March 05 Plenary Minutes

1) **CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, March 10th, 2005 by Chair David McNeil.

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

3) The agenda was approved as amended (reordering if resolutions).

4) The minutes of the January plenary were approved.

5) **ANNOUNCEMENTS/INTRODUCTIONS**
   a) Chair McNeil introduced George Blumenthal, Chair of the University of California Universitywide Senate.
   b) $264 million was raised by SLO in their 100th anniversary campaign. The endowment has grown from $40 million to $140 million. There are now 20 endowed chairs on the campus.
   c) Cheryl Mason was introduced as a new senator from San Diego.
   d) There was a discussion of the implications of the Long Beach Grand Prix for our April interim committee meetings.
   e) Manal Yamout, was introduced as a representative from CSSA.
6) REPORTS
   a) Chair—a complete text can be found on the website.
      i) The first round of the LDTP process is almost completed.
      ii) SB 724 (Scott, applied doctorates) is going forward. It has our senate support, with reservations about adequate funding to maintain quality.
      iii) A statement on graduate education developed jointly with the UC faculty leadership has gone to the legislature.
      iv) An SB 5 (Morrow, student academic rights) subcommittee of the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) has been formed to provide testimony and materials in opposition to the bill. There may be hearings as soon as the 30th of this month. We are leery of provocations on campuses designed to stimulate conflict, which will bring publicity to this issue. Please let the Executive Committee know if there are incidents on your campus.
      v) We will be selecting candidates for faculty trustee today. Materials are available for review in the senate office.
      vi) We have been focusing on facilitating graduation. It is a priority for the system. While there are enrollment pressures and the desire to move student expeditiously through to graduation, we have some reservations about the desirability, effectiveness and consequences of some proposed solutions to perceived problems.
      vii) Outside employment—the CSU will not be proposing legislation this year on this issue. Disclosure of outside employment is on the bargaining table. We hope that campuses will work on local policies to address this issue. We appreciate the work of the joint CFA, administration, ASCSU task force.
      viii) We are awaiting developments in CAN and/or an alternate CSU process to meet the mandates of SB 1415 (common course numbering).
      ix) We are looking at the judicious use of senate assigned time for committee work.
   b) Academic Affairs (Ted Anagnoson)
      i) The committee received a report from Keith Boyum on LDTP and applied doctorates.
      ii) Facilitating graduation—we are looking at incompletes, repetition policy, early selection of major.
      iii) Resolutions before the body.
         (1) Advising
         (2) Athletics
         (3) Remedial education
         (4) SAT writing test
c) **Faculty Affairs** (Jan Gregory)
   i) VC McClain and CFA President John Travis visited to make presentations.
   ii) We discussed the following issues.
       1. Potential changes to PERS.
       2. SB 5
       3. The MPP Hiring Process
       4. Faculty Salary Equity
       5. International Faculty Issues (hiring, security, foreign speakers)
       6. Access to instructional technology, class materials for students with disabilities.
   iii) Resolutions Worked on:
       1. Collective bargaining—there may be protracted negotiations.
       2. CMS Implementation.
       3. USA PATRIOT Act
       4. Expert Banks
       5. PERS/Retirement

d) **Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** (Hank Reichman)
   i) We met with Wess Larsen via teleconference to discuss the CSU legislative program.
   ii) CFA Political Action Chair Susan Meisenhelder met with us to discuss the CFA legislative agenda.
   iii) Legislation Discussed
       1. SB 5 (Morrow), “student bill of rights” is unlikely to come out of the CA Senate Education Committee. We are coordinating our response with the Executive Committee.
       2. SB 724 (Scott), applied doctorates, has support in the legislature.
       3. SB 1796—Accountability
       4. AB 992—eavesdropping authorization for CSU sworn officers. CSU is supporting it. There were reservations in the committee expressed about the bill.
   iv) Discussed the budget. We have concerns about the LAO analysis pertaining to higher education.
   v) Are discussing potential changes to PERS.
   vi) We met with CSU CIO David Ernst to discuss our CMS resolution. He indicated that campus cost/benefit analyses could be undertaken regarding the implementation of the Student module. Our resolution has been amended to request this for the campuses yet to implement.
   vii) April 4th and 5th will be lobby days in Sacramento. We will be meeting with local legislators and members of the Senate Education Committee and Assembly Higher Education Committee. Will be
discussing the CSU budget and SB 724. We will likely have a dinner meeting on Monday April 4th.

e) Teacher Education and K-12 Relations (Marvin Klein/Gayle Hutchinson)
   i) We discussed the recommendations contained in the Presidents’ Commission on Teacher Education. We are concerned about the recommendations regarding RTP and the process by which the report was developed. We are planning to develop a joint resolution with other committees on the necessity for consultation in shared governance.
   ii) Math/Science preparation is being addressed programmatically by the UC, with the CSU asked to be a partner in the initiative. The CSU has not been consulted.
   iii) We are looking at SB 724.
   iv) The state is redesigning the accreditation process for teacher education programs. We are developing feedback on proposals.
   v) The committee has distributed a survey on blended programs.
   vi) We have a resolution on the agenda in support for federal TRIO outreach programs.
   vii) We are looking at State Board of Education guidelines for teaching—in particular, the use of textbooks and learning outcomes.

f) CPEC—Susan McKillop provided a lengthy written report. Chair Carol Liu of the Assembly Higher Education Committee is the only holdover on the committee. Master Plan hearings are continuing.

g) Faculty Trustee Nominating Committee Chair Jim Wheeler reviewed the procedures for nomination and the accompanying activities to be undertaken today.

h) GE Course Review Subcommittee Chair Ken Nishita reported that 1800 courses were submitted for review. This is an increase of 800 over last year. The reviews were conducted on-line via OSCAR after an orientation session at the Chancellor’s Office. This greatly facilitated course review. In the future, faculty will be able to download course outlines directly from ASSIST. We are looking for reviewers in the Arts and Humanities areas. The Senate could benefit from any suggestions for reviewers.

7) PRESENTATIONS

a) Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence thanked the Senate for its good work on the Early Assessment Program and the LDTP process. Trustee Achtenberg will be with us later. She has a particular interest in these issues. The Board of Trustees is very interested in our progress in implementing the suggestions from the facilitating graduation report and campus-facilitating graduation plans. We are very interested in reviewing course repetition policies. Some campuses have no policies. Campuses need to make decisions on the specifics but the issue needs to be
addressed at a system level. We are also interested in early declaration of major, mandatory advising, etc. We are pursuing the authorization for independent applied doctorates. We have some difference of opinion about the need for this authorization with the University of California. We will continue to support our joint EdD programs. Still, we feel that the demand for these programs greatly outweighs the capacity of these joint programs. There has been a great increase in the demands for applied advanced education. The UC remains the premier research, PhD granting institution in the country. The CSU is in a better position to offer these applied doctorates. California is lagging far behind the other large states in the possession of EdDs by educational professionals. Given our high state standards, assessment and accountability demands, and the diversity of students in our state, our school administrators should be the most qualified professionally instead of lagging behind the rest of the nation by a wide margin. We can envision demand for at least 400 of these degrees per year. Many other educational groups are supporting this authorization. We will just have to agree to disagree over this issue with our UC colleagues. We have different missions, orientations. This makes it difficult to make joint programs work effectively. Q: While we have supported the authorization, we have concerns about funding. A: We may approach funding at a national or UC level of support. We will discuss this with you. We will develop a cost, subtract the state contribution, and set fees accordingly. Q: How can we maintain quality and still produce the number of degrees you are talking about? A: The demand is there. I know we need to consider hiring faculty to meet the demand. Q: We heard your commitment to these degrees but existing programs cannot hire faculty given our salaries. A: We can raise fees significantly to raise more revenue and still be very attractive in our pricing compared to other alternatives. The Board will look very closely at resources and quality when approving new programs. Q: Have you considered the very different missions of the polytechnics when developing the LDTP patterns? A: (Keith Boyum) There are guarantees that local campus programs will not be forced to change as a result of these patterns. (David Spence) We recognize this. If there is a sound reason for programs to be differentiated on a particular campus, it can be accommodated. Still, I have been heartened by the progress in establishing systemwide patterns.

b) George Blumenthal, Chair, University of California Universitywide Academic Senate addressed the senate. He appreciated the visit of David McNeil to the UC Academic Council. He is impressed by the similarities of issues of interest across the UC and CSU faculties. He has noticed this in the work of ICAS (Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates). ICAS is looking at coordinating the various transfer initiatives
and evaluating our accrediting agencies. We share common views and interests in these issues. Dr. Blumenthal reviewed the role, functioning of the UC senate. The faculty has control of academic degrees, curriculum, program initiation and discontinuation, and admissions standards. They also give advice on budget and academic personnel matters. Their campus senates are viewed as subunits of the universitywide senate. They are engaged with administration in a major vision/strategic planning effort for the UC. They are looking at faculty recruitment and retention, international partnerships, graduate education, educating a growing and increasingly diverse population, and partnerships with business and industry. They have invested much more energy in tracking and responding to legislation. In some ways, they are trying to emulate the fine example of the CSU senate. They believe that the proposed changes to PERS and the UC retirement system could be the most damaging development to higher education in the state. It has been a great tool in faculty retention. The UC has developed a joint communication and resolution on graduate education with our CSU colleagues. Hopefully, this concurrent resolution will be adopted by the legislature. They hope that the disagreements of doctoral education will not divert attention from other very important joint issues such as funding graduate education, budget and reducing the SFR. As academics, we should all read and evaluate the separate UC and CSU reports on the joint EdD. The Senate establishes admissions policy. While eligible students may be admitted, they often will not be admitted to the campus of their choice. While Santa Cruz and Riverside have taken these students in the past, Merced will likely be asked to take these students even though the demand for admissions seems to far exceed capacity. We are looking at (and have approved in principle) two transfer-related proposals 1) a SciGETC GE transfer pattern and 2) a requirement that all UC campuses accept courses accepted by at least 4 UC campuses. The local campus senates approve curriculum. The universitywide senate approves graduate programs as well as new schools/colleges. The senate is taking a stand on the publishing of stem cell research funded by Prop 71 and is encouraging the ICOC to require published research papers to be posted on a free site within 6 months. Our senate agendas are very similar. We are concerned about enrollments, funding, student diversity, the PATRIOT Act, etc. Q: What are the UC objections to the CSU doctorate authorization. A: We should be careful changing the Master Plan and we believe the demand for EdDs is much lower than Dr. Spence believes. Q: Why is the UC participation been so sparse in IMPAC? A: Our senate does not have close ties to campus departments, not as close as in the CSU. We have made appointments to IMPAC leadership and our record is better of late.
c) **John Travis, CFA President**, reviewed the collective bargaining situation. CFA is concerned about diminishing student access. 15,000 eligible students did not enroll who were eligible. There are concerns about some LAO analyses, including a reduction in the marginal cost in funding enrollment in the CSU. CFA agrees with the CSU administration about the inadequacy of marginal cost funding. The LAO is proposing reducing support for the CSU even as demand is increasing and we need additional funding just to restore previous levels of service and quality. CFA is very concerned about the potential changes to PERS. George Diehr is initially visiting the 10 largest campuses to discuss the attack on the retirement system. The proposal to change CalPERS from a defined benefit plan to a defined contribution plan in the legislature is probably DOA. The Governor will attempt to effect changes by initiative. The Governor has also proposed other changes regarding redistricting and public employees that we are following. The CFA and CSU administration have submitted their initial proposals for collective bargaining. The CSU proposals will not become “official” until approved by the Board next week. The CSU is proposing merit based pay. **Q**: The proposal is to drop the FERP limit to 2 years. If this is the case, what is the advice do you have for people close to retirement? **A**: I’m not sure how serious they are about eliminating FERP. They are more concerned about the length of FERP based upon administrative issues raised by the presidents. We are fighting hard to keep the program as it is. We were able to keep a 5-year limit in this interim period. The students are supporting ACR 73, which deals with increasing tenure, tenure-track faculty and lowering the student/faculty ration. **Q**: There is a problem with starting salaries for some disciplines. Can CFA address salary caps in range? They are hurting us in business. We cannot hire. **A**: We are paying attention to this issue and the issue of “salary compression.” We have not found a quick fix but are concerned. **Q**: What is your view on outside employment reporting and the 25% rule on overload especially as it applies to quarter campuses? **A**: We did not adequately address the issue of semester vs. quarter campus differences on a variety of issues. The CSU administration sponsored legislation on outside employment. We have a joint CFA/Senate/Administration task force working on the issue. The contract has a provision that outside income be reported upon request. We will probably deal with this through bargaining. **Q**: Does the CFA monitor tenure track ratios, provisions of ACR 73? **A**: In bargaining, we set targets for tenure track searches. Given traditional hiring yields, these targets would have resulted in progress in meeting ACR targets. The recession has put a stop to our progress. Lecturers make up over half of the total faculty in the system. **Q**: What about limiting access until tenure-track faculty are in place? **A**: We are
arguing for additional funding for access, which eventually will result in more money for faculty hiring. We all know that the SFR is creeping up.

d) **Chancellor Charles Reed** began by discussing the budget for 05/06. Our proposal seemed to be well received by the legislature. We expect no changes until May. We have not denied any eligible student. However, we have employed enrollment management techniques to achieve our targets. After a last minute $84 million reduction last year, measures were taken to limit applications, etc. Many of the students who did not come to CSU were not fully eligible and likely ended up on CC campuses. We accepted all fully eligible students. We guaranteed admission to all transfer students to the campus of their choice. Every student who applied was admitted in his or her service area. Our unfunded needs to meet quality and other priorities like deferred maintenance are over $1 billion. While we are putting on a brave face, we are woefully under-funded to fully carry out our mission. Our admissions cycle make fine-tuning enrollment difficult. We should meet our long-term enrollment targets in the fall of 2005. Chancellor Reed then addressed summer terms. We will have to work around the arbitrator’s decision regarding summer work. We cannot afford to run summer session within the arbitrator guidelines. We anticipate very thin summer offerings. We were forced to pay full cost for undersubscribed courses taught by full professors on some campuses to get students through, even though those faculty that had originally agreed to teach them for a small fraction of the ultimate cost. Regarding USA PATRIOT Act: 2 CSU students were involved in hijacking the plane that crashed into the Pentagon. The apartment of a CSU student was used to plan the bombing of the USS Cole. There was a CSU faculty member who was a double agent. We need to do a better job of tracking our international students. **Q:** The retirement system is a great recruiting tool. What is happening with the Trustee who is behind the proposed changes? **A:** The Trustee in question is not behind the proposed changes. We know that this would devastate higher education. Current employees are grandfathered in. We recruit outside of California. We need to be more like the UC in our pension system and be nationally competitive. I think people have been receptive to our needs. There have been signals from the Governor’s office that there may be some flexibility in their position. **Q:** Do you have a timetable for replacing Dr. Spence? **A:** No. We have been very busy with presidential searches. We would like to find another David Spence quickly. He is the best the CSU has had. **Q:** We know our starting salaries in some disciplines are not competitive. We also have serious salary compression. **A:** I have the same problem hiring presidents. The faculty gap is 13.6%. The president gap is 49%. **Q:** The time is right to make our case for increased emphasis on, and funding for, graduate
education. A: This is a Cornerstones principle. We continue to raise the issue of graduate funding. We think a graduate differential in funding will be considered this year. We have faced tremendous first time freshman demand. Our average student age has gone from 27 to 23 during my tenure. Q: Where are you on an excess unit fee? A: I am opposed at this time. If other measures do not work, perhaps we should consider it. Until we do things like mandatory graduation plans and get GE and major prerequisites squared away, we should not try such strong solutions. Q: What do you think of the LAO analysis that shows we are overfunded? A: The LAO lacks credibility. Don’t worry about their report too much.

e) Trustee Roberta Achtenberg began by expressing her gratitude for what she hopes will be many opportunities to address the Senate. She is currently the vice-chair of the Board and will likely soon be the chair. Leadership of the Board is the capstone of her career in public service. She has been the chair of the Education Policy Committee in which she has been outspoken in supporting the mission of the CSU and defending it against threats to its mission. She highlighted initiatives such as facilitating graduation as the reason for the excellence or our system. She thanked the Senate for its good work. She also expressed admiration for the sacrifices and dedication of the faculty and laments the lack of pay raises. Compensation is a high priority for the Board. Q: How can the Senate do a better job of supporting the Board in its responsibilities? A: It would be helpful to have more interaction with the faculty when they are considering academic issues. Perhaps faculty could have regular meetings with the Education Policy Committee for increased interaction. Q: What will the Board do on proposed pension reforms? A: I am unsure what the Board will do on the issue. I intend to discuss this with the Chair and the Chancellor. My view is that a defined benefit program is a wonderful benefit and a part of the overall compensation package that in part makes up for deficits in salary. Q: President Zingg at Chico has a proposal to first achieve CPEC salary comparability and then implement merit pay. What is the Board view? A: The Board is interested. Our discussions on merit pay have been preliminary and unstructured. We are concerned about the lag in faculty pay, pension developments. I am very concerned about a 49% lag in presidential compensation. We may still want to look at merit pay before the CPEC gap has disappeared. I cannot say how I would vote on a merit pay proposal but I am sympathetic to your concerns. Q: We have increasing salary compression. New hires are making close to what many experienced faculty are receiving. We have great inequities. It seems a poor time to raise the issue of merit pay. A: Duly noted. Q: How can the faculty trustee most effectively provide input to the Board? A: I think it is currently being done very effectively. We value the opinion of the
The two that I have worked with have been assertive in expressing views and are listened to. The Board is very cordial and collegial. We could probably benefit from more formal interaction with the Senate. 

Q: Chair George Blumenthal discussed the role of the Senate in the UC. Admissions policies are determined by their Senate. In the CSU faculty are a minority on the Admissions Advisory Committee. That could change. We would like a faculty co-chair. How would the Board respond to a resolution proposing these changes? 

A: I’m not sure the Board members have a good idea of what the role of faculty in admissions is. We would rely on people like David Spence to provide insight and background on the issue. 

Q: It seems like enrollment targets are disconnected from campus resources to accommodate students. 

A: There are many factors that go into system, campus targets. It is complicated and we are struggling with insufficient resources. 

Q: We miss our interactions with the Trustees at our academic retreats, which have been suspended due to budget constraints. Could you meet regularly with the Senate Chair? 

A: Sounds good. 

Q: Other than merit pay and hiring difficulties, what will occupy the Board’s attention this coming year? 

A: I am focusing primarily on graduation initiatives. We have made progress but need to stay focused until these efforts are brought to fruition. The campuses are implementing facilitating graduation measures. We are making progress. I would like to see things move even faster. Advising is an important part of this effort. I am particularly interested in excess units, advising, and repeat policies. I am involved in The Campaign for College Opportunity and am interested in creating opportunities for all students. We lack the capacity and support to get millions of students through college. 

Q: Salary, the lack of doctoral programs, and the cost of housing are the three reasons why I cannot hire faculty. Could the Board work on a program to assist with housing? 

A: We have talked about a possible CSU home assistance program like the one we implemented in the city of San Francisco. It is time to come up with a creative financing program to attract new faculty and staff. 

Q: We think a brief (30-45) minute orientation of new trustees by the faculty would be a good idea. 

A: Sounds good. 

f) Faculty Trustee Kathleen Kaiser began by thanking the body for their vote of confidence in renominating her for another potential term. She reported on a joint visit with Chair McNeil to CSU, San Marcos. Advising was a source of common concern to both faculty and students even though those groups had not previously discussed their concerns. Several presidential searches are underway. The new Stanislaus president will be appointed next week. Commencements are coming up. At least one trustee tries to be present at each campus. Several items of interest are on the Board agenda for next year. There will be increasing pressure for
presidents to be involved in fundraising. There is great variation across campuses with regard to outside fundraising. It may be possible to create more experimental high schools on CSU campuses in addition to the one at Dominguez Hills. There will be a report on remediation. Campus facilitating graduation reports will be reviewed. Several Board members have interest in this issue. We will be looking at teacher preparation and the success of our graduates. Campus academic plans will be approved. There is great variety across campuses with regard to national accreditation. There are proposed changes to Title V language regarding non-discrimination. This arose out of a proposal for additional sorority housing on the SDSU campus. The provision regarding non-discrimination will be expanded to include other groups, with potential impact on fraternity and sorority practices. The CSU has been recognized for their success for preparation of Latino students.

g) **Manal Yamout, CSSA Academic Senate Liaison** is a biology major from San Marcos. We had a joint summit on budget with UC and CCC leaders and others. We heard presentations on the budget. We passed a resolution opposing penalties on excess units and one lamenting the lack of progress on sustainability. On April 20 we will have a protest at the Capitol and potential student walkouts. On May 9 we will engage in lobbying and other activities. We are strongly supporting a bill prohibiting age discrimination in Cal Grants. We have been busy lobbying and have visited each legislator. We are asking for 1.5% additional enrollment growth on top of the Compact, the restoration of a financial aid set-aside to 33% from 25%, and the passage of the Cal Grant bill. We are looking at SB 5 (student bill of rights). We are generally in opposition to the bill but are likely to offer changes to the bill. We are following up on campus grievance policies and procedures.

8) **EXECUTIVE SESSION TO NOMINATE FACULTY CANDIDATES**
(Thursday afternoon, Friday morning) Chair Jim Wheeler began by thanking the nominating committee and Ann Peacock for their good work. The format of candidate presentations and question/answer was reviewed. Presentations from the four candidates and responses to questions followed. The names of Kathleen Kaiser (Chico) and Craig Smith (Long Beach) will be forwarded to the Governor for his consideration.

9) **RESOLUTIONS**

a) **Reconsideration of the Student Administration Component of CMS**
(AS-2682-05/FGA) Second Reading
i) The resolution passed unanimously as amended.
b) Observing the 50th Anniversary of the CSU as a System and Preserving the History of the CSU and of Each CSU Campus (AS-2684-05/EX Rev.) Second Reading
   i) Senator Cherny was thanked for his work on this resolution.
   ii) The resolution passed unanimously.

c) Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT) Act (AS-2685-05/FA) Second Reading
   i) The title was changed.
   ii) Several clarifying amendments were made to the document.
   iii) The resolution passed unanimously.

d) The Effect of the Proposed Retirement Plan Modification on the CSU (AS-2693-05/FA) First Reading m/s Gregory/Warschauer
   i) The issue addressed in this resolution is very important and could have a dramatic impact on faculty in the CSU.
   ii) Some discussion centered on the distinction between defined benefit and other plans.
   iii) Employer/employee contribution levels are of concern.
   iv) George Diehr (CSU faculty member, PERS board member) has been visiting campuses to talk about related issues. Perhaps he could be invited to address the plenary as we are considering this resolution.
   v) Editorial suggestions were made.
   vi) Substantive suggestions for clarification/perfection were made.

e) Creating and Overseeing Faculty Expert Banks (AS-2686-05/FA) First Reading m/s Gregory/Kegley
   i) There will be a CO web page with information about potential speakers/experts. Campuses have their own lists/sites. This resolution intends to ensure that there is “fair access” for inclusion in these resources.
   ii) The resolution should contain a mechanism/responsibilities for ensuring that this goal is achieved.

f) The Role of Prebaccalaureate Programs (Remediation) in the California State University (AS-2687-05/FA) First Reading m/s Anagnonson/Thompson
   i) The intent of the resolution is to facilitate the retention and progress of admitted students who may require additional coursework in order to succeed in the CSU.
ii) This resolution is timely given the looming deadline (2007) regarding remedial education.

iii) A lengthy discussion of remedial education and student preparation prior to transfer ensued.

iv) Several senators indicated that remediation results have been more effective on CSU campuses than on CCC campuses.

v) The issue at hand deals with retention rather than admission.

vi) Several suggestions were made to perfect the resolution.

g) **Support for the Framework for Comprehensive Intercollegiate Athletics Reform by The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) (2003) (AS-2688-05/AA) First Reading m/s Anagnoson/Edelman**

i) The original resolution was changed dramatically from an earlier focus on the eligibility of teams to participate in postseason tournaments.

ii) This resolution would ask for support of reforms suggested by COIA.

iii) Much support was expressed for the intent of this resolution.

h) **Academic Senate CSU Calendar of 2005-2006 Meetings (AS-2689-05/EX) First Reading m/s Thobaben/Tarjan**

i) Conflict with the LB Grand Prix came up.

ii) There is great interest in reinstating the academic retreat.

i) **Actions Needed to Improve the Quality of Academic Advising in the CSU (AS-2690-05/AA) First Reading m/s Anagnoson/Van Selst**

i) A waiver was requested because of a desire by the Board to receive faculty advice prior to the Board meeting next year. The faculty may be cast in a poor light if we do not pass something prior to their meeting. We may need some additional time, even if it is today, to perfect the resolution. The fact that we have already passed a resolution on many of these issues probably indicates that our resolutions are neither remembered nor read carefully.

ii) Several wording changes were suggested.

iii) Reference to a prior resolution on facilitating graduation may be indicated since many of the points addressed in the current resolution are replication of the earlier resolution. We may also wish to simply reaffirm the previous resolutions.

iv) Lack of information and financial resources greatly handicap our ability to accomplish quality advising.

v) The resolution was tabled pending perfection by the committee during a working lunch.
vi) A revised resolution was submitted. A first reading waiver was granted.

vii) The committee feels that this may be the only resolution needed to accomplish the intent of the body.

viii) A resolved clause was added to address the seeking of additional funding to implement/improve the initiatives described in the resolution.

ix) The resolution was passed without dissent.

j) **Support for the Use of the “New SAT” in the CSU Eligibility Index**
   (AS-2691-05/AA) First Reading m/s Van Selst/Kellner
   i) The new SAT will have 3 sections—critical reading, mathematics and a writing component with various sections, including a 25 minute essay.
   ii) The College Board estimates 74% or more of all institutions will use all three components for admissions.
   iii) The recommendation is to include the writing section included in the computation of the CSU eligibility index.
   iv) Editing changes were suggested.

k) **Support for Federal TRIO Programs** (AS-2692-05/AA) First Reading m/s Klein/Wheeler
   i) These programs have been very useful for access and support of CSU students. They are currently up for review at the federal level.
   ii) These programs have proven to be successful. It may be a mistake to redirect these funds to other programs without a proven track record.
   iii) Recommendations for perfection were made.

10) The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 pm on Friday, March 11th, 2005.