CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 10:40 a.m. on Thursday, January 23, 2003, by Chair Jacquelyn Kegley.

ROLL CALL: Senators and alternates (*) attending the meeting were: (Bakersfield) Jacquelyn Kegley, John Tarjan; (Channel Islands) Dick Williams*, Kathleen Kaiser; (Dominguez Hills) Dick Williams*, Rudolph Vanterpool; (Fresno) Jacinta Amaral, Lester Pincu; (Fullerton) Vincent Buck, Bill Meyer, Barry Pasternack; (Hayward) Calvin Caplan, Hank Reichman; (Humboldt) Robert Snyder, Marshelle Thobaben; (Long Beach) David Hood, Susan Rice, Craig Smith; (Los Angeles) J. Theodore Anagnoson, Marshall Cates; (Maritime Academy) James Wheeler; (Monterey Bay) Bobbi Bonace, J. Ken Nishita; (Northridge) Lynne Cook, Michael Reagan, Barbara Sverkes; (Pomona) Rochelle Kellner, Marvin Klein; (Sacramento) Cristy Jensen, Thomas Krabacher, Louise Timmer; (San Bernardino) Buckley Barrett, Tapie Rohm; (San Diego) Ray Boddy, Brent Rushall, Thomas Warschauer; (San Francisco) Robert Cherny; (San José) Kenneth Peter, Bethany Shifflett, Mark Van Selst; (San Luis Obispo) Manzar Foroohar, Myron Hood, Unny Menon; (San Marcos) Dick Montanari, A. Sandy Parsons; (Sonoma) Philip McGough, Susan McKillop; (Stanislaus) John Sarraillie, Mark Thompson; (Emeriti Faculty) Len Mathy; (Chancellor's Office) David Spence.

INTRODUCTIONS
During the course of the meeting the Chair introduced:
Harold Goldwhite, Faculty Trustee and Professor of Chemistry, CSU Los Angeles
Gary Hammerstrom, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, CSU
Richard Serpe, Social and Behavioral Research Institute, CSU San Marcos
Peter Ucovich, California State Student Association Liaison to Academic Senate

Deborah Hennessy, Executive Director, Academic Senate CSU
Margaret Price, Assistant to Executive Director, Academic Senate CSU
Shirley Sparkman, Staff Assistant–Budget, Academic Senate CSU
Tracy Butler, Administrative Assistant, Academic Senate CSU
ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS

REPORT OF CHAIR JACQUELYN ANN K. KEGLY

Academic Technology Planning Committee meetings – November 15 and December 6, 2002

At these two meetings, the Academic Technology Planning Committee (ATPC) discussed and established project goals, framed a vision for academic technology in the California State University (CSU), developed a set of guiding principles for the planning process as well as a set of planning assumptions. The group also began development of a set of criteria that will guide selection of initiatives and projects that will constitute the final academic technology plan. There was also discussion of a communication plan whereby ATPC will share reports of its progress and preliminary work products with campuses and various systemwide advisory and affinity groups for reaction and feedback. A key element of this communication plan is the posting of work products on a website at http://its.calstate.edu/academic_technology/atpc.shtml.

Vicki Casella and Lou Zweier have now completed seven two-day visits to CSU campuses at Chico, Long Beach, Northridge, Pomona, San Francisco, San Marcos and Sonoma. These campuses were chosen to provide a representative mix of CSU campuses, north-south, urban-rural, large-small, etc. During these visits focus groups were conducted with faculty, staff, and students, to determine needs in using academic technology and to hear about successful campus academic technology projects. The over 3000 individual responses are being entered into a database for analysis. A second round of campus visits and consultations with advisory/affinity groups will be conducted in January and February.

Academic Council – San Francisco- November 19, 2002

At the meeting of the Academic Council (Provosts and Academic Affairs Vice Presidents), there were a number of important updates. The first was an update on the Common Management System (CMS) Student Administration as it is progressing on various pilot campuses. The pilot campuses reported good progress and fair satisfaction with the project as it was proceeding. Louanne Kennedy and I expressed concern, on behalf of the Facilitating Graduation Task Force, that CMS be able to facilitate graduation checks. Much time was given to reports on Teacher Education issues including the Teacher Preparation Evaluation results and the Teacher Performance Assessments being proposed by Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). A great deal of concern was expressed regarding the financial and human resources costs of the CTC assessment process. Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence announced the formation of an Advisory Task Force under the leadership of Professor Robert Cichowski, on leave from CPSU San Luis Obispo, based at the Chancellor’s Office as the Associate Director of Teacher Education and Public School Programs. The Task Force will review blended programs with a view to providing an answer to Senator Dede Alpert’s expressed desire for an Undergraduate Major in Education (SB 1646). I insisted that faculty be nominated for this group and since that time six faculty members have been proposed by the Senate Executive Committee and
accepted for membership on this group. In addition to various other reports, there was discussion of enrollment targets and faculty recruitment plans. I reported on our forthcoming reports on Intellectual Property, The Roles and Responsibilities of Chairs, and the Workload Taskforce.

Council of Library Directors, CSU Bakersfield- November 21, 2002
I was able to briefly attend the meeting of the Council of Library Directors on my campus, CSU Bakersfield on Thursday, November 21. I reported to them on the Intellectual Property report as well as the Facilitating Graduation report. In addition I was able to hear a brief discussion on a recommended policy on Library Support for Joint Doctorates. The recommended policy is as follows:

“When developing joint doctoral programs with CSU/UC (University of California) campuses, in the area of information resource support, all campuses offering the programs will have a written agreement stating that all faculty and students teaching or enrolled in the program on all participating campuses will have equal access to information resources in all formats that support the doctoral program.

“In addition, as a part of the planning process for the program, collection development librarians in appropriate disciplines from each campus will assess the quality and depth of the existing collections to support a doctoral level program; identify the core collection required as onsite collections for each campus which need to be purchased; recommend titles as shared resources; arrange cooperative licensing agreements for electronic resources; and make budget recommendations for the augmentation of resources and propose how the recommended budget should be allocated to each campus.”

ICAS Transfer Committee meeting- November 22, 2002
As Chair of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), I established an ICAS Task Force on Transfer in order to provide a forum for faculty members from the three segments to discuss openly various issues impacting transfer between and among the public institutions of higher education. This Task Force had its first meeting on November 22 preceding the regular ICAS meeting. Members present were Jackie Kegley, Cristy Jensen, and Ken Nishita from CSU; Hoke Simpson, Kate Clark, and Julie Adams from the California Community Colleges (CCC); and Larry Pitts from UC. Bob Snyder from CSU was unable to attend because of travel difficulties. I outlined the background for the Task Force for the group including the recent appointment of an Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC) on Transfer that includes various administrative persons as well as faculty. Transfer has been and continues to be a serious concern of various legislators and there is a real threat of legislative action if faculty and the segments do not demonstrate serious progress toward smoother and increased transfer. The group reviewed the charge of the ICC Transfer Committee and discussed ways in which our group could work jointly with this group. There was also a review of the various statewide transfer and articulation initiatives, projects and consultation groups including Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulation Curriculum (IMPAC) system, the CSU Core Projects, the UC Dual Admissions program, California Articulation Number (CAN) system and the 4CSU effort [CCC transfer students committed to CSU]. CSU
representatives expressed serious concern about recent actions by the Assembly of the CCC that opposed such an effort. An overview of questions and current discussion of a Transfer Associate’s Degree was presented and briefly discussed. It was agreed that the group would meet again in February before the next ICAS meeting. Larry Pitts also agreed that he would seek more UC faculty to participate in the group discussions. Consideration will be given at the next meeting to the idea of a Transfer Associate’s degree and the key factors it represents.

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates- November 22, 2002.

After an update on the ICC Retreat from the ICAS Chair Jackie Kegley, each segment senate chair presented reports. Hoke Simpson, Chair of CCC, discussed a recent report on diversity that focuses on successful models for promoting diversity among faculty and students as well as in the curriculum. He also discussed a report that sought to project the real cost of education for a community college student. In addition, he reported on funding available for the English as a Second Language (ESL) project and on two recent transfer degree projects in math and English. Larry Pitts, Vice Chair, UC Academic Council, reported that a new statement on Academic Freedom is being developed in light of the recent controversy over a course on Palestine at Berkeley. The Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) is also undertaking a comprehensive review of diversity in the UC as well as of graduate admissions. There will also be a gender equity summit held in the near future. Finally, Larry reported that UC Merced has hired its first 15 faculty members to begin development of the curriculum for that campus. I reported for CSU on our resolution on 60 units for transfer as well as on the upcoming reports on Facilitating Graduation, Intellectual Property, Workload, and the Roles and Responsibilities of Chairs.

A progress report and a financial report were given on the IMPAC project. A proposal from John Tarjan for an Intersegmental Business Articulation Council was approved. Each segment Senate Chair will contact and appoint members for this council. Mary Gil and José Michel gave a presentation on the proposed new CAN articulation model. The senates of each segment will be asked to review this and provide feedback and/or approval. At the request of Hoke Simpson, Jackie Kegley reported on the Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR 73) Proposal and especially on the specific plans to meet the 75/25 ratio. The final report of the ICAS ESL Scoping Committee was received and approved as well as a proposed charge for a Task Force on English Language Learners. Each segment will nominate four faculty members (one from English composition) to be on this Competency Task Force. It was agreed that the next meeting of ICAS would focus on legislative-Master Plan issues and budgetary consultation processes.

The California State Student Association (CSSA) meeting- San Francisco- Dec. 6-8, 2002.

On Sunday, December 8, 2002, I was able to join the members of the CSSA Board of Directors for their meeting. I updated the group on three items of special concern to them: the ACR-73 Plan; the Intellectual Property Report; and the Facilitating Graduation Task Report. There was good discussion of these reports with the students. In addition, we were able to have an extensive discussion of the proposed Board of Trustee resolution to
increase undergraduate fees by 10% and graduate fees by 15%. I expressed concern that the burden of the state’s fiscal mismanagement was falling on students and also argued that the CSU had very few revenue sources to meet the devastating cuts being proposed for this year and next. I pointed out that the key concern for faculty was the ability to provide access to classes and to continue to facilitate student progress toward graduation. The discussion was amiable although disagreement was definitely present.

**Workload Task Force Meeting- December 14, 2002**
The final meeting of the Workload Task Force took place on Saturday, December 14. The updated version of the comparable faculty workload report was reviewed and approved, followed by a discussion of the draft “Findings and Recommendations” document prepared jointly by Jackie Kegley, Susan Meisenhelder, Scott McNall, David Spence and Gary Hammerstrom. Recommendations divided into four categories: Workload; Faculty Evaluation and Other Reward Processes; Research and Scholarly Activities and Lecturer Issues. The final version of the “Findings and Recommendations” document will be circulated for approval among all parties. This will be released to all constituencies along with a Press Report. The Comparable Workload report will be sent to senators in January and time will be set aside at the January Plenary for questions and discussion of that report.

**Academic Technology Planning Committee Retreat- San Diego-January 7-9, 2003**
Members of the Academic Technology Planning Team met in San Diego January 7-9. The first task of this group was to review and validate a vision statement, a set of project goals, planning assumptions, strategic criteria and tactical criteria. The group then heard a report of the Academic Technology Planning Focus Groups held on seven campuses. The various issues and suggested needs for academic technology arising out of these meetings were discussed along with a review of ongoing academic technology initiatives submitted by all 23 campuses. Through varied small group work, a set of draft initiatives were developed that will serve as a guide for possible projects in academic technology for the system as well as a stimulus to suggestions for initiative focus from campuses as the remaining campus visits take place in February. Members of the ATPC will be assisting in facilitating meetings on the campuses. I hope senators will also become personally involved in these focus groups and will urge colleagues to attend to make their concerns and statements of needs for academic technology known.

**Meeting with David Spence and Conference Call for Accountability Meeting**
On Monday, January 13, 2003, I met with Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer David Spence in Long Beach to discuss the Governor’s proposed budget for 2003-2004 as well as The Facilitating Graduation report, transfer issues and the Joint-Doctoral Review Panel. Providing clear and facilitated pathways to graduation for all students, including transfer students, is a strong goal of both the Trustees and the Legislature. Fortunately, the CSU in conjunction with the Academic Senate CSU has been working hard on this goal with its Common Core Projects; the Early Math and English Assessment project and the recent report on Facilitating Graduation. To continue moving toward this goal, David and I agreed that the Task Force on Facilitating Graduation, augmented by
another Vice President for Student Affairs and more students, should become the group (recommended in the Facilitating report) to review and develop policies on Academic Withdrawals, Repeats, etc. In addition, David will present to the Senate a plan for addressing transfer issues. Finally a joint letter from David and me has been sent to Provosts and Campus Senate Chairs asking for nominations for reviewers for Joint-Doctoral proposals.

On Friday, January 17, there will be a conference call to discuss the forthcoming January 22 symposium on Postsecondary Education Accountability for California proposed by Senator Dede Alpert and involving 40 participants including postsecondary education leaders, public officials, students, faculty, and members of the business community. The team from CSU will include Presidents Koester and Rosser, David Spence, Richard West, Patrick Lenz, Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa, Artemio Pimentel and your Chair, Jackie Kegley.

********

Standing Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs Committee  Chair Robert Snyder reported that Academic Affairs has two resolutions, one on the report facilitating graduation and one on the recommended changes in the CAN process. We also discussed AB 2202 and SB 953, which were passed in the last legislative session. These bills, in part, recommend and mandate curricular changes for the California State University in Gerontology programs and programs in the helping professions. Academic Affairs will draft a resolution explaining why curriculum by legislative mandate does not result in good academic policy. We will also write a letter to the Chancellor’s Office asking that it collect information about the extent to which programs in the helping professions already satisfy the legislative mandate before the system take any action on the bills. The Committee has been discussing enrollment management for some time. We have generated a draft report and will convert this to a letter, coming from the Senate Chair and Chancellor’s Office, requesting broad consultation with faculty and faculty senates on enrollment management issues. This letter will go to provosts and senate chairs. The Board of Trustees is considering allowing campuses that are at the master plan enrollment ceiling of 25,000 to increase their enrollment ceiling. Academic Affairs will draft a resolution concerning this issue. We need to decide if we support increasing enrollment ceilings and, if so, that it include broad faculty consultation. The final item we considered was the Social Science Database membership. Currently the Chancellor’s Office pays for three of these databases through Information Technology Services. There is concern that with the current budget crisis ITS will not fully fund this service, asking participating campuses to pay part of the bill. We will follow this issue.

Committee on Teacher Education and K-12 Relations (TEKR) did not meet in December 2002, but the committee was active in monitoring California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) actions and communicating with those campuses most immediately affected. Specifically, an item on CCTC’s agenda of December 4-5, 2002, that had potential impact for three CSU campuses in spring 2003 and two additional campuses in 2003-04. CCTC staff proposed that "That the Commission focus its accreditation activities for the remainder of 2002-2003 and all of 2003-2004 on initial program accreditation activities to
implement fully the SB 2042 standards. All institutions/programs formerly scheduled for site visits in those time periods will have the visits delayed for two years, with the exception of all NCATE/CCTC merged visits, which will be held according to schedule.” (Ref: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/aboutctc/agendas/december_2002/december_2002_PREP-3.pdf).

This action would defer for at least two years CA’s accreditation of CSU Chico which was scheduled for spring 2003 but would continue the merged accreditation visits (NCATE and CCTC) for San Jose State University and San Diego State University in spring 2003 and for Cal Poly, SLO and California State University, Los Angeles in 2003-04. An additional 20 CA teacher preparation (non-CSU) programs would be affected during the specified period. TEKR members interviewed faculty and administrators at the three CSU campuses originally scheduled for spring 2003 and consulted with CSU Deans of Education and CSU Academic Affairs. It was not possible to develop a definitive CSU faculty position in the short timeframe or in the absence of a meeting of the Academic Senate. After consulting with the Senate Chair, TEKR took the position that we should request on behalf of the CSU faculty that CCTC modify this item so that it would be permissive for non-NCATE institutions that are scheduled for accreditation visits in 2003 and spring of 2004 to elect to delay their visits for two years. Senator Bobbie Bonace represented TEKR and the AS CSU at the CCTC meeting and offered compelling arguments for this position. The CCTC nevertheless adopted the item and has suspended all non-NCATE accreditation visits for at least two years. The notion is that this will allow campuses to prepare more effectively to implement all of the SB 2042 provisions before having accreditation reviews. While there is some discussion that NCATE visits might also be suspended, TEKR and the campuses that TEKR has consulted do not wish to support such action.

TEKR members received and reviewed the report entitled, *Teachers for Tomorrow: A Collaborative Approach to Secondary Teacher Preparation* prepared by the Presidents Commission on Secondary Education. After discussion with the chairs and vice chairs of Academic Affairs and Faculty Affairs, it was decided that TEKR would take the lead on developing a response to this report to present to the Senate. TEKR is continuing this review. Additionally TEKR chair and vice chairs participated in a discussion of the CSU Accountability Report with the chairs and vice chairs of the other three standing committees and concurred with the position that will be presented by Academic Affairs.

TEKR committees of 2001-02 and 2002-03 and their liaisons unanimously passed a resolution honoring Hal Charnofsky, AS-2590-03/TEKR, which is now being co-sponsored by Academic Affairs and will be considered at the January meeting of the Senate.

In the January 22 meeting TEKR heard updates on two CSU activities, discussed issues related to the Joint Ed.D. degrees, and reviewed several CCTC actions and positions that have significant implications for CSU campuses.

Chair Cook reported that CalTeach had immediately incorporated TEKR’s suggestions for modifying the pilot CSU Teacher Education Data System it is developing with select CSU campuses. A subsequent review and discussion will be scheduled for the spring. A draft
of the CSU Subject Matter Studies report is being distributed for comment by the advisory board and the next draft will be available to TEKR and the Senate in the next few weeks.

Two items from the December CCTC agenda were considered. In discussion of the Deferment of Accreditation Activities (see comments above from December activities), the committee decided to revive previous discussions of the merits of national accreditation by the National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and to engage Academic Affairs committee in future discussion. Greater time was spent on examining the second CCTC December agenda item: Expanding the Availability of Pre-Intern and Intern Programs (Ref: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/aboutctc/agendas/december_2002/december_2002_CCA-1.pdf).

TEKR has great concern about the fiscal and capacity implications this CCTC action may have on CSU given our current and anticipated budget cuts. There are too many yet undefined elements in the policy item as posted and passed. TEKR expressed concern that there will be appropriate monitoring to ensure that the large number of interns to be created by this action will be appropriately admitted to and making satisfactory progress in approved preparation programs. The committee charged Chair Cook with seeking clarification from CCTC.

Beverly Young joined the committee for our continuing discussion of the Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs) required by SB 2042 and being developed by CCTC. The collaborative efforts between TEKR and the CSU Academic Affairs described in our November report have not progressed as anticipated. The costs of TPA implementation and the challenges of ensuring assessment of high quality and value in a short timeframe are of significant concern. SB 2042 requires that the TPAs be implemented “subject to the availability of funds in the annual Budget Act”. Various interpretations of and “strings attached to” the interpretation of that simple phrase are being discussed at administrative levels. TEKR finds it to be an exceptionally clear statement and one that should be exceedingly easy to interpret during our current budget situation. Chair Cook is attending a briefing in Sacramento on the current status of the TPAs on January 23 and will provide further information to the committee and the Senate following that and subsequent meetings.

Harold Goldwhite, Faculty Trustee  Report of the Meeting of the Board of Trustees
The Board of Trustees will meet at the Chancellor’s Office on January 28 and 29, 2003. I expect that concerns about the 2003-2004 General Fund budget will be prominent. As usual the full agenda is available on-line at http://www.calstate.edu/BOT/agendas/

After a closed meeting which will include review of executives and consideration of proposed honorary degrees, the Committee on Collective Bargaining will meet, but there are no major issues currently on its agenda. The Committee on Institutional Advancement will act on proposals to name facilities at Long Beach and Fresno, and on the 2001-2002 report on external support. The Committee on Governmental Relations will consider the Reaffirmation of the Trustees’ Legislative Principles; the first report of the 2003-2004 session; and the CSU’s Federal Agenda for 2003.
The Committee on Finance will hear a status report on both the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 support budgets; no action is expected, but as you know the Governor’s proposal of January 10, 2003, significantly reduces funding to all of higher education, and proposes increasing the student-faculty ratio at CSU and substantial increases in student fees. Action items for the Committee include approval of revenue bonds, a public sector partnership to develop a Regional Crime Laboratory facility on the Los Angeles campus, and a property development on the Pomona campus for a regional blood processing center for the Red Cross.

The Committee on Educational Policies will act on the upping of transfer requirements for upper-division standing from 56 to 60 semester units; will hear the seventh annual report on remediation; and will hear a report on facilitating student success in achieving the baccalaureate degree.

On Wednesday morning the Committee on Audit is followed by Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which will hear a report on the 2003-2004 state funded capital outlay program. Thanks to the bond measure approval, this is one of the few budget bright spots. The Committee will be asked to endorse schematic plans for a parking structure at Fullerton; the regional crime laboratory at Los Angeles; a student union upgrade at San Bernardino; and a new building for the College of Business Administration at San Marcos.

The plenary agenda includes recognition of the first Emeriti Association in the CSU, which was formed 25 years ago on the Los Angeles campus.
ACTION

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: The agenda was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The November minutes, having been moved and seconded, were approved.

AS-2590-03/TEKR/AA HAL CHARNOFSKY, DISTINGUISHED SENATOR AND BELOVED COLLEAGUE

WHEREAS, Harold "Hal" Charnofsky has distinguished himself as a collegiate and professional baseball player and manager, as a scholar and professional leader in the field of sociology, and as a valued faculty member and academic leader since 1966 at CSU Dominguez Hills;

WHEREAS, Hal’s outstanding dedication and talent for teaching was formally recognized when he was designated as the Lyle E. Gibson Dominguez Hills Distinguished Teacher in 1990 and received the CSU Trustees' Outstanding Professor Award in 1992; and

WHEREAS, Hal has been a member of the Academic Senate of the California State University for more than 25 years, making him by far the longest serving senator in the history of the body; and

WHEREAS, Hal has served on every standing committee of the Academic Senate CSU and chaired the Academic Affairs Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee; and

WHEREAS, Hal has served several terms on the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate CSU, as Secretary or as Member at Large; and

WHEREAS, Hal served ably on the board of the Institute on Teaching and Learning, including serving as the co-chair of that board; and

WHEREAS, Hal ably chaired the Merit Pay Task Force of the Academic Senate CSU in 1997; and

WHEREAS, Hal has facilitated effective and reasoned action of the Academic Senate CSU by regularly promoting serious reflection in all deliberations;

WHEREAS, Hal has endeared himself to large numbers of senators by taking responsibility for organizing tickets for a baseball game every spring; and

WHEREAS, Hal has always batted the impossibly perfect 1.000 with senators and staff through his collegial support and mentoring, as well as his steadfast commitment to the mission of the CSU and those who enable it; and

WHEREAS, Hal has achieved a critical balance in his professional and personal life that serves as an inspiration to his colleagues in the Academic Senate CSU; therefore be it
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University bestow upon Hal Charnofsky the title, *Distinguished Senator and Beloved Colleague.*


AS-2590-03/TEKR/AA motion approved by acclamation.

AS-2594-03/FGA STUDENT FEES IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (CSU): MITIGATING THEIR EFFECTS

RESOLVED: The sole purpose for which student fees of any kind are warranted is to provide students with access to a high quality university education; fees that are destructive of this end by restricting access are antithetical to the mission of the CSU; fees that are carefully constructed and implemented may sometimes be necessary in order to protect access and quality. Student access should be understood to include both access to admission to the CSU as well as access to a the necessary range and quality of courses and services that will provide for timely progress to a degree; and be it further

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University reluctantly supports the decision of the CSU Board of Trustees to implement mid-year student fee increases as one means of protecting the existing range and quality of the curriculum offered to our students; and be it further

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate CSU recognizes that additional student fee increases may be imposed as a result of the current massive state budget deficit. Current and anticipated fee increases in the CSU should be implemented in a way that do the least harm possible to student access to higher education. Fee increases should:

- Provide for sufficient financial aid to cover the additional need created by the fee. This should include expansion of financial aid programs to cover new recipients as well as increases in the amount of financial aid for existing recipients. We recommend that financial aid greater than the traditional 1/3 proportion be set aside to cover these needs.
- Provide for maintenance and expansion of programs designed to educate current and potential students about the availability of financial aid and the procedures for obtaining it. Such programs should be exempted from cuts and treated as a necessary expense associated with the increased fees.

RESOLVED: Revenues raised by additional student fees should remain within the system to support instructional program on the campuses.
RATIONALE: The CSU has recently raised student fees by 15% for graduate students and 10% for undergraduates, and the Governor’s budget proposes an additional fee increase for AY 2003-04 of 25% for undergraduates and 20% for graduates. The CSU is experiencing a budget shortfall so severe that, whatever the fee increases, severe cuts are expected. Those cuts should not fall upon those specific programs and services that can help students cope with the fee increases, or else student access to higher education will be even more seriously imperiled.

AS-2594-03/FGA will be a second reading item at the March 6-7, 2003, meeting.

AS-2595-03/FA  OPPOSITION TO A DECREASE IN CSU FUNDING TIED TO AN INCREASE IN STUDENT-FACULTY RATIO

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees, in negotiating the budget for the 2003-4 fiscal year, to oppose any decrease in the CSU budget tied to an increase in the student-faculty ratio (SFR), and be it further

RESOLVED: That given the urgency and potential impact of such a decrease, the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to discuss and report through the chair to the Academic Senate CSU any recommendations or advice that emerge.

RATIONALE: A recent Academic Senate document, The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California (Sept. 7, 2001), argued convincingly that the current CSU system has long been under-funded based upon an excessive SFR. Further, that report found the current SFR is endangering academic quality and therefore should be reduced. Furthermore, the ACR 73 Task Force recommended a reduction in the SFR in order to accomplish the goals of ACR 73 as enunciated by the California Legislature. An increase in the budgeted ratio may result in irreparable harm to the educational quality within the system. Structural changes to manage short-term financial difficulties should not be instituted.

AS-2595-03/FA motion approved unanimously.

AS-2596-03/FA  PROGRAM SUSPENSION/DISCONTINUATION/DISSOLUTION

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge campus senates to review, or develop as appropriate, policy recommendations regarding processes and guidelines related to the suspension/discontinuation of academic programs or dissolution of academic departments; and be it further
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to ensure that their policies call for suspension/discontinuation/dissolution proposals to explicitly address employment options, informed by the applicable collective bargaining agreement, for the affected tenured and probationary faculty and permanent staff; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus senates to take into consideration the principles articulated below as they modify or develop their policy recommendations. Policy related to the suspension/discontinuation/dissolution of programs should:

- Clearly define the breadth of curricular elements encompassed (e.g., any sequence of courses leading to a formal degree option, certificate, or credential).
- Identify the individuals/groups from which a formal request to suspend/discontinue a program may originate as well as to whom the request is made.
- Include provisions for a formal review process comparable to the process utilized for the creation of academic programs. The factors considered in the review process should be as broad as possible and include:
  - In depth explanation of need for suspension/discontinuation/dissolution
  - Student enrollment, application, retention, and graduation patterns
  - Faculty recruitment and retention patterns
  - External funding patterns
  - Likely effects of suspension/discontinuation/dissolution on faculty, staff, and students
  - Likely effects of suspension/discontinuation/dissolution on other campus courses/programs, university mission, and service to the community, as well as the affected department
  - Input from affected alumni and community members
  - Program quality, cost, effective use of resources
  - What would be necessary in order to resume program
  - Recent program (internal and external) and/or accreditation reviews
  - Costs and benefits of suspension/discontinuation/dissolution
  - Complete list of courses that would not be offered and their relationship to other academic programs
- Include criteria around which decisions can be made.
- Specify timelines for the review.
- Specify notification dates and cut-off date for accepting students should the decision be made to discontinue/suspend a program.
• Provide viable mechanisms for students presently enrolled to complete their program of study.
• Clearly identify the role of the campus academic senate, faculty, students, administrators and staff in the process.
• Include identification of mechanisms to be employed to communicate suspension/discontinuation decisions to the campus community and prospective students.

RATIONALE: Any decision to suspend or discontinue academic programs and/or dissolve a department must be made with the same care and thorough review accorded the creation of new programs. Moreover, there is the additional need to provide due process and every available option to students, staff, and faculty affected by such decisions. The Senate is calling for a review of policies at this time due to concern that budget constraints may influence campus decisions regarding the suspension or discontinuation of programs as they seek to contain costs.

AS-2596-03/FA motion approved.

AS-2585a-02/FA WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) call on campus academic senates to work with their local administrations to review, develop, and approve campus policies on “whistle blower” protection, which
a) In order to be consistent with the provisions of Section 8547.12(c) of the Government Code, must either defer to or mirror CSU policy as defined in Chancellor’s Executive Orders 821 and 822 of May 23, 2002; and
b) Designate an individual on campus to receive whistleblower complaints and evaluate compliance with the order. It is for the campus to decide if the individual receiving the complaint will also be the individual responsible for investigating the complaint; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU call on campus senates to work with their local administrations to educate faculty and staff about the existence and provisions of both the executive orders and campus policy.

RATIONALE: Whistle-blower complaints at the CSU have roughly doubled since 1999. However, in some instances of administrative, staff or faculty misconduct, those aware of the misconduct may be afraid to come forward. The California Whistleblower Protection Act establishes a procedure for responding to complaints filed under the Act and protects designated whistleblowers from retaliation. The Chancellor’s executive orders were promulgated both to fulfill the requirements of the Act and to address concerns that the university was open to unnecessary legal risks. The executive order specifically indicates that “each campus president is
responsible for developing and issuing a campus directive implementing” the requirements of the Order. Strong campus policies protecting whistleblowers can alleviate employee fears and enable the university to curtail wrongdoing more quickly. Experience suggests that university policies are most effective when developed and implemented in collaboration with faculty.

AS-2585a-02/FA motion approved unanimously.

AS-2586-02/FA THE ROLE OF FACULTY IN DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULA AND LOCATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) again strongly reaffirm the basic principles articulated in Principles and Policies: Papers of the Academic Senate CSU about the primary role of faculty in the development of academic programs, course development, and recruitment decisions affecting curriculum; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU encourage all campus presidents and other academic administrators to develop the widest possible consultation processes with campus senates and college or school faculty prior to creating, funding, implementing, and determining the location in the academic organization of the campus for new academic programs and courses; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU affirm that these principles shall apply regardless of external guidance or funding that may accompany the development of new courses or programs.

RATIONALE: Principles and Policies: Papers of the Academic Senate CSU defines the respective roles and responsibilities of various constituencies in the CSU, specifying that “responsibility shall be vested in the faculty or its elected senate/council representatives for developing policies and making recommendations to the campus presidents” on a variety of matters, including “curricular policies, such as . . . approval of new courses and programs . . . and academic standards.” That role may be undermined by the actions of groups or individuals who wish to influence the nature of academic programs or individual courses.

Particularly in times of budget shortfall or perceived crisis of other kinds, the pressure exerted by individuals or groups outside the university may appear persuasive enough to induce members of university communities to act without regard for the long-established principles developed by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), embedded in Principles and Policies, and later endorsed by the Board of Trustees, CSU.

AS-2586-02/FA motion approved unanimously.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University create a 9th Bylaw, as follows:

1. The Executive Committee shall be responsible for recommending the apportionment and reapportionment of Senate seats using the formula listed in Article II Section 1 of the Constitution. Each year it shall conduct a "census" using the most recent and reliable Fall FTEF data to determine whether reapportionment of seats among campuses is necessary. The results shall be presented to the Senate for its approval at its first meeting in the calendar year.

2. When new seats are added to the Senate due to the addition of campuses or constitutional revisions, these seats shall be filled in the next spring election cycle following the Executive Committee's completion of the census.

3. Whenever reapportionment results in a campus losing a seat, the seat lost shall be the first seat to complete its three-year term following the announcement of the reapportionment, and the seat shall not be lost until the three-year term expires.

4. Whenever a campus is entitled to a new seat, the Executive Committee shall determine whether the length of the first term for that seat shall be 1, 2, or 3 years. In making this determination, the Executive Committee shall attempt to stagger the years in which that campus's seats expire, so as to maximize continuity in representation from that campus.

RATIONALE: This Bylaw concerns apportionment of Senate seats, prepared by the special committee appointed for this task. The purpose of this bylaw is to give the Senate a transparent procedure for implementation of the new constitutional amendment and for keeping apportionment up to date in the future.

AS-2589-02/Floor motion approved unanimously.

*March 6-7, 2003—The Senate instructed the Executive Committee to recommend (during this Senate meeting) changes that would take place for the Academic Year 2003-2004. The Senate approved the recommendation of the Executive Committee that increases representation by one additional senator for the campuses of Chico, Fresno, Los Angeles, Maritime Academy, and Pomona. It also allocates two senators to the new campus at Channel Islands.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University commend the multi-system collaborative process that produced the new CAN Articulation Model dated September 2002; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly endorse the DRAFT new articulation model (attached) with the following qualification:

With reference to the Validation of Institutional CAN Courses, the CAN System solicit both lead faculty representatives and discipline review faculty through the academic senates of the participating systems and institutions of higher education;

and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU encourage the CAN Board to:

(1) continue efforts to develop web-based CAN descriptor templates
(2) extend the CAN process to elective courses recommended for preparation within a major
(3) continue collaboration with other articulation projects, (e.g., CSU-Core Alignment, IMPAC) to facilitate student transfer between institutions of higher education.

RATIONALE: The DRAFT of the new CAN Articulation Model, designed to improve transfer and articulation among segments of California higher education, is the result of nearly two years of study by the CAN Board, involving thorough assessment and input by representatives of all three California higher education systems. This revision effort relied heavily on intersegmental collaboration and emphasizes the primacy of a discipline-faculty review process to replace the current process whereby four 4-year institutions are needed to approve a CAN course. The new CAN model will allow for the introduction of complementary faculty articulation concepts into the CAN process that originate in other forums, including the CSU Core Alignment Project and IMPAC. The new model also allows for the expansion of CAN from a system that focuses only on required courses within a major or discipline to elective courses, prerequisite to the completion of a major. Further advantages include:

(1) a statewide rather than regional approach to articulation
(2) a five-year review cycle for all courses within all disciplines
(3) a renewal of institutional commitments to CAN
(4) increased specificity in official CAN course descriptors, and
(5) development of a web-based template for further descriptor development
Finally, the new model will create an appeal process and establish a specific timeline for course review to make participation in CAN both effective and efficient during campus articulation efforts.

AS-2597a-03/AA will be a second reading item at the March 6-7, 2003, meeting.

AS-2598a-03/AA UNIVERSITY TASK FORCE ON FACILITATING GRADUATION: FACILITATING STUDENT SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING THE BACCAULAUREATE DEGREE

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University commend the collaborative process and the report (attached) produced by the Joint Provost/Academic Senate, California State University Task Force on Facilitating Graduation produced: Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse the principles and recommendations of the Joint Provost / Academic Senate, California State University Task Force on Facilitating Graduation (attached) with the following stipulations:

(1) review, in consultation with the Academic Senate CSU and the Chancellor’s Office, the data on improving graduation rates and determine what further research, if any, should be engaged. Any additional policy options that may be considered, based upon this review, should be developed through ongoing consultation with the Academic Senate CSU and the campus senates; and

(2) ensure that individual campuses of the California State University system, through the shared governance process, retain autonomy in their efforts to design institutionally tailored programs guided by the principles and recommendations articulated in the Report from the California State University Task Force on Facilitating Graduation, to facilitate student success in achieving the baccalaureate degree.

RATIONALE: The committee structure and process that developed the report, Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree, was a model for shared governance. It was a joint committee of provosts and faculty, selected by the Senate, supported by staff from the Chancellor’s Office. Members of the Board of Trustees were involved in early drafts of the report and the final report is a product of all three groups. The report is being presented to the Board of Trustees on a time line that allows the Academic Senate CSU and the campus senates to respond.

The Joint Provost/Academic Senate of the California State University Task Force on Facilitating Graduation has produced a report grounded in a large set of data, with a good review of the literature, that provides a wide range of policy options. The principles recommended by the report emphasize
that facilitating student success toward achieving the baccalaureate degree must be achieved within a framework of academic excellence and program quality. At the local level, the recommendations emphasize campus autonomy by asking each campus to develop a plan “based on local institutional research, to improve graduation rates.”

It is important that the California State University Board of Trustees both recognize and acknowledge the need for individually tailored campus efforts to facilitate student success in achieving the baccalaureate. The diversity in institutions, programs, campus cultures, and student populations within the CSU makes it doubtful that any single formula or programmatic structure will address the needs of students on all campuses.

At the system level the California State University Board of Trustees is asked to “assess improvements in graduation rates, and to consider if more incentives and disincentives are needed for both students and institutions. Because graduation rates are affected by a wide variety of complex issues, it is important that the California State University Board of Trustees and the Chancellor’s Office work closely with the campuses, through the shared governance process, and the Academic Senate of the California State University in developing further policy options.

AS-2598a-03/AA will be a second reading item at the March 6-7, 2003, meeting.

AS-2599a-03/FGA  CAMPUS BUDGET CONSULTATION AS A CRITERION FOR PRESIDENTIAL EVALUATION

RESOLVED: That Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) strongly urge the Board of Trustees to include “Regular consultation with campus academic senates on matters of budget planning” as one of the specific criteria contained in “The California State University Criteria for Presidential Assessment”. (Attached)

RATIONALE: The statement on collegiality adopted by the Board of Trustees (1985) maintains “Collegial governance allows the academic community to work together to find the best answers to issues facing the university.” It goes on to state “The collegial process also recognizes the value of participation by the faculty in budgetary matters, particularly those directly affecting areas for which the faculty has primary responsibility.” More recently, both Chancellor Charles Reed and Board of Trustees Chair Debra Farar have stressed the importance of involving faculty in campus budget planning, especially in light of the major fiscal challenges currently facing the CSU. By making consultation with faculty through the shared governance process on matters of budget planning a formal criterion of presidential evaluation, the Board of Trustees would emphasize in a concrete manner the importance of such consultation and
increase the likelihood that it will occur in a meaningful way on the individual CSU campuses.

AS-2599a-03/FGA will be a second reading item at the March 6-7, 2003, meeting.

AS-2591a-03/FA  CAMPUS POLICIES ON PRIVACY OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) reaffirm its support for privacy in communication, including electronic communication, among students, staff, faculty and others as enumerated in AS-2263/FA “Policy on Email Privacy” adopted March 9, 1995; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU endorse the attached privacy provisions of paragraph nine of the American Association of University Professors’ statement on “Academic Freedom and Electronic Communication”; and be it further

RESOLVED: That on campuses that have adopted electronic communication policies, the Academic Senate CSU urge those campus senates to ensure adequate privacy protections consistent with these statements. On campuses where such policies have yet to be developed, the Senate encourages their development with the inclusion of these privacy protections.

RATIONALE: An important aspect of academic culture implies the essential reliance on the confidentiality and privacy of all communications between the parties of the academic process consistent with the law. The Senate adopted a “Policy on E-Mail Privacy” (AS-2263-95/FA) on March 9-10, 1995, which “urged the individual campuses to support privacy in the use of email to the maximum extent possible.” The Office of the Chancellor also promulgated a “Statement on Internet Use Policy” which applies to Chancellor Office activities. However, a review of individual campus policy statements reveals that most campuses have not yet developed policies at all or have policies with inadequate protections for electronic communications among students, staff, faculty and others.

AS-2591a-03/FA will be a second reading item at the March 6-7, 2003, meeting.

AS-2592a-03/FA  TASK FORCE ON ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) thank the task force on roles and responsibilities of department chairs and commend them for their efforts which resulted in the document titled Roles, Responsibilities, Resources, and Rewards for Department Chairs; and be it
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend that campus senates review the findings and recommendations from the system and campus-specific information in the task force reports and facilitate campus-based discussions among administrators and chairs to resolve relevant issues enumerated in the reports; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend that the chancellor’s office review the findings and recommendations of the task force and work with the Academic Senate CSU to develop systemwide policy recommendations as appropriate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU distribute the Task Force’s report on *Roles, Responsibilities, Resources, and Rewards for Department Chairs* to relevant staff and administrators in the Chancellor’s office, campus provosts, deans, senate chairs, and the California Faculty Association

RATIONALE: The task force report on *Roles, Responsibilities, Resources, and Rewards for Department Chairs* is an excellent resource that provides a point of departure for faculty and administrators to begin to address the complex issues surrounding the roles and responsibilities of department chairs. Their position and duties are unique and their ability to function effectively has a direct bearing on the ability of the CSU to accomplish its mission and deliver quality instruction to the wide array of students looking to the CSU for extended education and/or professional preparation.

*AS-2592a-03/FA will be a second reading item at the March 6-7, 2003, meeting.*

*AS-2593-03/FA, FACULTY REVIEW OF AUDITS, a placeholder, was withdrawn.*

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m. on Friday, January 24, 2003.

* *** **

Approved (or corrected)

Date:________________________ _______________________________

Jacquelyn Ann K. Kegley, Chair
Les Pincu, Secretary

Margaret Price, Recording Secretary