

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2721-05/AA (Rev)  
September 16, 2005

**Campus Autonomy in Establishing Their Academic Calendars**

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) strongly reaffirm the principles and policies stated in [\*Principles and Policies: Papers of the Academic Senate of the CSU \(1999\)\*](#) and Resolution Regarding the Academic Calendar (AS-2524-01/EX) that campuses have the right and responsibility of controlling their academic calendars in consultation with their academic senates; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recognize that the campuses of the California State University are 23 distinct universities, each with their distinct individual missions, environments, and populations; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm Cornerstone's Principle 10: The California State University campuses shall have significant autonomy in developing their own missions, identity, and programs, with institutional flexibility in meeting clearly defined system policy goals; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recognize that individual campuses, by exercising control over their academic calendars, have the ability to provide opportunities for faculty to engage in intensive research and curricular innovation, to provide short courses for students who wish to give their full attention to a particular subject, or to offer non-traditional educational opportunities such as travel courses; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU oppose any efforts to impose a common academic calendar on all CSU campuses.

*RATIONALE: Principles and Policies: Papers of the Academic Senate of the CSU (1999), Section II, Responsibilities of Academic Senates within a collective bargaining context, Campus Senate/Council Participation in Campus Governance "joint decision making and consultation between administrators and faculty is essential to the performance of the educational mission of the CSU..." and further (from subsection D) "The Academic Senates/Councils shall be consulted by the campus presidents concerning: (i) the academic calendar and policies governing the scheduling of classes..."*

*Each individual CSU campus has individual needs. These needs take into consideration (i) different feeder school academic calendars, (ii) different employment opportunities for students (e.g., ski resort through January or agricultural work [Northern California schools]), (iii) a general opportunity for necessary remediation or acceleration of meeting major requirements in the service of facilitating graduation, and (iv) individual educational needs and desires of students.*

**Approved – November 3, 2005**

From: Harold Goldwhite, Chair  
Statewide Senate Constitutional Review Committee

Subject: Report to Senate

## **Constitutional Review Committee Report**

Introduction:

The Committee agreed that while its main charge was the representation of the individual campuses on the Academic Senate CSU (Article II Section 1 of the Constitution) it would be free to make recommendations more generally on representation. The Committee developed a questionnaire that was sent to campus senate chairs with a request that it be considered informally by their executive committees. The questions included the following:

Are large campuses underrepresented? Would a larger Academic Senate CSU be more representative of disciplines, ethnic backgrounds etc.? Would increasing the size of the Senate improve or diminish the effectiveness and efficiency of problem-solving debates and discussions?

Is the Academic Senate CSU's work currently being performed adequately with the present number of senators? Has your Senate changed its size or composition recently; if so what has been the impact on workload, output, diversity, etc. Are you aware of any studies on size versus effectiveness of governance organizations?

From the campuses that responded to our questions (about half) there seemed to be no strong feeling that the work of the Senate was not being done with the current composition. The Committee received some responses that urged more representatives for larger campuses. If there is any general direction to the campus responses they suggest that if the Senate is to be increased in size, the change should be modest. The Committee agreed with this view.

Under the present constitution as new campuses are created the Senate will come closer to a U.S. Senate model. The Committee believes that the more appropriate membership model for the Academic Senate CSU is the U.S. House of Representatives rather than the U.S. Senate, with larger campuses having more representatives.

### **Recommendations**

1. The Constitution of the Senate should be changed to transfer questions of membership to the By-Laws. Article II would read:

Membership: The membership of the Academic Senate shall be decided by the Academic Senate under provisions in the By-Laws of the Academic Senate.

Rationale: As the number and sizes of the campuses of the CSU change over time, the Senate may find it necessary to reconsider membership periodically. Because the

process to amend the Senate's Constitution is so elaborate and time-consuming, the Committee recommends transferring it to the By-Laws.

The Committee recommends several changes in Section 1 of the proposed By-Law on membership. They are presented separately below. We propose that Article II Sections 2 through 8 be transferred without change to the By-Laws.

### Section 1. Membership

- (a) The Academic Senate shall include elected campus representatives as follows:
  - one senator from each campus with an FTEF of 100 or less;
  - two from each campus with an FTEF exceeding 100 but not exceeding 700;
  - three from each campus with an FTEF exceeding 700 but not exceeding 1200;
  - four from each campus with an FTEF exceeding 1200.

Rationale: This meets the goal of increasing representation from larger campuses.

- (b) There shall be up to 3 at-large voting members, serving three-year terms (staggered initially) to be chosen by a procedure approved by the Academic Senate. (The at-large members shall not be counted as campus representatives.)

Rationale: There are continuing concerns about the underrepresentation of various groups in the senate, e.g., by ethnic origin, gender, discipline, faculty status (lecturers, probationary faculty). This provision is designed to respond to that concern.

- (c) There shall be one emeritus—a voting member—serving a 3-year term, and selected by CSU ERFA.

Rationale: The senate needs all the wisdom it can muster.

- (d) The immediate past chair of the Academic Senate if not an elected member. (The immediate past chair of the Academic Senate, if not an elected member, shall not be counted as a campus representative.)

- (e) The Chancellor or representative as an ex-officio non-voting member.

Conclusion: If all these changes are adopted the following indicates the extent of the change in senate size (based on 1998-99 FTEF data):

Campus representatives: 1 senator: Maritime Academy; 2 senators: Bakersfield, Chico, Dominguez Hills, Hayward, Humboldt, Monterey Bay, San Bernardino, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus; 3 senators: Fresno, Fullerton, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo; 4 senators: San Diego.  
Total: 55

Additional senators: 6

Harold Goldwhite, Faculty Trustee and Professor of Chemistry  
California State University, Los Angeles