

## Senate Chair's Report – September 2011

### The CSU Budget and the Senate's Budget

We will be receiving a budget report at the plenary on the State and the CSU budget situation and plans. I will leave those issues to EVC Quillian and AVC Turnage.

As I reported in my June 12 e-mail to Senators, we have made a series of changes to the Senate's budget in an attempt to preserve our operations, including assigned-time allocations for 2<sup>nd</sup>-year and beyond Senators. These changes include:

- Eliminating of summer stipends for Executive Committee members.
- Returning assigned-time allocations for committee chairs to historical values.
- Converting all interim meetings to virtual formats.
- Scheduling later start times for the first meetings of our plenary sessions to minimize the need for overnight stays.
- Limiting lodging reimbursements to \$120 per person per night.
- Eliminating reimbursement for Hotel Occupancy Taxes.
- Encouraging Senators to utilize all reasonable cost-cutting strategies.

Even with those steps, there is no guarantee that we can hold to our current budget. That uncertainty, coupled with the potential for mid-year budget cuts, led us to the structure where only fall allocations of assigned-time were sent to campuses. The situation will require a reevaluation to occur after our November plenary.

### Summer Activities

The elimination of summer stipends for Executive Committee members was made with the understanding that their summer Senate work would be minimized and the chair, who is on a 12-month contract, would attempt to fill in as possible. By my count, that has included 53 meetings over the summer; mercifully, some of these were teleconference meetings. The CSU major initiatives, especially SB 1440 Implementation have come under heavy scrutiny by the Legislature, so many of the meetings, such as hearings help by Senator Padilla and inquiries by the Legislative Analyst's Office, were in the context of these efforts.

### Early Start

Most of the "plumbing" issues for the Early Start Initiative have been designed and are being integrated into our database (CMS) and admission (CSU Mentor) systems. For the most part, the curriculum for the program will be an adaptation of the currently-used curriculum at each campus to the structure imposed by the Early Start Initiative (<http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1048.html> and <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/EarlyStart/docs/EarlyStartGuidelines92910.pdf>). Since the design of the Initiative was designated to the individual campuses, each campus' plan has its

own flavor ([http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/EarlyStart/docs/ES\\_SummaryofPlans.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/EarlyStart/docs/ES_SummaryofPlans.pdf)) and the major role of the System and the oversight committee is the campus-to-campus coordination required for implementation. Senators should query their local administrators and the math and English faculty who are developing and adapting the curriculum regarding their challenges and plans. Assessment and evaluation plans are being developed locally and systemwide and I encourage APEP especially to oversee these developments.

### SB 1440 Implementation

We've made a remarkable amount of progress on the implementation of SB 1440, especially on the curriculum issues, mostly because of the CSU and CCC senates' creation of the statewide Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC.) A total of 16 disciplines (Communication Studies, Psychology, Sociology, Mathematics, Administration of Justice/Criminal Justice, Art History, Business, Early Childhood Education, English, Geology, History, Kinesiology, Physics, Political Science, Studio Arts, and Theatre. See [www.c-id.net](http://www.c-id.net) for more details.) A few more (Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Music, and Teacher Preparation) are nearing completion. Next month faculty in 11 other disciplines will gather to begin work on the next set (Radio/Television/Film, Engineering, Journalism, Anthropology, Information Systems, Spanish, Philosophy, Geography, Nursing, Social Work, and Economics.)

The approval of a TMC then triggers two processes: the design of CCC campus versions of the transfer AA (or AS) degrees that link to the TMC and the CSU approval of the TMC as "similar." Over 100 such AA degrees have been approved by the CCC Chancellor's Office and about 85% of the first three TMCs have received "similar" designation by the CSU campuses. Decisions on the next 13 are due within the month.

The work of reviewing the courses that are used in the TMCs is in progress and during the fall the CSU campuses will be working on a process of "getting to yes" for the approved TMCs, so the work is still significant and will continue all of the coming year. A piece of good news is that the CSU and CCC have received a \$1 million grant from Complete College America (<http://www.completecollege.org/>.) Some of those funds are allocated to our Senate to pay for the work that otherwise come from the Senate budget allocations.

I've heard about some pockets of misunderstanding about the American Institutions issue and thought that I'd try to clarify what The Board of Trustees did (and did not) approve at their July meeting. The context for waiving the AI requirement is so limited that few of you are likely to deal with the issue during your career as a Senator or a faculty member.

The context: SB 1440 (Padilla), now the *STAR Act*, California Education Code section 66746, placed a very restrictive 120-unit cap on a specific set of CSU baccalaureate degrees that must be offered to California Community College transfer students who have obtained a Transfer-AA (or AS) degree prior to transfer. The community college campuses are in the process of designing the AA degrees, and as that occurs, the CSU departments are evaluating the corresponding BA degree to see if it can "fit" the STAR structure. In 85-90% of the cases so far the answer has been "yes" and no further CSU curriculum work is required. In the cases where a fit was imperfect, most had to do with the choice of courses in the linked degrees but it was anticipated that there **might be cases** where the cap on units would be the blockage.

The possibility for requesting a waiver of the AI requirement that the Board approved (delineated in Executive Order 1061, <http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1061.html>) is limited to this narrow

#### CSU Campuses

Bakersfield

Channel Islands

Chico

Dominguez Hills

East Bay

Fresno

Fullerton

Humboldt

Long Beach

Los Angeles

Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay

Northridge

Pomona

Sacramento

San Bernardino

San Diego

San Francisco

San José

San Luis Obispo

San Marcos

Sonoma

Stanislaus

context (and a few other unit-restricted contexts) and envisions a process such as we use for the similar waivers of other graduation requirements, such a General Education waivers. When a Transfer-AA degree comes to a CSU department and it is determined that it does not fit into the STAR Act structure, the faculty of that department can consider a wide array of mechanisms for linking their BA to the T-AA within the imposed unit limitation. Options include:

- Reducing the number of elective units,
- Reducing the units required in the major,
- Moving required classes from upper to lower-division to accommodate the T-AA,
- Require double counting of the AI courses with the major course requirements,
- Require double counting of the AI courses with upper-division GE requirements,
- Reduce the number of units in campus-specific requirements,
- Double count AI with campus-specific requirements, and/or
- Request a waiver of the AI requirements.

Note that the AI waiver is only one of several alternatives for “getting to Yes” in this context. Also note that it would be the discipline faculty who would suggest the specific strategy for meeting the degree requirements and then that proposal would move through the normal curriculum-approval processes. (Prior to the July Board action, the above list would have one fewer entry.)

I may also be worth mentioning that this response to the STAR Act is a “paper exercise.” Community college transfer students overwhelmingly meet the AI requirement prior to transfer by taking the AI courses and “double-counting” them as lower-division General Education requirements and this pattern is expected to continue. Campuses only need to show that the STAR requirements can be met; we need not control student choice or real-world behavior.

None of the comments above are intended to minimize concerns about Legislative intrusion into our curriculum or complaints about limited faculty consultation on the issue. I just want the concerns and complaints to be properly informed. I'm sorry that I cannot be present today to respond to questions or other concerns.

### **The Online Initiative**

The Technology Steering Committee (TSC,) a presidents' panel, has been exploring a significant expansion of the CSU's online education efforts. They have been quite private with their deliberations, including little communication with the Academic Technology Steering Committee (ATSC) which has significant Senate and Academic Affairs representation. The Senate was involved with the consultant, Richard Katz, at our May plenary and a draft his report (<http://its.calstate.edu/onlinelearning/documents/CSUOptions.pdf>) has just recently been made available, yet it reveals options and not a specific plan. The search for an Executive Director has commenced, with Senate representation on the search committee. This person will be responsible for forming a CSU plan from the various reports.

I bring this issue to Senators attention to highlight the significant role that the faculty and the Senate play in upholding the quality and integrity of our academic programs and course offerings. And with that recognition, to encourage our active involvement

#### **CSU Campuses**

Bakersfield

Channel Islands

Chico

Dominguez Hills

East Bay

Fresno

Fullerton

Humboldt

Long Beach

Los Angeles

Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay

Northridge

Pomona

Sacramento

San Bernardino

San Diego

San Francisco

San José

San Luis Obispo

San Marcos

Sonoma

Stanislaus