Bylaws and Rules of Order* may also be amended by prior written notice and by a two-thirds affirmative vote of those present at a regularly called meeting.
- (4) Standing Rules shall be amended by affirmative vote of a majority of those present at a regularly called meeting.

## **Bylaw 2 Officers, Duties and Procedures for Nomination and Election**

### **a. Officers**

The Senate annually shall elect a Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary; and two Members-at-Large. These officers of the Senate shall serve until regularly succeeded.

### **b. Duties of the Officers**

- (1) The Chair shall preside at meetings of the Senate and the Executive Committee. He or she shall be responsible for communications with the faculties of the campuses colleges. He or she shall have the authority to convene regular and special meetings of the Senate. Requests for expenditures of State Funds in connection with the Senate activities shall be subject to the approval of the Chair or his or her designee.
- (2) The Vice Chair shall assume the duties of the Chair when the Chair is unable to serve. He or she shall be responsible for carrying out such other duties as may be delegated to him or her by the Senate, the Executive Committee, or the Chair.
- (3) The Secretary shall keep the minutes and the records of the Senate and shall carry out such other duties as may be delegated to him or her by the Senate, the Executive Committee, or the Chair.
- (4) The Members-at-Large shall carry out such duties as may be delegated to them by the Senate, the Executive Committee, or its chair.
- (5) An individual designated by the Executive Committee shall be responsible for the regular production and distribution of a newsletter for all the faculties of The California State University. (See Bylaw 7)

### **c. Time of Election**

The election of officers shall be held annually at the first meeting of the new Senate. The duly elected officers of the Senate shall assume their duties on June 1 following their election, except that the new Executive Committee may meet earlier than June 1 in order to begin the organization of Senate assignments and responsibilities for the coming year.

### **d. Election Procedures**

- (1) Offices shall be filled, starting with the office of Chair and continuing with Vice Chair and Secretary and with the other officers, in successive order with nominations and election by secret ballot.
- (2) Every senator shall have the opportunity to make nominations.
- (3) All nominees shall be listed on the first and subsequent ballots alphabetically. Those having the highest number of votes, and whose votes, when added together, constitute a majority of the votes cast, shall appear on the next ballot. Voting shall continue in this manner until one candidate receives a majority of votes cast.

- (4) The Members-at-Large shall be elected annually in accordance with section Bylaw 2,d.
- (5) In the event that a new representative has not been elected in time to participate in the election of Senate officers at the first meeting of the new Senate, the outgoing representative shall be entitled to vote in such elections.

**e. Vacancies in Elected Positions**

- (1) When the Chair's position is vacated due to resignation or other reasons, the Vice Chair shall assume the title and responsibilities of the Chair.
- (2) When the position of Vice Chair, Secretary, or Member-at-Large on the Executive Committee is vacated, the position shall be filled by election at the next regular Senate meeting after the vacancy occurs, according to the election procedures stated in Bylaw 2,d.
- (3) When the position of Immediate Past Chair is vacated on the Executive Committee, the position shall remain vacant.

**Bylaw 3 The Executive Committee**

**a. Membership**

The Executive Committee shall consist of the elected officers and the Immediate Past Chair.

**b. Duties and Authority**

- (1) The Executive Committee shall be responsible for preparing the agenda, for advising the Chair regarding the conduct of the Senate business, and for such additional duties as the Senate may assign.
- (2) The Executive Committee shall have the authority to act for the Academic Senate of The California State University between meetings on items requiring action before the next meeting of the entire body.
- (3) The Executive Committee shall appoint the members of the standing and special committees of the Senate, and consultants to the Senate, including specialists.
- (4) A majority of the Executive Committee may direct the Chair to call a meeting of the Senate.
- (5) The standing and special committees shall appoint their own subcommittees, subject to the approval of the Chair of the Senate, who shall consult with the Executive Committee.

**Bylaw 4 Committees and Specialists**

**a. Standing Committees**

The Senate shall have, but not be limited to, the following standing committees:

- (1) The Academic Affairs Committee,
- (2) The Faculty Affairs Committee,
- (3) The Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee, and
- (4) The Committee on Teacher Education and K-12 Relations

**b. Special Committees**

The Senate may establish special committees as needed.

**c. Specialists**

The Senate may have specialists, with designated duties, as shall be determined by the Executive Committee each year.

**d. Appointment of Chairs**

The Chairs of the standing and special committees, and the specialists, will be appointed annually by the Chair of the Senate, with the approval of the Executive Committee.

**e. Membership**

Members of the standing and special committees shall be appointed annually from the current membership of the Senate. At least two-thirds of the members of each special committee of the Academic Senate shall be appointed from the members of the Senate. Chairs of the committees shall be members of the Senate. No member of the Senate shall be appointed to more than one standing committee. ~~Appointees who are not senators shall be appointed only after consultation with the senators of the campus from which they are appointed.~~

**f. Responsibilities of the Committees**

(1) *The Academic Affairs Committee:*\*

The Committees shall make recommendations to the Academic Senate on matters of statewide concern, including but not limited to, the following areas:

- (a) systemwide aspects of academic planning;
- (b) general or liberal arts education;
- (c) criteria for state approval of specific curricula, programs or degrees;
- (d) accreditation;
- (e) statewide requirements for admission, retention, and graduation of students;
- (f) credit by evaluation;
- (g) minimum standards and conditions for the award of certificates to students;
- (h) academic standards;
- (i) grading standards and symbols;
- (j) systemwide aspects of program review;
- (k) new program allocation;
- (l) joint doctoral programs;
- (m) systemwide aspects of the basic directions of academic support programs;
- (n) library development;
- (o) research related to educational programs;
- (p) academically related fiscal matters;
- (q) systemwide aspects of student services;
- (r) policies governing the awarding of honorary degrees;
- (s) matters relevant to statewide and international programs;

---

\*It shall not be the function of this committee to intervene in any questions as to which courses within an approved program on any campus are proper, improper, adequate, or inadequate.

- (t) research, planning, formation, allocation, and delivery of programs outside traditional campus service areas;
- (u) extended education, campus-based study abroad, faculty participation in international programs, faculty exchange, student exchange, and activities between and among campuses;
- (v) statewide and international programs and the resources to serve non-traditional as well as international students; and
- (w) such other matters as may be brought before it by the Executive Committee or the Academic Senate CSU.

The committee shall maintain liaison with CSU, ~~the Advisory Committee on International Education, the Academic Council on International Programs, the Commission on Extended University, and other committees and commissions as designated.~~

(2) ***The Faculty Affairs Committee:***

The committee shall make recommendations to the Academic Senate on matters of statewide concern, including but not limited to, the following areas:

- (a) criteria and standards for the appointment, retention, promotion, evaluation and tenure of academic employees as well as preservation of the principle of peer review and evaluation through the direct involvement of appropriate faculty in these decisions;
- (b) professional development, including minimum criteria and standards to be used for programs designed to enhance and maintain professional competence such as the awarding of sabbaticals and other academic leaves;
- (c) systemwide policies governing the appointment and review of presidents and academic administrators;
- (d) policies governing the appointment and review of systemwide executive officers and academic administrators;
- (e) academic freedom and responsibility;
- (f) professional matters not collectively bargained;
- (g) other professional matters which may overlap items being collectively bargained where such matters have substantial academic or educational effects;
- (h) the role of faculty in institutional governance; and
- (i) such other matters as may be brought before it by the Executive Committee or the Academic Senate.

(3) ***Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee:***

The committee shall make recommendations to the Academic Senate on matters of statewide concern, including but not limited to, the following areas:

The functions of the committee will be:

- (a) ~~to monitor, evaluate, and make recommendations on~~ system budgets including strategic and academic initiatives;
- (b) ~~to evaluate plans and make recommendations to achieve~~ adequate funding for the cost of instruction;
- (c) ~~to monitor and make recommendations on~~ the assessment of faculty productivity and its relationship to the budget planning process;

- (d) ~~to evaluate and make recommendations on~~ current and evolving measures of accountability as they relate to the budget planning and evaluation process
- (e) ~~to work closely with the Chair of the Academic Senate to provide~~ support for Academic Senate positions and policies before the Legislature and other governmental bodies;
- (f) ~~to propose the proposal of~~ legislation and policies for consideration by the Legislature and other governmental bodies consistent with Academic Senate policy; and
- (g) ~~to work closely with the Chair of the Academic Senate to provide~~ support for Academic Senate positions and policies before the Legislature and other governmental bodies. Further, at the direction of the Chair, the committee shall:
- (h) ~~to represent~~ the Academic Senate before governmental bodies;
- (i) ~~to assist~~ the Chair in determining the timeliness and accuracy of Academic Senate resolutions directed to the Legislature;
- (j) ~~to work with~~ standing committees of the Academic Senate in researching resolutions directed to the Legislature;
- (k) ~~to develop~~ a cooperative working relationship with the Office of the Chancellor and the Trustees so that the CSU can, whenever possible, present a unified approach to the Legislature; and
- (l) ~~to inform~~ the Executive Committee and the Academic Senate of relevant matters pending before the state government.

(4) ***The Committee on Teacher Education and K-12 Relations:***\*

The committee shall evaluate and make recommendations on matters regarding the CSU's relationship with K-12 and shall maintain liaison with appropriate K-12 representatives on matters of teacher education. The committee shall also make recommendations to the Academic Senate on matters of statewide concern, including, but not limited to, the following areas:

- (a) CSU policies and statewide activities affecting campus teacher education and other credential programs;
- (b) state legislation and regulations concerning the requirements for credentials under the jurisdiction of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing;
- (c) state legislation having potential impact on the CSU responsibility to educate school personnel;
- (d) intersegmental efforts to improve teaching at all levels; and
- (e) such other matters as may be brought before it by the Executive Committee or the Academic Senate CSU.

**g. Reporting Procedures**

---

\*It shall not be the function of this committee to intervene in any questions as to which courses within an approved program on any campus are proper, improper, adequate, or inadequate.

All standing and special committees, unless otherwise specifically directed by the Senate, shall report to the Senate. Their recommendations shall not be considered policy statements until formally approved by the Senate.

#### **Bylaw 5 Establishment of the Official Roster of the Senate**

The alternates from the several campuses shall at each meeting at which they are official delegates present to the Secretary of the Senate their names and the names of the senators whose places they are taking.

#### **Bylaw 6 Voting on Substantive Motions**

- (1) Voting on substantive motions may take place at any meeting of the Academic Senate CSU when the reports giving rise to the motions have been distributed to all senators at least two weeks in advance. Such reports shall be referred to as "Action" items on the agenda.
- (2) Substantive motions based on reports which have not been distributed to all senators at least two weeks in advance shall take place only after a second reading of the motion at a meeting subsequent to the meeting at which it was first introduced, except that the Academic Senate CSU, by three-fourths vote of those present, may waive this requirement. The motion to suspend the rules to waive this requirement shall be debatable.

#### **Bylaw 7 Establishment of Faculty Newsletter**

- (1) There shall be established a faculty newsletter coming from the Academic Senate CSU and sent to all CSU faculty at appropriate times.
- (2) Funds shall be provided for this newsletter from the Senate budget.

#### **Bylaw 8 Session of the Academic Senate**

The session of the Academic Senate CSU shall be from June 1 through May 31.

**AS-2360-97/EX motion was approved unanimously.**

**AS-2366-97/AA  
ACTION**

**REVISION OF HIGH SCHOOL COURSE PATTERN  
REQUIRED FOR ADMISSION TO THE CSU**

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University recommend to the Chancellor that the high school course pattern required for admission to the CSU be changed to require (a) a second year of social science and (b) a second year of a laboratory science.

**RATIONALE:** The CSU Board of Trustees recently approved a policy on precollegiate education for the CSU (January 23-24, 1996). This proposed change in the required high school admission course pattern is consistent with the Trustee's policy in that it strengthens the preparation of students

who will enter the CSU. The graduation requirements for high schools now include a second year of social science, so this requirement is already met by all high school graduates. The requirement of a second year of laboratory science would better prepare college-bound students to undertake study in the sciences. For Fall 1996 CSU regular admits, 76% had completed two years of laboratory science in high school. The Admissions Advisory Council of the CSU is also currently studying the feasibility of recommending these changes.

These two changes would also make the high school admission course patterns of the CSU and UC more consonant and therefore more easily understandable to high school counselors and students.

**On behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, Chair Paul Spear moved (Franklin seconded) the resolution.**

**Senator Franklin moved (McNeil seconded) to postpone to the Fall.**

**Senator Spear requested consent to take a straw poll on the current view regarding this revision to CSU admission requirements in order to advise the campuses. There were no objections.**

**AS-2366-97/AA motion was postponed.**

### **9:00 a.m. Time Certain: Cornerstones**

**Senator Whitney moved (Heisch seconded) to add to the agenda, as Item 9, a floor resolution to adopt the three Cornerstones reports of the Faculty Affairs Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, and TEKR presented at the May 1997 meeting of the Academic Senate. Motion was approved.**

**AS-2364-97/AA  
ACTION**

**SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED REVISION OF NEW-  
DEGREE PROGRAM REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS**

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University support the "Proposed Revision of New-Degree Program Review and Approval Process" from the Committee on Educational Policy of the Board of Trustees (March 18-19, 1997); and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU support the statement, "If approved, the revised new-degree and approval process will be reviewed and evaluated five years from implementation," as contained in the presentation statement by the Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and request that the statement be included in the Board of Trustee's policy, "Proposed Revision of New-Degree Program Review and Approval Process."

*RATIONALE: The proposed Revision of Process For Approving New-Degree Programs was developed with the advice of a working group of campus representatives, with the intent of streamlining the approval process. Almost all campuses (17 out of the 22) responded to a call for comments on the original draft. They either supported the original draft or raised minor concerns, and the draft was modified in accordance with most of their suggestions. The revised process maintains the requirement that all proposals are subject to a thorough campus review process before approval. The revised new-degree and approval process will be reviewed and evaluated five years after implementation.*

*The revision is designed to meet the following objectives: to create a true partnership between campus and Academic Planning, to promote greater cooperation and collaboration among campuses and across segments, to promote more campus responsibility for new-program proposal quality, to speed up and simplify the new-program review process, to promote greater attention to workforce and societal needs in program development, and to improve the working relationship with CPEC.*

*The current two-step review process remains appropriate for new programs that would involve major capital outlay and other significant additional new resources. Programs that involve degrees in areas new to the CSU as well as most programs that involve separate specialized accreditation also benefit from the longer, two-step review process. However, programs that involve no major capital outlay and which can be accommodated within the existing resource base of the campus could be handled in one step.*

**On behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, Chair Paul Spear moved (Vicknair seconded) the resolution.**

**AS-2364-97/AA motion was approved unanimously.**

**AS-2365-97/AA  
ACTION**

**SUPPORT FOR CONTINUED SYSTEMWIDE  
FUNDING FOR THE INTRASYSTEM LENDING  
AND BORROWING SERVICE**

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University reaffirm its support for adequate funding of the CSU Intrasystem Lending and Borrowing Service (ILBS) stated most recently in its resolution entitled "Continued Systemwide Funding for the CSU Interlibrary Lending Program" (AS-2298-95, approved September 8, 1995); and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU express its concern that the current systemwide funding has not been used for its intended purpose on some campuses, forcing the libraries on those campuses to draw upon their library funds to support ILBS; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to support the continued funding of the CSU Intrasystem Lending and Borrowing Service

at a level that meets the increasing need for those services, as a systemwide provision and to specify that this systemwide funding be used for its intended purpose on each CSU campus.

*RATIONALE: During the mid-1970s, the California State University systemwide Interlibrary Lending (ILL) Program was developed to facilitate resource sharing among the CSU libraries and the libraries of the University of California, and was funded by the Chancellor's Office library division. The ILL Program (now referred to as the Intrasystem Lending and Borrowing Service - ILBS) was designed to provide students and faculty with print media (e.g., periodicals, serials, and books) and other materials in a quick and efficient manner, and to serve as an alternative to purchasing costly and specialized information resources. The ILBS Program is composed of two components: (1) interagency agreements with three UC libraries (Berkeley, Davis and Los Angeles); and (2) funding of transportation costs to support shipping of ILBS program materials among CSU libraries and between CSU and UC libraries.*

*The economic crisis from which California is now emerging had an especially severe impact on many CSU library collections, including the cancellation of numerous periodicals and serials. According to the Coleman report ("Collaboration in a Networked Environment," February 1997, a report to the CSU Council of Library Directors), an examination of the last 10 years of CSU Library Statistics shows four trends: "1) complete stagnation of CSU acquisition budgets in real dollars; 2) a reduction in total items acquired on an annual basis system-wide of nearly 40% (between 1985-1995); 3) a shift in acquisition dollars from monographs to serials resulting in percentages approaching 80% serials/20% monographs in some CSU institutions; 4) a doubling of interlibrary loan requests." (pp. 1-2). The report further notes that during the same 10-year period, the total number of ILBS requests has doubled. This statistic is almost in all cases an underestimate of the actual demand because ILBS is a "rationed" service sometimes only available to faculty or graduate students. While some campuses have made efforts to restore the quality of their holdings, the magnitude of the problem guarantees that there will be a compelling need for the continuation of ILBS at a substantial level.*

*During the 1996-1997 fiscal year, the Chancellor's Office sent campuses \$4.9 million identified to fund the Academic/Technology Support Fund. The Executive Council agreed to return to the Chancellor's Office an equivalent of \$2/FTES to fund centrally the ILBS program (since the contracts with UC and delivery providers are best made collectively). While many campuses forwarded those funds to the Chancellor's office to help defray the costs of ILBS, some campuses retained the money centrally and required the library to fund ILBS out of their own scarce budgetary resources. However, to date, there has been no permanent resolution of how the ILBS program will be funded in the future.*

*Any further development of distance learning in the CSU, for example, the initiation of the proposed CSU Virtual University, must also make provision for adequate library access. This is also likely to impact ILBS by increasing the demand for interlibrary borrowing.*

**On behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, Chair Paul Spear moved (Franklin seconded) the resolution.**

**AS-2365-97/AA motion was approved unanimously.**

**AS-2367-97/F&GA            1998-99 BUDGET PRIORITIES  
ACTION**

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University strongly urge the Chancellor to recommend to the Board of Trustees in rank order the following Budget Priorities for 1998-99:

1. Close the CPEC-identified CSU faculty compensation gap within three years as a priority investment in the quality of our human capital and as a necessary factor in enhancing recruitment efforts.
2. Develop multi-year strategies for the management of anticipated enrollment growth which will increase administrative and budgetary flexibility for the CSU and campuses.
3. Increase resources available for student financial aid.

*RATIONALE: The Academic Senate of the California State University has been asked to provide input on budget priorities for 1998-99. The Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee has reviewed the CSU Budget and has consulted with the Senior Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance about current and anticipated future needs. We have reviewed the priorities for FY 1997-98 endorsed by the Senate last year and note positively the steps taken to address technological support needs and the accumulated gap in physical plant and maintenance referenced in last year's priorities. We continue to have serious concerns about the compensation gap for faculty and have again identified closing that gap as the number one budget priority for the 1998-99 CSU Budget.*

**On behalf of the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee, Chair Cristy Jensen moved (Wort seconded) the resolution; and requested the following editorial changes: in number 1 of the Resolved clause, add “-identified CSU faculty” after “Close the CPEC”; correct Richard West’s title in the first sentence of Rationale; delete “(CPEC)” after “compensation gap” in the last sentence of Rationale.**

**Senator Kaiser moved (Spear seconded) an amendment to number 3 of the Resolved clause to add “and adopt strategies to broaden the range of distribution of financial aid to CSU students.” Amendment failed.**

**Senator Cherny moved (Heisch seconded) an amendment to number 2 in the Resolved clause to add “and which will reduce the significant differences that now exist among large campuses in per student funding.”**

Senator Charnofsky moved (Heisch seconded) to amend the Cherny amendment by deleting “large.” Amendment failed. The Cherny amendment failed.

Senator Hammerstrom moved (Thobaben seconded) to insert “state” in between “Increase” and “resources” in number 3 of the Resolved clause. Amendment failed.

AS-2367-97/F&GA motion was approved without dissent.

AS-2368-97/AA  
FIRST READING

**TERMINATION OF THE SONOMA STATE  
UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS EXPERIMENT**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University urge the Chancellor to terminate the Sonoma State University Admissions Experiment prior to the Fall 1997 admissions cycle for the 1998-1999 academic year unless explicit justification for the continuance of the experiment is demonstrated. Such justification should include:

1. A copy of Sonoma State University’s admission policy including the criteria, different avenues for admission, the general implementation process, and specific admissions criteria, if any, applied by various academic programs;
2. A data analysis of the three-year admissions experiment regarding
  - a) the changes in student composition, especially diversity and ethnic issues,
  - b) the changes in the admitted student grade point averages and standardized test scores,
  - c) the changes in the retention rates for students admitted during the experiment,
  - d) the impact on the Sonoma area regarding its native students applications for admission,
  - e) the demographics of the applicant pool, and the admitted and enrolled groups, and
  - f) the redirection assistance provided to CSU-qualified freshmen and transfer students who were rejected for admission.

RATIONALE: At the October 1996 meeting of the CSU Admission Advisory Council, the Council recommended to the Chancellor that the Sonoma State University admissions experiment be approved for a three-year extension. The Chancellor accepted that recommendation. This is the first differential campus admission policy that is not justified by a campus having more qualified applicants than can be accommodated. The campus has not provided definitive description of the admission criteria being used in this experiment since its inception three years ago. The Admission Advisory Council has consistently requested information and did so again at the October 1996 meeting. Personnel in Academic Affairs in the

Chancellor's Office have also been attempting to gather information since at least October 1996. The Academic Affairs Committee of the CSU Academic Senate discussed the issue at its November 1996 meeting and has been trying to get information about the experiment, formally and informally, since November 1996.

Answers to the issues stated in the resolved clause need to be provided so that the quality, appropriateness, and value of the experiment can be determined.

**On behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee, Chair Paul Spear moved (Franklin seconded) the resolution.**

### **1:30 p.m. Time Certain: 1997-98 Organizational Meeting**

**AS-2369-97/FA  
FIRST READING**

**THE USE OF TEMPORARY FACULTY IN FACULTY  
POSITIONS IN THE CSU**

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University reaffirm its 1987 and 1991 positions on temporary faculty in the CSU (see AS-1703-86/FA and AS-1977-90/FA attached) and urge local campuses and individual departments to study their ratio of temporary to tenured/tenure-track faculty in light of these positions.

**RATIONALE:** The continuing health of the Academy depends upon its tenured and tenure-track faculty. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are committed to the University beyond current classroom instruction. The University relies on tenured and tenure-track faculty for leadership in program development, the maintenance of academic values, and the mentoring and nurturing of students. The sum of this is the defense over time of high quality in the teaching-learning process.

In 1984, in response to academic concerns about the considerable increase in the number of temporary faculty in faculty positions in the CSU, the Academic Senate of the California State University established a CSU Academic Senate Committee to Study the Educational Implications of the Use of Lecturers in the CSU. The Committee produced a report in 1986, which led the Senate in 1987 to propose policy recommendations on the use of temporary faculty for campus senate adoption. The Senate reaffirmed the recommendations in 1991. (See attachments.)

The conditions which prompted Senate action in 1987 and 1991 obtain in 1997. There are large numbers of temporary faculty in the CSU and they are found in more than the replacement, specialty, basic skills/remedial, and applied positions temporary faculty have traditionally held. As the Academic Senate of the California State University observed in 1987, the

employment of large numbers of temporary faculty poses problems for the quality of our student's educational experiences. Temporary faculty, for example, are not, nor should they normally be, expected to contribute to advising, curriculum development, and academic governance; an increase in their number, further, dilutes the size and influence of the tenured faculty and undermines the stability of academic freedom and the tenure system.

**On behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, Vice Chair McIntire moved (Stanley seconded) the resolution.**

**AS-2370-97/FLOOR            CORNERSTONES CONCERNS  
FIRST READING**

**RESOLVED:** That in order to guide and inform Senate representatives on Cornerstones during the summer and to record faculty concern that essential academic issues have been left unresolved, the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the three reports of its standing committees, Faculty Affairs, Academic Affairs, and TEKR, as the current collective wisdom of this body concerning the Cornerstones proposals.

*RATIONALE: Senate participants and faculty partners to the Cornerstones task forces have expressed a desire for Senate adoption or acceptance of some specific points addressed by the three reports. The points addressed by the three reports are based on comments heard from campus faculty at the February meeting in Monterey, at subsequent campus meetings, and at Senate committees. Although unedited, these reports represent the collective concerns of the Senate with regard to the March 1997 version of the Cornerstones Task Force reports together with ten principles derived therefrom. It is the view of the Academic Senate CSU that the commentary provided by the committee reports (as appropriately expanded and embellished by representatives of the three committees) should be prepared as a working report to inform members of the Cornerstones committee of the Senate's views.*

**Senator Whitney moved (Marshall seconded) the resolution and requested consent to make the following change: in the Rationale, add "and at Senate committees" after "subsequent campus meetings." There were no objections.**

**Senator Whitney moved (McNeil seconded) to waive the rules to take action on the resolution at the present meeting. Motion carried.**

**AS-2370-97/Floor motion was approved unanimously.**

\* \* \* \* \*

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m. on Friday, May 9, 1997.

\* \* \* \* \*

Approved (or corrected)

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
James M. Highsmith, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Hal Charnofsky, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Margaret Price, Recording Secretary

**ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**of**  
**THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
400 Golden Shore, Suite 132      Long Beach, California 90802-4275  
562-985-2613

**MINUTES**

**ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING OF THE 1997-98 ACADEMIC SENATE**  
May 9, 1997

**CALL TO ORDER:** The organizational meeting was called to order at 1:45 p.m. on Friday, May 9, 1997, by Chair James Highsmith.

**ROLL CALL:** Senators and alternates (\*) attending the meeting were: (Bakersfield), Ernie Page; (Chico) James Postma, Paul Spear; (Dominguez Hills) Hal Charnofsky, \*Robert Dowling; (Fresno) Jacinta Amaral, James Highsmith, Lester Pincu; (Fullerton) Vincent Buck, Albert Flores, Barry Pasternack; (Hayward) Judith Stanley, Don Wort; (Humboldt) Elmo Moore, Marshelle Thobaben; (Long Beach) Gene Dinielli, Simon George, Patricia Rozee; (Los Angeles) Harold Goldwhite<sup>1</sup>, Dorothy Keane, Rosemarie Marshall; (Monterey Bay) J. Ken Nishita; (Northridge) Elliot McIntire, Gerald Resendez, Mary Lee Sparling; (Pomona) Edward Fonda, Rochelle Kellner; (Sacramento) Cristy Jensen, Louise Timmer; (San Bernardino) Walter Oliver, J. Paul Vicknair; (San Diego) Annette Easton, Dan Whitney; (San Francisco) Eunice Aaron, Robert Cherny, Gary Hammerstrom; (San Jose) Charles "Buddy" Butler, David McNeil, Bethany Shifflett; (San Luis Obispo) Reginald Gooden, Tom Hale, Timothy Kersten; (Sonoma) Susan McKillop, \*Robert Tellander; (Stanislaus) Richard Levering, \*Jere Wade; (Chancellor's Office) Charles Lindahl.

**Senator Hammerstrom moved (Charnofsky seconded) the agenda. The agenda was approved.**

**INTRODUCTION AND SEATING OF NEW SENATORS:**

Dominguez Hills	Hal Charnofsky, Professor of Sociology, had been reelected.
Fresno	Lester Pincu, Professor of Criminology, had been reelected.
Fullerton	Vincent Buck, Professor of Political Science, had been reelected.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Senator Goldwhite is not an elected member from a campus of the 1997-98 Senate, the immediate past chair does remain a member.

Hayward	Don Wort, Professor of Management and Finance, had been reelected.
CSU Long Beach	Patricia Rozee, Professor of Psychology and Women's Studies, had been elected.
CSU Northridge	Gerald Resendez, Professor of Chicano Studies, had been reelected.
CSU Sacramento	Michael Fitzgerald, Professor of Communication Studies, had been elected.
San Bernardino	Walter Oliver, Professor of Foreign Languages and Literatures, had been reelected.
San Diego	Dan Whitney, Professor of Anthropology, had been reelected.
San Francisco	Gary Hammerstrom, Professor of Business Analysis and Computing Systems, had been reelected.
San Jose	Bethany Shifflett, Professor of Human Performance, had been elected.
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo	Tom Hale, Professor of Mathematics, had been reelected.
Stanislaus	Pamela Russ, Professor of Teacher Education, had been elected.

During the course of the meeting, the following resolutions of commendation were introduced and approved by acclamation.

AS-2371-97/Pomona	Peter Clark
AS-2372-97/Long Beach	Barbara Franklin
AS-2373-97/Los Angeles	Harold Goldwhite
AS-2374-97/San Jose	Allison Heisch
AS-2375-97/Chico	Kathleen Kaiser
AS-2376-97/San Francisco	Ken Monteiro
AS-2377-97/Sacramento	Sylvia Navari
AS-2378-97/FAC	Edward Thompson III

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS:**

<b>CHAIR</b>	<b>James Highsmith</b>	<b>Professor of Finance and Business Law CSU Fresno</b>
<b>VICE CHAIR</b>	<b>Marshelle Thobaben</b>	<b>Professor of Nursing Humboldt State University</b>
<b>SECRETARY</b>	<b>Walter Oliver</b>	<b>Professor of Foreign Languages and Literatures CSU San Bernardino</b>
<b>MEMBER-AT-LARGE</b>	<b>Judith Stanley</b>	<b>Professor of History CSU Hayward</b>
<b>MEMBER-AT-LARGE</b>	<b>Gene Dinielli</b>	<b>Professor of English CSU Long Beach</b>
<b>PAST CHAIR</b>	<b>Harold Goldwhite</b>	<b>Professor of Chemistry CSU Los Angeles</b>

Please note that the above officers together with the Immediate Past Chair, ex officio, constitute the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate of the California State University.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The elections concluded the organizational meeting of the 1997-98 Academic Senate.

Approved (or corrected)

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
James M. Highsmith, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Hal Charnofsky, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Margaret Price, Recording Secretary