

January 06 Plenary Minutes

1) **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Marshelle Thobaben called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, January 26th, 2006.

2) **ROLL CALL: Senators Present:** (Bakersfield) Jacquelyn Kegley, John Tarjan; (Channel Islands) Dennis Muraoka, Lillian Vega-Castaneda; (Chico) Jim Postma, Paul Persons, Sam Edelman; (Dominguez Hills); Don Silvis; (East Bay) Hank Reichman, Calvin Caplan; (Fresno) Jacinta Amaral; (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, Marshall Cates; (Maritime Academy) Greg Cho, James Wheeler; (Monterey Bay) Ken Nishita, Mark O'Shea; (Northridge) Steven Stepanek, Barbara Swerkes, Michael Reagan; (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; (San José) David McNeil, Romey Sabalius, Mark Van Selst; (San Luis Obispo) Manzar Foroohar, Myron Hood; (San Marcos) Dick Montanari; (Sonoma) Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson; (Stanislaus) Mark Thompson, Paul O'Brien; (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, CSSA Representative.

3) The minutes of the November plenary were approved.

4) ANNOUNCEMENTS/INTRODUCTIONS

a) Steven Stepanek (Computer Science) is the new senator from Northridge.

5) The agenda was approved.

6) REPORTS

a) **Chair**—Chair Marshelle Thobaben The chair's report is available for review on-line and was distributed via e-mail. She thanked Senator McNeil and the EdD Committee on their excellent report, which was developed with a tight deadline. Senator Anagnoson and the ASCSU Budget Task Force were also thanked for their good work on developing information and a proposal to deal with the budget situation. A new oversight committee on independent EdDs is being formed. Senators Jensen (chair), Yee, Mason, Hunt, O'Shea, and McNeil will be faculty members on this committee.

- b) Academic Affairs** (Mark Van Selst) We had a report on disability accommodation and the Center for Alternative Media (CAM) from Mary Cheng, the Director of Accessible Technology Initiatives from the Chancellor's Office. Action resulting from this meeting was the production of a resolution on the electronic availability of textbook text (e-text) from publishers for use in disability accommodation. We also discussed the CSU fee structure (per unit versus flat fee), registration priorities (how they vary across campuses), and joint and independent Education Doctorates. Additionally, we are looking at the UC life science admissions requirement (a-g) and discussing the implications of the consensus that we would like to see a "distance education" or "technology mediated instruction" flag for use with the LDTP descriptors. We are working on an update on the 21st century report and will use the February interim meeting to accomplish this. We discussed the ASCSU budget shortfall. The February Interim meeting will be replaced by a series of more localized meetings (some electronically mediated) focused on the 21st century report. We will pick up the upcoming resolutions at the committee meeting immediately prior to the March plenary.
- c) Faculty Affairs** (Jan Gregory) We had a very full agenda, and are bringing two second reading items--one on support for new tenure-track faculty, and the second on external efforts to intrude on faculty autonomy in designing curriculum. We are developing or have developed resolutions on textbook prices, external security, salary structure, and the retention of probationary faculty, which will appear on the March plenary agenda. We are also interested in reestablishing the CSU Academic Conference and will be bringing a resolution to the full Senate. We had an update on the upcoming CSU RTP workshop (February 24, with campus teams to be selected if they haven't already been chosen). Jackie McClain and John Travis discussed a number of issues with the committee. We are interested in reestablishing the CSU Academic Conference and will be bringing a resolution to the full Senate.
- d) Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** (Tom Krabacher) We are reinstating the Capitol Staffer of the Year Award and are making arrangements for the award. We will be bringing a resolution to the Senate in March honoring the committee's recommended recipient. Legislative days will be Tuesday, April 18th. We expect a smaller delegation to be involved this year (FGA, EC and a few others). We are still awaiting the introduction of bills affecting higher education. One bill that has been developed already (AB 546) which would prohibit state agency employees from using computers to download obscene or pornographic materials. The key issue is a provision requiring that faculty get approval in advance for any faculty research involving downloaded pornography, which the

committee sees as a threat to academic freedom. Neither the UC nor CCC would be affected by this legislation. FGA has been in discussion with members of the Chancellors Office on a CSU response to this bill. On a broader level, FGA is striving to work more closely with the CSU administration on the coordination of the system's response to legislative activity in the Capitol. We are also working on a revision of the 1998 best campus budgetary practices survey. We are looking at faculty salary inversion and compression with FA.

- e) **Teacher Education and K-12 Relations** (Jim Wheeler) We had a full agenda. We have 2 second reading items—commendation of EAP and support for the math & science initiative. We are attempting to be more proactive in monitoring important issues in teacher education. We are forging closer ties with the CSU Council of Education Deans. We have a first reading item on the in-service and pre-service aspects of the EAP. We will be monitoring upcoming legislation on teacher education.
- f) **LDTP Advisory Committee** (John Tarjan) We met yesterday afternoon for the first time in person although we had a teleconference last week. The committee is composed of ASCSU members, Chancellor's Office staff and a CSU articulation officer. In addition, there are 3 representatives from the California Community Colleges: a senator, an articulation officer, and a Chancellor's office representative. We began with an orientation to LDTP and the history of the project to date. Many important issues need to be addressed by the committee. It will be meeting again two weeks from today. This group will both set policy to guide the LDTP process and be the nexus of communication for faculty and other individuals participating in the project. I would be glad to answer any questions although I may have to defer to Marshall Cates who has been intimately involved in the day-to-day operations of LDTP. (Marshall Cates) We have completed the first 33 major patterns although a few departments (18) have yet to complete their local patterns. About 1/3 of the departments representing the subsequent 14 majors have completed their work and 2 statewide patterns are still incomplete. The development of course descriptors is still underway. We are running up against some deadlines. We are about 50% of the way through the process but no descriptors have yet reached the threshold for approval. Communications with the disciplines continues to be an issue. Q: How can other disciplines get involved with LDTP? A: We are still working things out with current disciplines. We expect more majors will be added.
- g) **Campus Initiatives to Facilitate Graduation Visitation Teams** (Harold Goldwhite) Campus reports were received in December. Peer review teams are composed primarily of faculty. Sandra Sutphen, Kathy Kaiser, Ted Anagnoson, and Harold Goldwhite are team leaders. The visits are to

be collegial in nature; there will be no formal report back to the CSU. Training was held at the C.O. on January 24th and included an update on the Student Administration Module in CMS in support of the 22 points. Leaders discussed most of the points. In March Northridge will be the first campus visited.

- h) General Education Advisory Committee** (John Tarjan) March 7th is the next GE survey meeting.
- i) Task Force on the Independent Doctorate** (David McNeil) We have 2 meetings and a video conference since the committee was appointed in the fall. We are submitting our final report on January 27. All editorial suggestions are welcome. We are looking at defining features that would be desirable in all independent EdD proposals. We will hand off our work to the new EdD Oversight Committee (chaired by Jensen). We have looked very closely at NCATE standards and their implications for our programs. These standards should be the minimum for our programs. Ensuring quality is a major feature of the report. We feel that an oversight body with a strong faculty presence is an important vehicle to help ensure quality. The new oversight committee will largely take up the work of the Task Force.
- j) Academic Technology Advisory Committee** (Tapie Rohm) We have been looking at technology policy and its impact on faculty and students. We have been spending time on accommodating students with disabilities. An executive order and coded memorandum are forthcoming. We will have an upcoming conference on Blackboard.
- k) IMPAC** (Mark Van Selst) We held the north meeting last Saturday in San Francisco. There is some ongoing confusion about the lack of any formal relationship between LDTP and IMPAC. The CCCs are developing their own numbering system. IMPAC allows for descriptors to be reviewed and discussed by both CSU and CCC faculty, but the LDTP descriptor decisions (and decisions regarding statewide transfer patterns) are CSU-only. There is, however, evidence that these cross-segment conversations are resulting in stronger descriptors. The IMPAC proposal for future years will be for more modest funding to support much smaller regional meetings than the current north/south division. It is also anticipated that IMPAC would organize a very restricted statewide meeting. Q: Perhaps ICAS can take up the relationship between IMPAC and LDTP?

Committee of the Whole Meeting

- 1) Report from the Task Force on the Senate Budget** (Ted Anagnoson) A motion was made to go into the Committee of the Whole for a period of a half hour or until all speakers had had a chance to voice their opinions on the change. Senator Anagnoson outlined the effects of the proposed change to the composition and size of the Senate. The task force included

all senators expressing a willingness to serve. This proposal was supported by three of five committee members. A variety of approaches to the budget deficit were considered. Four alternatives, including reducing the size of the Senate, reducing the Senate's use of assigned time, reducing the amount of Senate travel, or obtaining more money from the Chancellor's Office, were presented to the body. The Executive Committee supported reducing the size of the Senate. Senator Anagnoson provided some supporting data. A lively discussion ensued. After leaving the Committee of the Whole, Item 6 was a first reading item. A motion to waive the first reading and make the item a second reading item failed. Several comments were made as advice to the Executive Committee regarding the second reading of the item in March.

7) PRESENTATIONS

a) Associate Vice Chancellor Keith Boyum Welcome to the New Year and new semester. I have been involved in many initiatives. I was very impressed with the wisdom and insights of the individuals involved in the campus efforts to facilitation visitation team training. This should prove to be a very worthwhile effort. I hope to be involved in the first visit to Northridge. Up to 5 more campuses will be visited this year with approximately 9 more each semester next year. The goal of these visits is to provide campuses with feedback via fresh eyes regarding campuses' own plans to better serve students and help them to achieve their degrees. The Academic Council (Provosts) will be told about the visits and the work on system-wide policies for the independent EdD. Proposals for new EdD. programs will undergo a familiar review that starts with the campus faculty and senate approval processes, includes also WASC review, and we will also assure appropriate system review. Chancellor Reed will have a communication on the implementation schedule for EdDs shortly. We need to develop an implementation plan that will best serve prospective students. Chair Thobaben attends the Academic Council. On another topic, on January 11th the CSU Office of the Chancellor hosted a meeting to which presidents were invited to discuss enrollment patterns in the LA basin. Due to increasing traffic congestion in the LA basin, which results in longer travel times on average for a given distance, basin campuses are increasingly drawing students from a radius around their campus. In data reviewed at that meeting we observed, among other things, a pattern of CCC students accumulating many units yet not transferring to a 4-year campus. The Admissions Advisory Committee has encouraged the Chancellor to reaffirm the policy of requiring all first-time freshmen to have a high school diploma. This issue has arisen given the number of students unable to pass the high school exit exam. The CSU does not set policy regarding a requirement of passing the exit exam in order to achieve a high school diploma, though we are surely interested in

strong academic preparation in high schools. The LDTP Advisory Committee has been formed and is working hard. ATAC is responding to mandates to accommodate students with disabilities. This may involve changing some faculty practices. We are working hard on math/science teacher education. We hope to double the number of new math/science credentials issued annually systemwide by the end of the decade. (From approximately 750 currently per year, to approximately 1500). Grants to support innovative programs for these credential programs have been made to campuses, and more grants are in prospect for next year. Q: What will happen to our budget in the future if we reduce the size of the senate? A: I will advocate preserving the functioning of the Senate. When budgets in other units within the Chancellor's Office are increased due to cost inflation, similar increases for the operation of the senate seem reasonable. Q: Is there anything happening on EAP? A: We are working with the state Department of Education and other entities, such as the Educational Testing Service, on contracts, etc. We hope EAP will result in lowered need for remediation. At the March 2006 meeting of the Board we will give a report. Note, however, that the "signal" that an EAP score provides to a student -- whether she or he is ready at the end of the junior year in high school for college-level work -- is the only intervention that will be represented in any way in the data on proficiency from Fall 2005. The EAP program features other interventions - notably, refreshed curriculum in English Language learning, and professional development efforts aligned to the refreshed curriculum - which are too new to have been a factor in the performance of students that will be reported in March 2006 to the Board. A pilot evaluation study on the effect of new jointly developed HS curriculum suggested that the new curriculum had a positive effect on preparation. Q: Will developmental writing courses still be offered this fall? There could be serious implications for faculty. We expect students to still require this instruction. A: The Trustees' deadline for elimination of remediation is Fall 07. We have had a conversation with presidents about the pro's and con's of siting most remedial, pre-college work at community colleges, but no decisions have been made. There is no policy in this area yet. I do not anticipate the total elimination of these types of courses. Q: Are there exceptions for foreign students for the diploma requirement? A: There are equivalencies. The issue of most concern is whether CA high school students without a diploma would be admitted, even as exceptions; and current policy with reference to that is that such persons are not admissible, even as exceptions. Q: Have staff been developing guidelines for EdD curriculum? A: Yes but these will be vetted through the faculty oversight committee. They will be key decision-makers. We are looking, for example, at the requirement of a dissertation. We are also looking, by way of another example, at policy that would govern the discontinuation of existing joint EdD

programs. Q: Is the GED the equivalent of a HS diploma? A: Yes. Q: How long has the size of the CSU increased? The senate budget has not increased proportionately as our workload as a senate has increased. Q: Do you have any information on the number of EdD programs anticipated by Fall 08? A: I anticipate most/all campuses interested in beginning in O8 will do so. Q: Is our goal for math/science teacher preparation overly ambitious? A: I am assured it is not. Q: We passed a resolution on campus autonomy over their schedules. The Chancellor has indicated his interest in using inter-sessions and summer terms but local campuses won't schedule classes through EUD due to FTES considerations. Q: Could you address lower-division transfers? (In light of the diploma requirement). A: They are relatively few but this option continues to be available on some campuses. Q: Could you give more detail on the EdD implementation schedule? A: The Chancellor is working on an announcement. Bob Maxson will head up the implementation effort. Campuses are working closely with school districts and community colleges to develop curriculum. Q: What about budget adjustments due to missing enrollment targets? A: Campuses that fall more than 2% below their targets will have to pay some of their allotment back for distribution to campuses exceeding their targets by more than 1%. We are aware of the problems faced by the campuses. The loss of fee income may already pose a hardship - that is, campuses may have budgeted the receipt of student fees from students who, in the end, did not enroll. Q: What about students with learning disabilities who cannot pass the HS exit exam? A: There is pending legislation to allow such students to receive a diploma without passing the test. I am unaware of specific programs in the CSU to address these students. Q: What about a graduate funding differential? A: While the budget process has a long way to go, the Department of Finance has proposed changing the FTE calculation to be based on 12 units (as in the UC) for any growth in the numbers of graduate students. It is unlikely this differential will apply to all graduate students. Q: What will be the impact of cutbacks in federal student aid? A: We are working on increasing loan and grant opportunities to allow these students not to experience hardship. Q: When will budget reallocations take place? A: Beginning next fall. Q: Will targets be readjusted based on current enrollments? A: Yes. Q: We have heard that the Tidal Wave of students is more of a splash. There is flat growth in grade schools. HS dropouts are increasing. CCC transfers are decreasing. Will we be able to meet our targets for the future? A: We are concerned about the numbers. We are looking at trends and the causes behind the numbers. It appears that the number of students graduating from high schools in California will flatten out in future years, implying some reduction in demand. We need to have contingency plans for the system and individual campuses. Q: What about student quality? A: The preparation of

students based on data we have appears to be unchanged. Q: Setting and making enrollment targets is a very complex process. We need to spend money where the students are but shouldn't we recognize things like success in promoting student progress to graduation? Otherwise, there may be a disincentive to getting students through to graduation in an efficient manner. It has been a number of years since a policy like this has been implemented. It can be arbitrary due to cyclical trends and other factors. The timing of this policy may be influencing the "winners" and "losers." Why not do these calculations on a several year basis? Or allow campuses to pay back the deficit through future growth?

b) John Travis (CFA) We are actively engaged in bargaining. We have agreement on many issues but a number of fundamental issues remain. Compensation and salary are a large issue. Our proposal incorporates what we have heard from the faculty on the campuses. Salary inversion and compression are being addressed. We hope that the new salary structure will address these issues, if not eliminate them. Workload is being discussed. We have 22,000 faculty, which makes developing a unified, sensible approach difficult. We hope that we will hire more new tenure-track faculty. This will take some of the burden off the senior faculty. Lecturers have replaced tenure track faculty. Our proposal contains some relief from WTU requirements (even though WTU language has been removed from the contract for a decade). Lecturers who have 6 years of teaching now receive 3-year contracts. We will protect tenure. We are concerned about proposals to eliminate or reduce FERP. We expect bargaining to be more contentious on the remaining issues. We have agreed to another 60-day extension (through March 15). We will likely be favorably inclined to extend yet again. We received a settlement to address chair compensation issues. The Chancellor has determined that there are problems in labor/management relations within the CSU. A consultant has been retained to look at these relations. The consultant concluded that the relations are poor and has made a number of suggestions to address the problem. He will become involved in current CFA/CSU bargaining process but will also facilitate relations with other bargaining units. We are preparing for a demonstration at the BOT plenary session next week. Q: Our department has had 8 offers in a row rejected by candidates. The main reason is the cost of housing. We have been told that the issue cannot be addressed because it impacts upon bargaining. Can you get together an ASCSU/CFA/Administration together to look at issue? A: Certainly. Q: Why is the CSU administration opposed to FERP? A: I'm not sure. The cost argument has little empirical support. Perhaps it has something to do with control over faculty. This argument does not seem reasonable. Q: Is there a way to discuss interim health care coverage for new hires until their benefits begin? A: We would be willing to

take this up. Q: What is the latest I can wait to sign up for FERP under the current system (5 years)? A: Faculty are required to sign up 180 days prior to entering the program. Presidents can waive this requirement. Q: Could you address summer term teaching? A: The administration proposal was disappointing. It included a rollback of the arbitrator's ruling. There has been some movement on this issue. The latest proposal is much better.

c) Faculty Trustee Craig Smith encouraged the ASCSU to continue to be proactive in their activities. He has visited a total of 15 campuses to date and will attempt to visit the remaining eight by June. He will post his report and travel agenda next week. Make sure your campus has extended an invitation this year. In his visits he examines both positive and negative aspects of what you are experiencing on your campuses. Trustee Smith highlighted some of the wonderful things he has seen on campuses. He is also communicating a faculty desire for workload reduction to members of the Board. Some progress is being made on that issue and redefinition of merit pay. He reminded the Senate that the Board is one of the most diverse groups in education. He assured the Senate that he is monitoring the Morrow bill on student academic freedom and the Gracia bill on computer use. He was encouraged that the governor has demonstrated that the Compact is a funding floor not a ceiling. There have been significant improvements in the Compact in the last month. We should be aware that there will be an explosion in college-age students of 27% from 2005-2015 in California. For every dollar we spend on these students, we receive three dollars back in state revenue. This influx of college graduates will support the economy. All of us need to work with our contacts in the state legislature and governor's office to retain the gains we have made and to argue for new ones.

d) Hiroano Okahana (CSSA Representative) CSSA met twice since the last Senate plenary. We welcome the ASCSU representatives. We are delighted by the Governor's announcement on fees. We have a full agenda for lobbying this year. We hope to join with ASCSU in our lobbying efforts. We are awaiting a decision by the governor on the new student trustee. We are supporting the removal of age discrimination in student grants/loans. We are urging an elimination of differentials in parking fees across students, faculty and staff. We hope this will be removed from collective bargaining. The students will respond to the GE survey. Q: I am disappointed with the students' position on parking fees.

8) RESOLUTIONS

a) **Ongoing External Efforts to Shape Curricula in Institutions of Learning 2722-05/FA)** M/S Gregory/Kegley Second Reading

- i) There have been minor wording changes in the title and ordering of the resolved clauses and wording of the rationale.
 - ii) Minor wording and grammatical changes were made.
 - iii) The resolution passed unanimously.
- b) **Providing Newly Recruited Faculty with Necessary Support** (AS-2723-05/FA) M/S Gregory/Cheyne Second Reading
- i) Some of the language has been cleaned up since the first reading.
 - ii) This issue is an important one for many campuses. The lack of support for this faculty is lamentable.
 - iii) Perhaps a future resolution could deal with other categories of faculty and support for them.
 - iv) FGA has had discussions with Vice Chancellor McClain about the initiation of benefits.
 - v) The resolution passed unanimously.
- c) **California State University Chief Academic Officer** (AS-2725-05/AA) M/S Van Selst/Yee Second Reading
- i) The resolution was withdrawn without dissent due to recent developments.
- d) **Commendation for the Early Assessment Project** (AS-2726-05/TEKR) M/S Wheeler/Cates Second Reading
- i) EAP is a great example of cooperation across educational segments and institutions.
 - ii) Perhaps this resolution could be sent to presidents and provosts. The follow-up work on the campuses has been more difficult to sustain given limited resources. Could the ASCSU Chair do this?
 - iii) The resolution passed unanimously.
- e) **Support of California's Science and Mathematics Teacher Preparation Initiative** (AS-2727-05/TEKR) M/S Wheeler/Mason Second Reading
- i) It may be premature to commend anyone until the proposed program bears fruit.
 - ii) It may be politic to commend people for good efforts on behalf of our students even for partial steps towards a goal.
 - iii) Minor wording changes were incorporated.
 - iv) The resolution passed.
- f) **Amendment to the Constitution** (AS-2729-06/EX) M/S First Reading/Waiver
- i) Prior to consideration of the resolution, the body moved to a committee of the whole meeting to allow free-flowing discussion surrounding the issues addressed in the resolution.
 - ii) Several senators spoke against a waiver of the first reading. This may not be time sensitive. Changes would not take place in time to impact

next year's budget. Campuses should have a time to consider this.
Other options might be generated in the interval.

iii) For a waiver: this issue has been before us for a long time.

iv) A clarification of the time line was requested. It is unclear how elections etc. would play out.

v) The waiver request failed.

g) **Provision of E-Text Material to the CSU Center for Alternative Media**
(AS-2730-06/AA) M/S Van Selst/Pasternack First Reading

i) This resolution would have the effect of encouraging publishers to provide electronic copies of texts earlier so that materials for students with disabilities can be developed in a timely manner.

ii) Suggestions were made to perfect the resolution.

h) **The Early Assessment Program: In-service and Pre-service Programs**
(AS-2731-06/TEKR) M/S Wheeler/Caplan First Reading

i) The resolution both commends the efforts of individuals who have worked on this program to date and urges support of efforts needed in the future.

ii) Several suggestions for perfection were offered.

9) The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 am on Friday, January 27th, 2006.

STATUS OF SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The status of the resolutions that were circulated for Senate consideration at the January 26-27, 2006, meeting in Long Beach are listed below.

(1) AS-2722-05/FA	Ongoing External Efforts to Shape Curricula in Institutions of Learning	APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY
(2) AS-2723-05/FA	Providing Newly Recruited Faculty with Necessary Support	APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY
(3) AS-2726-05/TEKR	Commendation for the Early Assessment Project	APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY
(4) AS-2727-05/TEKR	Support of California's Science and Mathematics Teacher Preparation Initiative	APPROVED

The following items were introduced at the January 26-27, 2006, meeting and will be acted upon at the March 9-10, 2006, meeting.

(5) AS-2729-06/EX	Amendment to the Constitution	SECOND READING
(6) AS-2730-06/AA	Provision of E-Text Material to the CSU Center for Alternative Media	SECOND READING
(7) AS-2731-06/TEKR	The Early Assessment Program: In-Service and Pre-Service Components	SECOND READING

The following item was withdrawn from the agenda at the January 26-27, 2006, meeting (copy not included):

(8) AS-2725-05/AA	California State University Chief Academic Officer	WITHDRAWN
--------------------	--	-----------