1. **Chair's Report** Chair Postma referred us to his written report. It is appended to this report.

2. **Excerpts from Other Reports**
   a. **Academic Affairs Committee** Has several items on the agenda. The chair recognized the hard work of committee members. Are looking at the proposed Title 5 change dealing with minors. A survey of campuses' policies reveals that campuses either have, or are planning to have, their own policies.
   b. **Academic Preparation and Education Programs Committee**
      i. Has several items on the current agenda.
         1. Courtesy Recommendations to CTC (second reading)
         2. Data collection of self-identified LGBT, disability and other information after acceptance and before registration (waiver)
         3. C-ID split-decisions (waiver)
         4. Electronic Transfer of transcripts and degree progress evaluation within the CCC (waiver)
      ii. Items held over for next year.
         1. A home for academic technology within campus senate structures
         2. Intersegmental standards for math and English competencies.
         3. Letter to CCTC re: proposal for the direct acceptance of non-accredited coursework used for early childhood education.
   c. **Faculty Affairs Committee** has resolutions on the following issues.
      i. Statement on academic freedom.
      ii. Faculty profile.
      iii. Emeritus faculty,
      iv. Amending the constitution regarding academic freedom.
      v. Curricular decisions in on-line courses.
      vi. The discussed sexual abuse reporting with VC Brooks.
   d. **Fiscal & Governmental Affairs Committee**
      i. Has 3 resolutions on the agenda.
         1. Digital textbook repository.
         2. Mandatory reporting—will be withdrawn since the associated legislation has been withdrawn.
         3. Commendation for the CSUN for hosting the “Funding the Future of the CSU” conference.
      ii. Is formulating legislative strategies to recommend to next year’s committee.
      iii. Is planning a modest Legislative Day on May 17th.
      iv. Senator Hood shared concerns about some of the directions that WASC is exploring, including the Degree Qualifications Profile which has offered guidelines for the content of degrees and the “benchmarking” initiative which would have us compare our student outcomes to those of other institutions.
   e. **Faculty Trustee** Cheyne told Senators to feel free to contact her to answer any questions we may have relative to her written report or other issues. The
Trustees will be meeting next week both for the Board meeting and for two presidential selections. She called our attention to item 2 in the Committee on Finance (see Dr. Quillian’s report below). The new Board policy on presidential compensation is potentially being revised to freeze salary levels until 2014 but would explicitly allow for supplements from campus foundations. Trustee Cheyne is making an effort to visit as many campuses as she can, given the need to minimize travel costs.

f. **GE Advisory** has not met but has put the so-called SciGETC GE pattern on its agenda for next September. There will be an ITL workshop this summer on GE assessment.

g. **Cal State Online** has met and has put out an RFP for the implementation of the web site. Some Board members have concerns about budget transparency. A number of questions about governance, how we would compete with other universities, the role of the faculty senate, etc. were raised and discussed. (See Chair Postma’s report at the end for more information.)

h. **ASCSU 50th Anniversary Task Force** subcommittees reports
   i. Celebration Subcommittee
      1. Has been working with AVC Vogel
      2. Are attempting to schedule a “mini Academic Conference” along the lines of the discontinued annual event.
      3. Senator Tarjan has proposed the following speakers and format—Len Mathey, Bob Cherney, Don Gerth, Chancellor Reed, President Alexander, and Chair Linscheid. Three breakout sessions dealing with challenges, best practices to support shared governance, ideas for moving forward together during challenging times.
      4. Have reserved facilities at CSULB for a one day event on March 13, 14 or 15. Are awaiting a cost estimate from CSULB.
      5. Chancellor Reed is tentatively committed to attend. If we cannot pull off the more ambitious plan, the Chancellor’s staff has indicated he would likely host a reception during our plenary sessions.
   ii. Fundraising—Senator Pasternack is meeting with CO advancement staff and contacting local businesses.
   iii. Logo/Gear—Senator Linder is working on potential logo designs.

i. **Admissions Advisory Committee** will be meeting on May 14th.

3. We passed the following resolutions that were previously introduced at our March plenary. Copies of these and other resolutions can be found at [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/).
   a. **Recognizing the Integration of Sustainability into CSU Academic Endeavors** is a reaction to implication in a Board resolution that such efforts are not already underway.
   b. **Endorsing the Joint Statement on Academic Freedom by CSU Presidents Armstrong, Hellenbrand and Welty** reaffirms our commitment to academic
freedom, endorses the joint statement and urges the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees to also do so.

c. **Academic Senate CSU Calendar of 2012-2013 Meetings** is self-explanatory.

d. **Resolution Calling for the Issuance of an Executive Order Banning the Sale and Distribution of Tobacco Products on the Campuses of the California State University** is self-explanatory.

e. **Appointment, Confirmation and Service of Trustees to the California State University** asks for timely appointment of members of the BOT that should not be politicized.

f. **CSU Faculty Profile: Proportion of Tenure-Track/Tenured Faculty and Demographic Trends, 2001-2009 Report on Commitment 2 of the CSU Access to Excellence Strategic Plan** endorses the report which calls for an examination of our commitment to have a “plan for faculty turnover and invest in faculty excellence,” calls for increased investment in the faculty and laments our lack of progress in addressing these issues.

  
g. **Calling for the Review or Creation of Campus Policies on Emeriti Faculty** requests campuses to have policies dealing with eligibility/criteria, the conferral process, honor/privileges, and responsibilities.

h. **Resolution Opposing the Western Governors University Model for Online Education** opposes the model because of concerns over quality.

i. **Support for Accessible and Affordable Open Source Digital Textbooks—Report on Commitment 2 of the CSU Access to Excellence Strategic Plan** endorses the report which calls for an examination of our commitment to have a “plan for faculty turnover and invest in faculty excellence,” calls for increased investment in the faculty and laments our lack of progress in addressing these issues. It does not take a position on SB 1052 & SB 1053.

j. **On California State University “Courtesy Recommendations” to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing** asks for restrictions to recommending graduates of non-CSU programs for “courtesy recommendation” to the CTC.

k. **Internal ASCSU Actions Following the Disposition of Resolutions** would assign responsibility to a standing committee to follow up and report on the distribution of our resolutions requiring actions/response.

l. **Procedures for CSU Administration and Board of Trustees Responses to ASCSU Resolutions** requests a formal response and a detailed explanation when our recommendations are not followed.

m. **Procedures for Dealing With a Vote of No Confidence** calls for the establishment of an investigative committee when there is a vote of no confidence in a campus president or the Chancellor. When the recommendations of the committee do not result in the resolution of the situation, it calls for a formal Board review.

n. **Amending the Constitution of the Academic Senate of the California State University to Include a Statement Advancing Academic Freedom** is self-explanatory.

4. We passed the following resolutions without a second reading due to their time urgency/timeliness.
a. CMS—Implementation of a Data Collection Survey to Include Self-Identification of LGBT and Disability Status is self-explanatory.

b. Resolving C-ID Split Decisions calls for a process that would engender confidence to resolve issues when faculty reviewers disagree on the approval of a course outline of record.

c. Commendation and Appreciation of Dr. Herb L. Carter recognizes the long and dedicated service of outgoing Board Chair, Dr. Carter.

d. Commendation of the “Funding the Future of the CSU” Conference Hosted by California State University Northridge commends the CSUN senate for hosting the conference and encourages the repetition of similar forums across the state.

e. Re-asserting Faculty Control of Curricula Regardless of Delivery Mode is largely self-explanatory. It was deemed appropriate given developments such as the initiation of Cal State Online.

f. Support for Early Degree Progress Assessment and the Efficient and Effective Electronic Transfer of Transcripts encourages CCC districts that do not currently have the ability to electronically record and transmit transcripts to develop the ability to do so in order to benefit students, particularly by providing early degree progress reports.

g. Resolution of Commendation for Elizabeth Ambos thanks her for her service as she leaves for an important job facilitating student research in Washington, D.C.

5. Chancellor Charles Reed spends most of his time these days working on budget matters. The Board has requested options for dealing with the budget crisis to be presented next week at the Board meeting. We expect bad news on May 14th during the May Revise. Revenue will likely be down resulting in a budget shortfall of close to $14b. The Chancellor has very little idea what the implications for our budget are likely to be. The Governor’s office has not provided much indication of what they are likely to recommend. Because of the cumulative impact of previous cuts, the system is operating under a structural deficit of $400m. We know have to find a way to address both this structural deficit and an additional cut of at least $200m. We are afraid all stakeholders will be negatively impacted, including students, faculty, staff, community, etc. The proposed funding by the state will continue to be inadequate. However, we have been given more flexibility in enrollment. Funding is based on enrollment and we receive fees based on the number of students. So, reducing enrollment can be a two-edged sword. In response to a question about the Governor’s November tax initiative—it will likely appear on a future Board agenda. The campus penalties for exceeding enrollment targets are necessary because we cannot continue to take more students as a system without more funds. We do not want to become funded like a large community college. We must preserve quality and have the resources to be a university. A: We may have a slight increase in out-of-state students. They pay more. But nothing like what they are doing at the CSU. We are economizing in many ways, many of which make me nervous. We are looking every place we can to become more efficient. Our funding per student is at a 40 year low. We have 90,000 more students than when the Chancellor arrived with slightly less state funding. In response to a cited article on UC efficiencies, the Chancellor outlined some of the many initiatives we have implemented and are considering as ways to save money. In response a three-part question—we have 3000 fewer people today than we had three years ago. Staff
reductions have to be part of the equation in addressing large cuts. 82% of our spending is in payroll. Dr. Reed believes the semester calendar is more efficient. It is not a “done deal,” just like the suspension of graduate SUGs was not a done deal. There is no good justification for moving the CO operations to a campus. In response to a question on SUGs: there is a very public good from an undergraduate degree. The benefit from graduate degrees often accrues more to the individual. There is no other system that has something like a SUG for graduate students. We looked at shifting all or part of the SUG currently being given to graduate students to expand undergraduate SUGs or address our budget deficit. We are doing nothing on this front for next year. Dr. Reed discussed the burgeoning prison population, the prison payroll, etc. We spend about $8000 per student. The prison spends about $64,000 per typical inmate. We are paying astronomical sums for health care for elderly inmates who pose little risk to society.

6. **EVC Ephraim Smith** reported a meeting in which system and campus representatives discussed our progress on the Access to Success initiative. Our progress, international comparisons, best practices, etc. were discussed. We hope to convene meetings like this in the future. AB 1440 remains a focus. There is not enough attention paid to success of transfer students (most attention nationally and in the CSU historically) has been focused on native students. [Chair Postma provided operational details about the implementation of TMCs.] If there are not system TMCs that make sense, we are encouraging the development of local TMCs. We are getting evaluation data on Early Start. We are looking at EO 1037 and the possibility of charging more for course repetitions and for courses taken by “super seniors.” We are also looking at a 3rd tier of tuition fees for those students taking more than 16 units.

7. **EVC Quillian** delivered a very dismal report to the Board on the outlook for CSU finances. We have to consolidate and eliminate programs, reduce athletics, lay off thousands of employees and take other very undesirable actions. The Board charged him with bringing “every conceivable option” he could develop for the Board’s consideration next week. [http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/may12/Finance.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/may12/Finance.pdf) (Item 2) He discussed some of the undesirable impacts of both potential cost reduction and revenue enhancement (fee increase) strategies. Q: Do you have money set aside for semester conversion and will it save money? A: The main benefit will accrue to the students with regards to transfer. There may be some savings for reduced enrollment periods over the long term. It is not a done deal yet. There is not money set aside. There was much additional discussion of semester conversion. Different campuses are at different stages of the consideration of conversion process.

State revenue projections are billions short. We fear the dreaded $200m triggered cut may actually occur this fall and be deeper still. The campus CFOs have been told to plan for deeper cuts. Standard and Poor’s is looking at both the state and CSU credit ratings. We will need to make some fundamental changes in the ways we do things. Some of these changes may actually be positive and result in appropriate efficiencies.

In response to a question—we hope to avoid furloughs in the future. Furloughs was not one of the strategies he presented to the Board.
8. **John Travis, CFA Liaison** gave an update on the progress of bargaining and the outcome of the strike authorization vote.

9. **ERFA Liaison William Blischke** reported that ERFA met last at Long Beach. They reappointed Don Cameron as Executive Director. Dr. Blischke was reappointed as liaison to ASCSU for another year. Oregon is most common state outside of CA for emeriti to live. [http://www.csuerfa.org/news-views.html](http://www.csuerfa.org/news-views.html)

10. **Organizational Meeting** The following leaders were elected for the 2012-13 ASCSU.
   a. Chair—Diana Guerin, Fullerton
   b. Vice Chair—Steven Filling, Stanislaus
   c. Secretary—Glen Brodowsky, San Marcos
   d. Member-at-Large—Chris Miller, Sacramento
   e. Member-at-Large—Catherine Nelson, Sonoma

**Senate Chair’s Report – May 2012**

I don’t want this to sound like a farewell address since I’m only leaving the chair position, not the Senate, but I can’t help but be a bit sentimental at such a time and I hope the Senate can benefit from a bit of a chance to look back with the purpose of looking forward.

I’ve been fairly busy the last two months without much time to report on my various interactions, so I will take this opportunity to give brief reports from several fronts.

**The Graduation initiative**

I attended a Systemwide meeting on the Graduation Initiative on April 16. This project, with its twin goals of improving the graduation rate and closing the “achievement gap” has not involved faculty in significant ways but has involved substantial participation from student affairs staff and administration. The initiative involves tracking of and attention to the key transitions in our students’ lives where attrition occurs and attempts to identify and mitigate problems that lead to this erosion.

It is difficult to draw significant conclusions at this time as the first cohort that has been tracked is just starting to graduate and the tumultuous environment that the State’s budget has created creates a lot of “noise” in the data. It appears that the overall graduation rate has improved a bit (possible due to these efforts) but the “gap” has persisted. More attention will be devoted to those issues that impact underrepresented students differentially, but many of these require resources that are not readily available.

I know that faculty are a significant factor in students’ graduation success, but these aspects are not really being tracked in any systematic way as part of this project. Financial pressures have led to a significant reduction in the involvement of permanent faculty in the key first- and second-year GE and majors’ courses along with larger class sizes and reduced student-faculty contact. I encourage the Senate to continue to offer advice and ideas on behalf of the faculty.

**Early Start**

April included a meeting of the Early Start Task Force. The dominant work of this committee has been to oversee the immense number of logistical issues involved in the Program in order to minimize the impact on students’ time, budget, and hassle. (Note that I said “minimize” the impact; starting college with remedial needs is a major problem involving time, money, and aggravation.)

The dominant issues for faculty have occurred on the campuses as the curriculum has been designed for the effort. For the most part, coursework consists of successful models that have been used in the CSU for years, adapted to the force schedule of the ESP. In particular, the “bridge” approach in
English that has been developed by many of our campuses is being retained and expanded fit the goals of the initiative.

The Senate has passed resolutions that highlight the expectation that this project receive a thorough analysis and appropriate critique of the various efforts, with the clear understanding that the program will be modified (and even reconsidered) based on its results. I encourage the Senate’s commitment to this vigilance. It is very easy to conflate the problems caused by the need for remediation with those caused by the ESP approach to a solution. Senators have the unique background and perspective to ensure an honest evaluation.

From my perspective, the real success of the Graduation Initiative and the Early Start Program will be a consequence of the publicity that the underlying problems receive and the attention that is generated in the K-12 community (students, teachers, parents, and administrators) which leads to remedies that are instituted in these settings. I think the Senate can be a leader in these needed reforms if it devotes its time and energy to the task in a proactive way.

**Calstate Online**
The Calstate Online Board met in April as well. Its focus at the moment is the array of services needed to mount such an effort. A request for proposals has gone out and in May these will be evaluated and vendors will be chosen. As I’ve noted previously, the business plan is still embryonic, but I am proud of the efforts of the Senators on the Board to steer the structure toward one that recognizes the policies and commitments that maintain the CSU’s reputation for quality. You can read the RFP as well as the growing list of commitments from Calstate Online at its website, [http://www.calstateonline.net/](http://www.calstateonline.net/). While the various Katz reports laid out a wide range of possibilities for Calstate Online, I believe that you will find the “Guiding Principles” and the commitments listed on page 3 of the “Open Letter” begin to define Calstate Online in ways that are consistent with faculty and Senate values.

**STAR Act Implementation**

The SB 1440 Oversight Committee met in April as well. I was quadruple-booked that day but we were ably represented by Senator Boyle. The CSU curriculum efforts in evaluating the fit of the 18 TMCs continues smoothly and in ways that protect the integrity of our curriculum and faculty control of such. The Senate has earned a significantly positive reputation from this project among legislators, their staff, the Legislative Analyst’s Office, the CSU Board and campus presidents. The corresponding work in the CCCs to design AA and AS degrees from the TMC templates seems to have bogged down, as I reported previously. The necessary course review processes to accompany the degree work (the C-ID project) has also been sluggish, in some cases due to lack of CSU faculty who are willing to perform these reviews (in spite of extra, though minimal, remuneration.)

The CSU’s enrollment impaction has raised the perceived value of the STAR Act degrees but also has increased the difficulty of adding structures to accommodate the admission guarantee/priority that SB 1440 promised. The automated systems needed to execute these types of CCC-CSU transfers are not yet in place and the CCCs are lagging in their commitments to develop these structures as well.

**The CSU Alumni Association**

One of my April weekends was spent with the CSU Alumni Association at Sonoma State. I always enjoy these interactions which allow me to interact with a large group of alumni (and campus staff) who are very committed to the CSU and its mission. They had asked me to give a brief presentation on the CSU’s major initiatives: Graduation, Early Start, SB 1440, and Calstate Online, and the alumni seemed appreciative for the information. The bulk of their meeting was devoted to ways of promoting
the CSU and raising funds on our behalf. In encourage you to get to know your campus’s alumni association personnel, especially the community volunteers.

As an added bonus, I was able to join the tour of the nearly-completed Green Music Center. All I can say is, “Wow!” If you have the chance, take in a concert there.

The Senate’s Budget
The reduction is assigned time for Senators has significantly hampered Senate operations and participation the past two years and created special hardships for the committee chairs. It will be such a relief to return to a bit of normalcy (though not complete) and I am glad to have been a part of the success that we had in making the case for the role of the Senate and the need for a base level of support.

Legislative Advocacy
I spent a few days in April in Sacramento as part of various advocacy efforts for the CSU. I participated in Higher Education Advocacy Day with presidents, chancellors, board members, alumni, and faculty from the UC, CSU, and CCC. (I believe that our three Senate representatives were the only faculty participants.) ICAS (the 3 State Systems’ Senate executive committees) also spent a day interacting with legislators, legislative staff, and Legislative Analyst staff.

I’ve taken a bit of flak for supposedly overreaching my Senate role by testifying (nominally opposed) to AB 2497 (Solario) on the Early Start Program. I’ve responded to those who have challenged me directly about the situation but have heard that there are others who have spread the accusation, so I thought I should address the issue.

I did testify during the Assembly Higher Education Committee hearings on this bill (the session included 17 other bills.) It appeared that the CFA had organized the “in support” session of the hearing and they did not ask me to speak. The CSU’s Office of Governmental Relations (Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa) had organized the “opposition” section and I had responded to this invitation. Being naïve about the legislative hearing process, I did not know until I observed the hearings for the other bills that the testimony session was scheduled in such discreet “pro” and “con” blocks.

The draft of the bill that was posted on the website contained one major requirement: that the CSU could not continue the Early Start Program without an explicit appropriation by the Legislature. By the day of the hearing the bill had been modified to include only a requirement that a report on the ESP be made to the Legislature.

I think I would have been on solid ground in opposing the bill by representing the Senate’s long-standing opposition to Legislative intrusion into the CSU’s programs. Because the bill had been so significantly altered, it was awkward to be labeled as “opposed” while my testimony consisted of support for the bill and its requirement for a report to be prepared (and acknowledgement that such would happen with or without Legislative requirement.) I am guilty of the charge of testifying in the “opposed” section without an explicit Senate resolution supporting that opinion. But my actual testimony highlighted the Senate’s call for a thorough report on the Early Start Program.

In Closing
I have greatly enjoyed the role of Senate Chair and have found it educational and stimulating. I believe that I have achieved some level of success in putting forth the values and opinions of the Senate and the CSU faculty and this has provided most of the satisfaction I’ve received from serving. I’ve joked that my main legacy will be described as, “well it could have been a lot worse” but I believe there is more to show for the efforts than just that. Time will tell.