1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, November 11th, 2004, by Chair David McNeil.

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

3. The minutes from the September plenary were approved.

4. The agenda was approved.

5. Introductions of new senators.
   a. Senator Rob Williams from San Francisco
   b. Senator Bernadette Cheyne from Humboldt

6. The Chair’s report is posted on the web site. Chair McNeil highlighted several matters.
   a. The CSU support budget is being developed.
   b. The LDTP project is being launched on Saturday with discipline facilitator training. ExComm selected the facilitators but Boyum, Cates and Anagnoson, and are in charge. ASCSU leadership is there in a support rather than directing role. Please direct questions to Senator Cates.
   c. The Academic Technology Advisory Committee (ATAC) has been revitalized after a hiatus. The committee is meeting and should make some important decisions regarding the support of professional development and teaching and learning.
   d. There is a reception for the ASCSU at University House (the Chancellor’s residence) tonight at 6:00.

7. Addresses from Visitors
   a. State Senator John Vasconcellos visited the Senate as a part of a farewell tour of the state where he has spent so much of his time in public service. He has been in the legislature long enough that he sponsored the bill establishing
the CSU. He is retiring after 38 years in the legislature. He expressed concern about the state of higher education in California. Fees are increasing while enrollments are being curtailed. Senator Vasconcellos reviewed the life experiences that shaped his values. He reviewed the values that have guided his political career and outlook. He encouraged the senators to remember how important it is for them to boldly move forward to affect the lives of their students—it is the most important work that they will do. He also introduced a new approach to politics that he calls the "politics of trust." He expressed concern over the future of the master plan. In response to a question regarding the CSU’s offering of applied doctorates Senator Vasconcellos indicated he had no strong feelings. He encouraged us to focus on access and funding before focusing on the expansion of our mission. The former are more central to our mission. However, if changes in accreditation, etc. make it necessary to continue serving existing needs, then perhaps it should be pursued. He is skeptical of the compact and pessimistic about the budget situation and the ability of the state to meet the needs of its citizens, especially in the face of the reticence to increase revenues.

b. **Chancellor Charles Reed** indicated that the Board budget was passed and forwarded two weeks ago. The CA director of finance has been replaced. We hope to have a good working relationship with the new director, Tom Campbell. The Compact should be very helpful to the UC and CSU. The Department of Finance is busy finding ways to cut spending and balance the budget in a climate of no tax increases. I strongly believe that in the absence of the Compact, we would be cut. A lot will happen over the next two months to get the proposed budget to the printers by January 10th. We have a great opportunity to build a partnership with high schools through the Early Assessment Program. This effort has garnered national attention. We have had meetings with the Department of Education to try to test earlier and get students into the English and math classes in a timely manner. The CSU is working with teachers through workshops to prepare them to train these students. I have met with the CC Board of Regents to improve transfer and articulation for two hours. They seem much more receptive than 6 years ago. The CC Senate members addressed the Board and seemed to minimize the need to improve access and transfer processes. The Board was much more receptive than the CC faculty. CC Chancellor Drummond and State Senator Scott are very pleased with what the CSU has been doing. We will be publishing an accountability report soon. Our graduation rates need to improve, even among "more traditional" students—6 years on average. Cutting time to degree by even one year would result in significant savings. Student advising is critical. We need to find ways to get better information to the students in a timely manner. Next Tuesday the Chancellor will present a communications plan for the next several years that will evolve in a political effort to get out the importance of the mission of the CSU. We need to be relentless in getting out our story. The CSU may be the most undervalued institution in California based upon what we deliver for the resources we consume. We have a tremendous impact on the economics and culture of the state. We can make the argument that the CSU “pays for itself.” The CSU budget is around $3.1 billion. The CSU stimulates $13 billion to the economy and 207,000 directly related jobs. We produce just over half of the baccalaureate degrees in California. We are the gateway to the middle class for
people of color. We provide 39% of the BA degrees for Asians/Pacific Islanders. We provide the majority for Latinos (58%) and African-American (52%). We have 1.7 million alumni. They produce $53 billion in the economy yearly and $3 billion in tax revenue. 527,000 jobs are created. The CSU provides about $200 million worth of student service to California communities. Over 185,000 students do the work. More than 1.2 million California citizens attend cultural events yearly at the CSU. More than 1.9 million California citizens attend sports events at the CSU. We believe that we return $4.41 in revenues for every $1.00 invested in the CSU. Q: Can you comment on the status of buildings affected by cost overruns? A: We will not give money back. We have used renovation money to new construction to save buildings. We have cut back on space and amenities to lower costs. Some projects will have to be delayed. We are looking at projects over $50,000,000 that can be “phased” over more than one year. The UC and the privates are facing similar problems. Asian demand for steel and concrete has driven up costs. We may need to adjust the amounts of future bonds in order to reflect increased costs. Q: What can be done about housing costs that affect faculty and staff? Can we include housing in the CPEC analysis? A: We do look at housing costs on a three-year basis. We are looking at local campus housing and partnership with local government. CI, Monterey, SLO, other campuses. The BOT agenda has the purchase of 24 townhouses in SF. We are aware of the problem of housing. Q: Can you include the ASCSU in your communications campaign? A: Yes, I will do so beginning this afternoon in meetings with ASCSU leadership. Q: What is the outlook for the Compact this year? A: I believe the Governor will fight hard to maintain the Compact. Governors get about 95% of what they ask for in the budget. The Legislature is our friends but do not have the will to raise revenues. We have made a decision to negotiate a Compact rather than rely on the Legislature to maintain the CSU on the priority list when there are so many pressing demands. Q: Incentives, encouragement regarding graduation to the campuses may be necessary from the CO to the campuses. Can the CO do this? A: We need to keep highlighting the importance of graduation in our meetings with Presidents and Provosts. There has been a lot of interest in EAP across the country. EVC Spence is busy informing other groups of our efforts. Q: What are your thoughts on double majors and minors? A: Good academic advising may help students to make more informed choices. I don’t have an adequate response to the issue since there are so many differences in the circumstances across students. Q: How are we doing on our enrollment targets? What will happen if we miss them? A: I think we will come close. If we do not reach our targets we will lose money. Under the Compact we can know well in advance what our targets are. This is essential for planning. Q: How will AB 1415 play out? Common course number exists in Florida. How does this work? A: IMPAC will be helpful in this. Even though different campus programs in Florida had different flavors, the lower-division courses transfer well. Discussions between CC and university faculty in Florida spent a lot of time talking together. They ended up with a very non-prescriptive approach to GE requirements. Even the private universities in Florida requested participation in the common course numbering system. Q: Can you address the fiscal tradeoff between advising and offering courses? A: It becomes a conflict about priorities and assignment of time. We need to improve advising. It cannot be the only priority. We need to improve advising
but should make appropriate tradeoffs. Faculty, in the absence of incentives/directives, will naturally flow into a skewed work profile. We need to teach, do research, do advising, etc. even though individuals likely should have different work assignments. Q: You have stated that your top priority(ies) is compensation. How are you pursuing this? A: The increase in compensation in the budget is more than the overall increase. Q: What is the status of the applied doctorate? A: I spoke with Chancellor Dynes earlier this week. We need to send a report forward on the success of the joint Ed.D. programs. The UC just cannot serve the number of people that need to be served. There is some disagreement between the UC and CSU on the report’s findings and conclusion. Also, it appears that the UC will not meet the state’s need for applied doctorates. This will be on the agenda of our meeting in December.

c. Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence commended the Senate for the good work on the graduation initiatives. The CSU has received a lot of attention across the nation on our initiatives, particularly early assessment. In meeting with leaders across the country, he stresses how critical it is to have faculty support and take the lead on these initiatives. He highlighted the article about early assessment in Crosstalk. It had three pictures—two of high school teachers and one of Senator Cates. An accountability report is being prepared and will be presented at the Board of Trustees meeting next week. The CSU has begun regular reporting on outcomes assessment. Approximately 60% of the emphasis in Cornerstones was on graduation. This is reflected in the reporting of outcomes in our report. Dr. Spence reviewed some of the statistics that will be included. Since advising is a very important factor in student success, he indicated a desire for the Senate to examine the allocation of assigned time to see if a reallocation which would support an increased emphasis on student advising would be appropriate. Q: How do we reward faculty for participation in advising? A: That is an issue for campus senates. Q: What incentives are there for campuses to graduate students? It appears there are none. Will a new Board be more receptive to including incentives? A: The state is interested in penalizing students who do not make adequate progress towards degrees. We have resisted this. Still, we need to recognize that given limited funds we cannot serve all of the eligible students given current patterns/course loads. We may be willing to revisit financial incentives in order to try to increase our capacity for new students. Q: What is the system doing to make the CSU more attractive/capable of attracting and retaining quality faculty? A: This is a tough problem. We are making some progress on some campuses in terms of housing. This issue is our first priority in our discussions with the Board. Q: In one Senator’s department, they have instituted mandatory advising. It was found to be very beneficial. What is your reaction? A: This is a great idea. How do we get faculty to buy into this concept? Q: What are we doing in reaction to the California Performance Review? A: The CSU accountability process is viewed as a model across the country. We seem to be in line with what the CPR and other state initiatives seem to want to require. Q: I thought we would report the process rather than the results of outcomes assessment. A: We will report a summary of the results from the reviews at the campus level but in terms of general outcomes rather than numerical data. Q: Will we penalize campuses for missing targets? A: No. But the state may penalize the system for not meeting enrollment targets. This has been a difficult
year for enrollment management given changing targets. One concern we have is the need to build adequate base funding before we can grow through enrollments. We do not want to be in a situation where admissions requirements and priorities vary even more across campuses. Q: Given our problems in recruiting faculty, what does the CO think in terms of adjusting faculty workload for the increasingly thin tenure and tenure-track ranks? A: I have no good response. Resources are a continuing problem. Q: We have found that early and ongoing advisement is keys to facilitating student success. We need to have a multi-level (faculty, student, staff) approach to advising. We may be looking at advising possibilities too narrowly. Even alumni may be interested in providing free career, other types of advising. Q: We need to be careful in considering the needs of dual majors, students who select minors, students who change majors. Advising can also be mediated through technology. A: These are good ideas—faculty are in a much better position to come up with good ideas like this. I hope the Senate will take the lead in examining new approaches to advising.

d. Faculty Trustee Kathy Kaiser referred the group to her written report on the website. http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Faculty_Trustee/index.shtml She gave a frank assessment of the state’s budget situation. Higher education is the only area of discretionary that does not have formal federal or state mandates that would protect its mission. Without a long-term fee policy, the Compact with the Governor is perhaps our only hope for maintaining the funding to fulfill our mission. Given changing enrollment targets, it may be very difficult for us to meet our enrollment targets for this year. It is difficult to control enrollments precisely. There is a lot of fee comparison information going to the board. The CSU continues to be a great bargain. Only so 45% get fee-based financial aid but many more get merit-based and need-based aid from other sources.

e. CFA President John Travis We are bargaining a successor to the previous 3-year contract with a 1-year extension. Our survey to the campuses was not scientific, but rather a way of getting ideas from the faculty. We are developing our initial proposals to the Board. CFA representatives have been meeting with faculty from each of the campuses to further identify the most critical issues. The top issues are salaries and workload. Many faculty would like an extension of SSIs in the full professor rank. The actual salary gap for senior faculty is close to 17%. Faculty complains of having more service expectations, larger classes, etc. CFA has been focusing on budget issues. We were disappointed that the Compact locked us into a situation where the needs of the CSU would not be met. We hoped that this would be a floor but the Board limited their request to the amount of the Compact, making it essentially a ceiling. We have concerns about the 8% increase in student fees. Perhaps there are ways to signal to the legislature that we hope the Compact should be viewed as a floor. While we are already turning away students, demand will increase next year. We hope to have a 1 ½% increase for enrollment next year. We would like to ask for more—if we don’t, it would be a ceiling. We hope the state will increase revenues. The CSU has great needs that will be difficult to meet. We need to rebuild the damage done over the last several budgets. Q: Where did the “grey areas” in the salary schedules come from? A: They have roots in the merit increase programs (PSSI and FMI) that caused salaries to increase within
ranges in apart from SSIs. Several questions regarding summer salaries were asked and answered.

f. Connie Vinita Dowell, Dean, Library and Information Access and Bill Robnett, COLD Chair In the Electronic Core Collection we have access to over 20,000 journals and other publications. We have the ability to search many collections of text including intelligent search. More than 300,000 received library instruction this past year. We are implementing 24/7 reference service for student. A variety of other available services and initiatives were reviewed. ETS has developed a test of information literacy. The CSU will conduct a beta test of the examination in February or March with 3000 students. Several comments, responses lamented the inadequate staffing levels in libraries, especially considering the increasing demands upon their services. Libraries as “places” and the advantages of physical collections were discussed.

8. Reports

a. CPEC—Susan McKillop submitted a written report to the body. For summaries and full reports developed by CPEC: http://www.cpec.ca.gov/secondpages/reports.asp Faculty Trustee Kathy Kaiser noted that the commission continues its work. She highlighted a report on executive compensation that should also have implications for addressing the faculty salary gap.

b. Academic Affairs (Ted Anagnoson, Chair) We dealt with seven issues. The first is embodied in a resolution on mandatory community service. We discussed the “SCIGETC” pattern and postponement of L.D. GE requirements until after transfer for nurses, etc. and have a resolution on the issue. We have a resolution on the quality of teaching in extended university courses. We discussed LDTP with Keith Boyum. We have a resolution dealing with remediation in progress. This recognizes that some remediation will still need to take place. We have deferred action on a resolution dealing with participation in postseason athletic activities because the experts on the issues were absent. We referred the issue of double-counting of GE requirements to the GE advisory committee. This issue came up as a result of local campus concerns.

c. Faculty Affairs (Jan Gregory, Chair) We dealt with several issues and have three resolutions coming forth, one on lecturer participation on the campus senates, one elaborating on previous academic freedom documents, the third about academic freedom rights of students. We had several visitors. Marge Grey discussed a proposed revamping of the faculty/staff page on the CSU web site, sought comments from the committee and said she would return to the committee before the project is finalized. Jackie McClain gave a brief update on the situation with the UAW that is now representing student assistants; no contract has yet been completed. She also discussed the status of CO consideration of an auditor’s proposal that background checks become a requirement in hiring of staff and faculty not presently required to undergo such checks. Blaine Wright came to discuss CMS with us. Marcus Harvey from the AAUP spent the entire day with our committee and others during lunch. You can learn more about AAUP by visiting www.aaup.org .

d. Teacher Education, K-12 Relations (Marvin Klein, Chair) We have no resolutions before the body. Three issues dominated our discussions: CSET, 5th year programs and induction, and the role of the CSU and the ASCSU in preparing teachers. Currently, successful completion of CSET is required for admittance to teacher preparation programs and some people allege that this
requirement has had a negative impact on enrollment in teacher preparation programs. Fifth year programs and induction were discussed as a means to achieve a teacher credential in California. The role of ASCSU and TEKR in teacher preparation and our relationship with constituent groups was identified, as a topic the committee will address. These topics will be discussed further at the December committee meeting.

e. Fiscal & Governmental Affairs (Hank Reichman) We have one resolution that commends the good work of students and faculty in voter registration. We met with Patrick Lenz for over an hour discussing the Trustee’s budget. We reviewed the general counsel’s guidelines on elections and free speech. We are developing our legislative agenda and visit list.

f. CSSA (Jeff Obayashi, Senate Liaison) The students have been very involved in lobbying. They are looking at the implementation of ACR 73. They are following bills, especially those related to the budget. The students are very concerned about advising and the resources to support it. They have a resolution lamenting the inadequacy/lack of availability of advising that requests more resources to be dedicated to it. They are holding firm on a target of 25% of education costs to be borne by students. They are working on a compromise position on long-term fee policy. Jeff reviewed the success of the voter registration drive and thanked the faculty for their support. CSSA is looking at purchasing some software to support communications with students on campuses.

g. LDTP (Marshall Cates) The facilitator training session will take place on Saturday. Disciplines will begin meeting in December and finish in January. They are trying to coordinate with the IMPAC regional meetings to allow discussion of LDTP development with our CCC colleagues. ASCCC will be sending observers (non-voting) to each of the discipline groups. The development of CAN descriptors will be supported in the project. Senator Cates answered several questions regarding the functioning of the project and how disciplines were chosen. [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/ldtp.shtml](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/ldtp.shtml)

h. Extended University (Commission on) (Dick Montanari) Gave a report on summer activities—YRO campuses and adjustments. Seed money grants (up to $50,000 each, $400,000 total) are available for program initiation and improvement. Proposals are now being accepted.

i. CAN (Barry Pasternack) will be meeting next week. We hope the new CAN process including discipline review groups, will be approved. The old process will no longer apply but courses descriptors will continue to be honored until replaced. The CSU faculty will have ultimate veto over course descriptors. We will be looking for 3 nominees from CSU and 3 from CCC and possibly 1 from UC for each of these discipline groups. We hope to name individuals who have participated in previous curricular efforts. How multi-disciplinary major courses (e.g., business) will be developed/approved has yet to be worked out. CCs should have approximately a year to update their curriculum after new CAN descriptors have been developed. The new procedures should be available by next week.

j. Election of Trustee Recommending Committee Senators Wheeler (Chair), Amaral, Anagnoson, McKillop, and Reichman, were elected. The Humboldt and
Bakersfield campus senates will provide the names of the final two members of the committee.

9. RESOLUTIONS
1. Allocation of Teacher Credential Fee Differential—second reading (AS 2673-TEKR) was withdrawn.
2. Service of Lecturer Faculty on Campus Academic Senates—first reading (AS 2674) m/s Gregory/Kegley
   a. What “equitable” representation of lecturers would mean was discussed. “Appropriate” might be a better word.
   b. Would the wording imply that this resolution deals with ASCSU rather than local senates?
   c. Support for the democratic intention of this resolution was voiced.
   d. The workload of lecturers (no compensation for service) is an issue of concern. There may be ways to address this. In fact, some campuses may compensate them.
   e. Campuses are moving in the direction of an increasing percentage of permanent lecturers so that this resolution may be very timely.
   f. Do we have information of how lecturers are treating in terms of membership on local senates from all of the campuses? No, but there is a body of anecdotal evidence that informed the discussion. Perhaps this could be taken up at the campus senate chairs meeting in December.
3. Reaffirmation of Academic Freedom—first reading (AS 2675-FA) m/s Kegley/Smith
   a. Editorial changes were forwarded to the committee.
   b. Tenure and academic freedom remain important issues for the professorate.
   c. AAUP plays a seminal role in addressing academic freedom. The contents of the AAUP statements on academic freedom were discussed. AAUP in California: [http://www.aaup-ca.org/](http://www.aaup-ca.org/) AAUP statements:
      [http://www.aaup.org/statements/index.htm](http://www.aaup.org/statements/index.htm)
   d. Perhaps the committee could consider directing this to the Board of Trustees also.
   e. Perhaps the updated AAUP statement could be appended.
   f. On one campus, the need to provide security attendant with a presentation resulted in impacting free speech from outside speakers.
   g. Several senators indicated that the resolution’s wording could appropriately be even more robust.
   h. CSU guideline on elections and political speakers might be referenced.
   i. Other resources include:
      [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucaf/reports.html](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ucaf/reports.html)
      [http://www.csulb.edu/~crsmith/1amendment.html](http://www.csulb.edu/~crsmith/1amendment.html)
      [http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/9-29-03.html](http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/coordrev/policy/9-29-03.html)
4. Academic Freedom for Students—first reading (AS 2676-FA) m/s Anagnoson/Smith
   a. There is a desire to have a parallel statement endorsing academic freedom for students. Adequate policies and communication of these policies should be present on all campuses.
   b. The UC has a statement that mirrors the intent of this resolution.
   c. The students (CSSA) are also working on this issue. They appreciate the efforts of the faculty in this regard.
d. Perhaps the audience for this resolution could be broadened to include the system-wide CSSA and local student organizations as well as the Board of Trustees.

5. **Opposition to the California Performance Review’s Proposed Mandatory Community Service Graduation Requirement**—first reading (AS 2677-AA) m/s Gregory/Kegley
   a. More resources would be needed to implement this type of requirement.
   b. The ASCSU has not previously taken an explicit formal position in opposition to mandatory community service.
   c. The first and second resolves may not be consistent in sentiment.
   d. Issues of liability may be an important aspect of this issue, as well as expense.
   e. Perhaps the rationale could stress student choice and recognize the extent of voluntary student community service that already takes place in the CSU.
   f. The committee may wish to consider communicating this idea via a letter also.

6. **Flexibility in Student Completion of the General Education Package Prior to Upper Division Transfer**—first reading (AS 2678-AA) m/s Anagnoson/Thompson
   a. This resolution supports the notion that some flexibility may be advisable for majors that either have significant lower-division coursework in the major or are heavily weighted toward the upper division.
   b. Some suggestions for rewording of the rationale were offered.
   c. The intent is to allow flexibility for some majors without penalizing the students for transferring without certification of GE.
   d. Perhaps the intent that this would apply to lower-division GE only should be explicitly stated.
   e. Perhaps resolution AS-2645 could be referenced/included.
   f. A suggested change in the wording of the title was offered.

7. **Maintaining the Quality of Faculty Who Teach in the Extended University**—first reading (AS 2679-AA) m/s Mathy/Anagnoson
   a. The concern over this issue arose on the LA campus in the 1960s during the initiation of YRO operations.
   b. A restriction such as this would be a matter of collective bargaining.
   c. To whom is this resolution being addressed?
   d. Perhaps the Faculty Affairs Committee should be consulted on this issue.
   e. AA was urged to withdraw the resolution.
   f. The current wording excludes ½ of the faculty in the system (lecturers).
   g. There is a task force on outside employment that includes VC McClain. The task force should be consulted.
   h. The reasoning regarding quality seems flawed. The relationship with quantity has not been clearly enunciated.
   i. A broader issue is the insufficient compensation for all faculty.
   j. A related issue is the lack of sufficient offerings of courses with state support.

8. **Commendation for Voter Registration Efforts**—first reading (AS 2680-FGA) m/s Reichman/Krabacher
   a. A waiver of the first reading was moved. The resolution is not necessarily time sensitive, just timely. The waiver passed.
   b. The language was perfected.
   c. The resolution passed unanimously.