Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 9, 2004, by Chair David McNeil.

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, John Shields, Sherman Sowby; (Fullerton) Vincent Buck, Diane Guerin, Barry Pasternack; (Hayward) Hank Reichman; (Humboldt) Marshelle Thobaben; (Long Beach) Luis Arroyo, David Hood, Craig Smith; (Los Angeles) J. Theodore Anagnoson, Marshall Cates, Nancy Hunt; (Maritime Academy) Greg Cho, James Wheeler; (Monterey Bay) Ken Nishita, Mark O’Shea; (Northridge) Lynne Cook, Michael Reagan, Barbara Swerkes; (Pomona) Rochelle Kellner, Marvin Klein, Ann Morgan; (Sacramento) Cristy Jensen, Thomas Krabacher, Louise Timmer; (San Bernardino) Buckley Barrett, Tapie Rohm; (San Diego) Fred Hornbeck, Thomas Warschauer; (San Francisco) Jan Gregory, Kenneth Monteiro, Darlene Yee; (San José) David McNeil, Romey Sabalius, Mark Van Selst; (San Luis Obispo) Manzar Foroohar, Myron Hood, Unny Menon; (San Marcos) Dick Montanari; (Sonoma) Susan McKillop, Robert McNamara; (Stanislaus) Paul O’Brien, Mark Thompson; (Retired Faculty) Len Mathy; (Chancellor’s Office) David Spence (Immediate Past Chair) Robert Cherny. Others Present: Keith Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor, AA; Jeff Obayashi, CSSA Liaison; Kathy Kaiser, Faculty Trustee; Ron Kroman, ERFA Representative; Manolo Platin, President, CSSA; Richard West Executive Vice Chancellor; Murray Galinson, Chair, BOT; Lorie Roth, Assistant Vice Chancellor, AA

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes—delayed pending editorial changes in process.

Announcements and Communications

a. A reception will be hosted at 5:30 in the foyer by Executive Committee
b. Release time letters and travel funds should have been received already at the campuses.

Reports

a. The Chair has submitted a written report. The Executive Committee has been working through the summer on transfer issues, the budget of the CSU, liaising with the other segments. The participation of Senators is vital to the process of shared governance. This plenary meeting will be weighted towards presentations as many potential resolutions will require more work before being introduced to the body. Good communications between the campuses and the Academic Senate CSU, and the Executive Committee and the Senate as a whole are essential. New Senators were given an orientation today, primarily through a formal presentation by Bob Cherny. Our budget is quite tight but we have been able to protect release time for this year. We need to be mindful of saving funds when traveling. Systemwide committee representatives should submit electronic copies of reports. Those reports containing more urgent issues can also be presented orally at plenary meetings. Nominations for faculty trustee are due soon. More information will be coming to the campuses.
b. Academic Affairs (Ted Anagnoson, Chair) We have received reports from Keith Boyum and Marshall Cates on the LDTP. Questions: How will 70 unit upper-division programs be accommodated? How will representatives be chosen—the coded memo from AA was clear in indicating that program faculty will select them. We are working on remediation and labeling of students. Community service has come up again in the California Performance Review. We believe it should be voluntary. Inter-campus transfer priority was discussed. We discussed graduation rates of athletes. Myron Hood has a resolution which would limit participation in the postseason to teams with a 6-year graduation rate of at least 50%. Did not get to a discussion of CCs offering BAs. Did not get to quality of courses taught through extended education. Did not get to EO 365—credit for non-traditional courses. The committee was requested to develop (or have Marshall Cates develop) a FAQ sheet on the LDTP. Several Senators indicated that there are so many questions being asked across the system that developing a FAQ sheet may be somewhat urgent. Keith Boyum indicated that his office is very willing to assist in the development.

c. Faculty Affairs (Jan Gregory, Chair) We carried over some old business. We are looking at the status of the movement of graduate business programs to divisions of extended education. We expect a resolution to come forward in January. Tom Warschauer will be the lead on this issue. The Morrow Bill (Student Bill of Rights) will likely be reintroduced to the legislature. Chair Gregory examined campus web sites to discover information on student grievances, student rights and responsibilities and academic freedom. There is a lot of variation across the campuses. The campus chairs will be updated at their October meeting. Any Senators that have campus information are encouraged to communicate with Chair Gregory. The committee is interested in forming a closer alliance between the CSU and the AAUP. A discussion of background checks on new hires was held with John Travis, CFA President, and Jackie McClain, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources. The UAW will represent graduate students with paid teaching and/or research responsibilities. No contract has yet been negotiated but the committee expects several contentious points. CMS implementation will be revisited.

d. Teacher Education, K-12 Relations (Marvin Klein, Chair) The Committee discussed the year’s agenda. It will include CSET (subject matter competency), joint Ed.D.s, the status of blended programs, and teacher performance measures. Resolutions on the President’s Task Force on Ed Leadership Programs report and the allocation of the teacher credential fee differential will come to the floor.

e. Fiscal & Governmental Affairs (Hank Reichman, Chair) Discussed avenues for influencing legislation. We are at the end of a legislative season. Reviewed the status of bills from last year. SB 1785 (Scott—LDTP) is on the Governor’s desk. It has been amended to address many of our concerns. SB 1415 (Brulte—common course numbering) is also on the governor’s desk. There was a lot of activity surrounding the Master Plan. It has borne relatively little fruit. AB 242 (faculty responsibilities) and SB 1331 (higher education accountability) are on the governor’s desk. The two textbook bills have been revised and do not include specific mandates to the CSU. The committee will try to work closely with the CO, CSSA and CFA to maintain adequate funding for the CSU. It is considering developing an Academic Senate CSU legislative report. A report on
the budget was delivered by Patrick Lenz, CO budget liaison. The Governor has tentatively agreed to a $225m increase including a 3% overall increase and a 2.5% enrollment increase. The question remains whether we should work within the Compact or ask for more. The Chancellor is concerned about the salary gap for faculty and administration. Karen Yelverton Zamarripa gave a report on lobbying efforts from the CSU. It is a very complex process. We discussed how differences in stances between the faculty and CO can be addressed. We discussed the California Performance Review. There is a resolution coming on student fees. A waiver of first reading will be requested.

development of the year in August. Are working hard on voter registration on all of the campuses. Board member Phil Vasquez has requested all possible help from faculty on student voter registration. Our Board priorities for the year are 1) CSU Budget, 2) Student Fees, 3) Voter Registration. Other issues include campus-based fees and excess units. We have been working to name representatives to systemwide committees and have been communicating with the legislature. We are interested in controlling textbook costs. We are tracking legislation. We are looking carefully at AB 2710 on a long-term fee policy. Manolo Platin (CSSA Chair) indicated that the CSSA is focusing strongly on Federal, other aid programs. In response to a question: the CSSA has not taken a position on the use of SSN for student identification.

c. CPEC California Postsecondary Education Commission (Trustee Kaiser, Susan McKillop) The last meeting saw heated discussion. The issue of the use of student identifiers by the CSU and UC was discussed. CPEC is of the opinion that they can receive data with identifiers from the systems. The CSU and UC believe that transmitting data with student identifiers may compromise federal aid. Legal opinions are being sought by both sides. CPEC is examining performance and performance indicators for the entire system of higher education. Is the state getting its money’s worth? Access is very good but student success measures lag. CPEC is looking at the salary gap for presidents (37% under market). Trustee Kaiser raised the point to CPEC that the methodology report used to examine executive compensation should also be used for faculty compensation. Space computations/allocations are being reexamined for the first time in almost 40 years. Several campuses have already ceased use of SSN for student identification.

d. SAFT (CMS Student Module) (John Tarjan) The 6 Banner campuses need to be fully implemented by Fall 08. This probably means that these campuses will need to begin implementation starting next fall. PeopleSoft is continually upgrading the product. SSN was discussed. Campuses are phasing out use.

i. Transfer Credit

1. It is very expensive to enter and maintain these rules. Is likely the largest tangible implementation cost
2. Automation of transfer credit is essential for campuses processing large numbers of transfer students
3. LB has approximately 400,000 transfer credit rules and has approximately 3500 new transfer students each fall.
4. San José used ASSIST data to populate many of their rules. It took a while to develop a conversion program but has greatly
facilitated input and update. San José will make this program available to other campuses.

ii. Advising

1. Students will be able to check their progress through self-service capabilities
2. Lots of flexibility in setting up requirements
3. Powerful degree audits

i. Executive Vice Chancellor Richard West discussed the current and next year’s budget. There was a lot of publicity regarding the current budget—the 4th straight year of reductions and fee increases. $562m was the total cumulative reduction. We believe the worst is over. $40m was restored in the spring. We will be about 10,000 lower in FTE this year over the past year. This reflects the reduction in our budget through limiting enrollment. The deficit reduction bond allowed CA to “balance” the budget this year. We believe there will be a $6b-$10b per year budget shortfall. It may be possible to balance the budget for one more year under current approaches but we will need to increase revenues in future years. It is a difficult environment for the CSU. We have deferred several items to future years. There is money for a 3% overall increase, 2.5% enrollment increase, 8% fee increase for next year. This will be the first increase in several years. In the past we have been reduced in budget and enrollment. We will not be restored to where we think we should be any time soon. The future is uncertain. We are working on a long-term fee policy. It will be on the Board agenda in September. We have been working with the Senate and CSSA on the issue. We feel that we will have to increasingly depend upon student fee income as a proportion of our revenues. Questions: What do “above the line” and “below the line” mean? And how do we determine what is reasonable to ask for below the line? What will we ask for this year? Answer: 4 or 5 items (mandatory costs such as health benefits, enrollment, compensation) are above the line. Salaries are a high priority for this year. Other initiatives such as libraries, infrastructure, deferred maintenance, appear below the line in the budget. Question: What is the likelihood that we will be able to keep the 3% compensation increase in 05/06? Answer: It is likely but increases in the next year are less likely. Question: What is happening on ACR 73? Answer: We are working on the numbers but are unlikely to do much in the near term? Executive Vice Chancellor West gave a report on the budget and the likelihood of quality-related increases/restoration. There is a pattern of fee increases in bad economic times and no increases during good economic times. Salaries are a priority but it is tough to do much in the short run. We are developing a long-term strategy. Questions: What is the strategy? Can we understand it? Question: Do we have data on the % of the budget devoted to instruction this year and historically? Answer: Salaries represent about 80% of our budget. About 41% of our budget goes to instruction historically. It does not change much. Question: Will we have to borrow money to implement CMS? Answer: One or two campuses are borrowing. There is precedent for doing this but most campuses have paid out of current funds. Question: What is being done on space allocation formulas? Answer: We are trying to be more flexible on designating categories of space. The LAO, Department of Finance have been more flexible in approving projects. We are trying to develop an intermediate category of capital projects that would allow remodeling, enhancement of
existing space. As a side note: almost every construction bid has come in 20-30% over budget this year. Question: To whom does the CSU auditor report? Answer: The CSU auditor is under the direct supervision of the Chair of the BOT. Question: What has happened concerning the case of the auditor that misplaced a hard disk with individual employee data? Answer: It was indeterminate whether the drive was stolen or misplaced. The disk was removed for replacement since it was defective. It was corrupted and likely unusable. There have been no indications that the data was stolen—likely to have been discarded and in a landfill somewhere. Notifications to potentially affected individuals were given strictly as a cautious measure. Question: Given the increase in systemwide targets, will campuses be held rigorously to enrollment targets? In 04/05 we will shoot slightly above target since we will have reductions for every student we fall short. In 05/06 we will likely go back to a +/- 1% target/actual goal for campuses. Campuses will likely get close to a 2.5% campus increase in 05/06 but negotiations will take place for 06/07.

j. **BOT Chair Murray Galinson** shared his background in the law, academia, politics and banking. Chair Galinson stressed the importance of collaboration across all CSU constituencies. We have to work together to ensure the highest quality education for our students. Issues coming before the board of potential interest: funding (state and private funds), campus capacity, faculty and administration compensation, student preparation, the effectiveness of Ed.D. programs, cooperation across the CSU, UC and CCC. Question: What was the involvement of the Board in developing the Compact with the Governor? We were informed that negotiations were underway—I was probably more informed than most. It was an unfortunate, but necessary strategy to pursue to protect the CSU. It is unfortunate that legislative leadership was unable to develop a specific proposal until after the Compact was signed and then were so negative about the Compact. Chair Galinson clarified his previous public remarks/views on remedial education. Remediation should be accomplished while students are in high school. The placement test should be given both at the high school level and when remediation is completed if at the university level. The CSU can do a lot to help K-12 to prepare our future students. In response to concerns over salary lags: a committee has been appointed to look at salaries at the executive, dean and faculty levels. It needs to be reinvigorated. Increasing salaries at every level is a priority for the board. We have 8 new Trustees. They have potential to be very effective members of the Board. They are balanced politically, are diverse and collectively have experience in all 3 systems. 6 of them went through an orientation. Chair Galinson feels strongly about the importance of Trustee campus visits. The Board is aware of the faculty retirement/hiring problem. Chair Galinson will bring up this issue with Chancellor Reed and Executive Vice Chancellor Spence. Question: What are the prospects for an independent CSU Ed.D.? Answer: We have some considerable support for the degree in the legislature. Chair Galinson expressed empathy for students who change their career goals while they are in school.

k. **Chancellor Charles Reed** emphasized the need to facilitate transfer. There may be up to $100m of access represented by the streamlining of the transfer process. He is optimistic about the future of the CSU, even given the “body blows” we have taken. We still have to cut $172m from the budget on top of
cuts in the previous 2 years. There has been roughly a $520m net reduction over the last 3 years. The presidents have been meeting monthly rather than every 2 months for the past 3 years to develop strategies to avoid layoffs and serve as many students as possible. There have been very few layoffs system wide. We will have to find room for an additional 7500 students this year (mainly in spring). Still we will have about 10,000 fewer students this year over last year. We cannot continue to serve the same number of students given the dramatic budget cuts. We believe most of these unserved students are in the CCC. Why have a Compact? The legislature had not come forward with sufficient funding to allow us to fulfill our mission. The CSU is working on statewide, regional, campus-by-campus economic impact statements. We believe we add $13b to the state economy. Student, alumni and employee tax contributions exceed our annual budget. Higher education is a high priority for the state but will never be the highest for our elected officials who need to maintain the public health and welfare. This makes an agreement with predictable funding essential when marginal funds can be drawn to other areas. We believe the Compact is a funding floor. It is for 6 years. It includes enrollment targets. It has increasing augmentations to our base in increased enrollment targets. We believe it will provide an additional $225m over the next two years. After 05/06 we will get back to where we were before the 02/03 cuts. A large structural deficit still exists in the state budgets. Revenue enhancements (taxes, fees) will need to occur. 06/07 may be a difficult year. Health care costs in CA are increasing: 11% this year. Our CSU health care costs are $225m. This represents the equivalent of a 9% raise for all of our employees. $50m is required to just “keep the lights on” in our buildings, campuses. Our insurance claims have been very minimal until this year. We have had a number of unfortunate accidents. We are concerned about increasing premiums. We may not even be able to find coverage in the United States. Interestingly, we were saving money when we used Enron as an energy supplier. We are paying about $25m more in power now that we have had to find alternate suppliers. Our increases in enrollment mean that we will need an additional $60m in funds. The Presidents are united that compensation is the number one priority. Unfortunately, we have a long list of other needed priorities. We will take a budget to the Board at the end of October. Question: what is your take on the California Performance Review (CPR)? Answer: There may be relatively few significant changes coming from the 2500 pages of findings, recommendations. While there are a lot of good ideas, there may be relatively little political support for most of the recommendations. For example, it is unlikely for CCs to offer baccalaureate degrees. The purported savings for the recommendations as a whole seem overly optimistic. Still, the CPR has some good ideas on transfer. Question: What is your take on campus-based fees? Answer: I have discouraged, even disallowed additional fees, including some of those levied by students on themselves. We need to push forward over the next 3 years to fully implement CMS. The CPR is realizing how antiquated, inadequate the current state information systems are. The state controller may be looking at PeopleSoft as a vendor for state systems. Question: Could you comment on the new members of the Board of Trustees? Answer: We had an unprecedented 8 new board members this summer. It is a great group of people with the right values, collective understanding. For the first time there was an
orientation from the Governor’s office. There is a steep learning curve for new trustees, but this group is committed. The new group includes 5 Democrats and 3 Republicans—this Board will be apolitical. Question: Given the funding crisis, why isn’t more money going directly to instruction rather than funding other priorities? Answer: Funds are limited and we believe many of these prioritizations need to be made locally. Students still need services and a clean and safe learning environment. While instruction is our #1 priority, other demands on funds are also urgent. Presidents, Deans, faculty need to have compensation increases. Each 1% increase in compensation systemwide costs us about $25m. Across the board increases at the level needed are very difficult. Questions: What can be done to recognize faculty who generate funds on campuses? Answer: It needs to be done at the campus level. It is unfortunate if it is not adequately done. Question: What can/is being done to restore our libraries? Answer: We are aware of the problem. Question: What will be done on ACR 73 (faculty composition)? Answer: I am optimistic that we can do some things to improve the situation in the long run. Given our salary structures, we are only competitive within California, Oregon and New York. This is not an acceptable situation. Regarding capital expenditures: our construction bids have come in 20-40% over budget this year.

I. Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence indicated that AA and the Executive Committee have continued working on many issues during the summer. Associate Vice Chancellor Keith Boyum has been a great help to the administration and Senate alike. The facilitating graduation initiatives are basically the only way that we can increase our capacity. In his presentation to the California Performance Review he indicated that he is extremely proud of our faculty and their efforts to help more students progress to graduation. The 3 components of this effort are early assessment, transfer initiatives, and campus initiatives for facilitating graduation. 186,000 high school juniors took the language arts test. 118,000 took the math diagnostics test. These numbers are much higher than anticipated. The purpose of early assessment is to get students the help they need in their senior year. Even if the results from these tests are disappointing—and they very well may be—it gives us the information we need to improve preparation. Due to the volume of students, the test results will be delayed this year. They will come back by August 18th next year. The faculty have worked with the schools, each other to bring this initiative to fruition. Interestingly, several people at the CPR had earlier indicated a pessimism that anything could be done to improve the transfer situation. The Chair of the CPR at one point turned to Dr. Spence who highlighted the good work of our faculty to facilitate transfer. The commission members were taken aback at how much we are accomplishing. SB 1785 was modified due to Executive Committee efforts to make the language more acceptable to the faculty. Dr. Spence brought up the desirability of having dedicated transfer AA degrees at CCs. The campus-based facilitating graduation recommendations generated by the Facilitating Graduation Task Force have been very valuable in this regard. We are concerned about improving the effectiveness of advising for students. The Board is very supportive and interested in the progress of the campus efforts to facilitate student success. The CO will try to ensure reporting to the Board on the progress in these areas. Dr. Spence also brought up our work on accountability measures at the CPR. Pending/proposed legislation
mirrors what we already do. We are opposed to substituting fee waivers for Cal Grants. It would be bad for both our students and our system. We are also firmly committed to serving all students but opposed to having CCs offer baccalaureate degrees. In response to mandatory community service, the CSU has restated its commitment to provide service opportunities to all students. The amount of CSU student community service has doubled in the last 2-3 years. Almost half of our undergraduates are involved with community service/service learning. Perhaps the only significant initiative that will come out of the CPR that will affect us is concerning transfer. We welcome it. Question: Can you comment on the Report of the Presidents’ Commission on Educational Leadership? Answer: Presidents’ commissions put us in a bind. Their recommendations come in final form but probably need to be amended/refined during implementation, especially when dealing with curriculum. While many excellent recommendations are contained in this report, much work remains for the faculty as we implement them.

m. Faculty Trustee Kathy Kaiser fondly recalled the opportunity she had to participate in the summer program on the Maritime Academy summer cruise. The ship has an international crew and faculty. It is an excellent learning opportunity for students across the CSU. Our Maritime Academy is the only such institution on the West coast. We should publicize this opportunity to our students—some slots went unfilled. The faculty did a tremendous job and received very high evaluations from the students. Dr. Kaiser is very impressed by the new group of trustees. She is especially impressed by their interest in data-based responses to inquiries. The trustees making campus visits are impressed by the tremendous diversity they encounter across our campuses. Campuses have already submitted the first report cards on facilitating graduation. Trustees attended nine campus graduations in the spring. It is always a wonderful experience. The process of determining an appropriate fee policy has involved many different constituencies and a great deal of collaboration.

n. CFA President John Travis reported that the UAW is now representing student academic employees on our campuses. By the time they had contact with the UAW the organizing cards had been returned. The CFA was chagrined at this lack of communication. The CFA had previously taken the stance that students who were teaching as a part of their degree requirements are more properly considered students but those that taught independently of program requirement should be considered Unit 3 employees. Because of this, an appeal was made to PERB that the CFA is the appropriate bargaining entity and if these students are organized, they should be represented by CFA. The appeal was denied. This ruling has also been appealed. The contract expires next June 30. CFA represents 22,000 faculty on 23 campuses. Bargaining and the development of proposals is a very complex process. A request was made for input on priorities from all faculty for the next round of bargaining. Campuses should hold meetings of their members. CFA supports many of the principles contained in the Compact but opposed the Compact on the grounds that we could do better through our lobbying efforts. A major theme of these lobbying efforts is to demonstrate the importance of the CSU for California. The administration has signed an agreement to recognize the UAW’s right to represent student academic employees, pending the ruling of PERB.
Dr. Cates had hoped for 20-30% of high school juniors to take the tests. Approximately 50% took them. This group includes a high percentage of students not completing our entrance requirements nor intending to enroll with us as freshmen. In interpreting the results, we should keep in mind that the students who took them were juniors only part way through the 3rd year of their high school experience. The pass rate may look worse than it would have with a smaller base. We hope that the results from these diagnostic tests will lead to a senior year experience in which more students will take mathematics and that the nature of English courses will change. The English Council has already developed some teacher development materials and the Math Council is working on materials.

7. **RESOLUTIONS PASSED**

1. **Student Fee Policy** (AS-2671-04/FGA)
   a. Waiver of first reading—necessary given time urgency (Board meeting).
   b. Discussion:
      i. Needed for planning—good for the students, the state to have a plan.
      ii. Perhaps we should study methodologies from other states
      iii. CSSA supports the spirit of this resolution to go beyond the Compact, has a lot of concern about campus-based fees
      iv. The Senate supports the 25% target but would like to further investigate long-term fee structures in conjunction with other interested parties.
   c. Text:

   RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) continue its support of the goals expressed in the California Master Plan for Higher Education which state, among other things, that California should ensure that those eligible shall have affordable access to higher education of high quality; and be it further

   RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU affirm the principle that higher education is an essential public good and that the preponderance of its cost should be met through public funding; and be it further

   RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm the guidelines expressed in AS-2631-03/FGA and the long-term undergraduate student fee policy expressed in AS-2644-04/FGA; and be it further

   RESOLVED: That, given the “Compact” of 2004 has already established a schedule of fee increases over the next three years, the Academic Senate CSU call upon the Chancellor’s Office to form a committee made up of representatives of the Academic Senate CSU, system and campus administrators, and representatives from the California State Student Association to study the issue of student fees with a goal of determining the appropriate share of the cost of education that should be borne by undergraduate and graduate students in following years and presenting a plan for reaching this goal.

   **RATIONALE:** Determining the portion of the cost of an education that is to be borne by students is a complicated issue requiring a great deal of study. For
example, the current fee structure of the California State University may limit the degree of federal funding available for supporting higher education. The Governor and CSU administration have entered into a compact that will determine fee increases for undergraduate and graduate education over the next three years. This will allow for sufficient time for the CSU to study this issue.

APPROVED WITHOUT DISSENT

2. **Response to the Report of The CSU Presidents Take Force on Educational Leadership Programs** (AS-2672-04/TEKR)
   
d. Waiver of first reading—this will be in front of the Board next week so a response is somewhat urgent.

e. Discussion:
   
i. The report seems to be well done and drew upon experts in the field.
   
   ii. No significant faculty consultation has taken place yet (summer receipt of report). We should leave time for consultation before implementation.
   
   iii. There was considerable debate on the best wording to indicate the Senate’s intent that any curricular initiatives arising from this report be under the control of campus faculty.

f. Text:

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) thank the members of the CSU Presidents Task Force on Educational Leadership Programs who worked collaboratively to examine the role of the K-12 administrators of the future and to provide recommendations to the CSU on the recruitment and preparation of K-12 administrators contained in the report of the CSU Presidents Task Force on Educational Leadership Programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That, given these recommendations have an impact on curricula, the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm its commitment to the principle that all curricula be developed by faculty on campuses where the program will be offered; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly urge that the Academic Senate CSU be included and involved in future review and input on systemwide recommendations that impact upon curricula.

APPROVED

8. **RESOLUTION—First Reading**

1. **Allocation of Teacher Credential Fee Differential** (AS-2672-04/TEKR)
   
a. The SFR in graduate courses is currently ½ of that in undergraduate courses—post-baccalaureate courses are already being subsidized at a high rate. Is the intent of this resolution to:
   
i. Reduce funding of these programs to a level commensurate with actual fees paid, as compared to other programs or,
   
   ii. further increase the subsidy of these programs at the expense of others?
1. Perhaps the resolution could be reworded to all post-baccalaureate programs.
2. Could some mention of stipends for Master Teachers be included in this resolution?

iii. Text:

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) recommend that any fee differential paid by post-baccalaureate credential students be allocated to the education programs in which the students are enrolled; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU communicate this recommendation to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees and urge them to develop a viable plan to implement this allocation.

RATIONALE: The State and the CSU have failed to fund adequately the costs of post-baccalaureate credential programs. Analysts of higher education recognize that post-baccalaureate credential education is more expensive than undergraduate education because of such factors as the necessity for close interaction of faculty with students and the technological support such programs require. To move the CSU toward adequately funding post-baccalaureate credential programs, the increased fees paid by post-baccalaureate credential students should be allocated to the programs in which those students are enrolled.

SECOND READING