May 05 Plenary Minutes

1) CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. on Thursday, May 5th, 2005 by Chair David McNeil.

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

3) The agenda was approved as amended. (Resolutions were reordered and a CFA report was added.)

4) The minutes of the March plenary were approved.

5) ANNOUNCEMENTS/INTRODUCTION
a) Senator Cook expressed thanks for the support received during recent family difficulties and announced she had accepted the position of Dean of Education and CSU, Dominquez Hills effective next January.

b) Various campuses announced the results of elections for statewide senator on their campuses.

c) Lillian Taiz (Vice-President, CFA) was introduced.

d) Trustee Guzman Moore was called away to Washington D.C. and is unable to be with us. She expressed regrets and her hopes for a future invitation.

e) We will have a reception hosted by TEKR after the plenary session today.

f) Interest forms for next year were distributed and need to be returned expeditiously.

g) A commendation for outgoing Immediate Past Chair Robert Cherny was passed by acclamation.

h) A commendation for outgoing emeritus faculty member Len Mathy was passed by acclamation.

i) Senators were reminded to submit their travel claims expeditiously so that the Senate financial books can be closed and budget planning for next year can go forward.

j) Senator Caplan gave an update on the Forgivable Loan Program.

k) Several commendations of other outgoing senators were read and approved by acclamation.

6) REPORTS
a) Chair—Chair McNeil praised the good work of the Senate over the past year. He recognized the efforts of the Executive Committee. He highlighted the efforts associated with SB 1415 (Brulte—course numbering) and SB 1785 (Scott—LDTP). Our relations with our UC colleagues have been strained over applied doctorates and with our CCC colleagues over our pull-out from CAN and development of a new course numbering system. We have continued to monitor SB 5 (Morrow—student bill of rights). LDTP will be a huge undertaking for the faculty over the coming years. There are many issues to be ironed out. We need to support SB 724 (Scott—applied doctorates) and graduate education in general. We need to follow up on student success initiatives. Student learning and success should be the focus of our faculty development efforts. Professor McNeil has come to appreciate even more the diversity across the campuses and within the system. We need to maintain quality while facilitating success. We need more resources to achieve our goal of excellence.

b) Academic Affairs (Ted Anagnoson)—we have five resolutions before the body. We have perfected the language in the athletics, SAT, and remediation resolutions. We have new resolutions on facilitating graduation and a course numbering system. We discussed doing a review of general education next year and establishing limits on the size of on-line courses.

c) Faculty Affairs (Jan Gregory)—there are five resolutions before the body. They deal with FERP, faculty compensation, retirement, access to technology for disabled students, and searches for academic administrators. We will hold items on textbook censorship and the high costs of texts over to next year. We pulled the item on merit pay and will reintroduce the issue next year. We are concerned about AB 992 which authorizes campus police surveillance of students. We hope the Executive Committee will continue to monitor developments over the summer. There was an incident of concern of undercover surveillance on a campus already. We remain concerned about the movement of courses to the extended university.

d) Fiscal and Governmental Affairs (Hank Reichman)—Gratitude was expressed for the senators who participated in lobby days. We will have a smaller follow-up lobbying effort in June. We have four items before the body. They deal with budget priorities, creating a task force on housing programs, faculty compensation (joint with FA), and the California “Live Within Our Means” act.

e) Teacher Education and K-12 Relations (Marvin Klein) There is one resolution before the body: support for federal TRIO programs. We have continued to work on the teacher education and subject matter faculty collaboration survey. After revising the survey based on feedback received from the pretest on CSU academic senators, the questionnaire was distributed to teacher preparation coordinators on CSU campuses. We have received eighteen completed questionnaires. A subcommittee will compile and analyze the data over the summer and report back to TEKR in the fall.

f) Admissions Advisory Council (Rochelle Kellner) We met with the UC admissions group (BOARS). We discussed EAP and LDTP at length. Alignment in A-G preparation was discussed. We worked on aligning science course requirements. We discussed bonus grade points for honors and AP courses in GPA calculations. This has affected diversity on UC campuses due to a lack of availability of these courses at many disadvantaged high schools and the possibility of unfair grade inflation in the high schools that offer them (the use of the so-called “gentleman’s ’B’”).

g) Early Assessment Program and LDTP Marshall Cates updated the progress of the EAP program. We expect to have additional capacity to score essays in a timely fashion. The finishing touches are being put on the LDTP patterns. Some
campuses/disciplines have been slow to respond with their campus-specific requirements. Some campuses apparently have misunderstood the requirements for the project. We will be following-up. There will be approximately 30 more majors done next year. So far, about 70% of transfers fall under completed majors. With the 30 additional majors, we will be over 90%. We will be working with the new Executive Committee to appoint facilitators and keep the project moving. Q: What plans does the CO have for assessing the success of the program? A: We do not believe that many students will follow all of the rules to qualify for priority transfer (such as notification of the receiving campus of intent to transfer before 45 units have been earned). We believe the more important impact will be the clear signal given to students in community colleges who are preparing for transfer. Q: What is being done with quarter campus requirements? A: No programs will need to be adjusted due to rounding between unit values of courses.

7) PRESENTATIONS
   a) Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence addressed the plenary for the last time in his role as Executive Vice Chancellor. He highlighted the graduation initiatives and stressed their importance. He thanked the senators for their good work and support for student access by facilitating the progress of students towards degrees. The state has been well served by these efforts. Tens of thousands of additional graduates have been or will be the beneficiaries of the faculty’s good work. These efforts are a partial culmination of the principles laid down in Cornerstones seven and ½ years ago. Dr. Spence will look for ways to highlight faculty efforts when addressing the Board and other groups. Early assessment, transfer curriculum initiatives, etc. are models for the nation. Transfer and articulation are not working well nationwide. We have made great progress in the CSU on these issues. The Board item next week will focus on what campuses, rather than the system, can do to facilitate graduation. The Board does not want to penalize students. We want to focus on helping student through the system. We want to help students make good decisions in the freshman year. We need to have students declare a major early in their academic careers. They need to have access to personal advising if wanted. They need to have a graduation plan. We may need intervention if students are not making progress. Dr. Spence cautioned that it may be many years before we see the ultimate result of a significant reduction in the number of units accumulated by graduates. We will have campus visitation teams composed of faculty and administrators doing a type of “accreditation” visit to review campus efforts. The team would meet with campus leadership in an exit interview. Presidents will be held accountable for reporting progress on their campuses. Dr. Spence noted that 80% of major programs are now at 120 units and many other majors have reduced units. This is a higher percentage than we had at 124 units several years ago. It is now time to reexamine campus policies such as double-counting of GE and major requirements. The Chancellor has the authority to waive some Title V requirements. An example of this type of flexibility is the reduction of one upper-division GE course for engineering majors. Decisions about double-counting, units above 120, etc. will be left up to the campuses. We need to do a review and make prudent changes but not adversely affect quality. Dr. Spence clarified the comments he made to a Northridge-area newspaper reporter. He spoke with her for 45 minutes and only a couple of things were quoted. He believes students take some units that will not move them towards graduation. These are not “wasted” units. The CSU GE package is the highest in the nation. It is up to the faculty to determine if this
is appropriate or not. Quality must be maintained. The administration will not independently reopen GE language in Title V. The senate may want to look at this. Tens of thousands of students are impacted by these efforts to facilitate student progress towards the degree. They are important. Thank you. Q: EAP is likely to be your greatest legacy. Thank you on behalf of the state. A: It is due to the efforts of the faculty also. Q: Campuses across the nation have target/expected graduation rates based upon campus/student characteristics. We should do this for CSU campuses to develop a useful metric. “Intrusive advising” may be a key to facilitate student progress. We need to look at support for students outside of the classroom. Tutoring centers, etc. require resources but provide great benefit. We need to get students through to graduation. A: Let’s talk about this metric with Analytic Studies. Q: The Northridge faculty were disappointed with the article. The changes in GE were faculty-driven. It is unfortunate that the article made it appear that the campus was complying with an administrative mandate. Please stress the need for faculty involvement in implementing campus processes at the Board meeting. Thank you for support of teacher education. Q: Thank you for your support of shared governance, early assessment. We urge you to work with us on student discipline guidelines to stress the faculty role in establishing campus climate and student responsibility. This is more important than the “policing” role of the campus. Q: You always give fair warning and follow through. Thank you. Q: You have been a great colleague and friend. Q: There is a directive tone in the Board item on graduation and no explicit role mentioned for faculty. You say we are high in GE. In fact, we are only 3 units above the WASC minimum. AA and GEAC will look at GE next year. A: Thank you for your comments. Q: Dr. Spence has been the EVC most involved with the Senate that I have seen. Thank you. General education should be looked at next year. We also need to pay attention to Cornerstone 4—faculty development. A: Dr. Spence singled out Bob Cherny as a model CSU faculty member. He recognized that there needs to be more emphasis on faculty development. He detailed a model for shared governance: 1) joint agenda setting, 2) give and take in negotiations, and 3) explanation of why the administration implements measures without full concurrence of the faculty (although this occurrence has been rare). It is important to separate CFA and Senate roles. Q: Dr. Spence was praised for teaching while in his EVC role. Q: There is a lot of senate, faculty work yet to be done on the 22 facilitating student success items on the Board agenda. The faculty needs to play a key role. A: The language in the Board item needs to be perfected. We need to send some clarifying language to the campuses. The Executive Committee needs to work with us on this. We need to clearly communicate ideas. Clear communication is both vital and difficult. We need to pay attention to how campuses perceive things. Q: Dr. Spence’s leadership in working with CCs has been critical. Q: What will be the role of these “accreditation” teams? It sounds like these will be like police forces. Could you clarify the language here? A: We will stress that this process should be formative and developmental. Since the Board likes to discuss something on graduation in every meeting, perhaps the Presidents would give informal updates on what is happening on their campuses. Q: Senator Spence was praised and thanked for his good work and his support of the CSU and the faculty. Q: Be careful about the language dealing with the Board items so that it does not appear to be a mandate when that is not the intent. Finally, a commendation recognizing the contributions and accomplishments of Dr. Spence and praising his personal qualities was passed unanimously by the Senate.
b) **Lillian Taiz, CFA Vice-President** indicated that April was a busy month of CFA action. Unfortunately, the CSU proposed budget is being considered a ceiling rather than a floor by the state. CFA is quite concerned about the inadequacy of the budget. Student walkouts and other student demonstrations in support of an increased budget were featured by the national press. These actions were independent of CFA. We will have joint demonstrations with other public employee unions. We are also working with the legislature. We had a lobby day yesterday. We delivered a petition to the Governor. We are working on the pension issues. We have several bargaining meetings scheduled through July. We believe the special election will go forward. The pension initiative will not go forward in its current form. The budget cap initiative does not yet have enough signatures. The redistricting initiative is going forward. The teacher tenure initiative is progressing. The “paycheck” initiative is going forward. Trustee Hauck is intimately involved in many of these initiatives which CFA opposes. We will have hard bargaining ahead of us. The FERP contract article is an indication of the tone of the administration. We will have another budget fight next year. We will be in touch with the membership during July. Q: Did CFA request the students walk out? A: No. The students are angry. There are thousands of class sections being cancelled. Q: What will happen to FERP? A: I believe we will have a FERP program. We are prepared to fight for a 5-year FERP. The action by the Trustees was seen as hostile. It has encouraged large numbers of people to leave this year. It was not well considered. Bargaining with the CSU is difficult but we do not think the CSU administration wants to eliminate FERP. Q: What is the situation with FERP and the sunshine proposal? A: The administration signaled a desire to reduce it to 2 years. We did not put anything in our proposal because we did not want a change. Q: With regard to ACR 56 which directs the LAO to examine actual instructional costs—what will be the impact on the budget? A: Talk with Susan Meisenhelder. Q: Also on ACR 56: it appears that this would lead to micromanagement on the part of the state. A: Forward your concerns to us. Q: We should request campus administrators to be flexible regarding FERP and retirement as things are uncertain for faculty right now. People don’t know what to do. What is CFA doing to hire and retain more tenure-track faculty? A: We supported ACR 73 and are continuing to work on the budget. We are working on having flexibility in deadlines for requesting FERP this year. Q: What are you doing on housing? A: It is difficult to find something that can work. Q: I encourage you to develop a long term strategy independent of annual budget considerations. A: I understand and will communicate your points. Q: ACR 56 is potentially dangerous. How money is allocated to campuses is quite clear. At CSULB, the budget process is very transparent. ACR 56 is not necessary. The student walkout backfired at CSULB. A: I am glad that the budget process at CSULB works well but there is a range of transparency across campuses. Q: I hope that CFA will oppose merit pay until the salary gap is closed. A: I agree. I also don’t think FERP and merit pay should be tied in negotiations.

c) **Chancellor Charles Reed** mentioned that he has worked for many years with Dr. Spence and will sorely miss him. Long-time Trustees have indicated that Dr. Spence has been the most effective chief academic officer the CSU has ever had. We need to continue with our retention and graduation efforts. We hope that Dr. Spence will continue to be involved in these initiatives even after he leaves our system. We expect our budget to go forward intact. We expect no big surprises. We remain on the Governor’s priority list. Our legislative agenda seems to be moving forward. Five Trustees went through hearings yesterday. Thanks to the faculty at Northridge for their
efforts to reexamine their GE program. This should be done system-wide and may take some time. Q: We are looking at an imposed fee increase to support athletics on our campus (SJSU). What will the Chancellor do? A: This fee increase will in effect go to academic support since the general fund currently subsidizes athletics. I will not oppose it. Q: Northridge’s GE program was so different from the rest of the campuses that what they accomplished was to be more in line with the rest of the system. Q: Would you like us to do anything else on SB 724 (applied doctorates)? A: You can send a letter clarifying comments referring to funding for graduate education contained in your Senate communications (minutes, newsletter). Those words have been twisted around somewhat. Q: AB 992 deals with surveillance of students by campus police and there is an item on student discipline being circulated. What will be the Senate role in these areas? A: I am not sure of our position on the surveillance bill. I will find out. Allison Jones is putting a group together to look at student discipline. There is a fine line between too little enforcement power and too much. Q: I am concerned that the current focus on GE revolves around numbers rather than the content of GE. What is your take on the current deficiencies in the CSU approach to GE? A: GE should be primarily in the lower-division. Perhaps we can look at major courses and electives in the upper-division. The content, mix could be reexamined. Q: We have some concerns about the student discipline policies being drafted. A: We are looking for a flexible policy. Q: There appears to be an “anti-education” climate in the state. Can you use your position to stress the importance of education for the state? The politicians seem unsupportive. A: Prop 98 has had a big impact. We need to come up with a way to properly fund K-12. There are varying approaches. Health care costs are increasing dramatically. The CCC, UC and CSU are getting a smaller portion of the state budget. K-12 growth rates are declining now. There are competing priorities and difficult trade-offs that need to be made by the state. Q: Can you do anything to stop “teacher bashing?” A: “Bashing” is a very common tactic in California. We need to figure out how to govern California and sort out our priorities. There may be 60 initiatives on the ballot this year.

d) Faculty Trustee Kathleen Kaiser attended the inauguration of Paul Zingg at Chico and will be attending the inauguration of Horace Mitchell at Bakersfield on May 20th. Trustee Kaiser will attend approximately 6 commencements. She reported on CSU Alumni legislative day and the Senate Rules Confirmation Hearings. Normally there are only about two confirmations of trustees per year. There are six new trustees and two additional vacancies. The faculty, alumni and one student trustee will all be named this year for an additional set of new trustee appointments. This represents more than half of the appointed Board members (20 in all). The trustee candidates were praised for both their diversity and breadth of experience. One senator made a number of negative comments about the CSU. The issues of financial aid and fees were raised. There was discussion of the applied doctorate. There was concern over payment fees via credit cards. There will likely be no additional resources coming to the CSU. There is a real problem maintaining access given the resources we have. This was stated as a problem for the trustees. They were charged with being an independent voice in their trustee role by the Senators. The UC and independents are opposed to the applied doctorate. Pell grants have been reduced. The age limit of Cal grants is a hindrance to many of our students. We are unsure if the Higher Education Act will be reauthorized. CPEC is attempting to expand its role in CA higher education, particularly in Accountability and wishes to publish an annual report for all systems. It seems more sensible to have each system report on its own accountability, which had been the
intent of earlier legislation, which made it to the Governor's desk, but was not signed due to the uncertainty at the time over the future role of CPEC. SB 5 may reappear. The system is taking a low profile on the issue to avoid giving it attention. Q: What is the stance on AB 992? The CSU website lists support for AB 992. Q: What is happening with SB 724? A: There is some sentiment that the increased requirements for audiology are not needed and that California could set its own standards. Others indicated the pitfalls of this approach. The UC and independents are strongly opposed. Q: Please make sure to the extent you can that faculty speak on legislation concerning the CSU such as SB 724. Q: We all wish to thank you for the excellent job you have done and how well you have kept us all informed. You have done a great job representing the faculty and communicating with us.

8) RESOLUTIONS

Note: a blanket waiver of second readings was passed for all first reading items before the body.

a) Creating and Overseeing Faculty Expert Banks (AS-2686-05/FA) Second Reading
   i) The item was approved unanimously.

b) The Role of Prebaccalaureate Programs (Remediation) in the California State University (AS-2687-05/FA) Second Reading
   i) Regardless of where the "bar is set" there will always be a need for "remediation" in the CSU.
   ii) The intent of the resolution was clarified through amendment of language.
   iii) The item was approved.

   i) The fourth resolved clause was removed.
   ii) The item was approved unanimously.

d) Academic Senate CSU Calendar of 2005-2006 Meetings (AS-2689-05/EX) Second Reading
   i) The dates were adjusted slightly.
   ii) The item was approved unanimously.

e) Support for the Use of the “New SAT” in the CSU Eligibility Index (AS-2691-05/AA) Second Reading
   i) The resolution was revised slightly during since the last plenary.
   ii) It deals with consideration of the writing portion of the new SAT for freshman applicants who have GPAs less than 3.0.
   iii) There is some opposition to the writing portion of the test by English faculty across the nation. It is difficult to come up with a good diagnostic.
   iv) Research has shown a correlation between the length of the associated essays and the score awarded to them. This finding was discussed.
   v) The item was approved without dissent.

f) Support for Federal TRIO Programs (AS-2692-05/AA) Second Reading
i) The item was approved unanimously.

g) **The Effect of the Proposed Retirement Plan Modification on the CSU** (AS-2693-05/FA)  Second Reading  
i) The item was withdrawn by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

h) **CSU Budget Priorities for Academic Year 2006-07** (AS-2694-05/FA) First Reading—waiver m/s Reichman/Krabacher  
i) This resolution largely mirrors the priorities from the previous year.  
ii) The language was perfected.  
iii) The item was approved unanimously.

i) **Creation of a Task Force to Develop Housing Programs** (AS-2695-05/FGA) First Reading—waiver m/s Reichman/Pasternack  
i) There is a large problem with housing affordable housing for CSU faculty.  
ii) The item was passed unanimously.

j) **Opposition to the California Live Within Our Means Act** (AS-2696-05/FGA) First Reading—waiver m/s Reichman/M. Hood  
i) This measure could severely impact funding for education in California.  
ii) The item passed unanimously.

k) **Reaffirming the Role of Faculty in Initiatives for “Achieving the Baccalaureate Degree”** (AS-2697-05/EX/AA) First Reading—waiver m/s Anagnoson/Edelman  
i) It is an ongoing concern of the faculty that curricular decisions are the prerogative of the faculty.  
ii) This was drafted to guide Executive Committee in their communications with the Board of Trustees and campus senates with regard to the items in front of the Board next week.  
iii) The wording was perfected.  
iv) The item was approved without dissent.

l) **Support, Principles, and Processes for a New CSU Articulation Number System** (AS-2698-05/FA) First Reading—waiver m/s Anagnoson/Cates  
i) This resolution is in response to the rapid developments in CAN and LDTP. It was circulated to the campuses and their input informed the version of the resolution currently in front of the body.  
ii) It sets out principles for implementing LDTP by establishing a process for developing and approving descriptors and keeping them up to date and for reviewing and qualifying community college courses.  
iii) The resolution was perfected via amendment.  
iv) Much discussion concerned voting membership for community college representatives on the associated communities.  
v) The item was approved unanimously.

m) **Searches for Campus Administrators in the California State University** (AS-2699-05/FA) First Reading—waiver
i) This item is brought forward in response to reports that MPP positions with responsibility for faculty-related issues on some campuses have been filled without appropriate faculty involvement.

ii) The language was perfected via amendment.

iii) The item was approved.

n) **Student Access to Academic Information Technology** (AS-2700-05/FA) First Reading—waiver m/s Reagan/Persons

i) Committee tried to balance the principles of equal access with the demands placed upon faculty and others who are involved in providing this access.

ii) The item passed unanimously.

o) **Faculty Early Retirement Program** (AS-2701-05/FA) First Reading—waiver m/s Reagan/Montanari

i) This program has been of value to the CSU and should be retained.

ii) The rationale was updated with more current information.

iii) The item passed unanimously.

p) **Faculty Compensation** (AS-2702-05/FA) First Reading—waiver m/s Montanari/Reichman

i) This resolution is very timely given recent developments.

ii) The resolution and rationale draw heavily upon the report *The CSU in the 21st Century*.

iii) It is clear that purchasing power has declined for faculty.

iv) It is difficult to attract faculty.

v) Housing is becoming much less affordable for faculty.

vi) Salary compression is a big problem in the system.

vii) Developments in retirement, FERP could pose further problems with retention.

viii) Hiring and retention are in a state of crisis. This needs to be passed and widely distributed.

ix) We are at a point where we may not be able to hire faculty and administrators without terminal degrees.

x) The language was perfected.

xi) The item passed unanimously.

q) **Commendation of David McNeil** (AS-2706-05/EX) m/s Thobaben/Cherny

i) The commendation was passed unanimously.

9) The meeting was adjourned at 12:28 pm on Friday, May 6th, 2005.