November 05 Plenary Minutes

1) **CALL TO ORDER**: The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, November 3rd, 2005 by Chair Marshelle Thobaben.

2) **ROLL CALL**: Senators Present: (Bakersfield) Jacquelyn Kegley, John Tarjan; (Channel Islands) Dennis Muraoka, Lillian Vega-Castaneda; (Chico) Jim Postma, Paul Persons; (Dominguez Hills); (East Bay) Hank Reichman, Calvin Caplan; (Fresno) Jacinta Amaral, Sherman Sowby, Otto Benavides; (Fullerton) Vincent Buck, Barry Pasternack (and Bill Meyer, alternate), Diana Guerin; (Humboldt) Marshelle Thobaben, Bernadette Cheyne; (Long Beach) Luis Arroyo, David Hood, Maria Viera; (Los Angeles) J. Theodore Anagnoson, Nancy Hunt, Marshall Cates; (Maritime Academy) Greg Cho, James Wheeler; (Monterey Bay) Ken Nishita, Mark O’Shea; (Northridge) Lynne Cook, Barbara Swerkes, Michael Reagan; (Pomona) Marvin Klein, Ann Morgan, Rochelle Kellner; (Sacramento) Cristy Jensen, Thomas Krabacher; (San Bernardino) Buckley Barrett, Tapie Rohm; (San Diego) Fred Hornbeck, Michael Perkins, Cheryl Mason; (San Francisco) Darlene Yee, Jan Gregory, Robert Williams; (San José) David McNeil, Romey Sabalius, Mark Van Selst; (San Luis Obispo) Unny Menon, Manzar Foroohar, Myron Hood; (San Marcos) Glen Brodowsky, Dick Montanari; (Sonoma) Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson; (Stanislaus) Mark Thompson; (Retired Faculty) Harold Goldwhite; (Chancellor's Office) Keith Boyum. Others Present: John Travis, CFA President; Craig Smith, Faculty Trustee; Ron Kroman, ERFA Representative; Hiro Okahana, CSSA Representative.

3) The agenda was approved.

4) The minutes of the September plenary were approved.

5) **ANNOUNCEMENTS/INTRODUCTIONS**
   a) The publication of the Fullerton Academic Senate is available to the body in paper form and online at [http://fullerton.edu/senate/forum/Fall_2005.pdf](http://fullerton.edu/senate/forum/Fall_2005.pdf)
   b) All committees other than FGA will be meeting in December.
   c) On the budget: the Executive Committee will continue to monitor the budget. Thanks to Senators for controlling costs. We expect to operate as normal (holding meetings, sending representatives) during the remainder of the Senate year.

6) **REPORTS**
   a) **Chair**—Chair Marshelle Thobaben The chair's report is available for review on-line and was distributed via e-mail.
b) **Academic Affairs** (Mark Van Selst) We discussed the difference between upper and lower-division coursework and masters and doctorate and graduate/undergraduate differences in coursework. We also have discussed the independent EdD and testing out of courses. Today we will have resolutions on double majors across two different degree programs, continuing support for joint EdD programs that are successful and viable, encouragement for campus senates to set up doctoral proposal curricular review procedures, campus autonomy in setting their academic calendar, and encouraging the Chancellor to hire an Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. We plan to withdraw the resolution on repeat policies.

c) **Faculty Affairs** (Jan Gregory) Vice Chancellor McClain and CFA President Travis visited the committee to discuss a wide range of topics, including Proposition 75, the status of collective bargaining, faculty salaries and the increase in executive salaries announced at the last Board meeting. The issue of private security guards on campuses was discussed with McClain. Travis informed the committee of an arbitrator's decision on FMI/SSI that was finally handed down after a very long delay. We will distribute a survey to the Senate today on how the work of the ASCSU is communicated to campuses. Two resolutions are before the body today and we have several others under consideration.

d) **Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** (Tom Krabacher) We will have no resolutions today for the body. We have been engaged in planning a budget workshop for campus chairs and our approach to the legislative and budget agendas for the year. Allison Jones and Wes Larssson discussed how we could have closer collaboration with the CSU administration in our lobbying efforts. We are looking at updating the 1998 survey on budget practices on the campuses. We are planning to give the CSU legislative staff award again this year. We are looking at how ASCSU can be more involved in the development of the CSU budget. We are looking at potential resolutions on budget enhancement and fee policies with Faculty Affairs.

e) **Teacher Education and K-12 Relations** (Jim Wheeler) Nancy Hunt has been selected as the Senate's representative on the Special Education Task Force. The TEKR lexicon is accessible through the TEKR web site. Forty-one Integrated Teacher Preparation course descriptors have gone out for discipline review. We have two resolutions that were presented as first-reading items: one on the Early Assessment Program and one on the Math/Science initiative. We have two continuing items demanding our attention: state and national accreditation and changes in enrollments in CSU teacher preparation programs and their implications.

e) **General Education Advisory Committee** (John Tarjan) We met yesterday afternoon. The main topics of discussion were the implications
of technology mediation for the review of community college courses and our comprehensive review of the structure of the GE program as contained in EO 595, which was implemented 25 years ago. The issue involving technology and the review of courses centers around the ability to meet course objectives when technology mediates the delivery of the course. Since courses being submitted for review are not longer identified as technology-mediated, there may be a need in certain disciplines to provide enhanced course requirements for all courses being reviewed. The second main topic was our review of GE. We began by reviewing the results of a brief survey of the campuses on their views on the structure of GE. We plan to use these preliminary results to design a more structured survey for the second phase of our data collection. Additionally, a decision was made to review all community college courses used to fulfill Area A2, English composition in the next review cycle. The next meeting of the committee will be on December 1st prior to our interim committee meetings.

f) **Task Force on the Independent Doctorate** (David McNeil) Things are moving very quickly. We met yesterday and plan meetings in December and January and will report back to this body. We are working on developing requirements and guidelines for these programs including things like workload, faculty selection, etc. Quite a bit of research will need to be conducted to become familiar with best practices in other systems and on other campuses. Assoc Vice Chancellor Boyum briefed us on progress to date and future plans. The issue of existing joint EdD programs – how to determine which are to be continued and which discontinued – is an important one. Quality guidelines from WASC and NCATE will need to be discussed and probably incorporated. These programs will be focused on educational leadership. We will need to partner with school district and community college colleagues in developing these programs. The number of required units in the programs and the requirement of a dissertation will be considered. Some concerns were raised about the progress to date in the absence of adequate faculty consultation. We are looking at a model similar to the UC model of a graduate program committee, which reviews proposals and ensures quality. Q: Was the need for increased resources to support research discussed? A: Thank you for raising the issue. We expect issues like this to be quality considerations. Q: Are you considering the role of normal curricular processes on the campuses? A: We need to make sure that faculty are appropriately involved when proposals come forward. Q: We should not be in a race to be the first to implement? A: In fact, there may well be advantages to being one of the “following” campuses starting programs after Fall 2007.
g) **Task Force on the Senate Budget** (Ted Anagnoson) We are meeting today to develop proposals to submit to the Executive Committee.

h) **Lower-Division Transfer Program (Marshall Cates)** Progress is being made. Most of the statewide patterns for majors and campus-specific requirements in the first wave are done and the systemwide programs are posted. Some campuses do not have their local patterns in yet. We are moving into the next phase. We have named groups to develop course descriptors for the statewide patterns. We hope to have descriptors submitted for approval to campuses by next month. We are also beginning the second and final wave of majors (15) this year. We hope that these new groups will simultaneously develop patterns and course descriptors for the patterns.

i) **IMPAC** (Mark Van Selst) We hope to use the IMPAC process to facilitate the LDTP process and course descriptor development.

7) **PRESENTATIONS**

a) **Chancellor Charles Reed** indicated that the CSU is “on the move.” Despite budget difficulties, we are moving forward. The Compact with the Governor was honored and we got an additional $7m dollars. We are working on the campuses to improve student progress to degrees. The LDTP program is a success in developing expectations for major preparation for transfer students. The National Governors Association has named EAP as one of the 10 best ideas. We have a 5-year plan to address salary lags for all employees. The CSU, Long Beach search resulted in an excellent pool of candidates. The authorization for independent EdDs was the result of a concerted effort. We are communicating economic and other impacts the CSU has on the state of California. I have been meeting with various ethnic groups, the hotel and entertainment industry, engineering groups and others. I am very optimistic. Q: I attended the forum on hospitality. It was interesting that industry leaders mentioned things like foreign language and student skills. What do you think of GE? A: I think we have too much GE. We may be the only system that has upper-division requirements. Many industry leaders have indicated consistently that they hope students will 1) be better communicators (writing, making presentations, public speaking, making articulate expositions), 2) have a more interdisciplinary focus and understand different perspectives, 3) to be able to work together in teams, and 4) have a working understanding more than one language (Spanish preferred in some industries). The leaders like our students because of their maturity, their work ethic, their stability and their preparation to go to work on the first day. The leaders of ethnic communities (representing 55% of our students) made it clear that we do not have adequate
communication strategies to reach these groups. We need to communicate better with school officials, teachers and parents about what it takes to go to college. A-G requirements, financial aid, etc. are not well understood. While we are enthused that 50% of high school juniors take the EAP, this means the 50% do not. The same skills needed for college are needed in the workplace. Reading comprehension is our biggest problem. High school teachers are not being prepared to teach reading. Q: It appears that 16 of 23 our campuses may not meet our enrollment targets. Are we worried about reaching targets? A: We will reach target as a system. Some campuses are carrying too much of the load. We expect about 1% over target enrollments. Given previous targets, this means we added 20,000 students. Community college enrollment all across the state is down. We want to know better why more students don’t transfer. We are getting a higher number of new freshman enrollments. Teacher education and credentialing numbers are down in some urban areas. We are trying to understand why this is occurring. Students are applying to more different campuses than they used to. We will now limit students to making applications to six different campuses without paying another fee. Applications are up 1% over last year. Q: Your leadership has been important for the successes you have enumerated. The faculty here have also been important for the progress we have made. The ASCSU has had to curtail its normal activities due to a lack of budget. The functionality of this body has been compromised. Can you try to provide us the minimum resources we need to be effective? A: You have all the resources you had last year. You have increased the size of this body. I did not feel this would be a good idea. Q: Technology is vital to everyday life. What strategies do you see for integrating technology, helping faculty to use technology in the learning process and providing technology to the system? A: Every industry leader believed that graduates should be well versed in the use of technology. We are attempting to build enough resources in our budget to refresh the technology every 3 years and to try to ensure that the disciplines get the technology they need. We are encouraging partnerships to help provide this to our campuses. We have an obligation to assist our faculty in using technology. We cannot do enough or do it fast enough. Q: Entering students are required to have 4 years of English but only 3 years of math. What do you see in terms of a required 4th year of math? A: There is pressure on school leaders. They know that math preparation is important but there is a shortage of qualified math teachers. I have committed to doubling the number of math teacher graduates. We are seeking resources to allow us to do this. Q: Regarding skills of graduates: I hear a lot about math preparation but not science preparation. I hope that we will support better preparation in science.
literacy. A: We heard a lot about science literacy in San José last week. The leaders feel that our national defense and progress are tied to science. In testimony before Congress, I have advocated to a return to federally funded partnerships between university and public schools. Q: Could you comment on the goal of closing the salary gap in 5 years? Given a 3.5% total increase over the last three years and a 25% gap, it appears we are not going to make up the gap. Where will the money come from? A: We presented a plan to the Board to close the gap in 5 years. The plan had a lot of assumptions that might not play out. If the Compact stays in place for 6 years (there is growth after next year that is considerable) we will have more resources. We looked at all groups over 5 years and analyzed various scenarios. We calculated what it would take in terms of a 10% increase in fees, enrollment growth, and the honoring of the contract to make up the gap. We also considered the legislature "buying out” fee increases. We looked at where various groups are in relation to market. While this plan has many assumptions, it is the first time we have a 5-year plan to make up the gap and understand how much that would cost. Q: We thank you for your part in securing the authorization for the independent doctorate. I would also like to urge us to involve campus faculty in all aspects of the implementation. A: We will involve the faculty. We probably all need to thank my wife for the sacrifices she made to allow me to be here during our planned vacation to lobby for the authorization. We need to go forward with doctorates ensuring the highest quality possibility. We need to fully involve high school and community college leaders. We need to balance programs geographically. Faculty will need to work hard over the next year. We will begin programs in 2007. We will be watched closely. Success in this area may lead to authorization for other new programs. Q: How is the replacement of Dr. Spence coming? A: I met with Senators Thobaben, Anagnoson and Reichmann next week. I will start soon and the Senate will be involved. Q: I appreciate your reaching out to minority groups. What specifically will we do? A: I have asked presidents to help me. It is a labor-intensive process requiring a lot of follow-up. Vice presidents, deans, etc. will also be involved to reach out to specific communities. For example, in the African-American communities we are working with ministers. Different approaches will be required for different groups. We have initiated an agriculture advisory group. This has resulted in a $1m earmark in the agriculture appropriations bill this year. We have no specific budget to support this outreach.

b) **Associate Vice Chancellor Keith Boyum** commented on the overall CSU agenda for improving education. The graduation initiatives are a part of this. We hope to facilitate graduation at CSU campuses. We are
reaching out to community colleges to improve transfer via LDTP. EAP is a means by which CSU encourages stronger preparation for college while students are still in high school. The independent doctorate is a part of our effort to reach out and enabling our constituencies to do better for the state of California. I am proud of the efforts we are making. Q: What is the impact of EAP? A: I am making a report next week to the Board. 660 teachers have gone through new training to equip them to better prepare students for entrance to the CSU. It appears that we are heading in the right direction. In March we will have a proficiency/remediation report. This will be the first time that we will analyze students who have had results of their scores prior to their senior year. We are still unsure what students have done in response to this information. We will keep you posted on results. Q: What is the status of ITL? A: When I arrived at the CO last year, ITL was in the midst of a strategic analysis involving faculty members. That process continues. Q: I am impressed with the efforts to develop math, science and reading abilities among our students. A real problem that is overlooked is the physical health and wellness of our students and population as a whole. Q: What is happening in audiology? A: The UC is a willing partner in Northern California and in San Diego. Things are developing.

c) **John Travis, CFA** Our main focus is on the special election. The two propositions on which we have focused our energies are Prop 75, which will inhibit CFA’s ability to represent our faculty and other constituencies through political processes and forums, and Prop 76, which will make it much easier for a governor to independently reduce the CSU budget. Senators are encouraged to participate in this election in any way they can. This is a very important election whose outcome could dramatically affect the CSU. The bargaining process continues. We had an impasse on the 3.5% GSI. Thank you for the ASCSU resolution. We feel it helped us to secure the salary increase, which is sorely needed. We have resumed bargaining on several issues. We expect bargaining to be particularly difficult in this cycle. For example, a merit program has been mentioned many times by the administration. We are attempting to work with the administration to develop a better salary structure to address a host of issues such as salary compression, junior faculty issues, etc. There may be an attempt to eliminate some job security for lecturers and the FERP program. We believe that the administration will attempt to bargain a reduction rather than an elimination of FERP. We hope that the budget this year will do more than reflect the Compact with the Governor minimums. That is what happened this year. These minimums are inadequate to meet our needs, especially considering the “hole” caused by previous reductions in allocations. We hope that the administration will
request the funds needed to rebuild the CSU. The Board recognition of
the CPEC salary gap was discussed. While faculty salaries are likely to
make no progress, executive salaries have been increased to make
significant progress to close the GAP. While CFA is the bargaining agent
for the faculty, the voice of the Senate can be very helpful in matters of
mutual concern. The Senate can appropriately weigh in on a number of
issues and is listened to.

d) Faculty Trustee Craig Smith has enjoyed his campus visits. There is a
lot of student concern and emotion over fee increases. The state fee
increases are often in addition to increases in parking and other fees. Staff
also has concerns, which he is able to convey to campus presidents. He
devotes considerable time to clarify Board intent in their resolutions, as communications
are sometimes difficult when filtered through memoranda. Some
administrators seem to misinterpret Board intent regarding some items.
Many education faculty have expressed dissatisfaction with current joint
EdD programs. There is a strong feeling by the Board that we should
move slowly on independent programs in order to ensure quality. Bob
Maxson, CSU Long Beach's outgoing president, will head up the
implementation program.

e) Hiro Okahana (CSSA Representative) was recognized by Chair
Thobaben for his excellent summaries of ASCSU meetings delivered to
CSSA. At its meeting in October, Jennifer Reimer from CSU Fresno was
elected to serve as CSSA Chair for reminder of 2005 –2006 fiscal year.
The November conference will be at CSU Bakersfield and the Board will
interview selected applicants for Student Trustee position and various
other issues. This year, CSSA has successfully filled all system-wide
committee seats and the Board is very excited about increasing
participation in the shared governance. University Affairs Committee
adopted and began its implementation phase for the policy agenda, which
includes, “Enrollment Management”, “Collective Bargaining”, and “Parking
Fee Equity”. The Board will be seeking some actions addressing equal
share of a parking fee among the university community by possibly
requesting the Trustees to propose legislation, which prohibit parking fee
to be on the collective bargaining table. Legislative Affairs Committee
will be voting to adopt its policy agenda at the Bakersfield conference, which
will include “lowering textbook costs”, and “Stop Fee Increase”. Actions,
which the Board will seek to lower textbook, include potential elimination
of sales tax on textbook. Also AB700, elimination of age discrimination for
Cal Grant, is now the priority 1 – support legislation for CSSA. The Board
will seek as much as support possible on this legislation to be enrolled.
Lastly, students from all 23 CSU campuses assembled at the Trustees’
meeting on October 27 protesting against fee increase. About 150
students, including ones drove 12 hours from Humboldt and camped outside of the Chancellor’s Office were there to send students’ message to the Trustees. We are very proud of the students and their presence and participation at the last Board meeting.

8) RESOLUTIONS

a) **A Commendation of Outgoing Senator Lynne Cook** was passed unanimously.

b) **Double Major Across Two Different Degree Programs (AS-2717-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Silvis Second Reading**
   i) There was a minor change to the resolution.
   ii) The resolution passed unanimously.

c) **Support for Campus-specific “Repeat Policies” (AS-2718-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Rohm Second Reading**
   i) There were significant revisions to the resolution that were reviewed by Chair Van Selst.
   ii) Opposition was voiced to the sentiment of the resolution.
   iii) The reasons for having such a resolution were discussed.
   iv) Debate occurred over the degree of prescriptiveness in potential policies that should be considered.
   v) The resolution passed.

d) **Continued Support for Joint Doctorates (AS-2719-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Yee Second Reading**
   i) The resolution is aimed at all types of joint doctoral programs.
   ii) The resolution passed.

e) **Reaffirmation of Early Declaration of Major (AS-2720-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Rohm**
   i) The item was withdrawn given the apparent lack of support by the body.

f) **Campus Autonomy in Establishing Their Academic Calendar (AS-2721-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Rohm Second Reading**
   i) This is in response to an apparent movement towards a common calendar.
   ii) An edited and perfected version of the resolution was presented to the body.
   iii) The resolution passed.

g) **Ongoing Efforts to Shape Curricula in Institutions of Learning (AS-2722-05/FA) M/S Gregory/Kegley First Reading**
   i) Several suggestions were made to perfect the resolution.

h) **Providing Newly Recruited Faculty with Necessary Support (AS-2723-05/FA) M/S Gregory/Cheyne First Reading**
i) This resolution attempts to address the many problems in hiring and retaining quality faculty.

   i) **Campus Review of Independent Doctoral Program Proposals** (AS-2724-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Yee First Reading/Waiver
   
   i) This resolution reflects a desire to be proactive in setting forth guidelines.
   
   ii) A second reading waiver is requested due to the current initiation of new independent EdD programs.
   
   iii) The second reading waiver passed.
   
   iv) The resolution passed as amended with clearer language.

j) **California State University Chief Academic Officer** (AS-2725-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Yee First Reading

   i) We feel it is important to have this academic leadership.

k) **Commendation for the Early Assessment Project** (AS-2726-05/TEKR) M/S Wheeler/Cates First Reading

   i) This has been a very successful program.

   ii) Should we specifically identify the developers that are commended?

l) **Support of California’s Science and Mathematics Teacher Preparation Initiative** (AS-2727-05/TEKR) M/S Wheeler/Mason

   i) The CO is adding additional monies to support this effort.

   ii) More specific on the extent of under-funding would improve the resolution.

   iii) A balance between given advice and whining was attempted to be maintained in the drafting.

9) The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 am on Thursday, November 4th, 2005.