Academic Senate CSU
Plenary Minutes

Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium

Thursday March 19, 2009 10:15 a.m. — 5:00 p.m. - Senate Social 5:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.

Friday March 20, 2009 8:30 a.m. — 2:30 p.m.

1. Call to order
10:15 Thursday March 19th, 2009

2. Roll call

3. Approval of agenda
   • Approved as amended
      o Item 8.7 (prop 8 resolution) moved first
      o Item 8.3 referred back to committee at committee request

4. Approval of minutes
   • Approved

5. Announcements
   • CSU Northridge is hosting a disability conference this weekend; passes for senators are available.
   • IT security policies are continuing to be reviewed by the appropriate groups at the Office of the Chancellor. There was a lot of campus input into the policies. Concerns were raised concerning due process.

6. Presentations/Introductions
   • Tracy Butler introduced Yvonne Benavides (Office of the Chancellor) who will be providing assistance to the Academic Senate of the CSU staff during this plenary
   • Chair Tarjan introduced Jerri Echeverria
   • Senator Cecile Bendavid was introduced by Steven Stepanek

7. Reports:
   • Chair
      o Appreciation and acknowledgement were given to Senator Barbara Swerkes (Matador Hall of Fame)
      o The search committee for the CSU Executive Vice Chancellor, Chief Academic Officer will meet next week (Rosser, Kester, Hall, Gould, Tarjan, Thobaben)
      o Budget should allow continued ‘normal’ Academic Senate of the CSU function for this year with continued careful shepherding of resources.
• **Standing Committees**

  o **Faculty Affairs (McNamara)**
     There are three second reading and three first reading items. The Faculty Affairs committee will be responsible for the social this evening. Liaison Lori Roth reported out extensively on faculty development opportunities. The California postdoctoral program is one such program. An additional program provides insight into faculty life for potential and future applicants to the CSU is another. Campus practices’ regarding governance is the subject of a survey being distributed by Faculty Affairs at this time. Elizabeth Hoffman (CFA) reported out on the CSU/CFA impasse. The first mediation action will take place in the near future and will likely extend through the summer. CFA is active in Washington working on stability in higher education funding and other initiatives.

  o **Academic Preparation and Educational Programs (Stepanek)**
     There is one resolution coming from Academic Preparation and Educational Programs as part of today’s agenda.

  o **Academic Affairs (Postma)**
     The resolutions put forth reflect the committee actions; other business of the committee included various liaison activities.

  o **Fiscal and Government Affairs (Barrett)**
     Some legislation was discussed (e.g., AA transfer degree, CTE)
     There was a report from Robert Turnage on the state of the California budget. Fiscal and Government Affairs continued planning for Academic Senate of the CSU Legislative days on Tuesday April 14th – This planning included both logistics and talking points.
     Fiscal and Government Affairs is sponsoring several joint resolutions (with Academic Affairs Committee)
     Fiscal and Government Affairs anticipates several resolutions for May on long-term budget planning.

• **Other committees and committee liaisons**

  o **Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)**
     At the taskforce meeting of Tuesday March 17th, 2009 the CLA taskforce agreed to forward the following recommendations to the presidents Accountability Council:
     - Continue to use the CLA as the Accountability Measure (of the CLA, Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress [MAPP], & California Academic Partnership Program [CAPP]) required by the Voluntary System of Accountability
     - Convene a taskforce of system test administrators and faculty to develop standard recruitment and implementation protocols for use throughout the system
     - Delay administration of the CLA for one year. After that, institute requirements that campuses administer the test a minimum of once every three years
     - Characterize the CLA as an accountability instrument instead of an assessment instrument
- Arrange a meeting between representatives from the CSU and Council for Aid to Education (CAE) to discuss possible changes and additions to the CLA to better tailor it to the needs of the CSU (e.g., Ethical decision-making and quantitative skills).
- It is intended that a formal report of the taskforce activities will be sent to the Presidents’ accountability council for their April 29th, 2009 meeting.

- **General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) (Baaske)**
  - International baccalaureate exams were considered. GEAC is seeking collaboration with the University of California (UC) so that International baccalaureate exams will be treated in a similar fashion within GE across the UC and CSU. Disciplines will retain control over how such exams are used within their majors.

- **Compass (Baaske)**
  - Several Office of the Chancellor and campus delegates will be sent to the Minneapolis “Greater Expectations” institute on General Education.
  - There are three beta campuses (San Jose State University, San Francisco State and CSU Chico) pursing improvement in achieving their General Education Program outcomes projects as Compass project initiatives.
  - There is a statewide General Education conference planned for the Summer of 2010 on campus actions to achieve the Liberal Education: America’s Promise (LEAP) outcomes within General Education.
  - Compass-based activities have the potential to illustrate the best use of resources to support General Education outcomes (high impact practices is the focus of the Compass project).

- **California State Student Association (CSSA) (Van Selst)**
  - One of the major focuses of CSSA efforts is on textbook affordability. A second major focus of the February meeting was on developing broader representation, better functioning, and increased participation in student government across the state. The annual student leadership conference – California Higher Education Student Summit (‘CHESS’) - will take place in April.

- **Lower Division Transfer Project (LDTP) (Swerkes/Van Selst)**
  - The LDTP intersegmental workgroup met on Tuesday of this week; this was the last planned meeting of that group. The decision was made within that meeting to transfer much of the function of the Intersegmental Workgroup on LDTP to the LDTP Advisory committee.
  - The number of course submissions from the Community Colleges to articulate against the Transfer-CSU (T-CSU) course descriptors increased markedly in this most recent cycle. The number of submissions in this lastest cycle (approximately 1,200) were the highest since the very first submission cycle in the Fall of 2006.
  - Review processes (reviewer training and technology) have improved markedly with the maturation of LDTP processes.
A major residual issue for the LDTP Steering Committee and a potential referral to the senate for clarification is what conformity of a CSU course to a T-CSU descriptor will mean for the campus in terms of articulation. Steering committee actions in April will focus on both of the processes of how to determine if a CSU campus matches up to a TCSU descriptor and what such a match will imply for the CSU campus.

LDTP-based articulation via the T-CSU descriptors has produced marked increases in CCC to CSU articulation at a number of CSU campuses who have used the T-CSU approved course list to expand articulation (e.g., San Jose State University, CSU Long Beach, and CSU Chico)

8. Faculty Trustee Candidates (9:00 a.m. Friday)
   - Presentations; Question and answer period
     - Kathy Kaiser
     - Hank Reichman
     - Darlene Yee-Melichar
     - Barry Pasternack
   - Election of candidate(s) for Faculty Trustee
     - Hank Riechman and Barry Pasternack were selected as candidates

9. Trustee Lou Monville (Time Certain 4:00 p.m. Thursday)

   We’re being asked to do more with less. This has a negative impact on quality. Transfer is a huge issue for the State of California; we, as a state, do not do it very well, and I say this as former member on the California Community Colleges Board of Governors. Providing a smooth and streamlined pathway is important. Protection of the academic standards of the system and to provide the best advice for students regarding preparation is important.

   Online, technologically mediated, or distance education efforts are incredibly important from a systems perspective to the State of California. Technologically mediated teaching is more demanding that in person instruction; the board of trustees recognizes this. The CSU needs to know what the difficulties are in order to best facilitate realizing student expectations regarding technologically mediated courses.

   **Comment:** I have taught distance learning for more than ten years. There are some students who lack the discipline for self-directed study. Students who come in with less than a 2.5 gpa are dramatically overrepresented in those dropping out and/or failing the courses when those courses are taught online. Online remediation does not appear to be a good bet for many of these students.

   **Question:** You mentioned the student as the consumer; is it not more important to view the State of California the consumer?

   **(LM)** There are expectations on the part of the students in the classroom. There are quality and access concerns with many of the online institutions.
Comment: Online/distance education is not an appropriate solution or opportunity for everyone.

Comment: College-based fees are being used at Cal Poly SLO to hire faculty. It is my understanding that this is not the intention of the board of trustees that such fees would be used this way.

Comment: Humboldt State has reached out to its local community colleges via TV, satellite, and now online to cover geographic distance. Many of the options are synchronous, some are asynchronous. Teaching, as art, requires that the instructor be responsive to the students they are interacting with.

Comment: Workload issues around online / distance education can prevent faculty from becoming involved in the progress.

Comment: Distance learning (at Palm Desert Campus) via synchronous videoconference was quite effective.

Question: Chancellor Reed has, in the past, used the Chancellor’s Office to argue against the appointment of a particular faculty trustee. On top of this, CMS was a disaster. Additionally, the compact was a disaster for the faculty. What are the appropriate roles of the Chancellor’s Office and of the trustees?

(LM): I can only reflect on the last two years in my roll as a CSU trustee and my experiences in Sacramento. Based on these experiences, I view the compact as an example of proactive leadership. I understand the role of a trustee as setting policy and the chancellor for implementing such policies.

Comment: At San Francisco State University we use i-learn (Moodle). As I have developed my technology skills as an instructor, I have found an increasing proportion of my courses moving towards hybrid content delivery. Having a technology refreshment cycle, which ensures that adequate computational resources are available, is an important aspect of having the opportunity to develop technology mediated instructional ability.

(LM): In addition to this, we also recognize that the workload required to allow adequate preparation for operation in a technology-mediated environment is high.

Comment: What we are being asked to do with the state budget is to do less with less. Quality will suffer. Access will suffer. Affordability will suffer. The status of the State of California demands this. CSU East Bay has a lot of experience with technologically mediated courses. The course level and subject matter, as well as the individual characteristics of the students and instructor, do matter. The cost of instruction, per se, is higher – it is the physical space maintenance requirements where there can be savings. Having an “online generation” imparts an expectation that students can effectively use online learning management software. This expectation is often not met in the classroom.
(LM): I share the concern over the reality that we will be graduating fewer students. I share the concern that students need to learn how to learn and that there will be individual differences.

Comment: When I use technology in the classroom, I see my students as functioning well on navigation tasks but not as well when assessment and critical analysis are required. Additionally, we assume that all students are technologically literate, at least on the navigation side. The on the ground reality is that this is not always true.

(LM): I recognize the importance of these skills. I make hiring decisions based on written communication skills and critical/strategic thinking skills. These are some of the fundamental skills that we need to produce through the educational experience.

Comment: Technology in the classroom does not mean that the technology is used to drive learning. We should remain cognizant of what students are actually doing with the technology. The idea of connection with the students leading to learning means that online interaction is inherently more demanding.

Comment: We purchase systems, but we do not consider the support that is required for maintenance and updating. Technology refresh and associated pedagogical changes require both money and time.

(LM): I too am very concerned about the quality of the educational opportunities we can offer to the students.

Comment: In the interests of stabilizing enrollments we are closing access to transfer students. This is contrary to effective graduation rates and the promises of the master plan for education.

(LM): I am concerned about the state of transfer in California. More students need to make use of transfer opportunities. Local agreements seem to work. The CSU should provide a bright-line path to transfer. This bright-line path should include a timeline.

Comment: I hope that the Board of trustees will convene a task-force to examine tuition costs, other student fees, and the possibility of added cost per (excess) unit.

Comment: Advising is an issue; CCC sees transfer as one of multiple missions ascribed to them.

(LM): Thank you for your work on encouraging the CCC system to increase its focus on transfer with your work on projects like the LDTP project. An understanding the CCC system reveals that the CCC districts do not have a cohesive structure… there are 70 community college districts, each with one or more freely elected boards. Where LDTP works best is where there are local relationships. Senator Scott, as the former chair of the Senate Higher Education committee and in his current role as Chancellor of the CCC system, is potentially the best hope for effective action on lower division transfer.
**Comment:** Online or technology mediated instruction can work. The assessment of technology-mediated instruction is an important element that cannot just be assumed.

**Question:** How much will Federal changes to Pell grants impact the CSU?

**(LM):** With the changes in Federal law the CSU now receives a much larger increase in Pell grant money than any other state.

**10. Benjamin Quillian, Executive Vice Chancellor, Chief Financial Officer (Time Certain 2:00 Thursday)**

The budget that is being worked on now is a revision of the 18-month budget that was just passed. The revenue projections in that budget are overly optimistic and also depended substantially on borrowing. The budget that was just passed is now predicted to reflect an 8 billion dollar deficit. Additionally, it is unlikely that the 10B trigger to avoid a further substantive reduction (50M) was not achieved. The May 19th special election has 5 propositions on it. These five propositions are required to allow the existing budget to pass. If 1A does not pass, several billion dollars in taxes will not accrue to the state. If the lottery proposition does not pass, that removes a further 5B from the state.

**Question:** Can the $10 Billion trigger be met later in 2009/10?

**(BQ):** No, there is a finite date by which the $10 Billion has to arrive. The ambiguity in determining the $10 Billion amount is that the $10 Billion has to come from the stimulus package and be used for general fund items.

**Comment:** At a recent CPEC meeting it was noted that the information regarding budget is changing daily. The elements seems to (1) Obama education policy appointees have not happened to a large extent yet, (2) the impact may not be immediate if it is trickled out through policy, (3) there is uncertainty in implementation.

**(BQ) Robert Turnage has presented a budget flow-chart that would track the stimulus monies. It is very complex. We do need to be aggressive in our pursuit of these monies.

**Question:** What is the long-term base budget impact of the current budget?

**(BQ):** The $255 Million is removed from our base budget and hopefully replaced by stimulus money. In two years $510 Million needs to be replaced into the CSU and UC base budgets. Even if the intention is to replace these monies into the base budget California’s budget situation may make it unlikely that these monies actually get restored in any reasonable way.

**Question:** There is a CFA initiative that is looking at taxing oil. Has the CSU taken a position on this issue?
The CSU has not taken a position on this.

**Question**: Has the CSU looked at the implications of extensive under-funding for the CSU?

(BQ): The CSU is looking at “extra units per semester” fees and other such interventions to assist the CSU and our students.

11. Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

We have renewed an open search for the State University Dean for Extended Education (The October to January Search did not succeed). After consultation with Extended Education Deans, the position description was changed to reflect a slightly stronger focus on inter-campus collaboration. The position should be posted shortly. The review of applications is hoped to occur by mid-May with the expectation of an appointment by mid-June. [Ed: The position description has been under further review since the plenary; the timetable may be delayed somewhat.]

There is a search for a new Director of CAPP (California Academic Partnership Program). CAPP is a statewide organization administered by the CSU. It was established by the legislature in 1984 to improve quality of public secondary schools and preparation of students for college; to this end, it supports and promotes regional K-16 (and business) partnerships. The collaborations and partnerships sponsored by CAPP have a strong assessment component. The new director will be based at the CSU Chancellors office (rather than Sacramento). The search committee will include UC and CSU representatives (including representation appointed by the Academic Senate of the CSU).

The CSU is seeking a new director for the California pre-doctoral program. CP-D Program is designed to increase and diversity the pool of potential faculty by supporting the doctoral aspirations of CSU students, many of who have experienced economic and educational disadvantages. The program includes the Sally Casanova Pre-Doctoral Scholarship Program (about 70-75 per year), as well as funded internships in summers. It also includes the annual California Forum for Diversity in Graduate Education (graduate school information and recruitment fair)- average attendance 1200+ (open to non-CSU, as well as CSU), which is a major student recruitment fair for graduate programs across the country. The Director occupies a two or three year rotating assignment in Chancellor’s Office. It is a full-time academic year position, with Chancellor’s Office reimbursing the campus at “replacement rate” for the faculty member. Campuses have been contacted to solicit applications.

Across the system, the CSU has increased its enrolment by about 1700 FTES for Spring 2009 as compared to Spring 2008 (this is based on projections from as-yet-incomplete census counts); this has taken place despite a reduction in about 5000 students (by headcount) and a pre-existing overage of roughly 4,500 FTES from Fall 2008. Students are taking a higher credit load and CSU retention/persistence rates are increasing. Four or five CSUs are responsible for more than 60% of the overages. Freshman applications are 2% fewer than last year but we had been anticipating a 10% decrease. Transfer applications are
up 15.5% and graduate/post-baccalaureate applications are up 15%. There is clearly a large unmet demand for education. There will be a meeting of the Presidents next week to discuss these trends and the worrying concern that, at the state level, there could be a push to recalibrate the “expected” number of students served upwards for the same fiscal support provided by the state since the CSU has not limit enrollments to the same extent that the CSU budget has been reduced. The number of applications for Fall 2009 have increased relative to prior years. Despite this increase, it is imperative that the CSU cannot come in much over target in fall 2009.

The Board of Trustees will receive two information items that are particularly pertinent to the CSU. The first item, at request of the Board’s Educational Policy Committee, presents a follow-up to the proficiency conference, with a special focus on identification and sharing of promising practices that could move remediation to a time prior to matriculation (“early start”). There was a particular focus on online instruction, which will be an update on online instruction. Fully on-line instruction is only one variant among technology-mediated pedagogies; important to note that hybrid courses are widely recognized as producing learning gains and CSU faculty have developed these in the thousands. The CSU already has 57 fully online programs, the majority of which are at Master’s level delivered via self-support. Several campuses are beginning to increase their development of fully on-line courses — The board item will feature four of them as case studies (East Bay, Chico, Northridge, and Dominguez Hills). ATSC, with input from Academic Council and the Presidents’ TSC, has developed some draft “design principles” to guide planning, implementation, and evaluation of additional CSU online degree programs—they deal with issues of (1) pedagogy and delivery, (2) access, (3) professional development, and (4) management and support. These potential guidelines and suggestion will be shared with the Academic Senate of the CSU for input into revision in the near future. The hope is that the Board of Trustees will become more knowledgeable about technology-mediated instruction and design constraints that should be included in technology mediated course development. There can be savings resulting from online instruction, but these savings are not in faculty time and salaries, rather, the dominant savings appear to be from the reduced in-person demands on equipment and physical facilities (savings of approximately $2,500/student FTE over a 30 year period).

Bill (AB 867) has been proposed to grant CSU authority to offer the DNP (parallel in main points to Ed.D. legislation). Assembly-members Nava and Arambula sponsored the bill. At this time there are over 30 co-sponsors. The DNP is no longer supported by the UC for this legislative session (the official UC stance is neutral). The nursing shortage is getting worse. We need to have a supply of teaching faculty for nursing. We are losing many of our faculty to the UC.

Executive Vice Chancellor Reichard thanked Senator Nelson for co-chairing the Joint Task Force on Collegiate Learning Assessment, and thanked Senators Bordino, Brodowsky, and van Selst for their work on the task force — and for the Task Force’s developing good recommendations in time to present them to the Presidents’ Council on Accountability at its April meeting.
**Question:** Can we use unmet demand to ask legislature for further resources and protections for higher education?

*(GR)*: Chancellor Reed is in Sacramento and is using the “tipping point” argument regarding quality of the education that is capable of being offered by the CSU.

**Question:** What happens when a campus over-enrolls?

*(GR)*: Campuses will have student fees redacted from their budgets for any student over the 2% overage allowable.

**Comment:** Thank you for incorporating online guidance outline material from the ITL committee.

**Comment:** E-learning policies are being revised on a number of campuses.

**Comment:** There seems to be a lot of resistance for the myth that online courses will be cheaper. Many of the hybrid courses that have emerged have been developed for pedagogically sound reasons. The current rush into online teaching may be somewhat misguided.

*(GR)*: Marginal costs per student are receiving downward pressure from the legislature.

**Comment:** Do we have any means of tracking applied but denied students? It is likely that current CSU actions in response to fiscal considerations will ultimately yield fewer university graduates.

**Comment:** The three segments should collaborate more extensively on redirection.

**Comment:** The BoT treatment on online education seems very appropriate and good.

**Comment:** The online educational experience may not meet what many students are expecting from a college training experience.

**Comment:** California Polytechnic San Luis Obispo is moving towards state-assisted rather than state-supported. The student fees may justify over-enrollment at this campus despite Chancellor Office fiscal disincentives.

**Comment:** There should be a clearinghouse for online policies across the CSU.

**Question:** Access and Quality are suffering under the current fee policy systems – can we limit students to ‘normal’ enrollment?

*(GR)*: Different CSUs have varying rules on “overload”. This has been a locally determined element and is unlikely to receive attention at the statewide level.
Comment: there does not seem to be a systematic communication plan regarding limiting enrollment (vs. “new facilities and outreach opportunities”).

(Gr): The consistent communication plan is that we are limiting enrollment. The caveat is that some campuses are in danger of not meeting their local target populations.

Comment: We appreciate the legislative agenda being put forward by the Chancellor’s Office. The public often misunderstands faculty workload – the faculty has a responsibility to systematically illustrate the realities of what it is that educational professionals actually do.

Question: It appears that student loads above 12 units are full time. Is there the opportunity to charge for unit loads above 15 units?

(Gr): Currently this is not allowable without a policy change by the Board of Trustees. No such change is anticipated to be pursued in the near future.

Comment: There is broad acknowledgment that some students are not ready for online education. Is there an intention to acknowledge these individual differences?

(Gr): These are important issues that need attention both directly and in policy. We welcome your advice.

Comment: The California teacher credential requirements for teacher accreditation requires a teaching assessment. This teacher performance assessment will professionalize teachers and the teaching profession. Ultimately the CSU will have to charge students for these assessments.

(Gr): We cannot charge students for this fee without approval of the Chancellor. At this time the fee the larger budget issues facing the CSU outweighed concerns.

12. Craig Smith, Faculty Trustee

Trustee Smith described the CA budget as a house of cards that could result in more serious cuts than we have ever seen. April 1 will mark a $50 million reduction; if the ballot propositions are defeated, which is likely, even more cuts will come. If the current budget deficit continues to grow, further cuts will occur.

Trustee Smith shares the concerns voiced within the Academic Senate of the CSU regarding online education and said he would take these concerns to the board. All on-line education should be vetted by local senate, including consideration of intellectual policy rights, proper labeling of sections of courses, and assessment.

Education policy item 4 on the BOT agenda concerns online education.
Student per unit fees have been advocated for before. Even some pilot program work looking at fee per unit (e.g., for higher than normal credit unit loads) would be well received. The Statewide Senate has recommended a task force on this subject and should push for its implementation.

The Colleges of Education within the CSU have absorbed the California teacher evaluation fees. Such mandates as these fees (e.g., Ed.D.) are taxing the resources of the system and the Colleges of Education in particular. Without support these mandates could cripple the system.

Several of the pending Academic Senate of the CSU resolutions were of particular interest to Trustee Smith:

- First, the Affirmation of Equal Rights resolution should be focused on its impact on the CSU.
- Second, support for campus processes for votes of no confidence should consider when such votes are appropriate (after exhaustion of other options) and whom they are appropriate for (department chairs should be deleted from the resolution).

College-based fees remain a concern. Such fees should not be used to support salaries rather than supplemental laboratory support.

**Question:** what will be the largest challenges for the next faculty trustee?

**(CS):** Recognizing that different value sets underlie beliefs. Representing the faculty without being a voice of the CFA is a concern. The Board needs to see this distinction.

**Comment:** please continue to work against reinforcing the myth of the automatic online savings.

**(CS):** There are benefits of access and space utilization. There are large workload costs. The BoT includes a strong contingency of individuals who are skeptical about the effectiveness and function of online courses.

**Question:** does the BoT get any information about student responses to online courses?

**(CS):** not explicitly. Academic Affairs may want to pursue this.

**Question:** The ability to be persuasive as an important characteristic predicting the effectiveness of a potential BoT member seems somewhat unusual. Very few BoT members have been faculty members. It seems strange that a governing body for an academic institution only has one academic on the board.

**(CS):** While I agree that the CSU should have more faculty representation on the board, we do have additional academic professionals within the current make-up of the board. I would hope that the faculty trustee would bring education-based persuasion to the table that is based on hard data.
13. John Travis, CFA

There was no CFA report at this plenary session

14. Brandon Chapin, CSSA Liaison

Eighteen campuses are likely to be part of CSSA; 20+ campuses have been consistent in attending. Reorganization should be finalized this weekend (CSSA meeting at Channel Islands). Major agenda items for this year around textbook affordability remain to be explored further. Of particular interest are potential savings to be achieved through pursuing custom course materials, greater selection and availability of used books, and potential savings achieved through the increased use of digital materials. The general focus in attempting to pursue solutions that lead to real cost reduction in the price of texts for students.

The March 16 “March in March” in Sacramento was a success. CSSA is seeking a legislative solution to prevent increases in student fees (tuition relief now).

**Question**: where is the student member of CPEC? Which segment has the current right to appoint?

*(BC)*: It is currently the responsibility of CSSA. The CSSA vice president (external) is pursing appointees for this position.

15. Committee Recommendations

AS-2877-09/AA (Rev)
Voting Rights for Coordinator Liaisons on the Academic Council on International Programs

AS-2878-09/AA (Rev)
Support for Campus Processes for Votes of No Confidence in Management Personnel Plan (MPP) Administrators

AS-2880-09/AA (Rev)
Energy Conservation, System Sustainability, and System Cost Saving

AS-2881-09/AA (Rev)
Support for Improved Faculty Development Opportunities for Lecturers

AS-2882-09/FA (Rev)
Opposing Restrictions on Academic Exchanges With Cuba

AS-2883-09/FA (Rev)
Affirmation of Equal Rights for All Individuals Regardless of Race, Ethnicity, Gender, Sexual Orientation, Disability or Other Dimensions of Diversity
Reaffirmation of Support for CSU Authority to Offer the Doctorate in Nursing Practice

Support for the Continued Alignment of the “a-g” Course Pattern and for CSU-UC Collaboration Related to Career Technical Education (CTE)

The following items were introduced at the March 19-20, 2009 meeting and will be acted upon at the May 7-8, 2009 meeting.

Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2009-2010 Meetings

Concerns Related to the Migration of State-Supported Courses to Self-Supporting Special Sessions During Times of Budget Constraints

CSU Faculty Professional Development Strategic Planning

Support for Honorary Degrees for Alumnae Interned by Federal Executive Order 9066

Support for International Baccalaureate Courses for GE and Transfer Credit

Support for Campus Guidelines and Policies on Consultation and Shared Governance

The following item was withdrawn at the March 19-20, 2009 meeting.

Keeping Recognition for Faculty Creators and/or Founders for Centers and Institutes Developed Within the CSU System

16. Adjournment