September 16, 2005 Plenary Minutes

1) CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. on Friday, September 16, 2005 by Chair Marshelle Thobaben.

2) ROLL CALL: Senators Present: (Bakersfield) Jacquelyn Kegley, John Tarjan; (Channel Islands) Dennis Muraoka; (Chico) Samuel Edelman, Jim Postma, Paul Persons; (Dominguez Hills) Donn Silvis; (East Bay) Hank Reichman, Calvin Caplan; (Fresno) Jacinta Amaral, Sherman Sowby, Otto Benavides; (Fullerton) Vincent Buck, Barry Pasternack, Diana Guerin; (Humboldt) Marshelle Thobaben, Bernadette Cheyne; (Long Beach) Luis Arroyo, David Hood, Maria Viera; (Los Angeles) J. Theodore Anagnoson, Nancy Hunt; (Maritime Academy) Greg Cho, James Wheeler; (Monterey Bay) Ken Nishita, Mark O’Shea; (Northridge) Lynne Cook, Barbara Swerkes; (Pomona) Marvin Klein, Ann Morgan, Rochelle Kellner; (Sacramento) Cristy Jensen, Thomas Krabacher, Bob Buckley; (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) Manzar Foroohar, Myron Hood; (San Marcos) Dick Montanari, Glen Brodowsky; (Sonoma) Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson; (Stanislaus) Steve Filling (for Paul O’Brien), 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; Hironao Okahana (Long Beach), CSSA Liaison.

3) The agenda was approved

4) The minutes of the May plenary were approved.

5) ANNOUNCEMENTS/INTRODUCTIONS
   a) The new faculty trustee, Craig Smith and new CSSA Liaison Hironao Okahana were introduced.
   b) New senators were introduced by their campus colleagues.

6) REPORTS
   a) Chair—Chair Marshelle Thobaben
      i) The Chair recognized the good work of members of the Executive Committee. They worked hard over the summer. The budget, the new student conduct code, monitoring legislation, developing orientation and other materials took a lot of time and energy.
      ii) The Board of Trustees has initiated a campus-based graduation initiative.
      iii) The LDTP project continues to move forward.
      iv) The Senate needs to be involved with the new independent EdD degree programs.
      v) Budget Discussion Chair Thobaben announced the senate budget is experiencing a shortfall. She stressed the senate budget allocation has not been reduced from last year. The cost of assigned time has dramatically increased this year and has resulted in operating costs that exceed the senate budget. The executive committee is exploring ways to economize. The executive committee wants to protect the core functions of the Senate if at all possible. Chair Thobaben suggested several ways to economize, such as being creative with one interim
meeting (meet electronically, etc.). If these actions are done, this should get us close to a balanced budget. She welcomed any suggestions the senators might have. Senators expressed concern about the small amount of shortfall ($40,000), stressed that shared governance is important, questioned the priorities of the CO, and expressed whether the senate may need to explore ways to develop independent funding. The senators also gave recommendations for dealing with the budget shortfall.

vi) Chair Thobaben announced she has appointed Vice Chair Anagnoson to convene an ad hoc committee to make recommendations to the senate about ways we can reduce the assigned time

b) **Academic Affairs** (Mark Van Selst) We have several resolutions for the body. They deal with dual degrees awarded at graduation, repeat policies, joint doctorates, and campus autonomy in setting academic calendars. We are concerned about the quality of the independent EdDs. We will be conducting a review of GE and be updating the 21st Century report. We will also be looking at the distinction between upper and lower-division coursework and master’s and doctoral level work. The GE review will be conducted jointly by AAC and The GE Advisory Committee. Nationwide trends are to increase GE. The Chancellor and Board seem to want us to reduce it. We plan to look at what is happening at other campuses and systems. **Questions and Comments:** What is happening with technology fees? Senators expressed concern over campus autonomy and the review of GE. The systemwide review of GE should not supercede what campuses are doing. One senator expressed the opinion that some parameters of GE must be decided upon at the system level and should be done before campuses make significant changes. GE has evolved differently on different campuses. The review of GE, the move to 120 units, and LDTP are all important curricular initiatives. It is difficult to implement serial changes. Perhaps we should delay all curricular changes until all of these initiatives can be coordinated. Since most of our students transfer after completing their lower-division GE, the only control we can exert over that portion of GE is at a system level. Concern was expressed that feedback and information flows between the campuses and GEAC and AA. Review does not necessarily equate to change. It has been 25 years since the last review of GE. It may be the time to review, particularly in light of the facilitating graduation initiatives. We know that there is pressure to reduce GE. Our agenda should be to improve GE rather than to reduce it. We may even decide to increase requirements. General education is becoming increasingly important as people increasingly have multiple careers. We need to avoid pressures to narrow people’s educational experiences. We need to improve system-campus communication and focus on quality. Perhaps the Executive committee could communicate with campus chairs about the sharing of curriculum responsibility at the system and campus levels.

c) **Faculty Affairs** (Jan Gregory) We are looking at support for new faculty, budget issues, the “Student Bill of Rights,” Constitution Day, Textbooks, and the controversy over “Intelligent Design”.

d) **Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** (Tom Krabacher) We have a resolution on Prop 76. We will be doing a budget and legislative orientation rather than an interim in October. We plan to do a budget orientation for campus chairs in December. We are planning for Legislative Days and are considering a restructuring of our lobbying efforts. We hope to focus on only a few issues and may reduce the number of senators participating in lobbying.
e) **Teacher Education and K-12 Relations** (Jim Wheeler) We have a resolution on the independent EdD. We plan to coordinate more closely with FGA. At the next plenary we plan to have a resolution commending the Early Assessment Program. We will be posting a TEKR lexicon on our web site. We continue to analyze the results of our survey of teacher education/subject matter coordination on the campuses. We are monitoring the progress of the Integrated Teacher Preparation Program. We continue to be concerned about and to monitor the development of the independent EdDs.

f) **General Education Advisory Committee** (John Tarjan) Issues addressed include the SCIGETC pattern, a review of Area A2, a comprehensive review of the structure of GE. The minutes of our meeting will be posted. Please review and forward any ideas/comments. **Comments:** Reducing GE will not result in earlier graduation for most students. It will only result in more free electives. Free electives are good. It is important to look at the purpose of GE.

g) **Commission on Extended University** (Barry Pasternack) The Senate has a written report. In addition, Bob Maxson, retiring CSULB President, will be coordinating the implementation of the independent EdD.

7) **PRESENTATIONS**

a) **Associate Vice Chancellor Keith Boyum** fondly recalled his experiences sitting on the Senate. He chaired several committees during his tenure. SB 724 (independent EdD) is awaiting the Governor’s expected signature. Bob Maxson (CSULB) will be working with the CO to guide the implementation of the EdD. The Executive Committee has been a full partner in curricular and other faculty-related matters over the summer. More students are taking the EAP tests. There is a slight improvement in scores. We are looking forward to the time when the good work of the faculty to define expectations and improve preparation for high school students results in large improvements. We are grateful for the faculty’s efforts in this program. Politicians are anxious to see tangible results. The LDTP project is moving along. It is a partnership with the Senate and faculty across the state. The finalization of the campus-specific portion of these patterns is taking much longer than we had anticipated. We are coming to closure on the initial 33 majors as we are adding 14 new majors and the ITP program is moving in parallel. Our next major task is the development of refreshed and elaborated course descriptors to facilitate systemwide articulation. We are working with the Executive Committee to name faculty to the descriptor development groups. We expect to have LDTP curriculum in place for 85% of the upper-division transfer students. This may be the only majors we do. The campus actions to facilitate graduation are the third initiative focusing on student success. I and the Executive Committee will meet with campus senate chairs and Provosts to discuss these initiatives. A major aspect of this will be the “accreditation style” visits conducted by peer teams. The peer teams will not be to report to the Board on campus situations. It will be up to campus leadership to report on campus progress. We plan a training session for peer team members in January. The teams will have a combination of continuing and new members. The graduation initiatives are the major focus of Academic Affairs. Q: Thanks for the support of EAP. Why doesn’t the administration oppose Prop 76? The small shortfall in the ASCSU budget seems significant to us but is insignificant when one considers the magnitude of what the ASCSU does. A: Message received. The work on the graduation initiatives will be supported independent of the senate budget. Q: While the graduation initiatives are valuable, we may have lost sight of the
importance of student advising. We probably could benefit by having CSU advisors on CC campuses. Q: Can you discuss plans for assessing the impact of LDTP? A: We have talked briefly with the Executive Committee about assessing the effectiveness but we need to spend more time developing an appropriate assessment approach. Q: How will CC courses be qualified for articulation? Can a course meet more than one requirement? What about upper and lower division? A: We will have faculty-led review using the descriptors which will be developed. It may be that staff will be able to assist in the reviews. We hope OSCAR can help. We will have to look at fulfillment of requirements with some flexibility. We rely on the faculty to determine what should happen when upper and lower-division questions come up. Q: The winter session is very valuable to students. Do you support local autonomy in academic calendar issues? Q: What is happening with the use of Social Security numbers to identify faculty? A: I will investigate. Q: I am concerned about the EdD and our role in preparing teachers. This is an opportunity for us to be involved in improving schools. Quality will be a major issue. Q: Who will be the “peers” on these campus visitation teams? A: Faculty will be a large part of 4-5 person teams. We think a dean or associate dean would be a good addition. Perhaps recently retired people could participate. Job descriptions and calls are forthcoming. Senators will be welcome. Q: We should assess whether the goals of these initiatives are met—for example are significant numbers of students helped by LDTP? We need some clarifying language on the 22 campus-based graduation initiatives. Q: We hope that both quantitative and qualitative approaches be taken to assessment.

b) **John Travis, CFA President** We are focusing on the upcoming special election. We are opposing Propositions 75 (“payroll protection” which places onerous demands upon public employee unions) and 76 (state spending limits). We are relieved that the CALPERS legislation has been withdrawn but anticipate that it will appear again. We are in bargaining. The contract does not officially expire until the parties go through mediation and fact-finding, a long process. After the contract expires, however, the administration can impose their “last best offer.” We were hoping for a 3 ½% general salary increase and an SSI for junior faculty that could be “paid for” by deferring the general salary increase. The administration would like a new merit pay program. We have had a very bad history with previous merit pay programs. We offered to establish two joint committees. They would look at merit pay and the true cost of SSIs. The administration is attempting to reduce the security for lecturers. We are discussing faculty workload. Our grievance procedures need to be overhauled. Grievances take too long to adjudicate. Question: we have called for a task force on faculty housing. It appears the administration is unwilling to establish one. Can we get a joint CFA/CSU/ASCSU task force going? Answer: we will try to address this important issue. Question: where did the merit pay proposal come from and what are you going to do? Answer: I don’t know why it came up at this time. We are open to exploring merit pay systems that have worked at comparable institutions. Question: what is likely to happen with the FERP program? Answer: we don’t think FERP will be eliminated altogether. The administration wants to change the structure. CFA does not want any change to the program.

c) **Faculty Trustee Craig Smith** Please refer to my written report. We will be looking and the environmental impact of proposed construction at SDSU. We will be looking at adopting a new student code of conduct. I and Senator Reichman and others have had a lot of input. Collective bargaining continues, although I am precluded from direct involvement. Facilitating graduation continues to be a focus. We are charged with
presidential review. This is an intensive process. I will be serving on a number of committees including Educational Policies. I will be visiting quite a few campuses this year. Have your president invite me.

d) Hironao Okahana (CSSA Liaison) reported on the CSSA meetings and election results. We are focusing again on voter registration. We support SB 191 which requires the CSU to have automated registration for students at the time they register for classes. We will be asking professors to open up their lower-division courses for visits to promote grass-root voter registration efforts. We have been working on the Title V revision – student code of conduct past three months. With help of the Chancellor’s Office, the board is likely supports the wordings on the proposal and continues to work with the Chancellor’s Office on the implementation document. We continue to be concerned about textbook prices and are looking forward to work together with the Academic Senate on this issue. We will be developing a policy agenda prior to your next plenary. We are reopening the search process for a second student trustee. I enjoyed participating in the GEAC and Academic Affairs Committee meetings and am looking forward to work with you all throughout the year.

8) RESOLUTIONS

a) Assisting Victims of Hurricane Katrina (AS-2712-05/FA) M/S Gregory/Persons First Reading Waiver
   i) This resolution is timely, hence the request for a first reading waiver.
   ii) The resolution urges support for faculty and students affected by Hurricane Katrina as well as those who are assisting in the crisis.
   iii) Are the last four resolved clauses really necessary?
   iv) A couple of minor amendments were made to the resolution.
   v) The motion was passed without dissent.

b) Urgency of Settling Faculty Compensation Matters in the Current Contract Bargaining (AS-2713-05/FA) M/S Gregory/Persons First Reading Waiver
   i) Many are disturbed by the slow pace of contract negotiations.
   ii) There is precedent for this type of resolution.
   iii) The call for a GSI of 3.5% seems reasonable when the MPP increase for this year is 3.65%.
   iv) The reason for the waiver is timeliness given bargaining developments.
   v) A proposal was made to delete a direct reference to the amount of compensation increase being bargained. This proposal was defeated.
   vi) The resolution was passed without dissent.

c) Re-affirmation of Prior Actions and Statements on Merit Pay (AS-2714-05/FA) M/S Kegley/Cheyne First Reading Waiver
   i) The item is urgent given current bargaining developments.
   ii) The resolution carefully reviews past actions and principles regarding merit pay.
   iii) Perhaps a simple resolution with fewer resolved clauses would be more effective.
   iv) An amendment urging assessment of merit pay systems was passed.
   v) This item passed.

d) Proposition 76: State Spending and School Funding (AS-2715-05/FGA) First Reading Waiver
   i) The item is time urgent given the upcoming election.
   ii) In the Spring we opposed this type of legislation in general terms.
iii) This measure could result in serious harm to the CSU through decreased funding from the state.
iv) This may be the most important issue facing the CSU today.
v) The item passed unanimously.
e) **Faculty Participation in the Development of Applied Doctoral Programs** (AS-2716-05/TEKR) M/S Wheeler/Cook First Reading Waiver
i) A first reading waiver was granted given the urgency of developing an ad hoc committee to develop principles and guidelines to be applied to these programs.
ii) The item passed unanimously.
f) **Double Major Across Two Different Degree Programs** (AS-2717-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Silvis First Reading
i) This item is in response to a referral from the Chancellor’s Office.
ii) Several current policies were discussed.
g) **Repeat Policies** (AS-2718-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Rohm First Reading
i) These types of policies seem to limit student choice.
h) **Continued Support for Joint Doctorates** (AS-2719-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Yee First Reading
i) The intent of this resolution is to reaffirm support for continuing joint programs in the light of potential authority for independent EdDs.
ii) There is concern on the part of the UC that the CSU commitment to the joint programs may be diminishing.
i) **Reaffirmation of Early Declaration of Major** (AS-2720-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Rohm First Reading
i) There are several attached documents dealing with earlier actions on this topic.
ii) Was consideration given to early declaration by transfer students.
iii) Senator consultation with their campuses was urged.
j) **Campus Autonomy in Establishing Their Academic Calendar** (AS-2721-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Rohm First Reading
i) This is in response to an apparent movement towards a common calendar.

9) The meeting was adjourned at 2:28 pm on Friday, September 16th, 2005.