

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

401 Golden Shore, Room 139 Long Beach, California 90802-4210
562-951-4010

MINUTES

Meeting of May 6-7, 2004

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. on Thursday, May 6, 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) Lyle Smith, Rudolph Vanterpool; (Fresno) Jacinta Amaral, 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) J. Ken Nishita; (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) Robert Cherny, Jan Gregory; (San José) David McNeil, Romey Sabalius, Mark Van Selst; (San Luis Obispo) Manzar Foroohar, Myron Hood; (San Marcos) Dick Montanari, Richard Serpe; (Sonoma) Philip McGough, Susan McKillop; (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:

Fred Hornbeck, New Senator from San Diego State University

Kathleen Kaiser, Faculty Trustee and Professor of Sociology, CSU Chico

Ron Kroman, CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (non-voting delegate)

Shailesh Mehta, CSU Board of Trustees

Ken Monteiro, New Senator from San Francisco State University

Mark O'Shea, New Senator from CSU Monterey Bay

Manolo Platin, California State Student Association Liaison to Academic Senate

Charles Reed, Chancellor, California State University

Lorie Roth, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs, Chancellor's Office

John Travis, President, California Faculty Association

Darlene Yee, New Senator from San Francisco State University

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--May 2004

I. Travels and Meetings

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

California State Student Association (CSSA) Board Meetings, Fresno, March 13; San Francisco, April 17: At both these meetings, I reported to the CSSA directors on our activities and the items on our upcoming agenda. In April, I also alerted the CSSA to SB 1335.

CSU Alumni Council, Fresno, March 13. I attended the quarterly board meeting of the Alumni Council and briefed them on recent actions by the Senate.

California Faculty Association (CFA) Board Meeting, Sacramento, April 23. I attended the meeting of the CFA board and reported on the recent work of the Senate. CFA adopted a resolution similar to ours that is pending on academic freedom.

CSU System Budget Advisory Committee, April 26. I attended this meeting via teleconference. David Hood was at the meeting in person, and our other two participants, Cristy Jensen and Bob Snyder, also took part via remote hookups. The central topic of the day was a proposal for a CSU fee policy, based on a cost of instruction defined as the total of general fund allocations and fees for the previous year and on ramping up to 1/3 of the cost of instruction over five years, the time it would take to do that without adding more than 10% per year to the previous level of fees. The Senate representatives indicated the Senate's position in favor of 1/4 rather than 1/3 with an eight-year ramp-up period as a way to keep annual increases modest. CSSA representatives also indicated that they support 1/4 rather than 1/3. Spread-sheets were distributed showing the year-by-year fee amounts for 1/3 but there were no data workups for other approaches.

CSU Academic Council, LAX, April 15. Budget and enrollment issues dominated discussions. Selections: If the CSU gets the governor's proposed budget, it will have taken a 21.6% cut over three years. The 2006-07 budget may be the first good one. The Department of Finance (DOF) is considering another 3% cut to the CSU; the Chancellor's Office (CO) has indicated that this would produce another 1.5% cut in enrollment plus a 21% fee increase for undergraduates. The enrollment reduction is likely not to be distributed proportionately but instead to be concentrated on the larger campuses since the smaller ones simply cannot take any more. The DOF and legislature are pushing hard that there be NO enrollment reductions. Most of the provosts agreed that keeping the reduction to 5% would be difficult if not impossible. San Diego State University, California State University, Long Beach, and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo are all turning away tens of thousands of CSU-eligible applicants. There was discussion of intra-CSU redirection like that done in the University of California (UC).

Regarding the Golden Handshake, Vice Chancellor Jackie McClain reported that the Governor's staff had insisted on recalculation of savings with different assumptions; the CSU was still able to show some savings, and she expects that the Golden Handshake will come through.

Regarding proposed United Auto Workers (UAW) bargaining unit: Negotiations are underway to identify the appropriate unit. UAW has defined a unit of students who grade, tutor, or teach. CFA is asking for those who teach based on a side letter with the CSU from some time ago. Some of those who grade do that for only a small part of their pay, and do clerical work for

most of their pay; CSEA is asking for those. CSU is asking that the unit not include any students receiving federal work-study funds.

I also attended the Provosts' Technology Steering Committee meeting afterward. The PTSC, in a conference call at a time when I could not participate, rejected most aspects of the organizational plan that the Senate executive committee developed in March. There is now a new proposal from the provosts. There was also discussion of progress toward several of the technology initiatives.

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), April 30. Bob Snyder, Jackie Kegley, Lynne Cook, and David McNeil joined me in attending ICAS, and Barry Pasternack came for the part of the meeting dealing with the Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum system (IMPAC). Discussion topics included pending legislation, the possibility of redefining the relationship between the Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) and the California Articulation Number System (CAN), transfer issues (including our pending proposal), the acceptability of community-college online courses for transfer credit in meeting CSU GE breadth requirements, and the CSU Senate's executive committee proposals for redefining the governance process of IMPAC. There was agreement to develop an executive committee consisting of the chairs of the senates of the three segments.

Campus Visits Trustee Kaiser and I visited Bakersfield on March 18, Hayward on April 6, and SLO on April 28-29. We have one more campus visit scheduled, to Dominguez Hills on the afternoon of May 19. During the course of the academic year, I'll have visited with the senates or with the senate leadership on 13 campuses (Chico, Sonoma, San Francisco, Hayward, San José, Stanislaus, Bakersfield, SLO, Channel Islands, LA, Dominguez Hills, Fullerton, and San Diego), and I'll have been on 5-6 more campuses in some capacity or another, mostly for CSSA or Alumni Board meetings (Sacramento, Fresno, Maritime Academy, Northridge, San Marcos, and perhaps Pomona yet to come), for a total of 18 or 19. Getting to see campuses I'd not visited before and meeting with the local senate leadership has been a treat, and I'm sorry that I couldn't make it to Humboldt, Monterey Bay, San Bernardino, and Long Beach.

II. Other Activities

Legislative activities Several senators took part in the CSU Legislative Day on March 22, including nearly all members of the executive committee. We met the evening before to discuss our approach to various bills, especially SB 1785. We had good discussions with a number of staff members, thanks primarily to the good advance work done by Cristy Jensen. Cristy and I also met with legislative staff on April 12, to build upon and extend the previous conversations. Cristy, Marshelle Thobaben, and David McNeil ably represented the Senate on April 28, at a Senate Education Committee hearing that included a number of bills of interest to us; I was not able to attend that day. Because of Cristy's good advance work, we were the only organization to have its opposition to SB 1335 registered for the committee. Cristy and I will also be in Sacramento on May 4, to meet with legislative staff members regarding specific legislation that concerns us and also to take part in a hearing of the Assembly Higher Education Committee. Cristy has organized a reception, on May 13, for the first recipient of the award created by the Senate last year for a CSU alumnus/a serving as a legislative staff member.

One of our goals for the year was to develop new ways of involving the Senate in the legislative process in Sacramento. Under Cristy's leadership, we have come a long way toward realizing that objective. We now have good working relationships with some key legislative staff

members who have responsibilities for higher education. Cristy and I have talked about ways to continue this year's gains when we both step away from our current roles, and we have some plans in the works that we hope will accomplish that. We all owe Cristy a great deal for the important work that she's done for the Senate this year in the legislative arena.

Naming Facilities Review Panel There have been no problems recently regarding inadequate documentation of faculty involvement in campus proposals for naming facilities.

Working Group on Outside Employment All three parties have named their representatives to this group, but the first meeting has not yet been held.

Search for a Permanent Senate Executive Director Due to problems with schedules, we have not yet been able to interview the applicants for the Senate executive director. Those interviews are now scheduled for May 17, and we hope to announce a decision soon afterward. The committee includes Bob Snyder, David Hood (replacing Jackie Kegley, who is unable to attend on that day), Shirley Sparkman, Pat Henry, and me.

Senate Foundation Account We now have a CSU Foundation account. You'll recall that I requested, early in the year, that you all use your airline frequent flyer miles to pay for one trip to a Senate meeting and that you use your hotel program points to pay for one stay during a Senate meeting. Some of you indicated that you prefer to donate to the Senate's foundation account. You may now do so! Bring your checkbook to the May plenary and talk with Shirley Sparkman about how to make it out.

III. Wrapping It Up

This is my last report to you as chair. I want to wrap it up with some personal comments and some recommendations, some of which get so tangled up together that I'll leave it to all of you to sort out which is which.

First of all, thanks to all of you for your very good work this past year. Thanks too for the way that you've all pitched in to keep travel expenses under control. I'm attaching a budget report for the third quarter of our fiscal year, and you'll see that we have managed, so far, to live within a much tighter budget than what we've been used to in the recent past.

Last May, I was very pleased after the election of the executive committee. All of them have proven the wisdom of your choice. In addition, the four standing committee chairs have all been outstanding. I've relied on them for advice throughout this year, and they've always responded quickly and with excellent advice.

This year, we agreed to add the standing committee chairs to the executive committee's listserv list, and to encourage them to take full part in executive committee discussions at all times when it is possible for them to do so. I consider this to have been a completely successful experiment--I strongly recommend that the same arrangement be followed in the future. The executive committee benefits a great deal from the insights of the standing committee chairs. Many thanks for all their good work this year to Bob Snyder, David Hood, Lynne Cook, David McNeil, Jackie Kegley, Mark Thompson, Marshelle Thobaben, Cristy Jensen, and Marshall Cates. And thanks too to Trustee Kathy Kaiser for her advice and insight.

We all owe a vote of thanks to our Senate office staff. Most of you see them only during plenaries, but I quickly came to understand that they would respond quickly, competently, and completely to virtually anything I asked of them. And they go all out during plenaries to make

certain that everything functions smoothly. Many thanks to Ann Peacock, Margaret Price, Shirley Sparkman, and Tracy Butler!

Finally, thank you for all the support you've provided to me this past year. It was, I'll admit, trying at times, but I always knew that I could count on the full support of the executive committee, the standing committee chairs, the faculty trustee, and all of you. I've appreciated your hospitality when I've visited your campuses. Being a member of the Academic Senate CSU is peculiar. I've come to know some of you better than I know colleagues in my own department. We socialize more than I do with most members of my department (an artifact in part of the amount of time we all spend in Long Beach). So, most of all, I am deeply grateful for your friendship. Perhaps the most difficult part of not running for reelection to the Senate is that I'll not be seeing you all on a regular basis, so I'm happy at least that we'll continue to see each other at Senate meetings next fall.

Best wishes,



And now for the photo location identification contest. I had an excellent one--as Jackie and Kathy can attest--but, unfortunately, I was not able to get the photo scanned. I thought I'd be able to do it on the spur of the moment, but my scanner isn't functioning, apparently. So I'm using a second choice. Here's the four past chairs of the SFSU history department standing on top of something. What is it? Where is it? The clue is on the left and perhaps the horizon.



* * * * *

COMMENTS BY LIAISONS AND VISITORS TO THE SENATE:

1. *Chancellor Charles Reed*

Even though the budget has declined 22% in three years, the CSU has tried to protect personnel. There are monthly meetings with the Presidents to ensure that this goal is attained.

The state administration is new, and it is both learning and changing day by day.

CSU's enrollment decline has grabbed the attention of the Governor as well as of the Legislature. The CSU is talking about authentic access: we should not admit students for whom we cannot provide classes and services.

In 2004-2005, the Governor must cut \$11 billion from the budget; this translates into about \$240 million for the CSU.

For 2005-2006, the state will have used up its accounting tricks and spent the \$16 billion bond; it will still have a \$7 billion structural deficit.

Higher Education is #2 on ALL lists. Further, last year the Legislature removed an extra \$84.5 million in the last days of budget negotiations.

The Department of Finance is unhappy with the CSU for reducing enrollment. However, the Governor is making many decisions himself and he will decide on the cuts and fees.

The CSU would like a compact with the Governor. This would ensure that the Governor's budget in January has a negotiated floor to which the legislature could add funds--provided the Governor doesn't veto the legislature's additions.

It is possible that there will be a tax increase next year, which is not an election year. Almost certainly there will be no tax increase in this (election) year.

2. *California Faculty Association (CFA) President John Travis* **Save the CSU Coalition**

There are 1100 partners ranging from large businesses to friends and alumni.

Budget politics: 14 Senate votes can stop business. We need legislative support for our budget. We need to get this message to the Governor.

The May Revise will be out May 13. We are asking our partners to communicate the CSU's needs to the Governor, the Department of Finance, and the Legislature.

Master Plan

Does California understand the Master Plan? It would appear that we have lost sight of the relationship of higher education to the State.

SB 1335

CFA is watching SB 1335, as is the AAUP. It poses a threat to academic freedom.

AB 2339

CFA sponsored this bill which would allow designees to attend Board Meetings and would prohibit the CSU and UC from having Board/Regents' meetings at the same time.

3. *California State Student Association (CSSA) Liaison Manolo Platin*

Well, I can't believe this year is coming to a close so quickly. It seems not long ago that I attended my first Senate meeting in September. This has been a great year for the CSSA, of course considering the budget.

Last month at SFSU, the CSU Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) Presidents conducted our annual student trustee interviews. We had a tough choice with many qualified candidates, but we did manage to cut the field to four finalists. Here they are in alphabetical order:

David Abella, San Francisco State University

Jesse Cerda, Cal Poly Pomona

Adam Dondro, CSU Chico

Corey Jackson, CSU San Bernardino

The Long Term Student Fee policy continues to be of critical importance to the CSSA. Negotiations with the Chancellor's Office have left our organization with certain tough choices. The CSSA maintains our position that students of California should not pay more than 25% of the total cost of education, that fee increases should be capped at no more than 8% a year, and with a ramp up time of 10 years.

The Excess Unit Initiative is another issue that the CSSA is trying to work on to the benefit and protection of students. We believe that any financial penalties designed to influence student behavior are reprehensible and should not happen.

Sustainability will be debated (finally) at the May Board of Trustees meetings, and we have kicked off a phone call campaign aimed at the Chancellor to develop a real sustainability policy with some teeth.

The CSSA has officially joined CFA's Save the CSU campaign and participated in the Los Angeles rally. Thanks to CFA!

In addition, CSSA has joined University of California Student Association's (UCSA) Keep California's Promise campaign, and we have helped plan a day of action on May 18, that will include a lobby day in Sacramento and a rally in LA.

The CSSA will meet at Cal Poly Pomona next weekend where we will debate several very important issues:

1. President of the Year will be decided upon
2. Student Bill of Rights (nothing to do with SB 1335)
3. Update our position on legislative bills
4. Discussion with our Chancellor's Office Liaison about the nature of campus-based fee referendums
5. Discussion on Intra-CSU transfer policies

At this point more than 18 of 23 ASI elections have happened and we have begun our transition period. This will include CSSA elections in June at Sonoma State and will culminate with our official transition meeting in July at the Chancellor's Office.

I want to thank the entire Senate for their collegiality this year, I learned a great deal. Specifically Trustee Kaiser continues to be an inspiration for students, and of course Chair Cherny has been an awesome ambassador to the student organization, and we

would love to continue the relationship between CSSA and ASCSU that we have developed this year.

4. Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence

Executive Vice Chancellor Spence introduced Keith Boyum, the newly-appointed Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. He also paid tribute to Lorie Roth and the other Assistant Vice Chancellors for taking up the slack after Gary Hammerstrom's retirement.

Vice Chancellor Spence thanked the Senate for its efforts in Core Alignment, the Early Assessment Program and Facilitating Graduation.

5. Trustee Shailesh Mehta

Trustee Mehta discussed the budget problems that are affecting both governments and universities across the nation. There is an underlying trend to fall behind in physical plant investment as well as in faculty compensation.

We need to increase our funding, and we need a long-term fee policy.

There are three problems/myths that need exploration:

*The Personnel Committee is working on Faculty compensation

*We need to stress quality above quantity, but this may be a greater issue in the schools than in the University.

*We need to understand that more money is not the only solution. Ingenuity and hard work must also be included if we are to solve the problems of higher education.

* * * * *

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 May 6-7, 2004, agenda, after minor reordering, was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The March 11-12, 2004, minutes were approved.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:

**AS-2642-04/EX ACADEMIC SENATE CSU CALENDAR OF
2004-2005 MEETINGS**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University adopt the following schedule for the 2004-2005 academic year:

<u>2004</u>		<u>Location</u>
September 9-10	Committees/Plenary	Headquarters
*October 8	Interim	----
November 10-12	Committees/Plenary	Headquarters
*December 3	Interim	----
 <u>2005</u>		
January 19-21	Committees/Plenary	Headquarters
*February 11	Interim	----
March 9-11	Committees/Plenary	Headquarters
*April 8	Interim	----
May 4-6	Committees/Plenary	Headquarters

; 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:

<u>2004</u>	<u>Location</u>
July 13-14	Headquarters
September 14-15	Headquarters
November 16-17	Headquarters
 <u>2005</u>	
January 25-26	Headquarters
March 15-16	----
May 10-11	Headquarters
July 19-20	Headquarters
September 20-21	Headquarters
November 8-9	Headquarters

*location and format to be determined

AS-2642-04/EX motion approved.

AS-2647-04/FGA RECOMMENDING ALLOCATION OF GRADUATE FEE DIFFERENTIALS TO GRADUATE PROGRAMS AND CREATION OF AN EXEMPTION TO THE DIFFERENTIAL FOR GRADUATE ASSISTANTS AND GRADUATE TEACHING ASSOCIATES

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

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend that graduate assistants and graduate teaching associates not be charged the graduate fee differential and be charged no more than the undergraduate fee rate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU communicate these recommendations to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees and urge them to develop a viable implementation plan.

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.

At many universities, because of their significant contributions to instruction, graduate assistants and graduate teaching associates receive a complete fee waiver. The CSU should at least limit fees for these students to the undergraduate fee rate.

AS-2647-04/FGA motion approved

AS-2645-04/AA SUPPORT FOR A SYSTEMWIDE CAMPUS-SPECIFIC TRANSFER PATTERN BY MAJOR 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 campus-specific transfer pattern by major degree program:

1. The creation of transfer patterns for each major 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 which offer that major degree program to count as units in the major degree program; the transfer pattern should resemble the academic road map experience of the native student so as not to disadvantage the transfer student.
2. The creation of campus-specific major degree transfer patterns for each major degree program specifying the additional transfer units beyond the systemwide transfer program which will be acceptable at the campus to

count as units in the major degree program; the transfer pattern should resemble the academic road map experience of the native student so as not to disadvantage the transfer student.

3. That community college students who have fulfilled the systemwide core/campus-specific 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.
4. That community college students accorded the highest admission priority under this transfer pattern must commit to a major degree program and campus no later than at the point of application to the CSU. That community college students electing to fulfill this pattern must complete the coursework within 70 CSU admissible baccalaureate-level units; 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 document the problem to be solved by the transfer pattern and to estimate the cost of implementation of the pattern; 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 Chancellor and the Academic Senate CSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor in consultation with the Academic Senate CSU to assess the impact of the systemwide campus-specific transfer pattern on enrollments, student retention, and time to degree. Such an assessment shall begin no later than three years after implementation; 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 (estimated at \$2.4 million) this large-scale initiative 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 142 units and transfer students with an average of 141. 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). According to a Chancellor's Office study of 1,952 transcripts of CCC transfer students who graduated from the CSU in 1999, transfer students take an average of 76 semester units after transfer; part of the reason for the high number of units may be 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. Beginning fall 2005, at least 60 units will be required 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 major degree program will take fewer units beyond those needed for the degree.

The transfer pattern must be achieved within existing policies, and, for many major degree programs, especially those that are not high-unit, lower-division preparation programs, the systemwide campus-specific pattern will likely include:

- 1. Completion of General Education Breadth requirements (39 semester/59 quarter units) or the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (37 semester/56 quarter units),*
- 2. Completion of the American Institutions requirement,*
- 3. Completion of a statewide lower-division major preparation pattern,*
- 4. Completion of any campus-specific lower-division major preparation courses, and*
- 5. Completion of elective courses to reach a total of 60 semester or 90 quarter units.*

The systemwide 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.

Program faculty may agree to more than 45/68 units in the systemwide major degree program core; however, there should be no coercion or expectation to go beyond 45/68 units.

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, especially those who achieve the highest priority admission status, graduate with fewer units.

**AS-2645-04/AA motion approved.
(attachment)**

**Academic Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate, California State University:
Q & A on Proposed Transfer Policy [3.7.04]**

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 impact 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.

**Academic Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate, California State University:
Q & A on Proposed Transfer Policy [3.7.04]**

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.

**DEFINITION OF SANCTIONABLE UNITS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR
CAMPUS FACILITATION OF PROGRESS TO THE DEGREE**

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; and be it, further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge, rather than using the above definition of sanctionable units as a means to penalize CSU students or campuses, that the Task Force on Excess Units recommend and the CSU Board of Trustees approve campus review and action in the following areas to facilitate students in their progress to graduation:

1. Each campus will conduct a careful survey of possible impediments to the progress to the degree.
2. Each campus will review its advising procedures with the goal of creating improved and mandatory advising that is the best fit for the campus's own calendar and particular mix of majors.
3. Each program that offers a degree or credential will review its plans for advising majors and for scheduling required courses and stipulated electives.
4. Each campus academic senate should review campus policies on repeating courses, changing majors, and registration to ensure those policies encourage students to graduate in a timely fashion; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend the following guidelines for campuses to use for adapting or developing campus policies:

1. Advising:
 - A. Require a timely declaration of major. In general, require that students declare a major after completing 25% of their total program (e.g., 30 semester units for a 120 semester-unit program, 45 quarter units for a 180 quarter-unit program) and before completing 40% (i.e., 48 semester units, 72 quarter units).
 - B. Require students to develop a personal graduation plan based on the declared major. Students should work with a faculty advisor in their major to develop a personal graduation plan permitting timely completion of the degree. If the personal graduation plan is not completed by the time the student completes 75% of the program, there should be a hold placed on registration until the plan is completed and approved by the appropriate advisor.
 - C. Perform a degree audit in the semester or quarter when a student reaches 75% of the program and inform the student and the student's advisor of missing requirements.

- D. Implement an automated degree audit system as soon as possible.
 - E. Put in place requirements such that when a student reaches 100% of the units needed for the degree program and does not graduate there are specified and progressively more stringent procedures that the student must follow until, at an appropriate point, the student is disenrolled for failing to make adequate progress toward the declared degree objective.
 - F. Campuses should provide adequate funding for both major and general-education advising.
2. Departmental plans and schedules:
- A. Each program should regularly review and, as necessary, revise its "academic road map" to ensure a clear and expeditious path to degree.
 - B. Each program should offer, as resources allow, required courses and stipulated electives regularly and on a predictable, published schedule.
 - C. For higher-unit sequential degree programs, the program faculty should develop alternative plans to assist students who take courses out of sequence.
3. Policies:
- A. Campuses should develop policies that discourage late changes in major.
 - B. Campuses should develop policies that discourage excessive course repetition.
 - C. Campuses should, to provide access to courses for the greatest number of students, develop policies that discourage registration for more than a full load of courses.
 - D. Campuses should give careful consideration to the role of "gateway" courses and inform students that inability to make the required grade in the courses indicates a different degree program choice.
 - E. Develop financial aid policy to encourage students to take degree-appropriate units and finish their programs expeditiously.

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 may not be 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.

The most effective action toward facilitating progress to the degree, however, is for each campus to build on the plans developed in response to Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree (2002). Only by identifying the relevant issues will the campus be able to move most effectively to resolve those issues. Results of

campus surveys of impediments are likely to vary; while Facilitating Student Success identifies some possibilities, it is unlikely that one size fits all. Further, each program that offers a baccalaureate degree should review the material in the report and adopt or adapt those best suited for its own situation.

AS-2646-04/AA motion approved.

**AS-2648-04/AA PRINCIPLES 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 or agreement on regional and statewide lower-division 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 degree program for the Integrated Teacher Preparation Programs and for the statewide campus-specific transfer patterns.
2. Faculty representatives from all affected campuses in the system or region will be included in decision making. Approval requires an explicit affirmative vote from the representatives.
3. Faculty and staff will be provided sufficient time and support to travel, meet, confer, and reach consensus or agreement.
4. In the event that programs, regions, etc. cannot achieve consensus, the position held by at least three-fourths of affected campuses will constitute the agreement for all affected CSU campuses within the system or region.
5. All program and curricular changes must be subject to consultation with elected faculty governance representatives at 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.
7. The real costs of implementing these large-scale programs in the CSU, including the necessary time and travel for faculty and staff, must be adequately funded.

RATIONALE: 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 governance 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 approved.
(attachment)**

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2626-03/AA
November 13-14, 2003

Integrated Teacher Preparation Program Framework for
Articulation: Principles for Implementation

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 AND FREE SPEECH RIGHTS

- 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 ensure that the campuses be 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 CSU or campus policy that would restrict academic freedom under justifications such as “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 approved.

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 call upon campuses that wish to offer credit-bearing classes on a self-support basis to charge student fees sufficient to offer courses of comparable quality and rigor to those 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 approved unanimously.

**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) cannot support SB 1785 as currently written; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU share interest of the authors of SB 1785 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 that 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 approved unanimously.
(attachment)**

SENATE BILL**No. 1785**

Introduced by Senators Scott and Alpert
(Coauthor: Senator McPherson)
(Coauthor: Assembly Member Liu)

February 20, 2004

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.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.

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

1 SECTION 1. Section 66739.5 is added to the Education Code,
2 to read:
3 66739.5. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the
4 following:
5 (1) The California Master Plan and supporting statutes place
6 utmost importance on the effective transfer of community college
7 students to the University of California (UC) and the California
8 State University (CSU) as a means of providing access to the
9 baccalaureate degree.
10 (2) In 2002, CSU enrolled 55,000 transfer students from
11 community colleges.
12 (3) Two out of three students who earn CSU baccalaureate
13 degrees begin in a community college.
14 (4) Effective use of state and student time and resources would
15 be maximized by students accruing fewer unrequired units in
16 earning their degrees.
17 (5) Additional access to community colleges and CSU will be
18 created by higher graduation rates and fewer nonessential units
19 taken.
20 (6) The state budget situation makes it urgent to streamline the
21 path of the transfer student to the baccalaureate degree.
22 (b) It is, therefore, the intent of the Legislature to ensure that
23 community college students who wish to earn the baccalaureate
24 degree at CSU are provided with a clear and effective path to this
25 degree, defined as follows:
26 (1) Knowing all degree requirements upon entering the
27 community college transfer program.
28 (2) Having reasonable access to required courses when needed
29 for effective progress to the degree.



1 (3) Having all community college baccalaureate-level course
2 units accepted by CSU upon transfer, as meeting requirements for
3 the baccalaureate degree.

4 (4) Having the opportunity to know and meet the same or
5 similar degree course requirements as counterpart freshmen and
6 sophomores who begin their study at CSU.

7 (5) Enabling community college students who transfer to a
8 CSU campus as fully qualified, as defined in subdivision (c), to
9 complete the remaining units required for the specific
10 baccalaureate degree within the total minimum units required for
11 that degree major.

12 (c) On or before February 1, 2005, the Chancellor of CSU shall
13 establish transfer student admissions requirements that give
14 highest priority to transfer students who meet the following
15 qualifications:

16 (1) Have earned at least 60 units of lower division coursework.

17 (2) Have declared a major program.

18 (3) Have met all lower division course prerequisites for the
19 major.

20 (4) Have met all general education requirements specified for
21 the declared major.

22 (5) Met any other campus-specific requirements specified by
23 the receiving CSU campus.

24 (d) (1) CSU campuses admitting students qualified in
25 accordance with subdivision (c) will make it possible for these
26 students to complete their baccalaureate degree in the minimum
27 number of remaining units required for that degree major.

28 (2) For purposes of this subdivision, the “minimum number of
29 remaining units” is the minimum number of units required for a
30 degree major after subtracting the number of fully degree
31 transferable units earned at the community college.

32 (e) The Chancellor of CSU, in consultation with the Academic
33 Senate of CSU, shall establish the following components
34 necessary for a clear degree path for transfer students:

35 (1) On or before February 1, 2005, the Chancellor of CSU, in
36 consultation with the Academic Senate of CSU, shall specify for
37 each baccalaureate program major a model core lower-division
38 transfer curriculum composed of at least 45 semester course units
39 that will be common across all CSU campuses offering specific
40 major programs.



1 (2) The 45 common course units shall be composed of general
2 education and, to the extent relevant, of lower division course
3 prerequisites for the declared major.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

40 (1) Completion of 60 units of college-level course work.



- 1 (2) Declaration of a major.
- 2 (3) Satisfaction of the general education and major course
- 3 prerequisites, as specified for the 45-unit common core curriculum
- 4 for the program major.
- 5 (4) Meeting any specific course requirements beyond the
- 6 common 45 units that are specified by the CSU destination
- 7 campus.
- 8 (h) A CSU campus shall guarantee that the transfer students
- 9 admitted under this section will be able to complete the
- 10 baccalaureate degree in the minimum number of course units
- 11 required for that degree.



AS-2653-04/FA CSU ADMINISTRATIVE SEARCH COMMITTEE PRINCIPLES

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) endorse the following principles for searches for CSU systemwide administrative positions:

1. When conducting a search for Chancellor's Office administrators who work with the Academic Senate CSU, there should be a significant faculty presence on the search committee, and
2. There should be a faculty majority on search committees seeking candidates for positions that have significant involvement with curriculum; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the application of these principles to the composition of specific search committees should be the subject of discussion between the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate CSU and the Chancellor, or the relevant Vice Chancellor or designee; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU request the concurrence of the Chancellor with these principles.

AS-2653-04/FA motion approved unanimously.

AS-2654-04/FGA BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 2005-06

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) request that the Governor and state legislature leave responsibility for allocating reductions within the CSU budget to the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor after consultation with the Academic Senate CSU and other constituencies through the System Budget Advisory Committee (SBAC), rather than mandate specific or targeted cuts; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees to secure funding that will ensure authentic access to a high quality education for those students admitted to the CSU and to limit enrollment to the number of students for whom the state has provided funding at the true cost, as opposed to the marginal cost level; and be it further

RESOLVED: That to assure high quality education, the Academic Senate CSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees to secure funding to reduce student/faculty ratios to their pre-1990 levels, and to provide and maintain adequate technology and library acquisitions to accomplish our educational mission; and be it further

RESOLVED: That to assure high quality education, the Academic Senate CSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees to secure funding to bring faculty salaries up to the level of California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) comparison universities and to secure funding to implement the recommendation of the Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 73 Task Force; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Chancellor and Board of Trustees consult with the executive committee of the Academic Senate CSU and the SBAC during the summer of 2004 when developing the proposed CSU budget for 2005-06; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be forwarded to the Governor, the leadership of the Legislature, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees.

RATIONALE: Specified and/or targeted budget reductions often have unintended and adverse consequences. Campuses are better able to implement budget reductions in the least painful way by adapting them to the unique nature of each campus.

Since the Donahoe Act of 1960, the state of California has sought to provide access to a quality education for all qualified students. The California code states, "The State of California reaffirms its historic commitment to ensure adequate resources to support enrollment growth." (66202.5). The code enshrined these goals in terms of the learning experience we as faculty provide: "It is the intent of the Legislature that the segments of higher education recognize that quality teaching is the core ingredient of the undergraduate educational experience." (66060). Current cuts in the CSU budget have undermined the master plan, while making it difficult to recruit and retain quality faculty.

AS-2654-04/FGA motion approved unanimously.

AS-2655-04/FGA motion withdrawn.

**AS-2664-04/FGA IMPLEMENTATION OF HIGHER STUDENT FEES
FOR REPETITION OF CLASSES**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge the Board of Trustees to implement a policy that charges students higher fees for repetition of courses beyond a certain limit.

RATIONALE: The Facilitating Student Success in Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree report of the CSU Task Force on Facilitating Graduation noted that the CSU should reconsider policies on drops, withdrawals and incompletes as well as work to reduce the number of courses students repeat. This resolution addresses these concerns.

At one CSU campus it was reported that in each of three semesters under study, 14% of grades earned were withdrawals, D or F. These are the grades that may require a student to repeat a class and these repeats can have a significant impact on campus resources.

When a student repeats a class, he or she is taking a seat away from some other student. Charging students a higher fee for course repetition should encourage students to be more careful in deciding how many courses to enroll in and should motivate students to do better in their classes. Additionally, in an era of declining state resources, such fees will generate the necessary funds for providing seats to students who have to repeat classes while not taking away resources from those students who are making good progress in their studies. Some allowance for repeating classes without penalty should be provided.

AS-2664-04/FGA motion failed.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) support the emphasis on access, high quality, and equity among the general policy goals proposed in ACR 193; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU applaud the statement in ACR 193: "The California State Legislature declares that a top priority in future state policy and budgets is the provision of opportunities for high-quality education"; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge Senator Scott and Assembly Member Liu to emphasize the importance of high quality by amending the third resolve clause, subsection (c) as follows:
The State of California, and its taxpayers, shall provide adequate and appropriate public investment in higher education *to accomplish the policy goal of high-quality teaching and programs of excellence on the campuses of California's public community colleges and universities and to ensure that all California high school graduates can attend a public college or university to secure the benefits of a college education; and be it further*

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate forward this resolution to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees and to Senator Scott and Assembly Member Liu.

RATIONALE: The Academic Senate Chair Robert Cherny advised the Assembly of Higher Education Committee in fall 2003 of the Academic Senate's deep concern with the erosion of quality in the CSU since the early 1990s. Many key indicators of quality were seriously eroded at that time, and most have not yet recovered. We are now experiencing a new round of budget-cutting, estimated at nearly 22% over three years (2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05), even though we have not yet recovered from the cuts of a decade ago.

This joint resolution by the chairs of legislative policy committees in both Houses of the California legislature declares "that a top priority in future state policy and budgets would be the provision of opportunities for high-quality higher education consistent with the Master Plan for Higher Education in California." The resolution sets forth the dimensions of the enrollment growth expected between 2005 and 2015, the short and long term deficit in revenues compared with current and projected expenditures and the resulting expectation to serve increasing numbers of students without a comparable increase in state funding, and the critical role of higher education in the economic growth and prosperity of the state. The resolution further recommits to the provision of opportunities consistent with the Master Plan including "all feasible steps" to provide access, the resources to support student success, and "ensure the most efficient use of limited state resources."

**AS-2656-04/FGA motion approved unanimously.
(attachment)**

Assembly Concurrent Resolution

No. 193

Introduced by Assembly Member Liu
(Principal coauthor: Senator Scott)

March 11, 2004

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 193—Relative to higher education.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

ACR 193, as introduced, Liu. Higher education.

This measure would declare that a top priority in future state policy and budgets would be the provision of opportunities for high-quality higher education consistent with the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. The measure would declare that the Legislature is committed to access to higher education for all qualified Californians, to high-quality teaching and programs of excellence on the campuses of California's public community colleges and universities, to educational equity through a diverse and representative student body and faculty, and to cost-effectiveness in institutional operations in serving students. The measure would also specify ways through which to achieve the provision of adequate opportunities for students to attend public higher education in California.

Fiscal committee: yes.

- 1 WHEREAS, Higher education has long served as the key
- 2 engine for California's economic prosperity and quality of life;
- 3 and
- 4 WHEREAS, Californians have long embraced the concept that
- 5 higher education is both a public good and a private good, and the

1 state has established the best public higher education system in the
2 world; and

3 WHEREAS, California's public community colleges and
4 universities provide economic and social benefits that far
5 outweigh the costs to the taxpayers; and

6 WHEREAS, California's colleges and universities are an
7 essential resource for providing all Californians with the
8 educational services they need to become economically
9 self-sufficient and productive members of our society, which
10 results in a higher quality of life for all; and

11 WHEREAS, Between 2005 and 2015, the number of
12 college-age young people will increase much faster in California
13 than in any other state, and therefore California's existing colleges
14 and universities will need to accommodate 20 to 30 percent more
15 students in fall 2015 than were enrolled in fall 2003; and

16 WHEREAS, California now has the opportunity to provide a
17 college education over the next decade to 1,800,000 Californians
18 who will otherwise not have a chance to benefit from higher
19 education; and

20 WHEREAS, California's state budget has both a short-term and
21 a long-term deficit in revenues compared with current and
22 projected expenditures, and our public colleges and universities
23 are therefore expected to serve an increasing number of students
24 without a comparable increase in state funding; and

25 WHEREAS, Economic prosperity and the availability of good
26 jobs require continued scientific innovation and a growth in
27 economic productivity made possible by advanced knowledge and
28 skills; and

29 WHEREAS, The completion of vocational programs, associate
30 degrees, baccalaureates, and more advanced higher education
31 degrees is essential for individuals and families to achieve
32 economic security; and

33 WHEREAS, The demographic composition of California is
34 changing rapidly, and the overall rate of college participation will
35 fall unless California achieves an increased rate of college
36 participation for groups previously underrepresented in our
37 colleges and universities; and

38 WHEREAS, The opportunity to enroll in college is the prime
39 factor motivating students to perform well in high school and to
40 complete a rigorous academic curriculum; and



1 WHEREAS, A cornerstone of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher
2 Education in California, adopted under the leadership of the late
3 Clark Kerr, was the promise that the “state would assure all
4 qualified students access to a quality higher education”; and

5 WHEREAS, The State of California has been unable to expand
6 opportunities for higher education in recent years to the extent
7 required by a growing number of high school graduates, thus
8 retreating from the promise of the 1960 Master Plan; and

9 WHEREAS, The proportion of the state budget that is devoted
10 to higher education has been cut dramatically in the past 20 years;
11 now, therefore, be it

12 *Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, the Senate*
13 *thereof concurring*, That the California State Legislature declares
14 that a top priority in future state policy and budgets is the provision
15 of opportunities for high-quality higher education consistent with
16 the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, including all
17 feasible steps to accomplish all of the following:

- 18 (a) Preparation of students to undertake collegiate level study.
- 19 (b) Encouragement of students to attend college.
- 20 (c) Provision of financial assistance to ensure affordability for
21 all college students.

22 (d) Provision of the instructional and physical capacity to
23 provide higher education for all eligible and motivated students
24 leaving high school; and be it further

25 *Resolved*, That the California State Legislature is committed to
26 each of the four general policy goals expressed below:

- 27 (a) Access to higher education for all qualified Californians.
- 28 (b) High-quality teaching and programs of excellence on the
29 campuses of California’s public community colleges and
30 universities.
- 31 (c) Educational equity through a diverse and representative
32 student body and faculty.

33 (d) Cost-effectiveness in institutional operations in serving
34 students; and be it further

35 *Resolved*, That the provision of adequate opportunities for
36 students to attend public higher education in California shall be
37 achieved in the following three ways:

- 38 (a) Governing boards of the three segments of public higher
39 education shall take all reasonable steps to ensure the most



1 efficient use of limited state resources to accomplish all of the
2 following:

- 3 (1) Enrollment of eligible students.
- 4 (2) Acceleration of student progress to a degree.
- 5 (3) Responsiveness to the highest state priorities.

6 (b) The Legislature and the Governor shall collaboratively
7 develop and implement a long-term student fee policy to provide
8 gradual, moderate, and predictable fee increases that alleviate the
9 'boom and bust' cycles of the past, with the availability of
10 adequate need-based financial aid to ensure that higher education
11 is affordable for all students.

12 (c) The State of California, and its taxpayers, shall provide
13 adequate and appropriate public investment in higher education to
14 ensure that all California high school graduates can attend a public
15 college or university to secure the benefits of a college education;
16 and be it further

17 *Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a copy
18 of this resolution to each member of the Regents of the University
19 of California, the Trustees of the California State University, and
20 the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.



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 to be submitted to the Board of Trustees for the development and maintenance of graduate programs in the CSU; 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; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU, together with the Chancellor's Office, explore the feasibility of differential fees for students in various types of postbaccalaureate programs and graduate degrees programs.

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 approved.

AS-2657-04/FGA

**HONORING DIANE CUMMINS, FIRST RECIPIENT OF
THE DISTINGUISHED LEGISLATIVE STAFF AWARD**

WHEREAS, Diane Cummins has provided expert fiscal and budget policy advice and guidance to policy makers in California for almost 30 years; and

WHEREAS, Diane Cummins has served with distinction as Chief Fiscal Policy Advisor to the President pro tempore of the California State Senate, the Senate's key budget staff person; and

WHEREAS, Prior to her current position, Diane Cummins served as Chief Deputy Director for Budgets and Deputy Director for Legislation for the State Department of Finance, capping a career of two decades in the Department; and

WHEREAS, Diane Cummins has given many hours to mentoring students, Fellows and interns, in the complexities of the budgetary policy-making process, giving her guidance, observations and insight freely and communicating her commitment to public service; and

WHEREAS, Diane Cummins is a frequent guest lecturer on budget issues to a variety of groups and public policy classes and has taught a graduate course on Public Budgeting at California State University, Sacramento; and

WHEREAS, Diane Cummins is an alumna of California State University, Sacramento; and

WHEREAS, Her career and contributions have demonstrated integrity, provided distinguished public service, and encouraged young people to pursue careers in public service; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University congratulate Diane Cummins as the first recipient of our Distinguished Legislative Staff Award to be presented on May 13, 2004.

AS-2657-04/FGA motion approved unanimously.

**AS-2658-04/FGA COMMENDATION FOR THE HONORABLE
DEIRDRE ALPERT**

WHEREAS, The Honorable Deirdre Alpert has served the people of California for six years as a member of the California State Assembly and eight years as a member of the California State Senate; and

WHEREAS, Senator Alpert has served in the legislature with great distinction, including chairing the Committee on Appropriations and co chairing the Joint Committee for the Master Plan for Education, serving as a member of the committees of Education and Higher Education, the Select Committee on College Admissions and Outreach, and other committees of importance to California; and

WHEREAS, Senator Alpert has been a visionary in her work in the California Legislature; and

WHEREAS, Senator Alpert has benefited the people of California especially through her service as Co-chair of the Joint Committee for the Master Plan for Education; and

WHEREAS, Senator Alpert has supported the California State University (CSU) along with other sectors of higher education while extending the principles of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education to the needs of all California citizens; therefore be it

avoidable) consequences that can weaken morale, erode personal relationships, constrain effective functioning of academic programs, and damage careers.

AS-2660-04/FA motion approved.

**AS-2661-04/FA ENDORSING THE AAUP STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ON
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) endorse the content and values embedded in the 1940 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comments; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend to each CSU campus senate that it endorse this Statement and incorporate it into its policies on academic freedom and tenure; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recommend this statement be taken to the Board of Trustees for ratification as a means of protecting the time-honored and traditional concept of academic freedom and tenure.

RATIONALE: One major right all teachers and professors have earned over a period of many centuries is that of academic freedom. This right has been vigorously guarded over time against attack from various critics—including those that purport to “expand” or “extend” freedom of expression but in fact do not.

The American Association of University Professors has developed the concept of academic freedom to fit American universities since 1940 (Redbook, <http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/1940stat.htm>).

AS-2661-04/FA motion approved unanimously.

**AS-2662-04/FA/FGA FINANCING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MASTER
PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) decry the continuing failure of the State of California to provide adequate funding for the California State University; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU ask the citizens of California and their elected leaders to reconsider the consequences of undermining the State’s long-standing social contract with those of its citizens in low and middle-income groups who are unable to meet the cost of baccalaureate and graduate or professional education; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU ask the citizens of California and their elected leaders to reconsider the consequences for the state's economic well-being of limiting access to the higher education that will drive the state's economy for the foreseeable future; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm its commitment to the cherished principles of affordability, access, and high quality contained in California's Master Plan for education; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU respectfully ask the California Legislature to generate and make available to the CSU revenue that would restore the social contract between the State and its citizens, thereby re-enabling the state to move toward restoration of its once-premier stature in the world economy; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be forwarded to Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, legislative leaders in the State Assembly and Senate, and media throughout California.

RATIONALE: The respective roles of government and individual citizens in any society are defined by a social contract that explicitly or implicitly specifies the expectations and responsibilities of each. In California, since the early years of the 20th century--under the leadership of Governors Hiram Johnson, William Stephens, C.C. Young, Frank Merriam, Earl Warren, Goodwin Knight, and Edmund G. ("Pat") Brown--there has been an unwritten social contract that assured citizens of government protection for the welfare of the very young, the low-income elderly, the infirm, and the disabled.

The State of California has for nearly 50 years included in that broad social contract the promises defined in the Master Plan for Higher Education (1960). As a result of the access to education assured by the Master Plan, the California State University (CSU) has provided the state with many hundreds of thousands of well-educated and well-trained professionals who have contributed their expertise to California, thereby contributing to the status of this state as the world's sixth-largest economy and generating by virtue of their work many hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue for the State.

The first major budget crisis of the new millennium has been so great in its scope, and so deep, that the survival of California's social contract with its citizens is in jeopardy, one specific consequence of that; and California has been unable to maintain its commitment to providing opportunity for California's diverse population to attain a moderately priced and high quality university education: in 2003-2004, because of reduced funding, the California State University was unable to enroll 5000 qualified students, and in 2004-2005 further budget reductions are likely to result in denial of access to the CSU of an additional 20,000 students. If this trend continues over the next five years 100,000 students will be denied access to the CSU. Operationally, this means that the economic and social future of California will be profoundly and for many decades jeopardized by the inadequacy of proposed funding levels for the state's institutions of higher education for 2004-2005 and their resulting inability to educate the teachers and child-care workers, nurses and other health care professionals, engineers, researchers, environmentalists, urban planners, linguists fluent in foreign-languages, corporate managers and leaders, and the multitude of other specialists whose expertise has built California's role in the world economy. It means also that the funding levels proposed by the governor's budget are so limited that they threaten to

diminish the quality of teaching and learning in the CSU, further eroding the economic and social well-being of the state.

But California's political leadership has the authority to increase state revenues or to revise the social contract in an open and considered arena. It is the belief of the Academic Senate CSU that the California legislature needs both to review in open hearings the state's commitment to the Master Plan for Higher Education and--if it wishes to maintain that commitment--to reconsider its ongoing reluctance to enhance state revenues by the simple and equitable strategy of increasing taxes for the state's wealthiest citizens. It is, further, the belief of the Academic Senate CSU that if the state is going to revise its social contract with its citizens that the consideration should take place in open hearings, the appropriate forum for a change of such magnitude.

AS-2662-04/FA/FGA motion approved unanimously.

**AS-2663-04/TEKR/FGA IN SUPPORT OF AB 2860 (PAVLEY): INTEGRATE K-12
ASSESSMENT WITH HIGHER EDUCATION**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) strongly support both the language and the intent of Assembly Bill 2860 (Pavley) - *Integrate K-12 Assessment with Higher Education* as introduced.

RATIONALE: This bill supports the Early Assessment Program (EAP) of the California State University by providing authorization for student data transmission to the CSU.

The EAP using California Standards Test (CST), taken in the 11th grade, allows students to earn exemption from the CSU's Entry Level Mathematics Examination (ELM) and English Placement Test (EPT) student-readiness placement requirement. Transmission of students' performance on the CST for early assessment of students' readiness for baccalaureate-level study at the CSU is essential.

**AS-2663-04/TEKR/FGA motion approved unanimously.
(attachment)**

AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 26, 2004

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2003–04 REGULAR SESSION

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 2860

Introduced by Assembly Member Pavley

February 20, 2004

An act to amend Sections 60607 and 60641 of the Education Code, relating to pupils.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2860, as amended, Pavley. Pupil assessment.

Existing law, the Leroy F. Greene California Assessment of Academic Achievement Act, provides a system of individual assessment of pupils. The existing act establishes, among other things, the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program and requires each school district, charter school, and county office of education to administer to each of its pupils in grades 2 to 11, inclusive, an achievement test and a standards-based achievement test. Existing law, commencing on July 1, 2004, will instead require the achievement test to be administered to pupils in grades 3 and 8, and the standards-aligned achievement test to be administered to pupils in grades 2 to 11, inclusive. Existing law repeals those provisions on January 1, 2005.

This bill would state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would improve that program and the pupil assessment data that it yields, as specified, and that would provide pupils enrolled in high school with ~~early indicia of the need for remedial coursework and encourage those pupils to complete that coursework before beginning postsecondary education.~~ *their readiness for postsecondary English and mathematics at the end of grade 11.*

Existing law provides that a pupil shall have an individual record of accomplishment that includes the results of achievement tests, end-of-course exams, and whatever vocational education certification exams the pupil chose to take, and prohibits the record of accomplishment from being released to any person other than the parent or guardian of the pupil, or a teacher, counselor, or administrator, directly involved with the pupil, without the express written consent of the parent or guardian of the pupil if the pupil is a minor, or the pupil, if the pupil has reached the age of majority or is emancipated. Existing law also prohibits individual results of achievement tests from being released without the permission of the parent or guardian of the pupil.

This bill would permit the release of the record of accomplishment, and the results of achievement tests, upon the express written consent of the pupil, and the permission of the pupil, respectively.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: ~~no~~ yes. State-mandated local program: no.

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

- 1 SECTION 1. (a) It is the intent of the Legislature ~~to enact~~
- 2 ~~legislation~~ to do all of the following:
- 3 (a) ~~Increase the validity of statewide pupil assessment data.~~
- 4 ~~(b)~~
- 5 (1) Reduce the need for additional pupil assessment and
- 6 redundant college placement exams where valid alternatives
- 7 already exist within the Standardized Testing and Reporting
- 8 (STAR) Program.
- 9 ~~(c) Improve the data used to assess effective educational~~
- 10 ~~strategies and school performance.~~
- 11 ~~(d)~~
- 12 (2) Encourage the University of California, California State
- 13 University, and California Community Colleges to utilize STAR
- 14 pupil assessment data for course placement decisions.
- 15 ~~(e)~~
- 16 (3) Provide high school pupils with an early indicator of the
- 17 ~~need for remedial coursework and encourage high school pupils~~
- 18 ~~to complete such requirements prior to entering college. their~~
- 19 ~~readiness for college-level English and mathematics at the end of~~



1 *grade 11, allowing high schools to work with pupils in grade 12 to*
2 *elevate skills to a level expected of a first-time college freshman.*

3 *(b) The Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State*
4 *Board of Education are authorized and encouraged to assist*
5 *California institutions of higher education to utilize the California*
6 *Standards Tests for course credit, placement, or admission*
7 *purposes.*

8 *SEC. 2. Section 60607 of the Education Code is amended to*
9 *read:*

10 60607. (a) Each pupil shall have an individual record of
11 accomplishment by the end of grade 12 that includes the results of
12 the achievement test required and administered annually as part of
13 the standardized testing and reporting program established
14 pursuant to Article 4 (commencing with Section 60640), results of
15 end-of-course exams he or she has taken, and ~~whatever the~~
16 vocational education certification exams he or she chose to take.

17 (b) It is the intent of the Legislature that school districts and
18 schools use the results of the academic achievement tests
19 administered annually as part of the statewide pupil assessment
20 program to provide support to pupils and parents or guardians in
21 order to assist pupils in strengthening their development as
22 learners, and thereby to improve their academic achievement and
23 performance in subsequent assessments.

24 (c) Any pupil results or record of ~~achievement~~ *accomplishment*
25 shall be private, and may not be released to any person, other than
26 the pupil's parent or guardian and a teacher, counselor, or
27 administrator directly involved with the pupil, without the express
28 written consent of *either* the parent or guardian of the pupil if the
29 pupil is a minor, or the pupil ~~if the pupil has reached the age of~~
30 ~~majority or is emancipated~~ *regardless of his or her age.*

31 *SEC. 3. Section 60641 of the Education Code is amended to*
32 *read:*

33 60641. (a) The ~~State Department of Education~~ *department*
34 shall ensure that school districts comply with each of the following
35 requirements:

36 (1) The achievement test designated pursuant to Section 60642
37 and the standards-based achievement test provided for in Section
38 60642.5 are scheduled to be administered to all pupils during the
39 period prescribed in subdivision (b) of Section 60640.



1 (2) The individual results of each pupil test administered
2 pursuant to Section 60640 shall be reported, in writing, to the
3 pupil's parent or guardian. The written report shall include a clear
4 explanation of the purpose of the test, the pupil's score, and its
5 intended use by the school district. ~~Nothing in this~~ This subdivision
6 ~~shall be construed to~~ does not require teachers or other school
7 district personnel to prepare individualized explanations of each
8 pupil's test score.

9 (3) The individual results of each pupil test administered
10 pursuant to Section 60640 shall also be reported to the pupil's
11 school and teachers. The school district shall include the pupil's
12 test results in his or her pupil records. However, except as provided
13 in this section, individual pupil test results may only be released
14 with the permission of *either* the pupil's parent or guardian *if the*
15 *pupil is a minor, or the pupil regardless of his or her age.*

16 (4) The districtwide, school-level, and grade-level results of
17 the STAR Program in each of the grades designated pursuant to
18 Section 60640, but not the score or relative position of any
19 individually ascertainable pupil, shall be reported to the governing
20 board of the school district at a regularly scheduled meeting, and
21 the countywide, school-level, and grade-level results for classes
22 and programs under the jurisdiction of the county office of
23 education shall be similarly reported to the county board of
24 education at a regularly scheduled meeting.

25 (b) The publisher designated pursuant to Section 60642 and the
26 publisher of the standards-based achievement tests provided for in
27 Section 60642.5 shall make the individual pupil, grade, school,
28 school district, and state results available to the ~~State Department~~
29 ~~of Education~~ department pursuant to paragraph (9) of subdivision
30 (a) of Section 60643 by August 8 of each year in which the
31 achievement test is administered for those schools for which the
32 last day of test administration, including makeup days, is on or
33 before June 25. The ~~State Department of Education~~ department
34 shall make the grade, school, school district, and state results
35 available on the Internet by August 15 of each year in which the
36 achievement test is administered for those schools for which the
37 last day of test administration, including makeup days, is on or
38 before June 25.

39 (c) The department shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that
40 the results of the test for all pupils who take the test by June 25 are



1 made available on the Internet by August 15, as set forth in
2 subdivision (b).

O



AS-2665-04/FA MAINTAINING QUALITY EDUCATION

RESOLVED: That the abysmal state of financial support for the California State University (CSU) has resulted in degraded educational quality and decreasingly limited full-time faculty resources, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU will not support the introduction of any new programs or faculty responsibilities that will incur financial costs for or demands on faculty, and be it further

RESOLVED: That existing faculty rededicate their energies primarily to maintaining quality of instruction, as degraded as it may be, while refusing new or divesting themselves of administrative/committee responsibilities that are not directly related to the central task of educating students with the aim of completing degrees.

AS-2665-04/FA referred back to committee.

AS-2666-04/TEKR COMMENDATION FOR SUE ROBB

WHEREAS, Sue Robb has served the faculty, Academic Senate, and the California State University (CSU) thoughtfully and professionally; and

WHEREAS, Sue's commitment to excellence in teacher education has been demonstrated by her work as an educator and faculty member in the Education Department at Cal Poly Pomona University through her service as co-chair of the department, and her introduction of the intern credential program in Special Education; and

WHEREAS, She has served on numerous systemwide committees on the preparation of teachers and administrators; and

WHEREAS, The CSU, faculty, and students have benefited from her diligence and commitment to teacher education; and

WHEREAS, All who have worked with her have benefited from her extensive knowledge of higher education in general, the CSU in particular, and the values and principles that underlie the actions taken in the name of shared governance; and

WHEREAS, Sue has provided sound, steady, and reliable staff support to the Committee on Teacher Education and K-12 Relations (TEKR) in a friendly, warm and personable way that belied the truth of the arduously long commute from Claremont to Long Beach; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University extend its deep gratitude for her time and efforts to improve teacher education in California, and its best wishes for her new professional life beyond the confines of her cubicle in Long Beach.

AS-2666-04/TEKR motion approved unanimously.

APPENDIX: Reports

California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) Meetings, March 8-9, March 30--Susan McKillop

The March 8-9 meeting included a number of items. Among these:

- *Recommendations on Higher Education Policies Contained in the Governor's Proposed 2004-05 State Budget.* It compares policy issues, fiscal implications, students impacted and CPEC staff recommendations. These include undergraduate, graduate and professional student fees, surcharge on excess units, reductions in student financial aid, funding for student enrollment growth, including no funding for growth, diversion of 10% of UC and CSU freshmen to the community colleges, provision for 3% enrollment growth funding to the Community Colleges; elimination of General Fund support for outreach programs at UC and CSU, increase of UC and CSU's student-faculty ratio, funds for UC Merced, and cost of living COLA increases at the community colleges, but not at UC. The CPEC staff position on each of these matters is presented.
- *Student Access, Institutional Capacity, and Public Higher Education Enrollment Demand 2003-2013.* The information item discusses the anticipated level of undergraduate demand for California public colleges and universities based on present economic circumstances. It makes alternative forecasts for undergraduate demand compared to current actual enrollments affected by changed fiscal circumstances.
- *Faculty Salaries at California's Public Universities, 2003-04.* CSU Professor, *actual* average salary 2002-03: \$83,409; Associate Professor \$67,303; Assistant Professor \$54,004, Instructor, \$41,686. The comparison group *actual* average salaries 2002-03: Professor, \$95,301; Associate Professor, \$68,874; Assistant Professor, \$57,103; Instructor, \$40,095. Comparison group *projected* 2003-04: Professor, \$98,827; Associate Professor, \$71,368; Assistant Professor, \$59,262; Instructor, \$40,683. *Percentage Increase required* in CSU Average Salaries to *Equal the Comparison Institutional Average* 2002-03: Professor 14.3%; Associate Professor 2.3%; Assistant Professor, 5.7%; Instructor, -3.8%. *Projected increase required to equal projected* 2003-04: Professor 18.5%; Associate Professor, 6.0%; Assistant Professor, 9.7%; Instructor, -2.4%. When these are weighted by CSU Staffing (headcount faculty) of 9.8% and Comparison Institution Staffing of 8.3% in 2002-03 and projected figures of 13.8% and 12.2% projected in 2003-04, the all ranks average actual for the CSU is \$69,508, for the actual comparison group, \$74,849; for the projected comparison group \$77,576. The result is an actual all ranks average shortfall of 7.7%, a projected average shortfall of 11.6%. The All Ranks Average shortfall for UC is 4.1% actual for 2002-03; 8.8% projected for 2003-04.
- The Legislative Update of March 2004 heard staff recommendations on current bills. These were presented in summary and matrix form.
- It examined the status of Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Program - Title II, Part A, No Child Left Behind Act, 2001. It examined the goals, federal mandates and 2003 funding initiatives relating to the program.
- *On March 30* CPEC completed its agenda of the March 8-9 meeting, a discussion of Title IX concerning gender policy in athletics. It found that gender was still unequally treated in high schools and community colleges, that the CSU and UC had made improvements in

Title IX opportunities, but that coaches and school administrators still needed further training in carrying out the mandates of Title IX.

- Other News: Murray Haberman was named interim Executive Director of CPEC.
- Many changes have been made to the CPEC site. Among the most useful are educational and demographic data on counties, these enriching the data earlier established for legislative districts. It is beginning to develop similar data on individual institutions and has posted a sample study of CSU Sacramento.

California Articulation Number (CAN) System Board Retreat, March 24, 2004--Barry Pasternack

The stated goal of the meeting was to come to an agreement on the new CAN model. The board was given a demonstration of Articulation System Stimulating Inter-institutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) and shown how the CAN agreements are treated by ASSIST. Some suggestions were made to revising the format for displaying these agreements on ASSIST.

Discussion ensued regarding the relationship of Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) system and CSU Project on Lower-Division Requirements in Majors (POL), how course descriptors will come to the CAN Board, and how duplication of work by IMPAC and CSU POL and/or conflicts can be avoided. Julie Adams reported that 24 new courses, 20 revised descriptors, and 1 core curriculum were sent forward by IMPAC to the CAN Board, but to date the Board has not seen most of these. Jose Michel indicated that these would be discussed at the next CAN Board meeting. Adams reported that she was communicating with CSU Chairs regarding these changes and that for certain disciplines, CSU Chairs will be meeting on April 30th at 8:00 am (prior to the start of the Statewide IMPAC meeting) to discuss proposed course descriptor changes. A subcommittee of the CAN Board was set up to define the CAN/IMPAC relationship. Pasternack and Swerkes will represent the Academic Senate CSU on this subcommittee.

There was discussion on SB 1415 (Brulte) dealing with common course numbering. Michel reported that this bill was not being sponsored by CAN.

There was discussion about the 2003-04 CAN budget, but as the year was nearly over it seemed to be a moot point. Pasternack indicated that the budget needs to be approved by the start of the fiscal year rather than the end. The Board will meet in May to discuss the 2004-05 CAN budget.

Following a lengthy discussion of the new CAN model it was agreed that Michel will present an implementation plan to the Board at the May meeting. Issues that need to be addressed in an implementation plan include: detail of CAN descriptors, catalog rights, length of time to revise courses, frequency of review, role of UC in this process, funding of the process, and designation that makes clear whether a campus is articulating to an old or new descriptor. A subcommittee was formed to assist in the development of this process.

Commission for the Extended University Meeting, April 9, 2004—Barry Pasternack

There was discussion of how extension programs should pay the campus for use of facilities and whether the treatment of extension programs should be similar to that of auxiliary services. See Executive Order 753 (<http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-753.pdf>). There was also some discussion of campus use of Continuing Education Revenue Fund (CERF) reserves and how there seems to be conflicted positions coming from the Chancellor's Office.

With regard to summer 2004, it was reported that 13 campuses have decided to go to self-support (with Bakersfield doing both self and state support), 7 campuses would continue on state-supported year-round operation (YRO), 2 campuses (Cal Poly SLO and Channel Islands) would not be doing a summer term, and Maritime Academy will be doing its cruise. It was also reported that for the campuses that have gone to self-support four compensation models were being used: Schedule 2357 – A, Schedule 2357 – C, overload paying 1/30th of salary per unit, and 85% of last summer's YRO compensation. Pasternack asked if the campuses that were continuing under state-supported YRO were going to be paying salaries based on 1/8th of annual salary per unit (as one would be lead to believe under Article 40.1 in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)). No one at the meeting could answer this and it seemed that many were surprised that the CBA calls for this.

There was some discussion of a white paper circulating among CSU business deans which calls for moving all MBA programs to self-support with the administrative function being handled by the business college on campus rather than the extended office. The Commission indicated that it should give input before any decision is finalized.

The Framework for Action document distributed was missing pages so discussion on this was postponed for the next meeting. It is hoped that this document can be finalized by May 2004. The final budget for the Commission for 2005 also will be presented at the May meeting.

It was announced that 17 requests for proposals (RFPs) were submitted to the Commission by Extended Education divisions. As the available funding for such projects is only around \$400,000 a subcommittee (with Pasternack and [Anagnoson](#) representing the Academic Senate CSU) met on April 19th to evaluate the proposals and make funding recommendations to the Commission.

It was also announced that a report on International Education would be sent to Commissioners in the next week

The meeting concluded with a discussion of the Extended Education presentation and brochure that will be presented to the Board of Trustees at their May meeting.

Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) System Meeting –Los Angeles, April 30-May 1, 2004 – Barry Pasternack

IMPAC had its statewide meeting in Los Angeles on April 30th and May 1st. There were a record number of individuals who signed up to attend (514). Many of the disciplines worked on finalizing course descriptors for submission to the CAN Board. A meeting of the IMPAC steering committee will be held later this month or in June to plan for next year's activities. As Chair Cherny indicated in his report, there is a new Executive Committee for IMPAC.

California State Student Association, (CSSA) 5/4/2004 – Manolo P. Platin, Liaison

Well, I can't believe this year is coming to a close so quickly. It seems not long ago that I attended my first Senate meeting in September. This has been a great year for the CSSA, of course considering the budget.

Last month at SFSU, the CSU Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) Presidents conducted our annual student trustee interviews. We had a tough choice with many qualified candidates, but we did manage to cut the field to four finalists. Here they are in alphabetical order:

David Abella, San Francisco State University
Jesse Cerda, Cal Poly Pomona

Adam Dondro, CSU Chico
Corey Jackson, CSU San Bernardino

The Long Term Student Fee policy continues to be of critical importance to the CSSA. Negotiations with the Chancellor's Office have left our organization with certain tough choices. The CSSA maintains our position that students of California should not pay more than 25% of the total cost of education, that fee increases should be capped at no more than 8% a year, and with a ramp up time of 10 years.

The Excess Unit Initiative is another issue that the CSSA is trying to work on to the benefit and protection of students. We believe that any financial penalties designed to influence student behavior are reprehensible and should not happen.

Sustainability will be debated (finally) at the May Board of Trustees meetings, and we have kicked off a phone call campaign aimed at the Chancellor to develop a real sustainability policy with some teeth.

The CSSA has officially joined CFA's Save the CSU campaign and participated in the Los Angeles rally. Thanks to CFA!

In addition, CSSA has joined University of California Student Association's (UCSA) Keep California's Promise campaign, and we have helped plan a day of action on May 18th, that will include a lobby day in Sacramento and a rally in LA.

The CSSA will meet at Cal Poly Pomona next weekend where we will debate several very important issues:

1. President of the Year will be decided upon
2. Student Bill of Rights (nothing to do with SB 1335)
3. Update our position on legislative bills
4. Discussion with our Chancellor's Office Liaison about the nature of campus-based fee referendums
5. Discussion on Intra-CSU transfer policies

At this point more than 18 of 23 ASI elections have happened and we have begun our transition period. This will include CSSA elections in June at Sonoma State and will culminate with our official transition meeting in July at the Chancellor's Office.

I want to thank the entire Senate for their collegiality this year, I learned a great deal. Specifically Trustee Kaiser continues to be an inspiration for students, and of course Chair Cherny has been an awesome ambassador to the student organization, and we would love to continue the relationship between CSSA and ASCSU that we have developed this year.

Reports from Marshall Cates

Mathematics Council

The mathematics council met twice during the past year. Budgets and hiring results are always on the agenda as well as general trends. The council was informed about the current status of the Early Assessment Project (EAP) was discussed and some recommendations were made. Additional topics of discussion included: Entry Level Mathematics Examination (ELM) validity and Business calculus.

Entry Level Mathematics Examination (ELM) Committee

The ELM committee meets twice per year. The primary activities are the creation of questions for future ELM exams and the review of student performance on the last ELM exam. This past year the ELM committee also made policy recommendations as related to the EAP. The ELM committee was given the additional assignment of creating examination questions for the EAP.

Early Assessment Project (EAP)

A pilot group of 6000 students were given the modified California Standards Test and also the ELM and English Placement Test (EPT). This information was used by the ELM committee, augmented by 4 additional mathematics faculty and two high school teachers, to come up with cut scores to be used by the EAP program to identify students who are to be given exemption status, or conditional exemption status, or no exemption status. Conditional exemption also requires a senior year experience. The delineation of these experiences, with input from the ELM committee, was one of the focuses this year.

General Education (GE) Course Review

The GE Review committee met and reviewed course submissions. This year the Online Services for Curriculum and Articulation Review (OSCAR) system was implemented. OSCAR allows for review of submissions on-line, thus allowing for review remotely. As an added benefit, OSCAR captures reviewer's comments which are then shared with the other reviewers. OSCAR was very successful.

* * * * *

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m. on Friday, May 7, 2004.

* * * * *

Approved (or corrected)

Date: _____

Robert W. Cherny, Chair

David Hood, Secretary

Margaret Price, Recording Secretary

* * * * *