January 05 Plenary Minutes

1) **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. on Thursday, January 20, 2005 by Chair David McNeil.

2) **Roll Call:** Senators Present: (Bakersfield) Jacquelyn Kegley, John Tarjan; (Channel Islands) Dennis Muraoka, Lillian Vega-Castaneda; (Chico) Samuel Edelman, Gayle Hutchinson, Paul Persons; (Dominguez Hills) Rudolph Vanterpool; (Fresno) Jacinta Amaral, Sherman Sowby; (Fullerton) Vincent Buck, Diana Guerin, Barry Pasternak; (Hayward) Calvin Caplan, Hank Reichman; (Humboldt), Bernadette Cheyne, Marshelle Thobaben; (Long Beach) Luis Arroyo, David Hood, Craig Smith; (Los Angeles) J. Theodore Anagnoson, Marshall Cates, Nancy Hunt; (Maritime Academy) Greg Cho, James Wheeler; (Monterey Bay) Ken Nishita, Mark O'Shea; (Northridge) Lynne Cook, Michael Reagan, Barbara Swerkes; (Pomona) Rochelle Kellner, Marvin Klein, Ann Morgan; (Sacramento) Cristy Jensen, Thomas Krabacher; (San Bernardino) Buckley Barrett, Tapie Rohm; (San Diego) Fred Hornbeck, Thomas Warschauer; (San Francisco) Jan Gregory, Robert Williams, Darlene Yee; (San José) David McNeil, Mark Van Selst; (San Luis Obispo) Manzar Foroohar, Myron Hood, Unny Menon; (San Marcos) Glen Brodowsky, Dick Montanari; (Sonoma) Susan McKillop, Robert McNamara; (Stanislaus) Paul O’Brien; (Retired Faculty) Len Mathy; (Chancellor’s Office) David Spence. Others Present: Keith Boyum, Associate Vice-Chancellor, AA; Beverly Young, AVC, AA; John Travis, CFA President; Jeff Obayashi, CSSA Liaison; Kathy Kaiser, Faculty Trustee; Ron Kroman, ERFA Representative; Kate Clark, CCC Academic Senate Chair.

3) The agenda was approved as amended.

4) The minutes of the November Plenary were approved.

5) Announcements
   a) TEKR has distributed a survey on blended programs to be filled out by ASCSU members.
   b) Secretary Tarjan has indicated that he is willing to routinely distribute preliminary notes from the plenary session and/or the newsletter in text form to senators who e-mail him and so request.

6) Reports:
   a) **Chair**—His full report can be found at the ASCSU web site. We have been working on a large number of issues this year and still have a busy agenda. The LDTP project is proceeding along. The facilitators have been trained and the discipline meetings have been taking place. We have maintained good communication with CFA. CFA is working on increasing the budget. The CFA board and ASCSU executive Committee were briefed by the Chancellor on the new PR campaign. We are looking forward to working closely with AAUP on academic freedom and other issues. Marcus Harvey from the California AAUP met with us during the last plenary. The Morrow bill on student rights has been reintroduced. The applied doctorate authorization is a major initiative pushed by the administration. Graduate education is another focus for us. We are very concerned about the quality of graduate programs. We are working on a joint resolution with the UC senate on the importance of supporting graduate education in the state. Advising continues to be an important focus of the Senate, the board, CSSA and the administration. We expect a resolution from AA. ICAS has been meeting on issues of interest across the three systems. Kate Clark, president of the CCCAS will
be meeting with us this plenary. George Blumenthal, chair of the UC Assembly will be meeting with us in March. The Trustee Nominating Committee has met and has forwarded four names for consideration: Lynne Cook (Northridge), Kathy Kaiser (Chico), Jack Bedell (Fullerton) and Craig Smith (Long Beach). Materials are in the Senate office and available for review. The four nominees will have the opportunity to address us prior to our election to determine the names going forward to the governor.

b) **Academic Affairs** (Ted Anagnoson) We looked at potential supplemental criteria for GE review. We are working on advising and have reviewed past resolutions. We do not have a comprehensive picture of how/where advising occurs in the system. We are also looking at the role it plays in RTP. Perhaps we can undertake a new study to supplement data collected on this issue in the past. We are reluctant to have a resolution on mandatory advising for first year students when it may already take place on most campuses. We have looked at SciGETC and have a resolution on it. We will have a resolution on remedial programs in March. We also have a resolution on mandatory service. A resolution on athletic team participation is on hold. We are looking at the applied doctorate. Are considering amending the UC resolution on graduate education so that we can perhaps jointly sponsor it.

c) **Faculty Affairs** (Jan Gregory) We have done revisions of the three first reading items at the last plenary: academic freedom, academic freedom for students and the service of lecturer faculty on campus senates. We are discussing the PATRIOT Act and Senate Bill 1212. We have a number of new issues—clinical appointments (w/ out terminal degrees), ADA compliance, and changes made by publishers in response to school board demands with or without author permission. We are interested in knowing more about the process for selecting a new executive vice chancellor. We received a CFA report, including the status of representation by the UAW of graduate students.

d) **Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** (Hank Reichman) We have a busy agenda. A resolution on implementation of the CMS student module is coming to the body. We discussed the status of CPEC extensively. They do comparative studies of things like salaries, etc. The CPR is recommending that CPEC be folded into the Student Aid Commission under the auspices of the governor’s office. The “Little Hoover” Commission will make a recommendation. Allison Jones will be testifying on behalf of the CSU. The administration is supporting the change. FGA is unsure whether the ASCSU should take a stand on the issue. We are mainly concerned that independent studies and advice continue to be provided to education decision makers. Patrick Lenz made a presentation on the budget. The Compact is protecting us but further cuts may in fact happen. He believes that we will likely get what the governor promised. We discussed with Wes Larson the CSU legislative program via teleconference. The major priority deals with authorization for applied doctorates. We were disappointed to find legislation on the agenda that would mandate disclosure of outside employment by faculty and others. Since this is a bargainable issue, we were disappointed that legislation is being supported which would have the effect of an “end run” around the collective bargaining process. We will meet in Sacramento on February 16th in lieu of our interim committee meeting. We are working on our legislative agenda. We hope to orient the new legislators on issues of importance to us. We tentatively have scheduled April 4,5 for Legislative Days in Sacramento. We are considering the proposed phase out of coverage of CAL-PERS for new faculty hires starting in 2007.

e) **Teacher Education and K-12 Relations** (Marvin Klein) The CSU has a methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of teacher education. They survey graduates after one
year and also survey teacher supervisors. We feel that the subject matter deans, in addition to education deans and provosts, should be made aware of the results. We discussed the joint Ed.D. programs with the UCs. Have developed a draft of a questionnaire on “Blended Program Collaboration” for review by senators.

f) **CPEC**—Susan McKillop provided a lengthy written report. If the functions of CPEC and the Student Aid Commission are, as proposed, folded into a new Office of Higher Education and Financial Aid within the Governor’s Office, the postsecondary segments want to be sure that key reporting functions are maintained and that the Cal Grant Program be continued appropriately. Some have suggested that the program would be improved if decentralized to the campuses.

g) **Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee**—Chair Jim Wheeler reviewed the procedures for nomination.

h) **Gerard Hanley, Senior Director for Academic Technology** reports to both Academic Affairs and Business and Finance at the CO. Dr. Hanley addressed the body on the “Digital Marketplace.” He deals with academic technology, making sure it meets the needs of faculty, staff and students. These groups have participated in focus groups to determine the needs to be addressed. Digital content and software create significant costs system-wide. Pooling resources to purchase in volume can result in great savings. For example, the Electronic Core Collection results in 25-35% savings for campuses. WebCT and Electronic Blackboard are other examples of products where we have saved significantly by pooling efforts. We are looking at texts, journals, etc. in digital format. A variety of delivery/sharing models for the “marketplace” are being explored. Whether or not to charge fees for usage or to fund centrally are being considered. Four major vendors/consortia have submitted proposals for the digital marketplace. The ATPC final report can be found at [http://its.calstate.edu/academic_technology/atpc.shtml](http://its.calstate.edu/academic_technology/atpc.shtml).

i) **Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence** thanked the Senate for its good work over the past few years. He is especially grateful for how quickly we are taking up the advising issue. He highlighted how important the transfer issues are and how much good work has been done by the Senate in improving student transfer and progress to graduation. In campus visits (7 campuses) Drs. Spence and Boyum have emphasized the importance of degree audit. Technology is extremely important but the complexity of transfer rules and agreements hinders implementation of things like degree audit. It took 2 years of 2 people working full time to enter the rules for transfer/articulation/course completion into the CSULB audit system. Our major transfer initiatives are vital to the transfer process. The CSU faculty are national leaders in addressing this issue. Q: What does the confidentiality requirement mean in the context of presidential reviews since presidents get copies of comments. A: I will find out. Q: Does the administration understand how important the budget/funding are in facilitating graduation? A: Perhaps some alternate delivery methods such as self-support or partial self-support could be used to improve availability of higher-cost courses. Perhaps a “bank” of low-demand on-line courses could be developed across the system. Q: What remains to be done on transfer? 1) Lower-division major transfer patterns are not complete. This work needs to come to closure. 2) Students need to have access to the courses they need at the CCs and be able to see a “clear path” to graduation through better advising and articulation efforts. 3) The community colleges would serve students by developing a 60 unit transfer degree. Q: What are you going to do with regard to authorization of applied doctorates? A: Chancellor Reed and I recently met with President Dynes and M.R.C. Greenwood. They were not supportive
of authorization. We are prepared to go forward with a recommendation to seek authorization at the Board meeting next week. We believe that the demand for Ed.D.s is currently not being met despite our joint programs with the UC. California lags the rest of the country in terms of the numbers and availability of Ed.D.s. We differ with the UC on this issue. The CCLD has made little progress in providing these opportunities. The applied doctorates will likely not be adequately supported by the UC if we take a joint approach to these programs as demonstrated by our experience with the Ed.D. We would support the UC in offering these programs but they have showed little interest. We are recommending to the Board to seek a general authorization to offer these degrees. Q: It looks like we keep admitting more students when we have insufficient funds to offer programs to existing students. A: The only money out there is growth money. The CSU is all about access. Many students will be affected if we limit enrollments. Q: Could you clarify the Chancellor’s comments on increased funding/better workload formulas for applied doctorates? A: We cannot offer these programs without more funds. In the next year or so it is unlikely we will get a graduate differential. We will likely charge higher fees to these students, on the order of UC fees, to support these programs. We would have to develop new methods to get the revenue from these fees through the presidents to the programs where they are generated. Our stance is to not offer these programs unless they are adequately funded. A higher fee will likely be the key. Even so, we would be a bargain compared to private university tuition. The fight for authorization will likely not be an easy one. We should not get ahead of ourselves in implementation issues until we see what is authorized. Q: The advising problem is different from the transfer problem. Enhanced advising requires enhanced resources. A: Early choice of major is a key. I also realize resources are a problem and something has to “give” to augment advising. Q: What advice do you have for us when the SFR continues to go up and we have so many demands upon the faculty? A: The faculty are underappreciated by California. ACR 73 is a good step but is not being funded. How advising, etc. gets recognized in the faculty workload, etc. is up to you/the campuses. I realize something will have to “give.” It is not my role to make suggestions on this to the faculty. Q: Why have we not tied enrollment targets more closely to funds allocated? A: For the first time last year we limited enrollment. We are working towards making it clear to the public that access will suffer as budgets are lean. Q: What planning has taken place in finding your replacement? A: We have two presidencies vacant right now. Those searches will be a more immediate priority. It is important to fill this position soon but the planning has not yet taken place. We are very lucky to have Keith Boyum in place during a transition period.

Executive Vice Chancellor Richard West and Chancellor Charles Reed jointly addressed the body. RW: Patrick Lenz met with FGA today. The overall budget is larger than last year. It is not balanced in that it uses one-time monies. Some categories have reductions, but most have some increases. Overall, it is a tough fiscal environment. The legislature is unlikely to challenge the Governor on not increasing taxes. The legislature seems to be focusing increasingly on middle-class and older constituents rather than health and welfare, which is primarily targeted to lower-income constituents. Any pronouncements/stances taken in Sacramento are likely to undergo significant revision as the legislative session proceeds. We expect a slow, tardy budget process this year. We have an overall $212m increase ($116m in general fund, the rest in fee increases). We have some growth funds. Enrollment targets have been
relatively stable. Mandatory costs have been met in the budget for the first time in a while. Outreach funds have been cut and we have had to redirect $7m to cover outreach. We hope that the legislature will not look to the CSU to cover deficits, that they will honor the Governor’s priorities. CR: The Compact was honored. This is a good starting point. Without the Compact, we believe the baseline for our budget would be about $100m less. Transportation, K-12, health care, middle-income folks, Prop 98 will be topics of discussion over the next month or so in the legislature. The CSU budget will come up later in the year for consideration. The media has stated that the CSU has denied admission to 10,000 eligible students. That is not true. We do have more impacted campuses but redirection does not mean they were turned away. We still have system capacity. Open enrollment is being curtailed at most campuses but students can still get into the CSU. Q: What do these developments mean in terms of outreach programs? A: There is no change from last year. This issue may be discussed in the legislature, however. The UC got cut much more for outreach. We want our fair share of funds when outreach is restored for both systems even though we backfilled outreach with funds from other areas. Q: Do you believe the Governor will eventually capitulate and back a tax increase? A: When you look at the revenue side, it seems like something needs to be done but the picture is cloudy. Ballot initiatives further complicate budget issues. Raising taxes is less attractive when so many revenues are directed towards specific causes, not allowing the fixing of structural problems. One of the biggest problems is the legacy of Prop 98. Q: We may have a “good” budget. How do we hang onto it? A: Good question. We try to highlight enrollment/serving California. We are still nervous about possible cuts. We will try to stay under the radar, point out that the Governor’s Compact supports the same priorities that the legislature has voiced. We are still concerned about “small” programs that could be funded with $10m or $20m cuts to higher education. We are still worried about “midnight” cuts at the last minute when scrambling to find money. The legislature seems to support increased fees. We hope that the Compact will diminish the likelihood of cuts funded through increased fees. Q: What do you see in terms of compensation, particularly for senior faculty? A: This is all bargainable. Q: What is your best guess on the final budget? A: It is unlikely that we will get anything above the Compact. They may raise fees and cut general revenue funds. We are worried about cuts. We are unlikely to get cuts in May. California is broke. There seems to be little recognition of the reality of the budget situation. Entitlements are sacred but revenues to pay for them are hard to increase. Fortunately, the Governor understands how important the CSU and UC are to the economic engine in California. We hope to take our message to industry and different demographic groups in the state. Q: How will we assure appropriate funding for potential applied doctorates? Won’t this commitment either take away from other programs or have to be done through self-support? A: The joint EdD programs are currently funded at a higher level. Why wouldn’t we get more funds for applied doctorates? A: We will have to charge a higher fee but we expect the state to fund it at a higher level. It is common practice to seek authority to do things separate from the funding. The funding may drag down the discussions to authorize. Q: Could you comment on where we have suffered the most due to budget reductions? A: Buildings, libraries, equipment, and compensation have all suffered significantly. Q: In 05/06, how much will we spend on CMS and where do these funds come from? Also we have heard about borrowing to fund it. Which campuses have done this? A: The implementation schedule is mostly intact. Presidents determine how to fund it. Three campuses have borrowed to cover associated equipment costs. Q:
When will we hear a CSU response to the Governor’s proposals on public pensions. A: We first have to understand what is being proposed. It is a confusing issue. In the past the state has fully funded our pension contributions. One proposal would roughly double the employee contribution. We have been shielded from something like this in the past. We need to talk with the Department of Finance to see if they anticipate treating us like other state agencies in the future. We seem to have been more responsible in pensions than other state agencies and hope to remain independent. Lifetime healthcare benefits are an area of concern to the state. Our benefit formulas have been rich in the past compared with other pension systems. There may be a lot of public pressure on pension and health care benefits for new employees. Q: Can you comment on how we will treat campuses that do not meet target? A: It looks like we will be about 1000 FTES short for the system. We will argue that the late date of the revised target made it difficult for us to reach target and that we should not be cut. Any cut would be one time. If we come in a lot under target we may have no choice but to penalize campuses. We hope to perhaps use year-end money to backfill. We try to avoid penalizing campuses. Q: How important is the Assembly Speaker’s support likely to be. A: The Chancellor met with the Speaker recently. Access continues to be a consistent theme. In both the Assembly and the Senate, there appears to be more emphasis on the middle class. Q: What happens to campuses that have trouble meeting targets? How will we balance enrollments/resources across campuses. A: There was an across-the-board 5% reduction in target last year. 1.87% was restored. We have attempted to restore the targets by 5% across-the-board but future increases will be distributed according to enrollment demand. Most of the enrollment pressure seems to be in the southern part of the state. Q: What is the current stance on campus-based fees? A: Patrick Lenz is looking at the issue. There are differing perspectives from the presidents and students. We are currently not encouraging these fees but they are possible. Course fees are considered a different category. Q: What are we doing on the pension issue? A: We are watching developments. We want to be careful not to draw attention to our relatively rich benefits at this point by entering the fray at the wrong time.

Kathleen Kaiser, Faculty Trustee reported that the Board will meet next week and highlighted several issues/agenda items. The CPR has recommended the dissolution of CPEC and many other commissions. The “Little Hoover” Commission will likely have the deciding voice. The CSU is unlikely to use political capital to support the continuance of CPEC. They are more interested in maintaining the functions of CPEC. The Hastings School of Law conducted study on similar functions and how they were provided in other states. In the audit section of the agenda there is an analysis of enrollment trends and its impact on fees. FTES have risen sharply but there has been a steady drop in per FTES state contribution. Student fees are becoming an increasingly important source of support. This development mirrors trends in higher education at the federal level. Pell grants are diminishing. We will receive reports on graduation rates and our efforts to facilitate graduate/student success at the Board meeting. Q: President Bush has indicated that he wants to raise Pell grants. How does this jibe with what you have said? A: While the limits on awards may be raised, fewer students will be eligible for awards. The percentage of fees allocated to CSU-based aid has slipped. The campus presidents believe it is more important to put funds towards opening sections rather than putting the funds into student aid. Q: There appears to be a trend towards less affordability and more outside support and away from state funding. What do you think? A: An analysis of seven comparable states
demonstrated the difficulty of persuading the public of the importance of funding higher education. We are in the same situation in California. Californians view education as a priority but not necessarily as a funding priority.

1) Kate Clark, California Community Colleges Academic Senate President expressed gratitude for the opportunity to address the body. It is very interesting to see the contrast between the three system senates in how they operate. The CCC Senate is so large, including our executive committee that we cannot meet in the same way you do. I am grateful for the collegial work that we get done through ICAS. The Governor’s budget had many surprises. We received $20m to articulate vocational education with the high schools that we did not ask for. Our system requests were cut in many other disappointing ways. We have published a number of position papers, most recently on our fees and faculty opposition to them. We are preparing a paper on textbook pricing and other text issues. We have ongoing concerns with accreditation. We are looking at CC degrees: AA, AS, transfer AA (not widely supported by faculty), etc. We are following the Morrow bill and the ASCSU work in this area. For those in the social sciences and humanities areas, some of the language in the Morrow bill is particularly troublesome. We are working on a system-wide performance matrix. There are many staff changes at our Chancellor’s office. There are fewer than 150 staff to oversee our huge system. Our new Chancellor is very outspoken and a big supporter of faculty. There are many assaults on quality/funding for our system. Transfer is important but is only one of many issues facing us this spring. Pensions in STRS are under assault. Q: Could you clarify the 75/25% law and the 50% rule? A: The 75/25% law sets a goal that 75% of all credit instruction be taught by tenure-track faculty. The 50% rule has guaranteed that 50% of district budgets be dedicated directly to instruction. Q: Why is a transfer AA “illegal”? A: Such degrees require 18 units of major credit according to Title 5 and need to include a coherent curriculum focused around the major. We need to honor the integrity of the AA degree as a form of terminal degree. We are grateful for the invitation to participate in the LDTP project. The observers who attended the December meetings were enthusiastic about their participation. We will still need to take a close look at the composition of the individual patterns. Q: The position you have communicated with regard to the transfer AA seems at odds with what I have heard from my community college colleagues in my discipline. A: We do not need a transfer AA to ensure smooth transfer through LDTP or other initiatives. We are carefully considering the issue and doing research on exactly what a transfer AA means on various campuses. The transfer AA that may be “forced” upon us by some parties is not necessarily in keeping with the guidelines for associates degrees. Q: How do you deal with grade inflation? A: Candid discussions within departments/across campuses and systems are valuable.

m) John Travis, CFA President discussed the progress of collective bargaining, other issues. The Governor has honored the Compact. CFA was afraid that the Compact would be a “ceiling” rather than a “floor” for funding. In fact, it was a ceiling and did not include adequate funding to maintain the mission of the CSU in providing a quality education and rebuild the institution. We can do no better than “maintain a holding pattern” in the face of such severe reductions in the past. We are also concerned about the steep rise in student fees and have proposed monies be allocated to mitigate the impact of increased fees. We are committed to the implementation of ACR 73. Our current contract expires in June of this year. We have been surveying the campuses and meeting with bargaining teams to develop our positions. This is not a
good budget year but we understand faculty concerns about needed resources and are committed to improvement. We are monitoring the developments in public employee pensions. The Governor has this high on his agenda. CFA will be working hard on the issue. Q: Would we have done better without the Compact? A: Yes, we accepted large cuts in exchange for predictability. The cuts last year affected future base budgets and were too deep to justify the Compact. Still, the Governor kept his word with the CSU when he did not with other groups. Q: Does the administration know how difficult recruiting and retaining faculty is given our salaries? Pensions are a big draw in the absence of competitive salaries. A: The Chancellor, presidents are aware. We need to safeguard pensions. Q: Are benefits considered part of the compensation package? A: They always have been. The 3 ½% increase in budget includes increases in benefits. We don’t anticipate attempts to increase contribution levels to PERS.

n) Jeff Obayashi, CSSA Academic Senate Liaison started by discussing the budget and the student fee policy. Given the cost of living in California, our fees are relatively low. Still, this would argue for increased financial aid. Given the cyclical nature of the economy, we should maintain funding for the CSU even if we are in a temporary downturn. CSSA takes stances independent of those of the student trustees. We will have a major lobbying effort next month. We continue to discuss a long-term fee policy. We will work closely with our allies in the legislature on this issue. There is considerable debate on aspects of this issue across student leadership in the CSU. The average family income of students receiving financial aid is surprisingly high. We are worried about students at the low end of the range. We are also concerned that students not be penalized for “excess units.” We support the Senate’s resolution on the issue. We hope this goal can be accomplished through other means. Access for underrepresented groups is a concern. There is less attention to sustainability in CSSA this year. The students at CSU Hayward are not supportive of the name change CSSA believes faculty should pay the same parking rates as students. Nothing has happened on this issue in terms of legislation. A more complete report was submitted to the body in writing.

7) RESOLUTIONS

a) Service of Lecturer Faculty on Campus Academic Senates [AS-2674-04/FA (Rev.)] Second Reading
i) The representation of various faculty groups on senates was discussed.
ii) Minor wording changes were made.
iii) The resolution passed.

b) Reaffirmation of Academic Freedom [AS-2675-04/FA (Rev.)] Second Reading
i) Many background materials were surveyed in developing this resolution.
ii) A request for the results of campus surveys to be forwarded to the ASCSU by March 15th was added.
iii) References to political and religious affiliations were included in the resolution due to current efforts to “balance” viewpoints in classrooms.
iv) Various wording changes and deletions were discussed in attempt to more clearly communicate the Senate’s support of academic freedom.
v) The resolution passed unanimously.
c) **Academic Freedom for Students** (AS-2676-04/FA) Second Reading
   i) The resolution identifies access to quality education and choice of field of study in addition to other types of academic freedom (but not limits on curriculum) as forms of academic freedom for students.
   ii) This resolution is timely. Some campuses do, but others seem not to, have such policies, and some are difficult to locate on the campus web sites. Recent experiences, e.g., at Bakersfield, highlight the need for clear, accessible policies.
   iii) Concern was expressed that the effect of the resolution would be to also develop and disseminate remedies for breaches of academic freedom.
   iv) Practical limits on the right to select a major (impaction of some programs, existence on specific campuses) were discussed.
   v) The resolution passed.

d) **Response to the California Performance Review’s Proposed Mandatory Community Service Graduation Requirement** [AS-2677-04/AA (Rev.)] Second Reading
   i) The resolution has an extensive rationale that nonetheless omits reference to liability issues and some of the work done by the ASCSU when this issue first came up during the Davis administration. The resolution was amended to include reference to AS-2488.
   ii) The resolution passed unanimously.

e) **Enhancing Flexibility in CSU’s Transfer Requirements** [AS-2678-04/AA (Rev.)] Second Reading
   i) This resolution is needed because of the difference in course patterns across majors (e.g., physics vs. criminal justice).
   ii) This is especially timely given the unique curricular process taking place through the LDTP project. It signals to the discipline groups that there is some flexibility to meet the needs of students within a given major.
   iii) The wording was changed to clarify that exceptions would be granted by major rather than to individuals.
   iv) The resolution was passed without dissent.

f) **Maintaining the Quality of Faculty Who Teach in the Extended University** (AS-2679-04/AA)
   i) The resolution was withdrawn.

g) **Commendation for Alumni Trustee Frederick W. Pierce IV** (AS-2681-05/EX) First Reading m/s Cook/Thobaben
   i) A first reading waiver was passed.
   ii) The Senate appreciates the fine work of Trustee Pierce.
   iii) The resolution passed unanimously.

h) **Implementation of the Student Administration Module** (AS-2682-05/FGA) First Reading m/s Reichman, Gregory
   i) There was concern, reflected in the attached petition, among campus chairs about proceeding with CMS student module in light of current developments and budget problems.
ii) This resolution requests campus discretion in implementation decisions regarding implementation of the Student module.

iii) Administrators on campuses have indicated a desire for a faculty resolution of this type.

iv) Senators from a number of campuses shared the negative impacts the implementation of the Student module have/will have on students, programs, etc. Support for the intent of the resolution was voiced along with a number of wording changes that would improve it.

v) Other concerns were expressed about the problems with the funding of the entire CMS system.

vi) Additional comments should be addressed to the chairs of the sponsoring committees.

i) **Support for the Authority for CSU to Grant Independent Professional/Clinical Doctorates (AS-2683-05/AA) First Reading m/s Anagnoson/Van Selst**

   i) A waiver of the first reading was requested given the fact that this item is likely to be on the legislative agenda of the Board next week. It was granted.

   ii) New accreditation standards in audiology, etc. make this authorization critical for the state of California.

   iii) Several minor wording changes were approved.

   iv) Many students have to take these programs through distance education in other states.

   v) The resolution was passed unanimously.

j) **Observing the 50th Anniversary of the CSU as a System and Preserving the History of the CSU and of Each CSU Campus (AS-2684-05/EX) First Reading m/s Thobaben/Barrett**

   i) The intent of the resolution is to preserve the records of the CSU on the campuses.

   ii) It was linked with the 50th anniversary of the CSU as a way of highlighting this issue.

k) **USA PATRIOT Act (AS-2685-05/FA) First Reading m/s Gregory/Persons**

   i) Chair Gregory invited suggestions for improvement of the resolution from the body.

   ii) A number of suggestions were made to improve the document.

8) The meeting was adjourned at 12:15pm on Friday, January 21, 2005.