

Executive Committee
of the
Academic Senate, California State University

October 2-3, 2003

1. The meeting was convened at 2:15 p.m. with Cherny, Cook, Hood, Kegley, McNeil and Snyder present as well as Faculty Trustee Kaiser and Standing Committee Chairs Cates and Thompson. (Snyder and Thobaben were delayed by fog; Jensen was delayed by a search committee meeting in Sacramento. All joined the committee at 8:30 on Oct. 3.)

2. **Approval of Agenda and Minutes**

The agenda was approved with numerous additions of discussion items.

3. **Minutes**

The Minutes of the September meeting were approved.

4. **Announcements and Reports**

Chair Cherny noted that the functions of the office staff were being reviewed in light of Debbie Hennessey's retirement and the appointment of Ann Peacock.

There will be a search for Gary Hammerstrom's vacated position; faculty will provide input in developing the position description and will also serve on the selection committee.

5. **IMPAC Lead Faculty for Journalism**

The Executive Committee approved the appointment of John Burks (SFSU).

6. **IMPAC Lead Faculty for Agriculture**

The Executive Committee approved the appointment of Mark Bender (Stanislaus).

7. **Draft Executive Order 168 on Research**

The Executive Committee authorized a number of changes to the letter and requested Chair Cherny send the letter to David Spence.

The Committee asked that Campus Senate Chairs be apprised of the new policy.

The Committee asked that Lynne Cook discuss its concerns with Faculty Affairs.

8. Title V Change

Pursuant to AB 1773 passed in 2000 specifying that the Board of Trustees in consultation with the faculty shall develop policies to prohibit the unauthorized copying of intellectual property for commercial purposes, the Committee authorized Chair Cherny to write to Board Chair Farrar stipulating that the required consultation had taken place and concurring with the Title V changes.

9. Projects on Lower Division Core Requirements in the Major (POL)

John Karras and Ken Nishita discussed ongoing Lower Division Projects with special attention to outcomes such as revised CAN descriptors. There was also discussion of the CAN Board meeting of October 10th.

The Executive Committee is particularly concerned about speeding up the disciplinary projects already in progress as well as starting new disciplinary projects that can be finished before April 2004.

Chair Cherny will write to project leaders encouraging them to complete their projects in a timely manner.

The Committee agreed that David McNeil, Ken Nishita, Bob Cherny, and John Karras would revise the "Process Outline" as well as develop a letter to department chairs, a model process and model budget, and a MOU with CAN to develop a process to submit descriptor revisions.

10. POL Economics

Chair Cherny will ask Dennis Muraoka to convene the department chairs in Economics to develop a list of common lower division major requirements.

11. Master Plan Issues

The Executive Committee discussed AB 242 and the positions of CFA and the Community Colleges on the bill.

There was a conference call between the three system senate chairs (Clark, Cherny, Pitts) on September 18th. Jensen and Cook also took part. The goal is to develop a common position on SB 6, AB 242, and SB 550. Larry Pitts was to develop a charge to three groups to develop common language on these three bills.

Chair Cherny was asked to give Larry Pitts a followup call to see what had been done as well as what could be done.

12. Liu Committee Hearings

Chair Cherny reported on his testimony before the Liu Committee on September 23rd, and plans were made for subsequent testimony at future hearings.

There will be three more hearings this Fall:

Tuesday- October 21: “Surveying the Alternatives”

What are the most promising options that should be considered for restructuring California's higher education funding mechanism and what are the basic strengths and weaknesses of each approach? Which three to four options should receive the greatest consideration?

Tuesday, November 18: “Choosing the Best Option”

What are the specific advantages and disadvantages of the most promising three to four policy options? What are the long-term consequences of each option?

Tuesday, December 9: “Final Recommendations”

What is our recommendation for changing the funding mechanism? Should California's higher education funding mechanism be restructured and, if yes, what is the best way to proceed in implementing the change?

Assignments were made to develop positions and make presentations at the hearings.

13. Report Time at Board of Trustees Meetings

After considerable discussion, the Executive Committee decided not to request a scheduled report time on the Board’s agendas. The Senate now has a special status, namely, it is considered a full participant in Board proceedings and its representatives may seek the floor to speak at any time. This status might well be lost if the Senate was designated a “Report group.”

14. Governance Group

There should be a meeting of the Governance Group in November. Senate Chair Cherny will contact Board Chair Farrar. There was agreement that the senate representatives would request an agenda based on Thompson's message preceding the canceled September meeting.

There was a discussion of campus faculty input into raising enrollment limits when they are not yet at the ceiling. Chair Cherny will discuss this issue with David Spence.

15. CMS and Committees

There has been a lack of faculty input into CMS matters. Further, Richard West's memo to the CMS Project Advisory Committee of September 30, 2003, discusses the charge to and duties of various committees. Chair Cherny will discuss this with Richard West.

16. Define Quality

At the Chairs' meeting, Richard West, when discussing the rise in the SFR, asked for some assistance in defining quality to the legislature. When we assert that quality is dependent upon a lower SFR, how can we substantiate this claim.

Various contacts were suggested to learn of the most recent research: Mary Allen, Nancy Shulock, and Lorie Roth.

Lynne Cook was asked to bring this before Academic Affairs Committee.

17. ICC Transfer Committee Report

Jackie Kegley presented the draft CSU portion of the ICC Transfer Committee report and requested that responses and suggested changes to it be sent to her.

18. Campus Senate Feedback

There was discussion of the relevance of Senate actions for campus senates.

We should request feedback on selected topics that are of overriding campus concern.

We should also think about training for new Senate Chairs.

19. Policies Regarding Research

In light of the draft E.O to replace E.O. 168, we should ask campuses about their research policies. Since there are currently two research models (one in which a foundation handles research grants, and the other in which an administrative office handles research grants), we should ask campus research directors and campus senate chairs which model their campus is using. Finally, we should ask for a report on the faculty role in research oversight.

20. ETS (Infocomp) and Student Assessment

The Academic Affairs Committee asked Lorie Roth for background data. The Committee is currently gathering further information and may offer a resolution for the November Plenary.

21. Legislative Information and Tracking

There was discussion of the ways that information regarding pending legislation is conveyed to the Senate and how the Chancellor's Office takes position on pending legislation. There continues to be a problem with the faculty receiving information on the positions taken by the Chancellor's Office legislative representatives.

Chair Cherny is to confer with David and Richard regarding ways to improve the flow of information.

22. Joint Meeting with FGA

At 1:00 p.m., the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee joined the Executive Committee, and were joined, in turn, by Susan Meisenhelder, the Chair of CFA's Political Action and Legislative Committee. Dr. Meisenhelder discussed how CFA's legislative agenda was developed, fielded questions on CFA's lobbying efforts, and discussed CFA's positions on various pieces of legislation.

23. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m. on October 3rd.

Respectfully submitted,



Dave Hood
Secretary