

Academic Senate CSU
Plenary Minutes
Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium
March 11-12, 2010

Call to Order

Meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

Roll Call

A quorum was achieved.

Approval of Agenda

Approved as amended.

Approval of Minutes

No action taken.

Announcements

- There was a recent LA Times article on the capacity shortage within the CSU and UC.
- The recently released book, *The People's University: A History of the California State University*, on the history of the CSU by former President Gerth is an interesting read.
- The ASCSU Executive Committee drafted a resolution asking for a second faculty trustee during the Plenary in January. The body may want now want to consider such a resolution.
- Congratulations to Senator Rohm on his Outstanding Professor Award at CSU: San Bernardino.
- Congratulations to Senator Thobaben on her Outstanding Service Award (Humboldt State University).

Presentations/Introductions

None.

Reports

Chair's Report

The chair was present in Sacramento yesterday for the Master Plan hearings. There were a number of individuals talking in support of the concept and utility of transfer degrees. There was discussion of what is required to expand the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded within California. Both transfer and articulation were "big" themes. Further alignment of GE and major requirements also received a lot of attention.

The Administration has asked for faculty representation on the EVC search committee. The membership will be the Senate Chair and one other individual. Interested parties should state their interest to the Executive Committee.

Q: Do you believe that the ICAS message on the successes of transfer and articulation “got through” during the Master Plan testimony?

A: Yes. This was stressed in the testimony provided, and I believe that the message was received. Admission standards were also discussed. The ASCSU chair communicated his belief to the chair of the committee and chief staff person that further alignment, while worth pursuing, would likely not result in large savings to the state—that there are many other factors causing students to accumulate “excess” units not necessary for a baccalaureate . The offices of Senators Runner, Solario, and Liu have contacted the segments’ governmental relations offices to schedule appointments with ICAS representatives to discuss further alignment in transfer (major and GE). Senator Block (San Diego) is sponsoring legislation addressing concerns of his constituents about local students not being able to matriculate at SDSU.

Standing Committees

Academic Affairs: Postma

AA had good discussion around resolutions and other topics. Outside of our resolutions, there no other action items to bring forward at this time.

Faculty Affairs: Baaske

FAC has two resolutions (1st and 2nd reading item – seeking waiver). FAC had a very good discussion with EVC Echeverria.

Academic Preparation and Education Programs: Wheeler

APEP has four resolutions forthcoming. They are on (1) super-seniors, (2) downstream consequences of FTES reduction, (3) improvements in EAP, and (4) requesting academic side input into Information Technology decisions.

Fiscal and Government Affairs: Barrett

There are two resolutions coming forward at this meeting. One is in support of the governor’s proposed budget. The other is a commendation for President Gerth related to his newly released book on the history of the CSU. The California budget as the primary item of concern, and current indications are that the California state budget process is likely to drag well into the summer. There was also good committee discussion around a number of potential bills of interest.

Other Committees and Committee Liaisons

Task Force on Tolerance and Anti-Semitism (Sabalius)

Composition is from representatives of the CCC, CSU, UC, and private institutions. The first

round of training proposed is for security and police, and then student affairs. There is hope that there will be a multiplier effect from such training. The proposal is that the training be provided by the Wiesenthal center.

Q: Is there a representative of an Arab, Muslim, or other Middle-Eastern ethnic background on the committee?

A: I am reluctant to comment on my colleagues' racial background and heritage, but obviously there is an African-American representative on the task force, who is the Vice-President for Student Affairs at SLO.

Q: What is the role of the faculty member on this committee, if the faculty member is not a “full” participant?

A: The intent of the task force is to focus on peace officers, student affairs leaders, and student organizations. At this point ‘faculty’ are not yet a focus for any potential training.

Comment: In Faculty Affairs there was a discussion about the scope and content of the sensitivity training. Faculty Affairs is interested in what any such training might look like before faculty become recipients of this opportunity for training.

Comment: Historically, academic freedoms can be intentionally or unintentionally constrained when such training is rolled out as a “done deal” rather than being included during its formation.

UC-CSU Joint Graduate Board (Yee-Melichar)

Chancellor George Blumenthal (UC Santa Cruz) and President Albert K. Karnig (CSU San Bernardino) co-chaired this inter-system committee which met February 9, 2010 via conference call. The UC-CSU Joint Graduate Board has final authority on the inter-system graduate review process requiring a minimum of six votes of the CSU members and six of the UC members. During the conference call, we discussed the Ph.D. in Geophysics (UC San Diego and San Diego State University) and the Ph.D. in Evolutionary Biology (UC Riverside and San Diego State University). Affirmative votes in favor of both joint degree proposals were obtained.

General Education Advisory Committee (Van Selst)

There is action to have College Level Education Preparation (CLEP) exams be more broadly used for CSU GE credit as a statewide recommendation. The list of exams is still under development. There is an issue around whether or not a language exam justifies “culture” credit within GE. GEAC intends to provide our recommendation after our next meeting in April.

The President’s Ad Hoc Committee on GE has not yet met. President (and Chair) Corrigan will be meeting with the campus senate chairs in April at the invitation of one of the campus senate chairs. GEAC will have an observer at this meeting. President Corrigan will be invited to meet with GEAC on that same date. Chair Van Selst will pursue this invitation.

Transfer Committee (formerly LDTP: Swerkes)

Much of the LDTP information has been removed from the CSU website. Some of the material will be reposted. We are working effectively and collaboratively with C-ID. We need a new MOU on transfer (the current one expires). This revisited MOU will be sent out for review with the senate. The overall perspective from our view is that C-ID has been very cooperative in receiving the work of LDTP and incorporated wholesale into C-ID for use in CCC/CSU transfer.

Other Reports

Gerard Hanley, Senior Director, Academic Technology Services

The cost of textbooks continues to rise and this is a substantial component of the cost of education for many of our students. A variety of alternatives to the classic textbook exist. Some of these include: open textbooks, open courseware, open educational resources, publishers' digital textbooks, and short term use licensing agreements for digital textbooks, and lower-cost custom print options. The "open" resources are available on the WWW, are free (no cost), and people have permission to use them under conditions. In the Open Educational Resources "movement," additional approaches have developed to provide user permissions to use material appropriately; Creative Commons is one alternative to copyright (<http://creativecommons.org/>). These mechanisms can support the learning outcomes that the course instructor is attempting to achieve. Campus libraries have extensive collections of digital content that is free for students and faculty can build digital coursepacks with the support of librarians. Any of these approaches should fit within the cultural learning context of the local campus where they are being deployed. When this occurs, the student can experience a lower-cost yet-still-effective option towards successfully meeting the course objectives.

One of the attempts of the current initiative is to support faculty in their discovery process and to streamline the work required by faculty to adopt such approaches. One of the questions is how to find, recognize, and celebrate those faculty who are electing to use such open education resources into their coursework. The CSU has created a web-site (<http://als.csuprojects.org>) to help make it easier for faculty, students, staff, and librarians to find the free and lower-cost content.

At CSU Dominguez Hills, the initiative started with the Dean of the Library with support from both the central office of the CSU and the president of CSUDH. Being provided with support for such initiatives allows students a lower cost alternative.

Comments/Questions/Answers

A digital open coursepack can be very effective but there are concerns regarding the intellectual property of the faculty members which can include both their syllabus as well as their coursework elements.

Comment: There is a concern regarding "canned courses" being taught by others – both as a concern regarding the quality of the offerings as taught and of the intellectual property rights of the author of the modules.

Comment: Given the recent history of mycoursehero continuing to publish intellectual property that they clearly do not have an entitlement to, how can instructor copyright be protected within this initiative?

Comment: What are some of the guidelines that we, as a system, want to adopt to streamline the protection of intellectual property rights? It is a challenge to identify agencies that help to protect faculty rights.

Comment: Some of the terms used on the CSU website are common terms such as intellectual property, but there are other non-defined terms used such as "intellectual contribution" and such. What are the implications of these terminology changes?

Q: Is this initiative being performed in collaboration with ITL?

A: Yes, there are faculty development centers on campuses that will play a role. We are trying to find ways to have it such that faculty will find it easy to find these resources. This pilot project at CSU Dominguez Hills is designed to test the functionality of the system. We will work with Cynthia Desrochers of the ITL to help disseminate information about the Affordable Learning Solutions

Q: When a campus has adopted the use of ‘vouchers’ to purchase course materials, is it the case that these vouchers actually paradoxically increase the cost to students, since the materials can only be acquired from the local campus bookstore?

A: It would depend on the implementation. It is often the case that the ‘codes’ for digital media are only available via the bookstore. Campus bookstores can provide very competitive prices.

On the issue of accessibility, there are targets of 100% accessibility for online and web-based materials by such and such a date. These targets are, of course, impossible to actually achieve. The nature of disabilities is extremely diverse; the definition of accessibility requirements continues to development. Campuses are now reviewing a new policy for the systemwide Accessible Technology Initiative that is guided by a continuous improvement model. We need to recognize where accessibility and accommodation gaps actually occur and make every student has equal access to a quality education.

Q: ADA compliance, as implemented on the campuses, is often more draconian than described in your earlier comments.

A: Fear is not an effective means of managing change. We need to use education to bring effective principles to the forefront in utilization. When the new policy is approved and disseminated, there will be training and professional development opportunities to inform people about the new approach.

Q: Speed of access to class materials can be a concern (e.g., delayed adoption of used textbooks).

A: This is generally not a concern with e-materials; use of “still valid” older texts can lead to avoiding availability lags with ‘new’ editions.

Comment: The issue of intellectual property in this initiative should be referred to the relevant senate committees (Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs).

Comment: The cost of self-printing e-materials can dramatically increase the “real” cost of electronic materials. In some cases the actual cost of shifting printing costs to the students are not recognized when computing the “savings” inherent in various electronic materials.

Ben Quillian, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer

During last week there was a meeting in Sacramento with representatives from finance, K-12, UC, CCC, and the CSU. This provided an opportunity for direct communication concerning the consequences of budget cuts from Dr. Quillian to the Governor. Topics included faculty, staff, student, and institutional impacts. Appreciation for the restoration of funds to the CSU in the budget proposal was noted, along with a statement that there are additional unmet needs. The volatility of California fiscal and budget processes were discussed. The meeting represented an opportunity to present the difficulties we are facing directly to the governor and to the press.

Standard and Poor’s credit rating for the CSU is an A+. The rating reflects strong conservative fiscal management, strong student demand, good risk control measures, and other elements. Moody’s report also confirmed our AA3 rating. At this time of year, the LAO does a fiscal

analysis, part of which is focused on higher education. Higher education is set for a \$377 million increase relative to 09/10 from the Governor's budget, but we believe a \$305 million number (less some federal matching funds) is a more realistic count. The LAO report is bullish on the ability of the CSU to be able to handle a large student increase with a minimal increase in funding. This is dangerous for the CSU, since it telegraphs to the community that the CSU could handle much higher student loads with only minimal increases relative to the heavily triaged 09/10 budgets.

Q: What is the current thinking regarding furloughs?

A: If the CSU obtained the \$305 million budget increase, it is unlikely that the system would request that furloughs would continue. There is no formal system decision on this yet.

Q: Why would the CSU continue its current death spiral with respect to under-funded support for our mission?

A: We have been forced to align our number of students with that for which we have been funded. The student reductions mean reduced access and a reduced number of graduates. There is record student demand – at this level it is unfortunate that student fees are not at a level that supports their education so we cannot grow to meet demand.

Q: The prior CFA vote from last semester was very close and has produced strong emotional reactions. Please do not count on furloughs being able to be passed via a vote of the membership again – the support for such an action may be quite weak. Please keep other non-furlough plans at the forefront of your thinking.

A: Yes. We appreciate that potential reality.

Q: The LAO has suggested that we can handle an additional 20,000 students.

A: We have targeted 310,000 FTES for fall. The LAO seems to disregard mandatory costs and is making the assumption that we can spread ourselves yet thinner. I do not agree with the LAO that there are large areas of inefficiency yet to be recognized.

Q: Should we raise all graduate fees by double or more?

A: This is tough. The market could likely bear an increase, but it would run contrary to the mission of the CSU, which is affordability.

Q: The LAO seems to consistently slam the CSU and higher education. Is this unique to California?

A: The LAO is a California entity. The reports seem to have misguided assumptions and/or erroneous data.

Ashley Garrett, Vice Chancellor, University Relations and Advancement

My job has been to reconstitute the University Relations and Advancement division. There are six departments within the division: public affairs, communications, outreach, advancement, and government relations (both Federal and State).

Our efforts at outreach, advocacy, and communications have been stepped up considerably. We are working with the other segments of higher education with greater intensity and frequency than in years past. The "bus tour" is on again for April, with a particular focus on middle schools.

The UC and CSU are the only elements within the governor's budget that have a year-to-year increase (at least relative to the one-year legislative budget history). The CSU impact study will be updated with some new data. The graduation initiative is a focus; the most recent "Super

Sunday” broke prior outreach efforts. We are developing a marketing plan for the 50th anniversary of the CSU.

Q: How was the “CSU return on investment” figure derived for the fiscal impact of a CSU degree?

A: We will work on a short statement.

Allison Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support

Enrollment management is the process by which we attempt to constrain CSU enrollment to that funded by the State. This involves a 40,000 student reduction. We are trying to maintain and/or increase the diversity of the student population of the CSU. We want to be sure that we can offer the courses to students that they need.

Enrollment management is to attempt to provide access to all qualified students; ideally we want to accommodate every fully qualified freshman and upper division transfer student. There are many constraints on enrollment management plans at the campuses (e.g., housing, etc.). When there are more applicants than spaces, campuses are allowed to apply supplemental criteria. The Education Code section 66202 requires that the State support and the CSU provide adequate educational opportunities.

There are other aspects of the Education Code that we need to maintain. We need to maintain a 60% upper division and 40% lower division ratio of students. Some campuses could, in absence of this requirement and based on enrollment pressure, be entirely upper-division. The education code does not permit this.

Impaction can cause confusion. There is a difference between campus impaction and program impaction. Admission to an impacted campus does not include assurance of admission to an impacted program at that campus. If a major or program of study is not offered as part of the curriculum at an applicant’s local impacted campus, CSU-eligible first-time freshman students are guaranteed admission to a CSU campus immediately adjacent to the applicant’s local region if it does offer that major or program.

Q: Does the 40,000 student reduction figure refer to FTES or head-count?

A: The real question is the starting point. We need to reduce FTES from 40,000 from the 08/09 levels to meet our likely 10/11 targets.

Q: What are other eligibility restrictions?

A: No second baccalaureate students; we have not induced systemwide eligibility restrictions on graduate students.

Q: What about out of state students?

A: The rubber hits the road when a legislator finds that an eligible California State student was not admitted to allow an out of state student to attend the CSU.

Q: What is the forbidden four?

A: Lower division transfers, second baccalaureate degree holders, undeclared post-baccalaureate students, admission exceptions for upper division transfers.

Q: Are there exceptions?

A: Yes, given enrollment pressures, each campus is allowed 8% exceptions.

Q: What are the financial rewards or incentives that accrue to the CSU when there is a four-year rather than a five-year graduation?

A: It is a capacity argument.

Q: Do we have physical capacity limitation?

A: There is a financial capacity limitation. We also have “maximum capacity” limitations for each campus.

Q: Post-baccalaureate credential programs seem to be in limbo vis-à-vis recent enrollment management actions. It is a Chancellor’s Office restriction that we cannot allow spring 2010 admissions. Together, these constraints may be killing some teacher education programs.

A: The forbidden four does not include teacher preparation because technically they are not undeclared students. The campus has to set its own enrollment management plan. Hopefully future plans will allow some more fidelity in enrollment management.

Q: Can you discuss the use of wait-lists?

A: They are not new, but are new to the CSU. With the potential of new money for enrollment based on the Governor’s budget, campuses have been asked to establish wait-lists. There are many years of data for enrollment management actions that are likely now not reliable. The admission uncertainty for student applicants has led to unpredictable behavior, and we do not yet have the knowledge to better predict yield. We do not believe we will have a budget before August. This is too late to have a fixed admission set – at this eleventh hour additional support may appear or too few students may actually “show up” on campus. For both of these reasons, wait-lists make sense.

Q: Have we tracked any of the transfer students who we did not admit in spring 2010?

A: We do not have this data – we only have anecdotal evidence. By not having a cycle for Spring 2010, we were hoping that students would finish their appropriate lower division requirements. There is little doubt that students cannot obtain some of the classes they need both at the CCC and CSU. There has been a significant increase in applicants for fall 2010 for the group of upper division transfers (40% increase).

Q: There are a number of campus-based programs that have been differentially impacted by the absence of Spring 2010 admissions.

A: We need to be responsive to the Legislature and how higher education is treated within the California State Budget. Dramatic cuts to education funding have demanded absolutely dramatic CSU responses.

Q: There are questions about whether those students who were denied in spring 2010 were unable to obtain sufficient coursework to allow full financial aid at their community college. It seems clear that our intermittent admissions will increase financial aid.

A: Any “need” shown at the CCC means that the CCC fees are waived. Pell grants allow partial coursework loads to retain eligibility.

Q: Would the CSU perform a survey of incoming fall 2010 students? It seems that knowing the impact of delayed admission would be useful. It seems that we could admit students but restrict unit registration.

A: Some CCC students are following up with proprietary institutions.

Comment: Teaching preparation is a central role for the CSU. Eliminating spring admissions from teacher preparation programs should receive particular attention in strategic planning.

Jeri Echeverria, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

Deliverology as a term and as an approach has distracted from the purpose and intent of the graduation initiative. The focus should be on having students graduate with appropriate degrees in a timely fashion without “pushing people out the door.”

Some of our campuses have been quite successful in achieving good graduation rates relative to their respective programs and the populations that they serve.

At the President’s and Provost’s meeting, faculty were identified as an obstacle to change (“deliverology – slide 18). This was unfortunate. It is hard to recover from missteps as we (jointly) move forward. It is important that faculty are partners in the graduation initiative. I have a strong hope that as the structure and nature of the graduation initiative moves forward, the faculty voice is present and is heard.

On the issue of the role of department chairs, there has been a long-standing tension between the administrative and faculty roles of the chair. Some of the underlying issues are obviously contractual. We welcome further discussion on addressing the newfound difficulties many department chairs are experiencing as some change from 10 month to 12 month campus appointments.

There will be a presentation to the board on Early Start Initiative. Depending on Board Action, the EAP will continue to develop.

Q: We respect your right and decision to retire. Know that your service here will be missed.

A: There are interesting challenges beyond my work life. When I pack up and lock my door, I know that I will be sad.

Q: On enrollment management, can you tell me how the CSU saves money if a student completes a degree in four years versus five years? Why is there a financial incentive to have students graduate in a shorter time-frame? There seems to be a failure to recognize that getting a college degree advantages the student and instead the focus seems to be on getting the degree quickly.

A: The underlying comment is “what increases degree attainment?” Clearly there are some metrics that could be used which may not reflect eventual degree attainment. The purpose for the graduation initiative is based on the desire to increase the percentage of students who will graduate. It is not financially driven.

Q: Most programs that appear before the board have been vetted by this body and elsewhere in the CSU. The Early Start proposal before the board does not seem to have benefited from this approach. What is publicly known about the board item is quite minimal. The actual program that the board is being asked to adopt seems quite underspecified.

A: What is envisioned is a two to three year implementation plan after taking recommendations from the English and Math groups. English recommended a phased approach to using new cut scores (e.g., a reduction of higher cut score to lift remediation requirements from some). The low scoring group will now be required to engage in remediation (“early start”) prior to matriculation. In all cases, each campus will be encouraged to select whichever of several types of approaches they will be using vis-à-vis remediation.

Q: You mention a “menu of choices” for implementation of Early Start. Some existing programs

are demonstrably effective, but may not be included in the menu of choices since they do not start in the summer before matriculation.

A: This is a controversial issue. The requirement to meet the board criteria does not appear to be negotiable.

Q: Can you assure us that the items in the “menu of choices” have demonstrable high levels of success at remediation? (Some of the non-menu choices do have empirical support for their efficacy [e.g., some stretch courses]).

A: No. But it should be pointed out that some of the approaches are currently in effect have little or no data indicating their level of success, either.

Q: To further pursue the question of the Early Start Program, is the plan to bring the original members of the Early Start Program together again to build an implementation plan?

A: I believe it would be a good idea to have members of the task force consider a draft of the executive order for consistency and to benefit from their six months of deliberation. A new group or implementation team will be formed to oversee the Early Start program, and perhaps some of the task force members will continue on the implementation team.

Q: The Early Start program could mean requiring students to enroll in self-support prior to their Fall semester. This could mean reduced aggregate coverage from financial aid.

A: Yes, this is a concern.

Q: It appears that we cannot start Early Start till 2012?

A: Yes, this is the intent of providing sufficient advance notice for the execution of Early Start requirements.

Q: There is a need for clarification of the consequences for students who do not successfully complete the summer program. Will they be denied admission?

A: Absolutely not. There is no way we could, nor would we intend to deny admission to such a student. The goal is to get students to complete remediation earlier.

Q: Looking at the Board of Trustees Educational Policies Agenda, there is no indication of whether a program seeking approval is online or not. Is there any plan to change this?

A: I agree; Chris Mellon, Academic Affairs, and ATAC should be consulted.

John Travis, CFA

All 23 campuses held events on March 4th that underscored the importance of higher education to California. The central message is that public higher education is of great public value to the state of California.

The Governor’s budget restored funds to the CSU. We hope that this additional allocation remains through the final budget processes. We are working on bolstering the perception that public higher education is a critical element of California’s future.

On bargaining, we are finishing the statutory requirements around the potential 08/09 salary increases. These salary increases were tied to Compact funding. There is a reopener pending on 09/10 statutory processes. The fact-finding process is designed to allow both parties a footing to see if negotiations should continue. The CFA/CSU contract expires June 30, 2010. From this point, all articles are available for either party

to begin bargaining. CFA approached the administration with the thought of extending the contract in order to allow joint CFA/CSU action on items of interest. The CSU declined this. CFA has begun collecting information via their survey to assist with future bargaining directions. CFA is formulating its public notice proposals (“sunshine proposals”).

CFA is a local (1983) of SEIU. CFA will accompany a SEIU delegation to Washington with the hopes of acquiring some additional federal funds for public higher education.

Q: What is the future of furloughs for the next year? If furloughs are to continue, the senate chairs and others are deeply concerned about many aspects including timelines for planning purposes.

A: There has been no official communication from the CSU regarding furloughs. The number of faculty who have not been retained (2009/2010 from 2008/2009) exceeds 2,000 (approximately 400 FTEF) across the system. The fiscal savings from this for the system is substantial.

Q: I have heard that the legislature may not touch the budget until after the June primary. Assuming this is true, what is the impact on bargaining?

A: Many in the legislature will be reluctant to take action while up for reelection. On the other hand, public higher education is on the radar of many legislators. Additionally, Speaker Perez is quite attuned to higher education issues. Nevertheless, summers are always a challenge for visible action and coordination for CFA.

Q: The venom with which public employees are being addressed is extraordinary. There is a perception that CSU employees are immune from being harmed by the CA budget cuts.

A: Most state workers have suffered dramatically under the state budget reductions. Clearly public employees are an easy target – CSU employees will and do get blamed for elements that are well outside of our control. The rallying cry of Meg Whitman is to fire 40,000 public employees – this inherently does not lead to a positive perception of CSU faculty.

Comment: At the federal level, there is not an appreciation that higher education accountability measures are going to cost substantially.

Q: The March 4th demonstrations were quite large and produced largely positive news coverage as well as increased awareness of the issues facing public higher education. What is planned to keep this message on the front burner?

A: The degree of cooperation across the three segments of higher public education showed a good amount of teamwork. This is very effective for our lobbying efforts. There is movement to identify tax loopholes to allow additional revenue streams for use with higher education.

Q: There is a negative attack advertisement sponsored by CFA called “leveling the playing field,” I am bothered by CFA involvement in a negative advertisement campaign.

A: In the particular case, some candidates pose a large risk for the CFA. The decision to “go negative” was not taken lightly.

Dunixi Guereca, CSSA Liaison

The second student trustee on the Board of Trustees was appointed: Nicole Anderson (Sacramento). At the most recent meeting, CSSA passed a resolution in support of local campuses having explicit advising policies advocating for excellence in advising. On March 22, 2010, there will be another action in Sacramento. On April 22-25, there will be the California higher education summit followed by CSSA advocacy day at the capital. The next meeting of CSSA will be at Dominguez hills. The website for the CSSA advocacy is <http://madeinthecsu.com/> .

Q: I am concerned about responsible behavior at these events protesting educational cuts.

A: CSSA has passed a resolution advocating for responsible behavior at such events.

Committee Recommendations

AS-2936-10/FA (Rev) – Approved without dissent

Private Donors’ Respect for Academic Freedom

AS-2937-10/AA/FGA (Rev) - Approved

Opposition to AB 440, as amended (July 4, 2009), Beall. California Community Colleges: Student Transfer

AS-2938-10/AA (Rev) - Approved

Openness of the Accountability Process in the Graduate Professional Business Programs

AS-2939-10/AA (Rev) – Approved without dissent

Use and Implementation of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)

AS-2940-10/AA (Rev) – Approved unanimously

Proposed Repeal of Title 5 Section 40503 Relative to Bachelor of Vocational Education Degrees

FIRST READING / WAIVER

AS-2935-10/AA (Rev) - Approved

A Call for Board of Trustee Action on Faculty Trustee Appointment

AS-2943-10/AA – Approved unanimously

Support for Proposed Title 5 Revision: Assignment of Priority Student Housing for Former Foster Youth

AS-2946-10/FGA – Approved without dissent

Commendation for President Emeritus Donald R. Gerth and His Book, *The People's University: A History of the California State University*

FIRST READING

AS-2942-10/AA

Use of College-Level Education Program (CLEP) Tests to Meet General Education (GE) Requirements

AS-2944-10/EX

Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2010-2011 Meetings

AS-2945-10/FGA

Support for Governor's Proposed 2010-2011 Higher Education Budget

AS-2947-10/APEP/AA

Consultation on Decisions Regarding Academic Information Technology.

AS-2948-10/APEP

Impact of Enrollment Management Decisions on Academic Programs

AS-2949-10/APEP

The Early Assessment Program (EAP) and Collaborations to Increase the Academic Readiness of Graduating High School Seniors

AS-2950-10/APEP

Facilitating Students' Academic and Career Goals in a Time of Economic Constraints.

AS-2951-10/EX

The Need for a Second Faculty Trustee (Tabled until May Plenary)

Adjournment