MINUTES
Meeting of March 11-12, 2004

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. on Thursday, March 11, 2004, by Chair Robert Cherny.

Present: Senators and alternates (*) attending the meeting were: (Bakersfield) Jacquelyn Kegley, John Tarjan; (Channel Islands) Dennis Muraoka, Lillian Vega-Castaneda; (Chico) Samuel Edelman, Gayle Hutchinson, Paul Persons; (Dominguez Hills) Rudolph Vanterpool, Lyle Smith; (Fresno) Jacinta Amaral, John Shields, Sherman Sowby; (Fullerton) Vincent Buck, Bill Meyer, Barry Pasternack; (Hayward) Calvin Caplan, Hank Reichman; (Humboldt) Robert Snyder, 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) bobbi bonace; (Northridge) Lynne Cook, Michael Reagan, Barbara Swerkes; (Pomona) Rochelle Kellner, Marvin Klein, Ann Morgan; (Sacramento) Cristy Jensen, Thomas Krabacher, Louise Timmer; (San Bernardino) Buckley Barrett, Tapie Rohm; (San Diego) Ray Boddy, Brent Rushall, Thomas Warschauer; (San Francisco) Eunice Aaron, Robert Cherny, Jan Gregory; (San José) David McNeil, Mark Van Selst; (San Luis Obispo) Manzar Foroohar, Myron Hood, Unny Menon; (San Marcos) Dick Montanari, Richard Serpe; (Sonoma) Philip McGough; (Stanislaus) Paul O’Brien, Mark Thompson; (Retired Faculty) Len Mathy; (Chancellor’s Office) David Spence.

INTRODUCTIONS
During the course of the meeting the Chair introduced:
Murray Galinson, Chair, Board of Trustees
Caitlin Gill, Vice Chair of Internal Affairs, California State Student Association
Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research
Kathleen Kaiser, Faculty Trustee and Professor of Sociology, CSU Chico
Ron Kroman, CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (non-voting delegate)
Cordelia Ontiveros, Senior Director, Academic Human Resources
Manolo Platin, California State Student Association Liaison to Academic Senate
Erik Roper, Environmental Officer, California State Student Association
Lorie Roth, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs
Elvyra San Juan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction
Lillian Taiz, Vice President, California Faculty Association
Beverly Young, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Teacher Education and Public School Programs
Deborah Wylie, University Architect, Capital Planning, Design and Construction
Ann Peacock, Interim Executive Director, Academic Senate CSU
Margaret Price, Administrative Support Specialist, Academic Senate CSU
Shirley Sparkman, Budget Specialist, Academic Senate CSU
Tracy Butler, Administrative Specialist, Academic Senate CSU
ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS:

REPORT OF CHAIR ROBERT W. CHERNY----March 2004
[was given as part of the presentation on and discussion of the Senate budget of 2004-2005 Time Certain on Friday morning]

This chair’s report, like the last, is divided into two major sections. The first part summarizes the meetings I have attended as your representative. The second part summarizes some important work done or in progress by the executive committee. I’ve also attached, as a separate file, material dealing with the Senate budget for 2004-05.

I. Since our last plenary meeting, I’ve represented the Senate in a number of meetings:

CSSA Board Meeting, San Diego State, January 24:  I reported to the California State Student Association (CSSA) directors on our January plenary, particularly on our endorsement of Prop 56 and our support for non-mandated cuts, and on our first-reading resolutions on sustainability and on fee policy for teaching credential candidates.

CHESS/CSSA Board Meeting, Sacramento, February 21:  This meeting came during the CSSA’s annual California Higher Education Student Summit (CHESS) conference, which Trustee Kaiser also attended.  In addition to attending their board meeting, I joined Trustee Kaiser to attend their 9th Annual Awards Banquet, at which they recognized their Legislator of the Year (Assemblymember Manny Diaz, 23rd A.D., a graduate of my campus) and Student Advocate of the Year (Manolo Platin).  I also presented a workshop on the history of the CSU budget process since the late 1980s, focusing on the transition from the Orange Book to compacts with the governor and marginal cost funding for growth.  During their board meeting, I introduced them to our discussion of transfer and excess units issues and discussed our likely agenda items for March.

Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC), January 30.  Jackie Kegley, who is a member of the ICC Transfer Committee, also attended this meeting.  Patrick Lenz reported on the governor’s budget proposal.  Allison Jones reported on the meeting of the California Education Round Table of January 21, and Chuck Lindahl and Kathy Cohn reported on the California Alliance of K-18 Partnerships.  There was also discussion of several continuing CERT/ICC initiatives.  ICC is a committee of the California Education Round Table (CERT).

IMPAC Steering Committee, January 30.  This meeting included a full and frank exchange on the need for CSU departments to give approval to changes in the California Articulation Number System (CAN) course descriptors created by the Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulation Curriculum system (IMPAC).  As a result, CSU department chairs in several disciplines have been invited to attend the IMPAC statewide meeting on April 30-May 1.  Senator Pasternack, the CSU lead faculty member for IMPAC, will report on IMPAC at more length.

CSU Alumni Council, Maritime Academy, January 31.  I sat in on the quarterly board meeting of the Alumni Council and reported to them on recent actions by the Senate and on our concerns for the likely impact of the governor’s budget on the CSU.

California Faculty Association (CFA) Board Meeting, Manhattan Beach, February 6-7.  I sat in on the meeting of the CFA board, renewed some old friendships, and reported on the recent work of the Senate, especially the discussions on transfer and excess units.

CSU System Budget Advisory Committee (SBAC), February 10.  I attended this meeting via teleconference.  The most important information involved the CSU response to the governor’s
budget, and the ways that the CSU proposed to address the reductions through a combination of enrollment reductions and spending reductions rather than through the targeted reductions proposed by the Department of Finance.

CSU Academic Council, February 11. The Academic Council consists of the system vice presidents for academic affairs. This meeting also heard much the same budget information as was discussed at SBAC, and the provosts discussed the CO's choice for a 5% reduction in enrollment. There seemed to be a widespread preference for a greater reduction. In addition, the body discussed a draft Executive Order on admissions, providing new priorities intended to reduce admissions and hence enrollment. Bill Wilson presented the results of a survey of CSU-trained teachers, to determine the effectiveness of our teacher education programs. I also attended the Provosts’ Technology Steering Committee, on February 10. The most important part of this meeting was a discussion of the role of faculty representatives in the implementation and development of academic technology initiatives. We agreed to use the existing Academic Technology Advisory Committee, but to update its charge and to modify its membership as necessary to create a committee with equal numbers of faculty and provosts. The process of revision is proceeding, and the revised committee is likely to meet in the near future. Senate representatives are Arroyo, Cherny, Edelman, Jensen, Kegley, Thobaben, and Thompson.

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), February 17. Bob Snyder, Jackie Kegley, and David McNeil joined me in attending ICAS. Discussion topics included the budget (always the elephant in the middle of the room at any meeting having to do with higher education), IMPAC, and CAN.

Taskforce on Excess Units, March 1. Bob Snyder, Jackie Kegley, Mark Thompson, Rochelle Kellner, and I took part in this meeting. This was an initial meeting, and it featured wide-ranging discussion on the nature of the problem and on the charge to the taskforce.

II. Other Activities

Naming Facilities Review Panel I serve on this panel, which reviews all proposals to the Trustees to name campus buildings. The relevant Board of Trustees (BOT) policy states, in part, "Each naming request must . . . confirm that the President has consulted, in a timely manner, with the executive committee of the campus Academic Senate." To my mind, it is not enough for a campus administration to inform a senate of its decision to name a building; to me, "consultation" means that the administration seeks the senate's concurrence, either in the form of a resolution or a letter from the chair. As I suggested in January, state senators should have a discussion with your campus senate leadership to make certain that your campus has a policy on this, and that the policy clearly establishes the role of the faculty.

Search Committee, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. On January 29, this committee interviewed six candidates. We then discussed them and recommended two to David Spence. The two we recommended are Keith Boyum, Fullerton, and Harry Hellenbrand, SLO.

Campus Visits: I visited Chico on February 3, a rescheduling of a visit originally planned for last fall. On March 4, Trustee Kaiser and I visited Sonoma.

Working Group on Outside Employment: As a result of conversations with John Travis, Chancellor Reed, and Jackie McClain, we have agreed to form a working group consisting of
representatives of the Academic Senate, CFA, and the Chancellor’s Office, to develop a CSU policy on outside employment for faculty members. We hope to announce the members of this group in the near future and to get the taskforce up and running soon.

Vince Buck and others identified the location of January’s photo without much difficulty, and Jim Wheeler provided the caption.

Maybe this one, with my wife and daughter, will prove to be more challenging. You need to name both the city and the person whose statue is behind us. There’s a clue to the location in the symbol on Rebecca’s t-shirt. If you cannot make it out, it’s a red dragon.

If you can identify the statue, it may be also useful in identifying the city.

* * * * *

COMMENTS BY LIAISONS AND VISITORS TO THE SENATE:
1. CFA Vice-President Lillian Taiz
CFA Vice President Taiz gave a Power-Point presentation on Save the CSU. For the full presentation see http://music1.csudh.edu/cfa/Spring2004_Tookit/GovernorsBudgetandCSU1.ppt

2. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence
Excess Units
The current exploration of excess units is being done in response to a recommendation contained in the Governor’s budget. In addition, there is pending legislation that will address the issue.

Vice Chancellor Spence said he is opposed to charging students for excess units.
If we do anything about excess units, we should act not because of a legislative or executive mandate but because it is good for students.

With decreased fiscal resources, graduating students more promptly may be the only way to increase access.

**Clear Path to Degree/Roadmap**

Vice Chancellor Spence presented a chart to illustrate everything being done to facilitate graduation. Please refer to the chart on the following page.

Emphasis is being placed on an early declaration of a major as well as on clear lower-division major requirements.

3. **Chancellor Charles Reed and Vice Chancellor West**

Chancellor Reed discussed the Budget Summit and provided a brief overview of California’s economic outlook.

There is a $27 billion deficit this fiscal year that is only partially filled by the issuance of $13.6 billion in bonds; in addition there will be $1.8 billion withheld from local governments, loans of $2.6 billion, program reductions of $7.3 billion and transfers of $1.2 billion.

To make matters worse, there are $7.5 billion at risk including unrealized tax collections, questionable pension bonds, over collected corporate taxes, tribal casino revenues not realized, corrections liabilities and savings not made because of late legislative action.

Many of this year’s solutions are one-time transfers and postponed obligations.

The State is also assuming considerable future obligations.

The initiative process in California has given the State Proposition 13 and Proposition 98, both of which are devastating to government services. A potential counter was Proposition 56, but Proposition 56 was annihilated at the polls. And the legislature is likely to be unwilling to impose new taxes in the light of the defeat of Proposition 56.

Even if the legislature were to impose new taxes, Proposition 98 would mandate that 70% of the new revenue go to K-14. Of the 30% remaining, the CSU would receive only a small fraction because of the other interests competing for those funds.

The economy is unlikely ever to reach the 1997-2000 levels again. The technology bubble that gave the state great surpluses is not likely to be repeated.

A Field Poll reveals that the people of California still have faith in the CSU. To keep that confidence, we should not reduce quality but, rather, reduce access to protect and preserve quality.

The Governor’s budget proposes a $240 million budget reduction, part of which will be accomplished through redirecting students to the Community Colleges.

Some reductions were earmarked, among which were eliminating Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), raising the student-faculty ratio (SFR), instituting excess units charges. The CSU is trying to convince the Department of Finance to let us manage those reductions and to make the unallocated rather than targeted.
Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree

CSU Campus Initiatives
- Clear program requirements
- Course availability/course demand
- Advising on degree progress
- Fuller use of calendar (summer, etc.)
- Use of on-line instruction
- Academic Policies on:
  - Repeats/withdrawals
  - Changes of major
  - Additional units

K-12 Academic Preparation
- Early assessment
- Targeted senior year preparation
- Professional development of high school teachers
- Identification of supplemental courses and other forms of instruction/tutoring in schools

Improving Transfer
- 60 units for upper-division transfer
- CSU systemwide core transfer program
  - Completion of GE (39 units)
  - Intent to declare a specific major
  - Completion of lower-division major prerequisite courses (6)
  - Early commitment to campus
The CSU needs a fee policy that is stable, transparent and fair. As we craft such a policy, we need to study financial aid and we need to examine the State’s commitment to access. The State, through the Master Plan, has to pay for access. Between 2000 and 2005, the state has reduced the amount it pays per student by about $1,500 while student fees have increased by about $1,000.

We must provide “authentic access” so students, once admitted, can obtain the classes they need to graduate in a timely manner.

If we redirect students to the Community Colleges, we must guarantee them admission to the CSU in two years provided they successfully complete a CSU-approved curriculum.

Since there is not a likelihood of a tax increase, the CSU is working on a plan, to be presented to the Board of Trustees in May, based on a system enrollment of 385,000-390,000. In addition, the system will do anything possible to minimize the impact of this reduction on students and staff.

The budget won’t get any better; we’ll be lucky if it doesn’t get any worse. The Senate is refusing to accept the Governor’s reductions in Health and Welfare and they will look elsewhere for money to replace those reductions. Last year in the wee hours we lost an additional $85 million. There will be little done until after the May Revise, when the real work will begin.

4. CSSA Environmental Officer Erik Roper

CSSA Environmental Officer Erik Roper made a Power-Point presentation of Sustainable Design, which was followed by a presentation on the same topic by Assistant Vice Chancellor Elvyra San Juan.

5. Representative Manolo Platin

CSSA January Conference: San Diego State

Board of Directors (Saturday): The Board of Directors heard reports from Special Officers, Student Trustees, the Chancellor’s Office Liaison, and Bob Cherny.

University Affairs: University Affairs had one action item, a resolution supporting Outreach Programs in the CSU.

Ad-hoc Shared Governance: This committee defined shared governance, will forward our definition to the full board in March. We also drafted amendments to the July 2001 BOT resolution on Shared Governance, in order to strengthen the language. Finally, we also decided to discuss the issue of Shared Governance with the Alumni Council at our meeting in Fresno.

Ad-hoc CSU Budget/Student Fees: The committee discussed the Governor’s Budget proposal for FY 2004-2005. The committee took the position of opposition regarding the budget implications to the CSU.

Board of Directors (Sunday): The Board took the following action on Sunday, January 24: CSSA Awareness Campaign was approved. This program is designed to raise the level of awareness of CSSA on campuses. Legislative Affairs reported that all items were information. With regard to the March primary, we had 12,000 new student registrations, and we are close to the 40,000 goal. Textbooks bill is being written up; there will be an actual bill to review in March. There will be 2 press conferences this month, and the CalPIRG report being released [January 29]. University Affairs moved to approve the Resolution In Support of Preserving Educational
Opportunity, Outreach, and Academic Programs within the CSU. Committee on CSU Budget/Student Fees sought approval of the Governor’s Budget Proposal, with the position of opposition.

CSSA February Conference: California Higher Education Student Summit (CHESS IX) CHESS was a great success. We had many great presenters and many interested students that benefited from them all. In addition to the workshops, the CSSA held our annual Lobby Day, where representatives from each campus lobbied our individual legislators and policy makers. Special thanks to Dr. Bob Cherny and Dr. Kathy Kaiser for taking time out of their personal lives to be present for the entire weekend! All official Board business was postponed until the upcoming March CSSA meeting in Fresno.

6. Board of Trustees’ Vice Chair Murray Galinson
Vice Chair Galinson provided the Senate with some personal background, explaining that he could understand the faculty because he had been a law professor at a law school in San Diego. After retiring from teaching, he went into banking and then moved into philanthropy, being especially interested in the education of inner-city children. When asked by then-Governor Davis how he would like to become involved, Dr. Galinson requested an appointment to the CSU Board of Trustees, because he believes in the mission of the CSU. He emphasized the centrality of the CSU’s mission to the economic health of the state. Plain speaking and straight talking, he stressed his commitment to work collaboratively to protect the mission of the CSU. Although the Master Plan appeared in good shape, the State’s finances were a disaster.

* * * * *

Standing Committee Reports:

Brief reports were made by standing committee chairs. Other reports in written form were shared with the Senate and may be found in the appendix following the action items of the minutes.
ACTION

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: The March 11-12, 2004, agenda was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The January 22-23, 2004, minutes were approved.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:
Agenda Item 1, *Support for a CSU Sustainability Policy*, was previously scheduled as a Time Certain with CSSA’s presentation by Environmental Officer Erik Roper.

Discussion of Agenda Item 2, *AB 1175: Education Code: Holocaust (Koretz)*, was delayed until the resolution and attachments had been distributed to all.

AS-2641-04/TEKR CLASSIFICATION OF TEACHER CREDENTIAL CANDIDATES FOR PURPOSES OF STUDENT FEE INCREASES

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) recognize that it is necessary for most students pursuing a teaching credential to take credential-required, post-baccalaureate coursework following completion of their bachelor’s degree in order to be certified to teach in California classrooms; and be it further

RESOLVED: That, in light of the state’s current fiscal crisis and recognizing the inevitability of a student fee increase, the Senate urges that any fee increase for post-baccalaureate credential students be set equal to those for undergraduates in recognition of the fact that this credential work is a necessary extension of the undergraduate degree; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU support the efforts of State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O’Connell, Chancellor Reed, and the Executive Council of the CSU Presidents to secure this accommodation on behalf of CSU teacher credential students.

RATIONALE: The California Department of Education has identified a need for an additional 265,000 K-12 teachers by 2005. The California Legislature also has repeatedly acknowledged the shortage of well-qualified K-12 teachers (AB 1241, e.g.).

Many states authorize undergraduate programs in education that enable students to complete their professional preparation within the framework of a baccalaureate degree. In California this is not the case. Here, most students pursuing a teaching credential are required to take as much as a year of additional coursework following completion of their undergraduate degree in order to be certified as qualified to teach. Such additional coursework, therefore, is best viewed as a necessary extension of the student’s undergraduate program in teaching preparation. As a result, fees for additional post-baccalaureate coursework required of students pursuing a teaching credential should be set equal to those for students in undergraduate programs.

AS-2641-04/TEKR motion approved without dissent.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the following schedule for the 2004-2005 academic year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Committee/Plenary</th>
<th>Interim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>September 9-10</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*October 8</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 10-12</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*December 3</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>January 19-21</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*February 11</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 9-11</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*April 8</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 4-6</td>
<td>Committees/Plenary</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

; and be it further

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

RATIONALE: The California State University Board of Trustees is in the process of determining its meeting dates for 2005, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>July 13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>January 25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September 20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 8-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AS-2642-04/EX will be a second reading item at the May 6-7, 2004, meeting.
WHEREAS, The State of California is no longer providing the funds needed to guarantee its high school graduates the promises contained in California’s Master Plan for Higher Education; and

WHEREAS, In 2003-2004, due to cuts in funding, the California State University (CSU) was unable to enroll 5000 qualified students; and in 2004-2005, further budget reductions will result in denying an additional 20,000 students access to the CSU; and

WHEREAS, California’s Master Plan calls for an affordable higher education for the State’s qualified high school graduates, but past and proposed increases in student fees threaten to limit their access to the CSU; and

WHEREAS, Budget cuts to the CSU have resulted in the reduction of the number of instructors, closing of numerous sections of classes, increasing class size, eroding vital library services (including book and journal acquisition) and reducing the operating and equipment budgets of all departments and programs throughout the CSU, and these actions lead to the deterioration of the quality of education in the CSU; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University note with grave concern that the continuing failure of the State of California to provide adequate funding to the California Community Colleges, the California State University and the University of California undermines the long cherished principles of affordability, access and quality contained in the Master Plan; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU ask the California Legislature to conduct open and public hearings on the impact of the current economic crisis on the Master Plan; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU work with the CSU Chancellor’s Office to inform the public, particularly current high school students and their families, of these limitations to higher education that have been imposed on the CSU because of budget cutbacks.

AS-2643-04/FGA motion amended and approved after being sent back to committee and rewritten for Friday’s discussion and approval.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) support the removal of the sunset provision in the Holocaust, Genocide, Human Rights and Tolerance Act of 2003 as contained in Assembly Bill 1175; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU support the addition of language to AB 1175 that will require the Center have a reporting relationship, for administrative purposes, at a specific CSU campus; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU support the elimination of language that designates participation of specific campuses; and be it further

RESOLVED: That no state general funds be used for the Center for at least two years.

RATIONALE: Since the early 1990s the State of California has mandated that the teaching of the Holocaust and genocide be done in grades 7-12. In the years since the passage of that legislation, teacher preparation in this area has been erratic and spotty. To rectify that problem at the urging of faculty from the CSU and supported by the Academic Senate CSU and other groups, the legislature passed AB 2003, the Holocaust, Genocide, Human Rights and Tolerance Act in the fall of 2002. AB 2003 created a state taskforce on Holocaust and Genocide Education and a center at CSU Chico. The Center has been functioning now for one year and has received over $190,000 in grants and donations in its first year and an additional $100,000 before its second year. More than 300 teachers have been trained in workshops and six workshops are scheduled for the spring of 2004. A web site has been created in cooperation with the Department of Education of the State of California. Removing the sunset clause enables the center and the taskforce to continue as long as funding from external sources is available. The clause regarding funding acknowledges the fundraising success of the Center and makes sure that during this budget crisis no state funds will be used to support the Center. Finally, the resolution supports the idea that the Center will be open to involvement of any faculty from the CSU who have the qualifications and desire to participate.

AS-2640-04/TEKR motion amended and approved upon resuming discussions after agenda Time Certain reports were given.

(Attachment)
An act to amend Sections 44775.1, 44775.7, and 44775.8 of, and add Section 44775.9 to, the Education Code, and to repeal Section 5 of Chapter 702 of the Statutes of 2002, relating to public schools.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 1175, as amended, Koretz. The Holocaust and genocide.

This bill would expand the center to the California State University generally, remove references to the pilot program, extend the deadline for submission of the center’s report to January 31, 2005, and delete the repeal date of the act, thereby extending the operation of the act indefinitely. *The bill would enact restrictions concerning the receipt of state funding for the center.*


*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

SECTION 1. Section 44775.1 of the Education Code is amended to read:

44775.1. As used in this chapter, the following words have the following meanings:

(a) “Taskforce” means the California Taskforce on Holocaust, Genocide, Human Rights, and Tolerance Education established pursuant to this chapter.

(b) “Center” means the Center for Excellence on the Study of the Holocaust, Genocide, Human Rights, and Tolerance established pursuant to this chapter.

(c) “State” means the State of California.

SEC. 2. Section 44775.7 of the Education Code is amended to read:

44775.7. (a) The Center for Excellence on the Study of the Holocaust, Genocide, Human Rights, and Tolerance is a program of the California State University. The purpose of the program is to accomplish all of the following:

(1) Create a center to coordinate and act as a clearinghouse of information on programs that provide teachers with the knowledge, training, and curricular materials to effectively teach pupils in the public schools about the Holocaust, genocide, human rights, and tolerance as established in the History-Social Science Framework and Content Standards for California Public Schools.

(2) Expand upon the work of existing Holocaust and genocide institutions, programs, and organizations, including the Museum of Tolerance, to provide teacher training, curricular materials, and other instructional resources that complement and integrate, rather than duplicate, those efforts.
(b) The goals of the center shall be to accomplish all of the following:
(1) Expand upon the framework established by the Model Curriculum for Human Rights and Genocide offered by the department.
(2) Develop and facilitate teacher access to instructional materials on the Holocaust, genocide, human rights, and tolerance.
(3) Expand delivery of training, materials, and resources on the Holocaust, genocide, human rights, and tolerance through the provision of online as well as face-to-face resources and classes.
(4) Create an integrated statewide clearinghouse of information on teacher training, instructional materials, and resources available through existing Holocaust and genocide institutions, programs, organizations, and the center.
(5) Support the integration of survivor testimony into instruction on the Holocaust, genocide, human rights, and tolerance.
(c) The director of the center shall prepare a master plan for the implementation of the program that outlines the manner in which the goals of the program will be accomplished and measured.
(d) The center shall work cooperatively with designated California State University campuses, including, but not limited to, Fresno, San Diego, San Francisco, Sacramento, Stanislaus, Sonoma, Northridge, and Long Beach, to offer training, curricular materials, and resources for teachers to effectively instruct on the Holocaust, genocide, human rights, and tolerance.

SEC. 3. Section 44775.8 of the Education Code is amended to read:
44775.8. The center shall engage in the following activities:
(a) Support and facilitate teachers’ use of certificate programs in Holocaust and genocide studies developed through the California State University.
(b) Act as a clearinghouse for teacher training materials.
(c) Provide specialized training for teachers and school districts.
(d) Assess and monitor the effectiveness of teacher training programs provided by the center.
(e) Promote Holocaust and genocide awareness.
(f) Compile a roster of volunteers who are willing to share their survivor testimony in classrooms, seminars, and workshops on the
subject of the Holocaust or genocide and make the roster available
on the center’s Web site.

(g) Solicit financial support from both the public and private
sectors.

(h) Promote activities to memorialize the Holocaust and
genocide events.

(i) Prepare and submit a report to the Secretary for Education,
the Governor, and the Legislature no later than January 31, 2005,
outlining the activities of the center and reporting on the progress
made in achieving the goals outlined in subdivision (b) of Section
44775.7. In addition, the report shall include information on the
amount of nonstate funds secured for the purposes of the center
and the number of teachers who have participated in training
provided by the center.

SEC. 3. Section 44775.9 is added to the Education Code, to
read:

44775.9. No funds, or resources supported by funds, available
to the California State University for support of its educational
mission shall be redirected to support the center, including
revenues from the General Fund, the California State Lottery
Education Fund, and student fee revenues, as well as
reimbursements and other income that otherwise would be
available for support of the educational mission of the center.

SEC. 4. Section 5 of Chapter 702 of the Statutes of 2002 is
repealed.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge the CSU Board of Trustees to adopt a sustainability policy that

1. Requires all new and renovated buildings be designed and built to a “Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design” (LEED) Silver rating or higher without binding the CSU to pursue LEED certifications,

2. Establishes specific goals for a 20 percent reduction in energy use per CSU student (from 2000 levels) by 2014 and of 40 percent by 2024 through energy conservation programs, energy-efficient building design, and use of high-efficiency equipment and systems,

3. Establishes specific goals that 25 percent of energy use in the CSU system be from renewable sources by 2014 and 50 percent from renewable sources by 2024,

4. Requires annual progress reports to the CSU Board of Trustees;

and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU commend the California State Student Association for their leadership in bringing the sustainability issue to the Senate and for educating us on it.

RATIONALE: The U. S. Green Building Council developed the “Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design” (LEED) Green Building Rating system as a voluntary, consensus-based, market-driven building rating system based on existing proven technology that evaluates environmental performance from a “whole building” perspective over a building’s life cycle, providing a definitive standard for what constitutes a “green building.” This standard seeks to fulfill three primary objectives: implement high energy/water efficiency, conserve natural resources, and create a healthy environment. The expected results of conformance to the standard are substantially lower operating, maintenance, and healthcare expenses and higher occupant productivity. The energy conservation and efficiency features that are designed in LEED buildings offer the most cost-effective means of reducing the cost and environmental impact of providing energy services. Further, the evidence is that LEED Silver designed buildings cost no more than non-LEED buildings when the appropriate design concepts, technologies, and materials are incorporated at the beginning of the design process.
A new sustainability policy as envisioned above will allow CSU to continue to be a leader in the efforts for responsible, cost-effective, development and consumption of resources. The Los Angeles Community College District and the University of California have each recently adopted forward-looking sustainability policies and Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger’s “Environmental Policy Agenda” stipulates that 20 percent of all electricity sold on the grid should come from renewable energy sources by 2010, with 33 percent coming from renewable energy sources by 2020. Finally, this resolution supports a similar resolution (attached) recently passed by the California State Student Association (CSSA).

AS-2639-04/EX motion approved.

(Attachment)
Resolution in Support of a CSU Sustainability Policy

Whereas, the California State Student Association (CSSA) is the official voice of the 414,000 students of the California State University (CSU) (www.csустudents.org); and

Whereas, CSSA advocates sustainability for CSU campuses and has worked on sustainability and green university as policy agenda items for the past three years; and

Whereas, our universities are a training ground for future leaders, a laboratory for cutting edge research, a place to develop solutions to our biggest challenges, an economic engine for the region, and taken together have a tremendous influence over environmental, economic, and social policies in the country; and

Whereas, the Talloires Declaration of 1990, an official statement by university administrators supporting environmental sustainability in higher education, articulates the urgency of these environmental problems: local, regional, and global air and water pollution; accumulation and distribution of toxic wastes; destruction and depletion of forests, soil, and water; depletion of the ozone layer and emission of greenhouse gases that threaten the survival of humans and millions of other species; the integrity of earth and its biodiversity; the security of nations, and the health and rights of future generations (source: www.ulsf.org/programs_talloires.html); and

Whereas, Executive Order D-16-00, signed by Governor Davis, promotes the integration of sustainable and cost-effective building design and construction within the State (source: www.energy.ca.gov/releases/2000_releases/executive_order_D1600.html); and

Whereas, the US Green Building Council developed the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System as a voluntary, consensus-based, market-driven building rating system based on existing proved technology that evaluates environmental performance from a “whole building” perspective over a building’s life cycle, providing a definitive standard for what constitutes a “green building,” with the convergence of these primary objectives: implement high energy/water efficiency, conserve natural resources, and create healthy indoor environments, all resulting in substantially lower operating, maintenance, and healthcare expenses and higher occupant productivity (sources: www.usgbc.org, www.buildinggreen.com, www.greenbuild.com); and

Whereas, the energy conservation and efficiency features that are designed into LEED buildings offer the most cost-effective means of reducing the cost and environmental impact of providing energy services; and

Whereas, LEED Silver-rated buildings cost no more than non-LEED buildings when the appropriate design concepts, technologies, and materials are incorporated at the beginning of the design process (sources: www.rmi.org/images/other/GDS-WhyBuildGreen.pdf and http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/greenbuilding/Design/CostIssues.htm#Cost&Benefit); and
Whereas, there exists a great opportunity to enact a CSU policy of responsible, cost-effective, development and consumption of resources as demonstrated by the design, construction, and use of LEED standards (source: www.esm.ucsb.edu/about/donald_bren_hall.html); and

Whereas, global warming of the earth by greenhouse gases emitted into the atmosphere occurs when fossil fuels are burned, releasing carbon dioxide into the atmosphere to act as a shield to trap heat inside the atmosphere; and

Whereas, there is a growing consensus in the scientific community that human-driven global climate change is not only a real threat, but may be the greatest environmental threat of our age, presenting grave and documented threats to the coasts and low-lying countries of the world; to the world’s agriculture and its economy; and to all of Earth’s ecosystems; and

Whereas, the California legislature has declared that global warming is a matter of increasing concern for public health and the environment and that control and reduction of emissions of greenhouse gases are critical to slow the effects of global warming (source: www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/bill/asm/ab_14511500/ab_1493_bill_20020722_chaptered.html); and

Whereas, renewable energy is created not by burning fossil fuels but by tapping into clean sources such as solar, wind, and waves that produce little or no pollution and generate power from energy sources that are in plentiful supply and virtually never run out; and

Whereas, California’s Renewable Portfolio Standard, SB 1078, mandates that 20 percent of the State’s energy generation be renewable by December 31, 2017 (source: http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/01-02/bill/sen/sb_1051-1100/sb_1078_bill_20020912_chaptered.pdf); and

Whereas, the State of California Energy Action Plan, passed by the California Energy commission, the Consumer Power and conservation Financing Authority, and the California Public Utilities Commission states that the State is aggressively implementing SB 1078, “with the intention of accelerating the completion date to 2010” (source: http://www.energy.ca.gov/2003_energy_action_plan/2003-05-08_ACTION_PLAN.PDF); and

Whereas, Governor-Elect Schwarzenegger’s Environmental Policy Agenda stipulates that 20 percent of all electricity sold on the grid come from renewable energy sources by 2010, with 33 percent coming from renewable energy sources by 2020 (source: http://www.joinarnold.com/en/agenda/#D1); and

Whereas, the Los Angeles Community College district recently adopted responsible development policies requiring that all 40-50 new Proposition A buildings be LEED Silver or higher with at least 15-25 percent renewable energy standard and with at least 10 percent being generated on site with energy from the sun (source: www.cleanenergynow.org/media/pressreleases/07122002.html); and

Whereas, one year ago the University of California (UC) used no clean energy and had no standards for green buildings, yet the UC Board of Regents passed a sustainability policy in July 2003 committing to the installation of 10 megawatts (equivalent to power used by 5,000 homes) of renewable energy across the 10 campuses; the
purchase of 10% of the university’s utility purchased energy from clean energy sources immediately and ramping up to 20% by 2017; and the reduction of systemwide energy use to 10% below 2000 levels by 2017, with a commitment to build all future UC construction to LEED equivalent standards; and

Whereas, a CSU energy portfolio with a higher percentage of clean, renewable energy generated within the state and on our campuses will increase safety and security by reducing dependence on corporations and on other states and nations for energy; lessen pollution and our contribution to global warming; create many skilled jobs; and keep more energy sector profits and taxes in California (www.calpirg.org/reports/renewableswork.pdf); and

Whereas, a CSU energy portfolio with a higher percentage of clean, renewable energy generated within the state and on campuses will increase safety and security by reducing dependence on energy firms and other state organizations; therefore be it

Resolved, that CSSA calls upon the CSU Board of Trustees to adopt a policy that all new and renovated buildings at CSU campuses be designed and built to a LEED Silver rating or higher (without binding the CSU to actually pursue LEED certifications); and be it further

Resolved, that CSSA calls upon the CSU Board of Trustees to direct that energy use per CSU student be reduced by 20 percent by 2014 and 40 percent by 2024 through energy conservation programs, energy-efficient building design and use of high-efficiency equipment and systems; and be it further

Resolved, that CSSA calls upon the CSU Board of Trustees to direct that 25 percent of energy use in the CSU system be from renewable sources by 2014 and 50 percent from renewable sources by 2024, at least half of which will be generated onsite incorporating sources such as solar, wind and biomass; and be it further

Resolved, that distribution of this resolution include, but not be limited to, the CSU Board of Trustees, campus presidents, student body presidents, the Statewide Academic Senate, and Chancellor Charles B. Reed.
A motion was approved to reorder the agenda so that discussion could be heard on Items 7 and 8 before Item 6.

AS-2645-04/AA SUPPORT FOR A SYSTEMWIDE CORE/CAMPUS-SPECIFIC TRANSFER PATTERN BY DEGREE PROGRAM IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) request that the CSU Board of Trustees adopt the following policy to provide for a systemwide core/campus-specific transfer pattern by degree program that would require the following provisions:

1. The creation of academic road maps for each degree program specifying a common core of at least 45 semester/68 quarter units acceptable at but not necessarily required by all campuses of the CSU to count as units in the degree program; as nearly as practicable, these units should mirror the road map experience of the native student engaged in lower-division major preparation and general education on that campus.

2. The creation of campus-specific academic road maps for each degree program specifying the additional transfer units which will be acceptable at the campus to count as units in the degree program; as nearly as practicable, these units should mirror the road map experience of the native student engaged in lower-division major preparation and general education on that campus.

3. That community college students electing to fulfill this pattern must commit to a major degree program and campus no later than the completion of [30 semester/45 quarter units] [45 semester/68 quarter units] [at the point of application to the CSU] [the same as a transfer agreement guarantee (TAG)].

4. That community college students electing to fulfill this pattern must complete the coursework within [2] calendar years from the date of committing to a major degree program and campus.

5. That community college students who have fulfilled the degree program-specific transfer pattern will be accorded the highest admission priority among all transfer students at the campus to which they have committed. Students have the option to sign multiple agreements or an agreement may apply to multiple campuses.

; and be it, further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor, prior to implementation of the proposed transfer pattern, to provide specific data that documents the problem to be solved by the transfer pattern, to estimate the cost of implementation of the pattern, and to perform a cost/benefit analysis of the proposed program; and be it further
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge that the process for implementation of the transfer pattern be developed jointly through direct consultation between the CSU and the Academic Senate CSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to carry out an assessment, in consultation with the Academic Senate CSU, in order to account for the impact of the systemwide core/campus-specific transfer pattern; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to recognize and the Legislature to fund the real costs of implementing this large-scale program in the CSU.

RATIONALE: There is a perceived problem in that both native and transfer CSU students graduate with more credits than are required to complete their degrees, native students with an average of 141 units and transfer students with an average of 142. These students occupy seats that could provide access for new eligible students who now may be denied admission. Initiatives to facilitate native students’ progress to degree are being developed or implemented on each CSU campus. Yet a significant issue remains because two-thirds of CSU graduates are transfers from the California Community Colleges (CCC). Based on reports of the Chancellor’s Office study of thousands of transcripts, transfer students take an average of 76 units after transfer, but part of the reason for the high number of units is to make up for units taken at the CCC that do not count toward the degree. Also, for these students the growing impaction of CSU campuses means that they may not be admitted to the campus of their first, or even second, choice. These students need clear information about what courses to take in both general education and their major, especially those courses that will meet major degree requirements regardless of which CSU campus admits them.

The stated goal of both the Academic Senate CSU and the CSU administration is to provide access to the baccalaureate for a greater number of students. Reducing the number of units taken beyond those needed for the degree is made more urgent because of budget reductions. Title 5 now requires at least 60 units of CCC students for upper-division transfer, and the CSU, with few exceptions, will no longer accept lower-division transfer students. Transfer students who enter the CSU with 60 or more units applicable to their degree program will take fewer units beyond those needed for the degree.

The systemwide core/campus-specific transfer pattern would presumably reduce difficulties in advising for CCC students and counselors. The current between-campus variations in requirements for lower-division major and major prerequisite courses are confusing and complicated. The model would encourage focused purposeful student behavior by offering preferential admission status.

This is a complicated program and will take some time for its implementation phase. Furthermore, it will need to be monitored for effectiveness. The CSU
will need to track and compare progress-to-degree to see if a substantial number of transfer students graduate with fewer units.

AS-2645-04/AA discussion was begun late Thursday, continued on Friday; motion will be a second reading item at the May 6-7, 2004, meeting.

(attachment)
1. Q. What is the problem?
A. Both native and transfer CSU students graduate with more credits than are required to complete their degrees, native students with an average of 141 units and transfer students with an average of 142. These students take up seats that could provide access for new eligible students who now may be denied admission. Initiatives to facilitate native students' progress to degree are being developed or implemented on each CSU campus. Yet a significant issue remains, as two thirds of CSU graduates are transfers from the California Community Colleges (CCC). For these students the growing impaction of CSU campuses means that they may not be admitted to the campus of their first, or even second, choice. These students need clear information about what courses to take in both general education and their major, especially those courses that will meet major degree requirements regardless of which CSU campus admits them.

2. Q: What is the goal?
A: The goal of both the statewide academic senate and the CSU administration is to provide access to the baccalaureate for a greater number of students. Reducing the number of units taken beyond those needed for the degree is a necessary strategy given budget reductions. Title 5 now requires at least 60 units for upper-division transfer, and the CSU, with few exceptions will no longer accept lower-division transfer students. Transfer students who enter the CSU with 60+ units applicable to their degree program will take fewer units beyond those needed for the degree.

3. Q: If transfer students accrue excess units when they graduate, did the extra units come from students' actions and behaviors at the CCC or CSU?
A. Both (according to reports of the chancellor's office study of thousands of transcripts). Transfer students take an average of 76 units after transfer, but part of the reason for the high number of units is to make up for units taken at the CCC that do not count toward the degree.

4. Q. What are possible actions the CSU can take in response to the problem of excess units accrued by transfer students?
A. Two possible responses are dual admission or a systemwide core/campus specific pattern of for each major.

5. Q. Will dual admission address the problem?
A. Dual admission would likely address the problem and may be the preferable solution, but it has been attempted in the past and was not supported by the CCC. The CCC faculty leadership continues to oppose dual admissions. In addition, dual admissions can apply only to students who were CSU-eligible at high school graduation and will not affect the significant number of transfer students who establish their eligibility for transfer based on their work in community college.

6. Q. What are the components of the systemwide core/campus specific pattern and why is it thought to be workable?
A. The pattern includes:
   1. Students must complete 60 units before transfer.
   2. Students should declare a major as soon as possible and no later than the point of application to the CSU. This will help to ensure that units students take will count toward their CSU degree and that students receiving financial aid will still be eligible for the aid for the most semesters after transfer.
   3. The 60 transferable units may include the required 39 units of lower-division general education and at least 6 units of coursework applicable to the major (which may be prerequisites to the major). For high-unit or high-preparation programs, such as those in business, science, engineering, nursing (and some other programs), students may need to focus more on prerequisites and delay some general education courses until arrival at the CSU campus. For majors without lower-division courses or prerequisites, the pattern of coursework should reflect that required of native students so as not to disadvantage transfer students.
4. Students must commit to a specific CSU campus and will be given the highest admission priority in order to take additional units applicable to the degree program at the specific CSU campus.

5. The systemwide core/campus specific approach facilitates transfer through a 45-unit common pattern, by major, of general education and major or major prerequisite courses while retaining flexibility for local campuses to maintain a unique campus identity for their degree programs through the remaining transferable units and, of course, the required upper-division courses in the major degree program.

7. Q. What would be some of the complications in implementing such a plan?
A. Complications include:
   1. The success of any program to facilitate progress to degree depends on effective communication and, especially, timely and accurate advising.
   2. The 45/15 pattern does not take into account the relationship among "excess" units, minimum coursework requirements for financial aid, and lack of available courses applicable to the degree program. (The federal government requires that Financial Aid Offices monitor a student's time to degree, GPA, and yearly units completed in determining aid eligibility. Each college or university sets its own requirements within some set federal guidelines. For units to degree, schools are allowed to use 150% of the units required for a degree and must use attempted units (rather than completed units). For example, if a degree takes 200 quarter units to complete, a financial aid student is allowed to take 300 quarter attempted units before losing eligibility for aid. This unit count has to include ALL college work - even units that do not transfer toward the student's degree.)
   3. Community colleges may not offer some of the necessary courses.
   4. A small number of students may game the system by taking majors with lesser requirements, then changing majors upon arrival at the CSU.
   5. Program costs may rise for the CSU with a decline in larger enrollment, lower division general education and prerequisite courses as students take more upper-division courses which are more expensive to staff.
   6. The timing of major declaration and transfer application and admission may not allow students to know the final 15 units required for priority admission at a given campus. For early declaration, would majors be affected differentially by a requirement for major declaration by the end of the freshman year? (Students may select majors such as communication, anthropology only after taking a general education course in that area.)
   7. How will CSU units taken through self-support rather than state support be counted?
   8. Will there be any effect on the use of advanced placement?
   9. Will this lead to upper-division CSU courses in the major being designated for CCCs to teach in the lower division with approval of a lower division course "covering" the same material?

8. Q. To what extent would the systemwide core/campus specific pattern reduce the number of excess units taken at the CCCs by transfer students?
A. The pattern would presumably reduce difficulties in advising for CCC students and counselors caused by campus variation in requirements for lower-division major and major prerequisite courses and would encourage focused, purposeful student behavior by offering preferential admission status.

9. Q. How will we know if the pattern has made a difference?
A. The CSU will track and compare progress to degree to see if a substantial number of transfer students graduate with fewer units.
AS-2646-04/AA  DESIGNATION OF SANCTIONABLE UNITS
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) accept the definition:

Sanctionable units: units in excess of 20% over the student’s current degree/credential program including all CSU eligible units transferred and all CSU baccalaureate-level units attempted and excluding units accumulated prior to completion of the summer immediately following high school graduation.

RATIONALE: The proposed definition was developed by the Academic Affairs Committee in response to a request for a definition from the Task Force on Excess Units. Application of the definition would provide a basis for penalizing campuses for allowing students to take units well beyond those required for a baccalaureate degree program and/or to penalize students for those units. During a time of budget pressures combined with increased demand for access to the CSU, it is not unreasonable to assert that at some point beyond the units necessary to complete a degree program, units may be deemed excessive. The definition of sanctionable units is a curricular matter and should be determined by the faculty.

AS-2646-04/AA motion will be a second reading item at the May 6-7, 2004, meeting.

AS-2644-04/FGA  LONG-TERM UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT FEE POLICY
RESOLVED: That the State shall bear the preponderance of responsibility for funding the cost of education for all California State University (CSU) eligible undergraduates; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the state university fees for the CSU paid by full time, in-state students shall rise to a permanent cap of 25 percent of the actual cost of instruction, as calculated by the Chancellor’s Office, inclusive of technology support, library resources, and faculty compensation needs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That fees should be raised on a schedule that would achieve a permanent cap of 25 percent in eight years; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Board of Trustees shall set aside an appropriate percentage of new revenue generated by the annual increases in resident undergraduate fees for institutional financial aid programs for CSU students; and shall make a determination of this amount by calculating federal and state financial aid resources and information provided in the Student Fee, Financial Aid and Cost of Education report.

RATIONALE: In-state student fees remain among the lowest in the nation. However, the actual cost of instruction per student in the CSU system has risen to approximately $13,000 annually when one takes into account the cost of
technology, library resources, and adequate compensation to bring faculty salaries up to the average in their cohort of state universities nationally. Furthermore, the current funding to the CSU has declined to only $10,355 per student toward the actual cost of educating students. Thus, the CSU system must receive increased funding from the state of California and from student fees.

AS-2644-04/FGA amended motion approved after discussion time was extended into 10:00 a.m. Time Certain.

AS-2647-04/FGA RECOMMENDING ALLOCATION OF GRADUATE FEE DIFFERENTIALS TO GRADUATE PROGRAMS

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) recommend that any fee differential paid by graduate students should be allocated to the graduate programs in which the students are enrolled; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU communicate this recommendation to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

RATIONALE: The State and the CSU have failed to fund adequately the costs of graduate programs. Analysts of higher education recognize that graduate education is more expensive than undergraduate education because of such factors as the closer interaction of faculty with students and the technological support such programs require. For example, Pennsylvania’s most recent allocation formula for higher education puts the cost of instruction at the Master’s level at approximately 140% of cost at the undergraduate level and funds these programs accordingly. To move the CSU towards adequately funding graduate programs, the increased fees paid by graduate students should be allocated to the programs in which they are enrolled.

AS-2647-04/FGA motion will be a second reading item at the May 6-7, 2004, meeting.

AS-2648-04/AAPRINCIPLES FOR REACHING CONSENSUS ON REGIONAL AND STATEWIDE PROGRAM ALIGNMENTS IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) recommend that the process for reaching consensus on regional and statewide program alignments be:

1. CSU faculty will determine, within the provisions of Title 5 and/or Executive Orders, the common courses and/or subject matter preparation acceptable statewide, within a region, and within a discipline or field for the Integrated Teacher Preparation Programs and for the statewide core/campus-specific transfer pattern.

2. Faculty from all campuses in the system or region will be included in decision making.
3. Faculty and staff will be provided sufficient time and support to travel, meet, confer, and reach agreement.

4. In the event that disciplines, regions, etc. cannot achieve consensus, the position held by at least two-thirds of campuses will apply to all CSU campuses within the system or region.

5. All program and curricular changes must be subject to consultation with faculty governance on the local campuses, and, to the greatest extent possible, program and curricular changes must be achieved subject to the normal approval processes of the individual campuses.

6. Faculty from the region or discipline will continue to meet periodically to review the curriculum for appropriateness, currency to the profession, content, and the effectiveness of the program in preparing transfer students to begin upper-division work in the CSU.

RATIONALE: Recent and pending legislation, provisions of recent changes to Title 5 and likely future changes, or Executive Orders mean that campuses will be required to reach agreement, for example, on 30 units of lower-division coursework acceptable to all multiple subject integrated teacher preparation programs, 30 additional units of lower-division coursework acceptable to multiple subject integrated teacher preparation programs in a given region, or 45 units of lower-division coursework acceptable for each degree program on a systemwide basis. To conform to legislation, Title 5, and Executive Orders, campuses will be compelled to agree on alignment. Owing to the variety in degree program requirements and courses across the system, some campuses may need to create or modify courses or modify programs. Control by local faculty governance of the local curriculum is an important standard of shared and, to the extent possible, all curricular modifications should be subject to recommendation of local faculty governance (see AS-2626-03/AA). After programs are aligned, it will be necessary for faculty to meet from time to time to ensure that the curriculum remains appropriate. To successfully complete such an initiative, which the state and system desire undertaken in a time of reduced budgets, requires recognition of and compensation for the additional time taken and work performed by faculty.

AS-2648-04/AA motion will be a second reading item at the May 6-7, 2004, meeting. (attachment)
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) recommend to the Chancellor the following principles for the implementation of the Integrated Teacher Preparation framework for articulation:

1. If required, program and curricular changes to accommodate Integrated Teacher Programs must be achieved subject to the normal approval processes of the individual campuses.
2. Appropriate funding must be provided by the system for faculty travel to the necessary meetings to achieve the required systemwide, regional, and local agreements as mandated in Title 5 and defined in the framework.

RATIONALE: The implementation of Integrated Teacher Preparation programs, as recommended in AS-2611-03/AA/TEKR and AS-2622-03/AA/TEKR and mandated in recent changes to Title 5, requires substantial, collaborative work among the California State Universities and the California Community Colleges. The collaboration will be on systemwide, regional, and local levels.

In spite of recent recommendations against continuing legislative intrusion (AS-2601-03/AA), the Senate recommendations to change Title 5 and the subsequent work of the Integrated Teacher Preparation Task Force were spurred by SB 81 (Alpert). It is important to ensure that such legislative mandates do not result in initiatives that bypass longstanding mechanisms of shared governance, especially those traditionally observed at the individual campuses.

Fulfilling the mandates of SB 81 and the Board of Trustees’ changes to Title 5 will require substantial time and travel by a substantial number of faculty over a number of years. The CSU must provide adequate travel support.

APPROVED – November 13-14, 2003
AS-2649-04/FA  ACADEMIC FREEDOM

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) reaffirm its commitment to upholding and preserving the principles of academic freedom: the right of faculty to teach, conduct research or other scholarship, and publish free of external constraints other than those normally denoted by the scholarly standards of a discipline; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU call upon the campuses to foster the free speech rights embedded in the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and to ensure that guests on any campus have full opportunity to the appropriate exercise of these rights; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU call on the university community to maintain the campuses as open forums for free expression of ideas and diverse views in the framework of scholarly inquiry and professional ethics; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU encourage the local campus senates to develop or review campus policies for the protection of freedom of inquiry, research, expression and teaching both inside the classroom and beyond; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU call for review and, if necessary, repeal, of any system or campus policy that would restrict academic freedom in the name of “security” or “a balanced approach” to controversial issues.

RATIONALE: In recent years, in the name of security, some universities have developed policies that place restrictions on academic freedom. There have been attempts to quell discussion of contentious issues under the guise of a need for a “balanced” approach to controversial issues. Academic freedom is the pillar of a university’s fundamental mission of discovery and advancement of knowledge and its dissemination to students and the public. Restrictions on freedom to teach, conduct research, express points of view, and publish create obstacles in fulfilling the academic mission of the university. Only when universities protect academic freedom and foster the free exchange of ideas can they effectively fulfill their mission of providing high quality education to the students and to the public.

AS-2649-04/FA motion will be a second reading item at the May 6-7, 2004, meeting.

AS-2650-04/FA  MAINTAINING QUALITY IN CREDIT CLASSES TAUGHT IN THE EXTENDED UNIVERSITY

RESOLVED: That the responsibility for the assignment of faculty to credit-bearing courses, offered without state support, rests with the academic department offering the class; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) call upon campuses that wish to offer summer or extension credit-bearing classes, on a self-support basis, to charge student fees sufficient to offer a program comparable to that offered with state support.
RATIONALE: In the current economic environment, campuses must have maximum flexibility to offer credit classes, particularly in summer sessions, that allow students to make normal progress to graduation, and to otherwise meet programmatic needs. It is essential to maintain the quality of offerings during this period. Selection of faculty teaching self-support classes should meet normal departmental standards, and compensation rates should be comparable to state support in order to maintain faculty quality. In order to accomplish this quality goal, fees for non-state supported credit classes must be sufficient to meet their costs.

AS-2650-04/FA motion will be a second reading item at the May 6-7, 2004, meeting.

AS-2651-04/AA RESPONSE TO SB 1785 (SCOTT AND ALPERT): PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION: DUAL ADMISSION PROGRAMS

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) oppose SB 1785; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU share the author’s of SB 1785 interest to facilitate student progress but urge that the authors provide only broad outlines to help ensure that community college students who wish to earn a baccalaureate degree at a campus of the CSU are able to do so; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU affirm that the complex curricular concerns—especially admission requirements—involved with a program such as that outlined in the current version of the bill are the proper domain of the faculty who deal most directly with the issues involved; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the legislature to appropriate sufficient funding for the additional time, consultation, advertising, and advising by faculty and staff necessary to implement any new initiatives; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU request that this resolution be forwarded to the California State Legislature.

RATIONALE: SB 1785 has the stated goal of ensuring that community college students who wish to earn a baccalaureate degree at a campus of the CSU are able to do so. To facilitate the goal, the bill calls for a new transfer admission priority category coupled with a model core lower-division transfer curriculum for each degree program.

Sharing the Legislature’s concern, the CSU has current campus-based, as well as statewide, initiatives exemplified by the systemwide project on lower-division requirements in the major (POL) and the specific plans developed by campuses to facilitate students’ achievement of the baccalaureate degree.

The bill as written has several problems, foremost of which is the detailed requirements which were not developed by or even in consultation with the faculty of the CSU. Additionally, no appropriation is indicated for the
tremendous amount of additional work required of faculty and staff to implement a large-scale initiative such as that envisioned in the bill.

Further, ambiguities in the proposed legislation make for various interpretations that may actually impede student progress to degree:

1. b.1 refers to a “community college transfer program”; however, it is not clear what program existing or proposed is referred to.
2. b.2 the lack of appropriation also does not anticipate the cost of creating and staffing new courses at the California Community Colleges (CCC) or the CSU.
3. b.3 could be interpreted as a requirement to accept courses as fully transferable to the degree even if those courses are not appropriate to the degree or, conversely, that no units which are not fully transferable to the degree could be accepted for transfer.
4. b.4 extends the ambiguity by requiring that CCC students may “know and meet the same or similar degree course requirements as counterpart freshmen and sophomores who begin their study at CSU.” This section may be read as an indication that similar rather than fully comparable, articulated courses will be accepted for degree credit?
5. c.4, and repeated in g.3, sets a criterion for priority transfer: “have met all general education requirements specified for the declared major”; requiring completion of all general education will not best serve the students pursuing certain degree programs.
6. f.1 the roles of the respective system authorities (CSU Chancellor, CCC Academic Senate) are not clear. Approval of courses for articulation is subject to long-standing processes in the CSU.
7. 4 amendment of any admissions policy must be subject to consultation with the faculty.
8. 4.g is mute on guaranteed admission but assumes that students will be admissible so that they may meet “any specific course requirements beyond the common 45 units that are specified by the CSU destination campus.”

In item 8, for example, it is not clear whether transfer priority or the guarantee of full transfer is portable to another campus if the student’s campus of choice is impacted. The need is not, however, for greater specification in the bill but for, at most, a general framework where such specific implementation details devolve to the faculty and administration of the CSU.

AS-2651-04/AA motion will be a second reading item at the May 6-7, 2004, meeting.
An act to add Section 66739.5 to the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST
SB 1785, as introduced, Scott. Public postsecondary education: dual admission programs.
Existing law establishes the 3 segments of public postsecondary education in this state. These segments include the California State University, the campuses of which are administered by the Trustees of the California State University, the University of California, which is administered by the Regents of the University of California, and the California Community Colleges, which is administered by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Existing law establishes community college districts, which operate campuses that provide instruction to students throughout the state.
This bill would establish a program with the purpose of ensuring that community college students who wish to earn baccalaureate degrees at a campus of the California State University are able to do so. The bill would require the Chancellor of the California State University to carry out specified tasks in connection with the establishment of this program.
The bill would require the Chancellor of the California State University to establish admissions requirements for community college transfer students in accordance with specified criteria. The bill would require the Chancellor of the California State University, in
consultation with the Academic Senate of the California State University, to specify for each baccalaureate program major a model core lower-division transfer curriculum. The bill would require California State University to guarantee that transfer students admitted under the bill will be able to complete the baccalaureate degree in the minimum number of course units required for that degree.


The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 66739.5 is added to the Education Code, to read:
66739.5. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:
(1) The California Master Plan and supporting statutes place utmost importance on the effective transfer of community college students to the University of California (UC) and the California State University (CSU) as a means of providing access to the baccalaureate degree.
(2) In 2002, CSU enrolled 55,000 transfer students from community colleges.
(3) Two out of three students who earn CSU baccalaureate degrees begin in a community college.
(4) Effective use of state and student time and resources would be maximized by students accruing fewer unrequired units in earning their degrees.
(5) Additional access to community colleges and CSU will be created by higher graduation rates and fewer nonessential units taken.
(6) The state budget situation makes it urgent to streamline the path of the transfer student to the baccalaureate degree.
(b) It is, therefore, the intent of the Legislature to ensure that community college students who wish to earn the baccalaureate degree at CSU are provided with a clear and effective path to this degree, defined as follows:
(1) Knowing all degree requirements upon entering the community college transfer program.
(2) Having reasonable access to required courses when needed for effective progress to the degree.
(3) Having all community college baccalaureate-level course
units accepted by CSU upon transfer, as meeting requirements for
the baccalaureate degree.
(4) Having the opportunity to know and meet the same or
similar degree course requirements as counterpart freshmen and
sophomores who begin their study at CSU.
(5) Enabling community college students who transfer to a
CSU campus as fully qualified, as defined in subdivision (c), to
complete the remaining units required for the specific
baccalaureate degree within the total minimum units required for
that degree major.
(c) On or before February 1, 2005, the Chancellor of CSU shall
establish transfer student admissions requirements that give
highest priority to transfer students who meet the following
qualifications:
(1) Have earned at least 60 units of lower division coursework.
(2) Have declared a major program.
(3) Have met all lower division course prerequisites for the
major.
(4) Have met all general education requirements specified for
the declared major.
(5) Met any other campus-specific requirements specified by
the receiving CSU campus.
(d) (1) CSU campuses admitting students qualified in
accordance with subdivision (c) will make it possible for these
students to complete their baccalaureate degree in the minimum
number of remaining units required for that degree major.
(2) For purposes of this subdivision, the “minimum number of
remaining units” is the minimum number of units required for a
degree major after subtracting the number of fully degree
transferable units earned at the community college.
(e) The Chancellor of CSU, in consultation with the Academic
Senate of CSU, shall establish the following components
necessary for a clear degree path for transfer students:
(1) On or before February 1, 2005, the Chancellor of CSU, in
consultation with the Academic Senate of CSU, shall specify for
each baccalaureate program major a model core lower-division
transfer curriculum composed of at least 45 semester course units
that will be common across all CSU campuses offering specific
major programs.
(2) The 45 common course units shall be composed of general education and, to the extent relevant, of lower division course prerequisites for the declared major.

(3) The 45 unit core requirements shall be specified in sufficient manner and detail so that existing and future community college lower division courses may be articulated to the CSU core course requirements.

(f) (1) On or before January 1, 2006, the Chancellor of CSU and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, in consultation with the Academic Senate of the California Community Colleges, shall identify those lower division courses at the California Community Colleges that meet for each degree major the common 45 unit course requirements specified in paragraph (1) of subdivision (e).

(2) To the extent that the goals of efficiency and urgency are advanced, existing articulation procedures such as the California Articulation Number (CAN) program shall be employed.

(3) On or before January 1, 2006, each CSU campus shall have identified any additional specific, nonelective course requirements beyond the common 45 unit requirements for each major. To the extent these additional course requirements are identified, each CSU campus shall make available these requirements to the appropriate community college campus.

(4) The Chancellor of CSU shall amend CSU’s transfer admissions procedures to encourage prospective community college transfer students to meet both of the following requirements:

(A) Declaration of a baccalaureate degree program major no later than 30 units into lower division study.

(B) Identification of, and, to the extent possible, commitment to, a specific CSU transfer destination campus before earning no more than 45 units of lower division college-level study as specified in subdivision (e).

(g) As allowed by enrollment demand and available space, each CSU campus shall develop a transfer agreement with those students who apply for admission before earning no more than 45 units. The transfer agreement shall guarantee full transfer of all 60 units as creditable to the baccalaureate degree subject to students meeting the following conditions:

(1) Completion of 60 units of college-level course work.
(2) Declaration of a major.
(3) Satisfaction of the general education and major course prerequisites, as specified for the 45-unit common core curriculum for the program major.
(4) Meeting any specific course requirements beyond the common 45 units that are specified by the CSU destination campus.
(h) A CSU campus shall guarantee that the transfer students admitted under this section will be able to complete the baccalaureate degree in the minimum number of course units required for that degree.
AS-2652-04/EX  RECOMMENDATION ON THE REPORT FROM THE
TASK FORCE ON GRADUATE AND POSTBACCALAUREATE
EDUCATION IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) endorse the principles and recommendations of the Task Force on Graduate and Postbaccalaureate Education in the CSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly urge that the Chancellor’s Office, together with the Academic Senate CSU, review the recommendations of this report and establish a definite plan of action for graduate program development and maintenance to be submitted to the Board of Trustees; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly urge that individual campuses, through the shared governance process, retain autonomy in their graduate degree programs, guided by the principles and recommendations articulated in the Report from the Task Force on Graduate and Postbaccalaureate Education in the California State University.

RATIONALE: The committee structure and process that developed the report, California’s Prosperity at Stake, was a model of shared governance. The committee comprised selected members of the Academic Senate CSU, representatives of the CSU Graduate Dean’s Council, and representatives of the Chancellor’s office. The committee’s work was done in consultation with the campuses, very frequently with the offices responsible for graduate and postbaccalaureate education, along with campus senates. It was this balanced solicitation of input from sources external to the committee that marked its adherence to shared governance principles.

This report builds upon and extends the previous CSU evaluation of graduate education, The California State University Master’s Degree: Implementation and Quality (Dinielli, 1989). The Task Force found this report as relevant today as it was 15 years ago.

AS-2652-04/EX motion will be a second reading item at the May 6-7, 2004, meeting.
APPENDIX: Reports

IMPAC Meeting - Sacramento, January 2004—Barry Pasternack

The steering committee met on January 30 to discuss procedures that should be adopted to govern sending out Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) correspondence. Discussion quickly broadened to the role of the steering committee, lead faculty, and IMPAC itself. Bob Cherny mentioned that CSU was contemplating changes to the IMPAC process that would ensure CSU departments were “on board” with descriptors and curricular changes recommended by IMPAC. Julie Adams proposed a series of questions that she asked the group to respond to. These included the following:

1. Do we need to create a more extensive review process?
2. When information is developed (transfer information) how can we ensure that the appropriate representatives have contributed to the discussion (i.e., discipline faculty, articulation officers, counselors, etc)?
3. How do we ensure that the lead faculty member has complied the true voice of the discipline? What do we need to determine the accuracy of the reports? Is this necessary?
4. The Steering Committee reviews the annual report at the end of each cycle. How can we ensure that all discipline faculty agree with the recommendations? Should there be an extensive review of the report by the Steering Committee? Could other discipline faculty leaders identify concerns in other disciplines? Is this necessary?
5. Is it enough to list the recommendations in the annual report? Or should the Steering Committee discuss the recommendations and any cross-disciplinary ramifications?
6. How can we add more credibility to the process? Should ICAS just accept the report? Or should they approve the report? If so, what do we need to do so that ICAS is comfortable for approving recommendations for disciplines?

Members of the Steering Committee agreed to e-mail their responses to these questions to each other. They will be worked on at the next Steering Committee meeting which is scheduled for Friday evening, February 27. The Regional IMPAC meeting was held on Saturday, January 31.

The following disciplines have CAN descriptors ready to go to CAN: anthropology, chemistry, criminal justice, earth sciences, geography, psychology, and sociology. In discussing with Julie Adams the importance of “buy in” by the CSU chairs of these disciplines, she agreed to find rooms during the statewide IMPAC meeting on Friday, April 30, for those disciplines which wish to have a meeting of CSU chairs (or curriculum chairs). Bob Cherny also requested that the history department chairs have such a meeting. The cost of attending will be borne by IMPAC.

I have discussed this with the Project on Lower-Division Requirements in Majors (POL) leaders and have heard from some that such a meeting was not necessary since campuses have already “bought into” the changes. In one case the discipline leader stated that the CAN descriptors are not what the Chairs agreed to and I will alert Julie of this fact. In two of the disciplines (anthropology and earth sciences) there currently are no POL leaders. I have asked Bob Cherny to request assistance from John Karras to try to organize discipline meetings in these areas.

The IMPAC Steering Committee met on Friday evening, February 27, 2004. The principal topic of discussion was planning for the statewide IMPAC meeting on April 30 and May 1. Julie
announced that for disciplines that had their CAN descriptors ready to go before the CAN Board, CSU faculty chairs would be invited to meet in the morning of April 30 (prior to the start of the statewide meeting) if the lead for these disciplines thought this was necessary.

The group felt that for the statewide meeting there needed to be a revised presentation of the opening IMPAC program as most attendees would have already attended a regional meeting. It was also suggested that we try to get a speaker for the luncheon on Friday. The lead faculty for the three systems will meet to finalize the schedule for statewide meeting as well as develop the morning presentations. Attached you will find a preliminary draft of the schedule for the statewide meeting.

On Saturday, February 28, the regional meeting for the LA basin was held.

DRAFT IMPAC Agenda
Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum

Statewide Meeting
Radisson Hotel, LAX Airport
6225 West Century Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90045
(310) 670-9000
Preliminary Schedule
Subject to change

FRIDAY, APRIL 30, 2004
10:00 a.m. Breakfast Reception

10:30 a.m. Opening Presentation [Lead Coordinators/Director will meet to discuss details of Presentation]
William Fink, Barry Pasternack, Mark Snowhite
IMPAC Lead Faculty Coordinators

11:00 a.m. Discipline Group Discussions

12:30 p.m. Lunch [Luncheon Speaker – to be determined]

2:00 p.m. Discipline Group Discussions (Continued):

4:00 p.m. Large Group Discussions: What are the Roadblocks?

5:00 p.m. Dinner on your own
Steering Committee Meeting (until 5:45 p.m. to discuss Saturday Agenda)

SATURDAY, MAY 1, 2004
8:30 a.m. Breakfast

9:30 a.m. Response to Roadblocks

10:30 a.m. Cross Discipline Discussions
During this time, discipline groups will meet with one or more related groups of discipline faculty to pose questions or pursue similar concerns, or discipline groups may continue to discuss among themselves matters raised in the morning session.

12:00 noon   Lunch
1:00 p.m.   Cross Discipline Discussions (Continued)
2:45 p.m.   Adjournment

Commission for the Extended University Meeting, February 6, 2004—Barry Pasternack
Senate members in attendance were Ted Anagnoson (LA), Myron Hood (SLO), Barry Pasternack (FUL), David Spence (CO), and Tom Warschauer (SD).

It was announced that a report on International Education is being finalized and should be available for the next meeting. Barry Pasternack suggested making the report available on-line rather than in printed form for the Commissioners in order to save money.

There was much discussion on summer school. It was reported that the Chancellor has given campuses approval to offer summer classes in either a state-support or self-support mode (or a combination of the two). The only proviso is that the fees charged to students for the summer term have to be the same as during a regular state-support term.

It was reported that campuses are approaching this in a variety of ways. Two campuses will remain fully on state support (Hayward and San Diego) while at Dominguez Hills there will be some classes on state support and some on self support. Four to six campuses have not yet decided how this would be done. It was mentioned that at least one campus may try to opt out of summer teaching altogether. Reference was made to Executive Order 879 (see [http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-879.html](http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-879.html)). For faculty on campuses that will hold the classes based on self support the salary schedule 2357 will be used. Mention was made of the arbitration that took place regarding summer school and how the arbitrator found that the system not standardizing summer faculty salaries was a contentious issue.

There was discussion of Executive Order 753 (see [http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-753.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-753.pdf)) which called for auxiliaries paying their fair share for the use of campus resources. The sentiment of the Commission is that Extended Education should not be considered as an auxiliary operation to the university. It was decided that further research would be done on this issue and it would be taken up at the April Commission meeting.

A number of Deans of Extended Education indicated that they felt left out or an afterthought by the Chancellor’s Office. An example of this was the call for input on technology agreements that were being negotiated by the CO.

There was a discussion of the Commission budget. This will be finalized at the May meeting. It was mentioned that the Extension programs should be providing the CO with .001 of gross income, but this has not been collected for some time. It was indicated that Extension has provided other funds to the CO.

An RFP subcommittee was formed with Barry Pasternack and Ted Anagnoson representing the Senate. This committee will meet in late March or early April to review the proposals sent in for funding by the different Extension programs.
The last item of business was a review of a presentation on Extension programs in the CSU that will be made at the May Board of Trustee meeting. While the presentation was a good first effort, there was general agreement that it should be “punched up” somewhat and that examples from each campus should be given.

**Student Administration Function Team Meeting (CMS), February 18, 2004—John Tarjan**

Announcements

- Richard West communicated with the campuses that those campuses scheduled to begin implementation of modules in 04/05 will be allowed to defer for one year.
- All 6 Banner campuses are going to request a deferral to 2008.

Implementing Campuses Reports

*Fresno*—the on-line (as opposed to printed) schedule was a big flop. Will go back to printed schedule again but hope to gradually move to all web-based registration (and phase out phone-in) soon. Are effortsing a move to have grades due before Christmas. Dealing with wait-list issues. Budget constraints have made things difficult. Overall, IT staff is optimistic.

*Sonoma*—working on student fees, 1098T (IRS) forms. Are having problems sharing education pages with Cal Maritime (through CSU Mentor). Making progress on the remediation modification. Training and testing take up a lot of time, particularly faculty training (grade entry, etc.). Students can print transcripts. In March, students will be able to do change of address, etc. in self-service. Will soon be on 100% web registration—making progress on web grade entry. Are making progress on required reports to the CO.

*Long Beach*—just completed first term totally under PeopleSoft with only minor problems. Problems using Blackboard to upload grades—a patch is being developed. Faculty desire this, especially with large sections. Some minor problems encountered in various areas but overall things are working well. Waitlisting, post-payment, etc. are causing some adjustment problems but LB is overcoming them. Have discontinued legacy system, but have image backups of all student transcripts from the old OASIS system. Post-payment is a change. Hope to handle summer just like normal terms. Working on changing product/method/fees for credit cards for web payment. Have loaded 47,000 applications for next fall. Have experienced some performance problems—also some bugs in scheduling registration on the web, etc. A little nervous about performance problems when self-service degree audit comes on-line. Require students to have an “official” e-mail address—has worked well for notifications. Students maintain own addresses, e-mail addresses—some transition problems but is superior to mailings for a variety of reasons. Need to use “overkill” in notification to students. No additional security forms for portal access unless degree audit or transcripts are needed. Have dedicated web terminals on campus to facilitate student self-service, registration when phone isn’t feasible.

*San José*—have moved through most of implementation to operation. Budget constraints have limited some feature implementation. Progress is being made on admissions. The biggest faculty training problem revolved around passwords. Are producing good transcripts. Some problems with advising. Financial side working well. Have missing student e-mail addresses. Looking at a one-way e-mail communication system (viruses less of a problem). Finance, financial aid skittish about using e-mail notification only.
Channel Islands—web-only registration began this fall. Are gradually automating processes. Limited staff is hindering implementation. Faculty want a waitlisting function. Faculty did web grading—only one faculty member showed up for training. Passwords were the biggest issue. Transfer credit is an issue. Have cleaned up some CO reporting issues, have changed some business processes.

Chico—in the midst of implementation. Are encountering more complexity than anticipated. Pre-payment for continuing ed is a problem. Beginning to build a course catalog—complicated by revision of course numbering.

Pomona—are in midst of implementation. Biggest challenge is encountering legacy data issues. April will be a very busy month with registration overlapping new implementation. There are some different issues for implementation on quarter campuses.

Common Themes: performance problems, faculty training, difficulty in processing registration and payments, difficult to get campus to change to e-mail only notification, hard to know if some performance problems are due to central processing in Utah or local portal capacity. Dealing with transfer credit.

Systemwide Reporting
• Things seem to be going much more smoothly for reporting. Many of the bugs have been worked out by individual campuses.
• Some interest expressed in doing 1098T processing cooperatively within the system.
• Campuses need to look early on at the programs (mapping sheets) in order to generate reports. The CO may need to be flexible on formats/schemas—one of the stickiest problems of implementation. Formats tend to be arcane. A campus with 15,000 students submitted an electronic report that generated 50,000 errors.
• ELM/EPT, EO665 issues are unique to our system—no system (including PeopleSoft) would have these reporting capabilities. We need to remember that we have all spent a lot of time putting unique reporting functionality into them over the years.

Data Warehousing
Looking at the creation of ad hoc, other reports that campuses may want to create. Can some standard reports, etc be generated from existing data or does additional data need to be built into tables?

There is a possible data warehousing effort to develop a schema which would be flexible enough to support local campus reporting needs.

Banner Campus Update
Banner campuses are looking at ways in which they can pool resources to facilitate conversion to SA. They are starting to meet together and contact vendors. Are looking at coming up with a plan of attack within a year.

Legacy Campus Participation in Teleconferences
SLO—have been participating in teleconferences. Has been valuable in developing a list of issues to be addressed, learning terminology.

San Bernardino—has been very helpful. The conversion is already time-consuming, the teleconferences are valuable. Understanding issues before implementation is invaluable.
San Marcos—listening to other campuses is very useful. Campuses interpret terms, policies differently.

Systemwide Initiatives
- Credentialing specialists from across the system are getting together to look at processes, data used to do credentialing analysis, reporting.
- Are working on a modification to baseline to handle international applications on CSU Mentor, including ERS (INS) information.

MISC
- Budget constraints are affecting the ability of campuses to send people to user group, other meetings.
- The waitlisting function is being developed. Appears to have many features which would be appealing to faculty.
- SCT has made an informal proposal to the CSU to do a systemwide Banner implementation. Unlikely that this proposal will be seriously considered at this advanced date of CMS implementation.

Report on CSU Council of Library Directors (COLD), February 26-27—Hank Reichman
COLD held its third meeting of the academic year at the Palm Desert campus of CSU San Bernardino (located conveniently near the intersection of Frank Sinatra and Gerald Ford Drives). The main objective of the meeting was to assess the status of current and contemplated COLD initiatives and priorities in order to set the stage for development in 2004-05 of a new library five-year strategic plan. Hence, much of the meeting was devoted to a series of reports, several of which contained information of interest to non-library faculty, including:

ATelling Our Story@: COLD has begun a more coordinated effort to ATell the story@ of the CSU libraries, including both some of the remarkable successes the libraries have enjoyed and the challenges they face. A presentation was made to the Technology Steering Committee and a second presentation to the provosts is scheduled for April. I would urge the Senate Executive Committee to arrange for a similar presentation to our plenary in May. For those who may think that libraries are Aold-fashioned@ it is useful to note that last year there were more than 25 million visits to CSU libraries, 5 million items were checked out, 306,000 students received library instruction, 157,000 items were borrowed between CSU libraries, and CSU library websites received more than 70 million Ahits.@

Information Competence: Ilene Rockman of the Chancellor’s office reported system, regional, and national developments. The joint project between the CSU and the Educational Testing Service on information competence continues. Faculty may find items of interest at the CSU Information Competence website (http://www.calstate.edu/LS/inforcomp.shtml). Ilene has also edited a volume to be published in April 2004 by Jossey Bass/Wiley entitled Integrating Information Literacy into the Higher Education Curriculum: Practical Models for Transformation, with contributions by CSU librarians and faculty including Rockman, Patricia Breivik, Sue Curzon, Renee Curry, Pam Baker, and Pat Sullivan, which should be of considerable interest to many faculty.

24/7 Reference Project: This is a project in which CSU libraries are cooperating with other libraries nationwide to provide continuous online reference assistance. At present 15 CSU libraries are participating, with 6,000 online sessions between September 2003 and February 2004.
Unified Information Access System: In its 1994 strategic plan COLD designated as its highest priority a project to plan, design, and implement a Unified Information Access System (UIAS), defined as a single, easy to use, integrated, and coherent computer-based user interface for access to library resources. UIAS has evolved into a suite of products that offers a common user interface. The applications that collectively make up the system can be used by CSU libraries to offer access to electronic and traditional library information and that each library can customize to suit its needs. At present the components of the system are:

$ MetaLib, which is the user interface offering the opportunity to search multiple electronic databases using a single search statement. In Spring 2003 a CSU version of MetaLib was developed that the various libraries may use or customize. MetaLib also provides an e-journal module that can provide browsing and title keyword and ISSN searching of journals. Some CSU libraries already have a complete list of journals in all formats available to their users via MetaLib. At present 5 CSU libraries are using components of MetaLib and 11 others are working on configuring it.

$ SFX, which takes the user directly from a citation in the search results screen in MetaLib to the full-text of an article if the library has a license to that full-text resource. SFX can be used independently, but its performance is enhanced in conjunction with MetaLib. At present SFX is available at all but 2 CSU libraries.

$ The CSU Union Catalog, which is a composite of the catalogs of all the CSU campus libraries. It has a current count of 4,224,977 bibliographic records resulting from merging duplicate bibliographic records among 13,142,117 such records from individual CSU online catalogs. This allows library users to search the entire CSU library system for materials. The Catalog is including within the LINK+ system, so CSU libraries that are members of LINK+ (about half) may only use the catalog indirectly.

$ The Resource Sharing System (RSS), which uses a locally customizable web form to allow a user in one CSU library to directly request a book from any other CSU library. Placing requests through RSS is also available through SFX. Again, libraries who are members of LINK+ may not use this system directly.

$ Remote Patron Access, which is an application that allows each CSU library to authenticate its registered users when they need to access the library’s electronic resources from a computer outside the university’s IP domain.

COLD discussed a series of recommendations for future development of UIAS. It was agreed to terminate the UIAS Management Team and turn over management of the initiative to the COLD Executive Committee as of June 30. It was also agreed to work toward the integration of the various UIAS components with Blackboard and WebCT. One possible vehicle for doing this, a product called Sentient Discover, was demonstrated. Essentially, this product (or another similar to it) would allow faculty to create a kind of digital version of a course reserve list that students could then access directly from a class Blackboard or WebCT site. Unfortunately, its cost may be prohibitive for the time being.

Electronic Core Collection (ECC): The Electronic Core Collection presently consists of 16 electronic databases. The principal criterion for a database’s inclusion in the ECC is the desire of at least 15 libraries in the system to acquire it. Acquisition of the database is then negotiated centrally by the Chancellor’s Office, which bears a portion of the costs (presently $2.4 million is borne by the CO). It will come as little surprise to senators that the availability of funding not only to expand but merely to maintain the current ECC is a major issue facing CSU libraries. Many
faculty, especially in the sciences, may know that the pricing policy of Elsevier’s Science Direct poses a particular problem. CSU’s contract with Elsevier has another year to run, but UC recently renegotiated its contract and COLD heard with interest a report on that negotiation. To prepare for possible budgetary reductions the CSU library directors were polled to rank the importance to their collections of each of the databases. The results of this polling will help guide any decisions to eliminate parts of the collection, although there was unanimity in COLD that all the databases were important and that, if anything, the ECC should be expanded, not contracted. Indeed, COLD received detailed information on database usage by campus, which indicated that usage of all the databases had increased, sometimes dramatically, on just about all campuses during the past two years.

Central E-Book Collection: COLD received a report on the central e-book collection, which now consists of more than 5,000 titles. COLD voted to authorize the CO to begin negotiating renewals at the present level of funding for the collection, although a final decision on a recommendation for e-book funding was deferred until COLD makes decisions on the 04-05 central library budget. A usage report demonstrated that use of the e-book collection has also increased significantly in the past three years.

COLD also reviewed and discussed some preliminary numbers related to the 2004-05 Systemwide Library Resources budget. This year available revenue was $3,600,000, of which $1 million was a one-time allocation. Assuming a 10% reduction in the general fund allocation, the 04-05 budget may total $3,430,000, which includes $1 million in lottery funds carried forward from previous years. Much of this reduction may be met through the prepayment of ongoing software and other expenses, including licensing and maintenance fees for SFX. In this quite preliminary assessment, funding for the ECC will rise slightly to $2.5 million and e-book maintenance would increase to $200,000. COLD voted to request the CO to retain as much of the balance from this year’s budget previously held for other purposes (about $100,000) for use next year either through prepayments or rollover. Since the budget discussion took place before the March 2 election, however, no final or even tentative decisions could be made and COLD will return to the budget in greater detail at its June meeting, which will be held at CSU Stanislaus.

Subcommittee for GE Course Review, March 8, 2004—Ken Nishita

The annual review of California Community College (CCC) submissions by the GE Course Review Subcommittee was completed in mid-February. This year both submissions and reviews were partially done using the web-based prototype known as OSCAR. OSCAR (Online Services for Curriculum and Articulation Review) is a web-based system for the CCC to use in submitting course outlines to CSU and UC for review during the annual IGETC and CSU GE Breadth update cycle. There were approximately 600-plus courses submitted this year; the majority of submissions were screened by the CSU staff based on the flexible authority previously outlined by the GE Committee. The faculty review was facilitated this year, by the well-established Staff Review process as well as the separation of course reviews among the academic disciplines, including arts/performing arts, chemistry, history, mathematics, and social sciences. Next year 2004-2005 will attempt to use OSCAR to a much greater extent in the hope of moving toward a completely web-based review process in the future.

CSSA January Conference: San Diego State

Board of Directors (Saturday): The Board of Directors heard reports from Special Officers, Student Trustees, the Chancellor’s Office Liaison, and Bob Cherny. We also had two special presentations: Josh Wood, CSU Sacramento and student representative to the systemwide Health Advisory Committee, and also had a presentation from Patrick Lenz, which was very insightful on the current state of the CSU budget.

University Affairs: UA had three information items – 1.) Cal State Cares/FAFSA Workshops, a report was given on the status of CSSA participation in FAFSA workshops. 2.) the University Affairs Priorities were discussed with regard to our next steps. 3.) Sustainability Conferences and Activities, the committee discussed the game plan for the March Board of Trustees meeting regarding the Sustainability Policy. We also discussed the UC students’ coalition “convergence” February 6-8 at UC Santa Barbara. We also had one action item, a resolution supporting Outreach Programs in the CSU.

Ad-hoc Shared Governance: This committee defined shared governance, will forward our definition to the full board in March. We also developed criteria for the Shared Governance award that would be directed at campuses. We also drafted amendments to the July 2001 BOT resolution on Shared Governance, in order to strengthen the language. Finally, we also decided to discuss the issue of Shared Governance with the Alumni Council at our meeting in Fresno.

Ad-hoc CSU Budget/Student Fees: The committee discussed the Governor’s Budget proposal for FY 2004-2005. The committee took the position of opposition regarding the budget implications to the CSU.

Board of Directors (Sunday): the Board took the following action on Sunday, January 24: CSSA Awareness Campaign was approved. This program is designed to raise the level of awareness of CSSA on campuses. Legislative Affairs reported that all items were information. Findings from the Higher Ed Committee were distributed; none of the 6 options considered are going forward at this time. With regard to the March primary, we had 12,000 new student registrations, and we are close to the 40,000 goal. Textbooks bill is being written up; there will be an actual bill to review in March. There will be 2 press conferences this month, and the California Public Interest Research Group (CalPIRG) report being released [January 29]. University Affairs moved to approve the Resolution In Support of Preserving Educational Opportunity, Outreach, and Academic Programs within the CSU. Committee on CSU Budget/Student Fees sought approval of the Governor’s Budget Proposal, with the position of opposition. Passed

CSSA February Conference: California Higher Education Student Summit (CHESS IX)

CHESS was a great success. We had many great presenters and many interested students that benefited from them all. In addition to the workshops, the CSSA held our annual Lobby Day, where representatives from each campus lobbied our individual legislators and policy makers. Special thanks to Dr. Bob Cherny and Dr. Kathy Kaiser for taking time out of their personal lives to be present for the entire weekend! All official Board business was postponed until the upcoming March CSSA meeting in Fresno.

COMPLETE CSSA MINUTES AND AGENDAS AVAILABLE ONLINE AT:
www.csustudents.org

Faculty Affairs Committee – Chair Marshelle Thobaben
Two resolutions: (1) Academic Freedom, (2) Summer term
Textbook bills: AB 2477 and AB 2678
Subcommittee formed to review the CALPIRG Report and make recommendations to increase faculty awareness regarding textbook prices and ethical issues associated with faculty use of textbooks.

Chancellor’s Office administration searches: after consulting with Beverly Young and Allison Jones, FAC has given its recommendation to the executive committee regarding faculty membership in these searches.

Honorary Degrees: FAC will be reviewing campus policies for meaningful faculty involvement in these recommendations.

* * * * *

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m. on Friday, March 12, 2004.

* * * * *

Approved (or corrected)

Date:________________________ _______________________________

Robert W. Cherny, Chair

_______________________________

David Hood, Secretary

_______________________________

Margaret Price, Recording Secretary

* * * * *